

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 29 AUGUST 1963

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

upon two youths whilst walking along a suburban street, will he insist on the full vigour of the law being invoked against these bodgie gangs of hoodlums?

Answer:—

“As late as the 21st instant the Commissioner of Police issued a directive to all District Officers of Police and Officers in Charge of Police Stations to take firm and positive action, within legal limits, with a view to the total elimination of the unlawful activities of young people, even to the extent of members of the Police Force in appropriate circumstances exercising lawfully the power of arrest conferred by law. Further, the Commissioner of Police has instructed that where a person by his conduct indicates that he is, in the operation of his own vehicle, a menace to law abiding road users by his disregard of the provisions of the Traffic Acts and Regulations, that that person is to be called upon to show cause why his Driver's Licence should not be cancelled or suspended.”

DISMISSAL OF EMPLOYEES, BEERBURRUM FORESTRY AREA.—Mr. Duggan, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Agriculture and Forestry,—

Is it true that a large number of forestry workers are to be dismissed soon in the Beerburrum forestry area? If so, will he give an estimate of the numbers involved in these dismissals and from what date or dates these dismissals will be effective?

Answer:—

“Of a total of 146 men employed on reforestation works in the Beerburrum Forestry Sub-District as at July 31, 1963, it is estimated that twenty-eight men will be dismissed. Of these, twenty-one are being given notice of dismissal effective as from September 4, 1963, and one effective as from September 6, 1963. Because of the limits of the productive work available, it will be necessary to dismiss a further six men about the end of September.”

DOCTORS ON NAMBOUR HOSPITAL STAFF.—Mr. Duggan, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health and Home Affairs,—

(1) How many doctors were on the staff of the Nambour Hospital at (a) June 30, 1963, and (b) June 30, 1957?

(2) Is it true that official outpatient hours at that hospital have been reduced by ten hours a week during that period?

(3) Is the present staffing position such that patients attending the outpatients' department are often forced to wait long hours for attention and often have to leave before a doctor is available?

THURSDAY, 29 AUGUST, 1963

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

QUESTIONS

PUBLIC HOSPITAL FACILITIES AT INALA.—Mr. Sherrington, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health and Home Affairs,—

Has he any plan for the construction of public hospital facilities in the outer suburbs and, if so, has the Inala area been given consideration?

Answer:—

“Following recommendations made by the Special Committee appointed by me to investigate and advise me in regard to hospital building priorities and generally in respect to overall hospital requirements consideration is now being given to the selection of suitable hospital sites in outer Brisbane suburbs including the Inala area.”

SUPPRESSION OF BODGIE GANGS.—Mr. Dean, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

In view of the newspaper report that the hoodlum menace is rapidly growing in Queensland and the recent vicious attack

Answers:—

(1) "Three Medical Officers were employed at the Nambour Hospital at June 30, 1957, and two were employed at June 30, 1963."

(2) "Yes. As a result of the medical staff shortage the outpatient hours at the hospital were reduced by ten hours a week. An Ante Natal Clinic is held on Fridays from 1 p.m. to 4 p.m."

(3) "Yes. The Board is advertising in an endeavour to fill the two vacancies, and every possible effort will be made in that direction. The overall position regarding availability of Medical Officers is expected to have improved by the early part of next year."

RUNNING TIMES, BRISBANE-CAIRNS MAIL TRAIN.—Mr. Graham, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport,—

(1) In view of his reluctance to give details with regard to the late running of the Brisbane-Cairns mail will he, in fairness to the many passengers who travel on this train, have some enquiries made to ascertain the reasons why this train consistently arrives in Mackay behind time?

(2) Is he satisfied that every effort is being made by the Department to try to keep this train on schedule between Rockhampton and Mackay?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "I have already arranged for an investigation of the late running of the Brisbane to Cairns *Sunlander* train with the view of obviating, as far as possible, the delays which have occurred, but which I understand are due in a large measure to work being carried out in connection with the improvements of the track necessitating running at limited speeds over a considerable number of sections on which such work is being undertaken. This has the effect on the long single line of track of disorganising the crossing of trains, and the position is considerably aggravated by reason of the heavy traffic at present being dealt with."

HOUSING COMMISSION HOUSES, MACKAY ELECTORATE.—Mr. Graham, pursuant to notice, asked The Treasurer,—

As no Housing Commission houses have been built in the Electorate of Mackay since the present Government came into office in 1957, will he include the Mackay Electorate in the allocation of Housing Commission expenditure in 1963-1964?

Answer:—

"At July 31 last only eight rental applications of any priority were held by the Clerk of Petty Sessions, Mackay, for both North and South Mackay. This number of applications in relation to the pool of ninety-two State Rental Homes in Mackay

is considered too low to warrant the construction at this stage of further houses, other than to meet specific purchase or loan applications. Since August, 1957, twenty-six houses have been completed in South Mackay, including one on the applicant's land, and twenty-four in North Mackay, including nine on the applicants' land."

TOTALISATOR ADMINISTRATION BOARD PREMISES.—Mr. Newton, pursuant to notice, asked The Treasurer,—

(1) What is the number of Totalisator Administration Board shops now operating in the State and of this number how many are (a) owned and (b) rented by the Board?

(2) Of the number rented how many eventually will be replaced by purchasing or building shops?

Answers:—

(1) "One hundred and eighteen T.A.B. Agencies were operating in Queensland as at August 24, 1963. None of the premises in which these Agencies are conducted are owned by the Totalisator Administration Board."

(2) "I am advised that the Board has not contemplated the purchase or building of Agency premises."

DELAYS TO BRISBANE-CAIRNS MAIL TRAINS THROUGH DERAILMENTS.—Mr. Newton, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport,—

How many times have the Brisbane-Cairns and Cairns-Brisbane mail trains been held up due to derailments and faulty rolling stock during the period January 1 to July 31, 1963?

Answer:—

"To extract the information sought by the Honourable Member relating to delays which have resulted to these mail trains due to what he has described as faulty rollingstock, would necessitate a check being made of every train service north and south over the 1,043 miles between Brisbane and Cairns for the seven months' period mentioned. This would involve considerable hours of research and substantial expenditure which I do not consider could be justifiably incurred."

ROSS RIVER HIGH SCHOOL, TOWNSVILLE.—

(a) Mr. Aikens, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) Will the first unit of the Ross River High School, for which approval has been granted, be completed in time for the opening of the 1964 school-year?

(2) How many students will it accommodate?

(3) Why is it to be called the Ross River High School in view of the fact that it is situated on Monkey Island and nowhere near Ross River?

(4) How many secondary school students will be enrolled under the new system in Townsville at the commencement of the 1964 school-year and what provision will be made to accommodate them?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "Approximately 350."

(3) "It is proposed to establish a separate technical college in the existing high school as soon as accommodation is provided on the Monkey Island site. 'Ross River High School' is only a temporary name adopted until the transfer of all high school students to the new school has been effected. The new school on Monkey Island will then be known as the Townsville State High School."

(4) "2,220. Of these, 625 will attend the Townsville State High School, 1,245 will be served by the High School at Pimlico and 350 will go to the new school."

(b) Mr. Tucker, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

In view of the fact that the new high school site in Townsville is referred to departmentally as the Ross River High School, will he give an assurance that, when all elements of the Townsville State High School are transferred to the new site, the name Townsville State High School will be retained in order to preserve the identity, character, colours and traditions of this great school?

Answer:—

"The Honourable Member's inquiry is covered by the answer to the previous question."

COMMUNAL TELEVISION ANTENNAE FOR HOUSING COMMISSION FLATS, TOWNSVILLE.—Mr. Tucker, pursuant to notice, asked The Treasurer,—

As television station TNQ 7, Townsville, has now been telecasting for almost a year, will he issue instructions for the immediate erection of a communal television antenna at or adjoining the ninety-six Housing Commission flats in Bundock Street, Townsville, in order that tenants might avail themselves of this form of entertainment and education?

Answer:—

"Television was not available in the Townsville area when the contract for erection of these buildings was let but provision was made in the construction for conduits to convey the necessary co-axial cable to each flat. Tenders were subsequently called for the design and provision of suitable antennae including connection

to all flats. The tenders and designs received were submitted to the Television Branch of the Postmaster General's Department for advice and on 26th instant I approved the acceptance of the tender of Sonor T.V. Services. This firm expects to complete the installation in eight weeks."

ADDITIONAL SICK LEAVE FOR RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.—Mr. Tucker, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport,—

(1) How many Railway employees with over twenty-six years continuous and meritorious service, who have exhausted their sick leave provided under the Award, have been granted additional sick leave and how many have unsuccessfully applied for this concession?

(2) Are the unsuccessful applicants given specific reasons for the refusal and have they any right of appeal against the Commissioner's decision and, if so, to whom?

Answers:—

(1) "Two hundred and sixty-three applications have been granted. Nine applications have been declined."

(2) "I would point out to the Honourable Member that I have already informed him by correspondence in relation to a particular case that additional leave is allowed only to persons who have had meritorious service, and if any application be refused the applicant could be expected to be fully aware of the fact that his service has not been meritorious. However, he always has the right to specially represent his case to the Commissioner, either through his Head of Branch or through his Union."

COST OF BOOKLET TITLED "ACHIEVEMENT".—Mr. Sherrington, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

(1) What was the cost associated with the production of the booklet titled "Achievement"?

(2) What was the number of copies printed and what was the general field of distribution of copies?

Answers:—

(1) "£1,068 5s. 9d."

(2) "9,950 copies were printed. The field of distribution included all members of the Queensland Parliament, all Queensland members of the Federal Parliament, the Agent-General for Queensland, political organisations, trade and diplomatic representatives throughout Australia and Commonwealth representatives in overseas countries. Copies were also included with other general literature on the State to interstate, New Zealand, and overseas inquiries seeking information about Queensland."

HOUSING OF ABORIGINES AT CLONCURRY, MOUNT ISA AND DAJARRA.—Mr. Inch, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) Has any recent investigation been made by departmental officers into the living conditions of aborigines quartered at (a) the Cloncurry Aboriginal Transit Camp and (b) the Dajarra Native Reserve?

(2) If so, what is the result of these investigations and what recommendations have been submitted to the Department for the overall improvement of the squalid conditions under which these unfortunate people are housed at present?

(3) If no investigation has been made of the conditions existing at the aforementioned Camp and Reserve, when can it be expected that such investigation will be carried out?

(4) Has the Cloncurry Shire Council Health Inspector the right to enter the Dajarra Native Reserve for the purpose of inspecting and reporting on all sanitation facilities at this Reserve?

Answer:—

“An officer of the Department of Native Affairs is now on a visit to Cloncurry, Mount Isa and Dajarra. The Honourable Member is assured that the Department will take whatever action may be deemed necessary upon consideration of that officer’s report.”

SUPREME COURT ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

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

Debate resumed from 28 August (see p. 106) on Mr. Munro’s motion—

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Supreme Court Acts, 1861 to 1961, in certain particulars.”

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (11.24 a.m.), in reply: I had expected that there might be some further debate on the Bill this morning, but, as there is not, I will take this opportunity of continuing the very brief reply I began yesterday before moving that progress be reported.

Mr. Aikens: The member for South Brisbane was going to talk but he is at a court again this morning instead of being in the Chamber.

Mr. MUNRO: That is unfortunate, because the hon. member for South Brisbane might have been able to make a useful contribution to the debate; but in his absence I will continue my reply to the matters that I dealt with to some slight extent yesterday.

I confined my remarks then to certain statements that had been made by the hon. member for Townsville South.

Following that, and because of the remarks of the hon. member for Townsville South, which were very largely a repetition of things that he had said on 20 August when the House met for the appointment of a Speaker, I feel that I can best supplement what I said yesterday by reading some brief quotations from a letter dated 21 August, 1963, addressed to the Editor of “The Courier-Mail”, Brisbane, by Mr. J. A. Douglas, the Acting President of the Bar Association of Queensland. The substance of this letter was published in that newspaper and I propose only to read certain extracts from it. I do so because, although it has been published in “The Courier-Mail” there is no reference to it in “Hansard”, and I think it desirable, so as to have matters clearly in their proper perspective, that these particular references should be recorded in “Hansard”.

The major portion of the letter deals with three particular matters. They are the question of unjustified attacks on members of the judiciary, an allegation that a Court of Criminal Appeal was hand-picked, and an allegation that members of the judiciary are appointed for political reward. On the question of what should be the attitude of this Parliament to what might be regarded as unjustified attacks on members of the judiciary, I quote the following extract from this letter written by Mr. J. A. Douglas—

Mr. Aikens: That letter would be purely his personal opinion.

Mr. MUNRO: No. I shall read what he said. The letter reads—

“On the assumption that Mr. Aikens’ speech is accurately reported in your newspaper, the Committee of the Bar Association directs me to state that they strongly deprecate what they regard as an unjustified attack on those members of the judiciary who were members of the Court of Criminal Appeal. Mr. Aikens’ attack seems to have been made under the cloak of privilege and has been made in circumstances where it is obvious that the members of the judiciary attacked have no practical way of adequately defending themselves.

“The charges are of such a nature that although they are not levelled at this Association or any member of it, this Association feels that it has a public duty to answer in detail the statements attributed to Mr. Aikens.”

The letter then goes on to discuss some of those points in detail. I read that quotation because I have no desire to be in any way personal in my references to the hon. member for Townsville South or any other member of this Parliament, but, by virtue of the position that I hold as a Minister for the Crown, I have also a public duty and I do not propose to shirk that duty on this or any other occasion.

Mr. Aikens: Do you suggest that I should shirk my duty?

Mr. MUNRO: No.

Mr. Aikens: Then what are you beefing about?

Mr. MUNRO: I have made it clear on a number of occasions that I shall do my utmost at all times to protect the rights of the hon. member in the carrying out of his duties, but that should be done with due regard to established practices.

I do not think that what I say will be irrelevant to this debate, because we are discussing judges and their salaries, if I point out the basic reason why members of the judiciary are regarded as being in a different position from members of the public or even members of Parliament or public servants.

Mr. Aikens: Don't you think that statement reeks of social snobbery?

Mr. MUNRO: No, I do not.

To continue, the basic reason for the difference is this—and the hon. member for Townsville South knows it as well as I do: that there are important different arms of government, and two of those are (1) the Parliament, and (2) the judiciary. It is very important that neither of those should be in any way subservient to the other, and for that reason I think it is a cardinal duty of each one of us to see that we protect the basic principle of the complete independence of the judiciary, which is such an important part of our British system of justice.

Mr. Aikens: But independence does not mean that they should be completely absolved from criticism.

Mr. MUNRO: No.

Mr. Aikens: You think they should be.

Mr. MUNRO: No; but I point out that provision is made in our Standing Orders for a procedure—

Mr. Aikens: Now you are quibbling. You know very well that such a motion would never be debated. It never has been debated, and it never will be debated.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MUNRO: Thank you, Mr. Hooper. I was going to remark that I do not in the least mind interjections, but, as I have mentioned on other occasions, I would appreciate it if the hon. member who is interjecting would wait till the conclusion of a sentence because if a member persists in interjecting in the middle of a sentence, it becomes very difficult for anybody else to follow what is being said.

To proceed with the quotation from this letter written by the Acting President of the Bar Association of Queensland, I shall now deal with the second matter, namely, the

allegation that the Court of Criminal Appeal was hand-picked—a very serious allegation indeed. The letter says—

“Mr. Aikens is reported as saying ‘The Court of Criminal Appeal was ‘hand-picked’ when Watson’s appeal came off.’”

Mr. Aikens: Will you read on?

Mr. MUNRO: Yes.

Mr. Aikens: Good. He admits it. This man admits that it was.

Mr. MUNRO: That is a case with which we are familiar. The letter goes on to say—

“Watson was convicted at Cairns on the 2nd September 1959. The listing of matters in the Supreme Court of Queensland is determined by a calendar which is gazetted yearly. This calendar lists the particular Judges who will sit in particular jurisdictions at stated times. The calendar for the year 1960, after being settled by the Judges, was approved by the Executive Council of Queensland in Brisbane on the 3rd December 1959 prior to publication in the Queensland Government Gazette of the 5th December 1959. Watson had not then appealed. A perusal of the said calendar indicates that the Judges who constituted the Court of Criminal Appeal which heard Watson’s appeal were the Judges, who, according to the said calendar, would be the only Judges available to constitute such Court.”

That is the end of the quotation referring to that particular matter. I do not think that any further comment is necessary.

The third allegation was that members of the judiciary are appointed for political reward.

Mr. Aikens: And so they are.

Mr. MUNRO: I did deal with that point yesterday with reference to two particular members of the judiciary who were mentioned by the hon. member for Townsville South, in one case by name, in one case by clear implication in the words that he used.

Mr. Aikens: I will give you two by name—Wanstall and Hart.

Mr. MUNRO: I replied generally yesterday in regard to appointments to the judiciary of persons who have at some time or other been members of this Parliament. I ask the Committee whether any member would contend that a barrister who had become eminent in his profession should be regarded as being disqualified from holding the office of a judge merely because at some time he had been a member of this Parliament.

Mr. Aikens: Now you are hedging.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the hon. member for Townsville South that continued interjections are not allowed. I ask him to refrain from continually interjecting—he had an opportunity to speak—and to allow the Minister to continue his reply.

Mr. MUNRO: I think I made it clear that such a suggestion would be completely untenable.

With reference to the third allegation, again I quote from this letter, and this, fortunately, does refer to the case of Mr. Justice Wanstall, with another. The quotation is—

“Mr. Aikens is further reported as stating that . . .”

This was referring to the Court of Criminal Appeal—

“ . . . it included Mr. Justice Wanstall and Mr. Justice Stable who had been appointed for political reward.’ This is offensive to the members of the Bar Association of Queensland. At the time of their respective appointments to the Bench, these judges were both members of this association in good standing, and, from a point of view of practice, were leading members of the Bar of Queensland and were logical choices for the office.”

Mr. Aikens: I do not deny that, but just the same they were political appointees.

Mr. MUNRO: If they were the logical appointees on the basis of their professional qualifications and professional standing, why should they be regarded as having been appointed for political reward?

Mr. Aikens: Why should you deny it?

Mr. MUNRO: The hon. member’s interjection condemns him because it is quite clear that that was not the basis of the appointments. I may say that since we have been in power there have been, I think from memory, something like 10 appointments to the judiciary, Supreme Court and District Court, and I should say that in every case, according to the proper standards of the Supreme Court and the District Court, we have been fortunate in being able to obtain outstanding men for those appointments. I think Queensland can be very proud of the standing of its judiciary.

I do not want to take up any more time on that matter, but because these things have been said in the Chamber, it becomes my responsibility to reply to them.

Returning now to some of the points that may be regarded as more directly relevant to the Bill, there have been references to delays in court hearings. I concede that this is something that is relevant to the Bill when we are proposing to increase the salaries of members of the judiciary. We will all completely agree on the desirability of having all cases dealt with as expeditiously as possible. To follow up my previous remarks about the independence of the judiciary, surely it will be realised that, as between the Executive Government and the judiciary, the arrangements for handling cases are a matter for the judiciary, not for the Executive Government. It is not our responsibility, or my responsibility, to attempt to direct

members of the judiciary on how they should carry out the duties of their highly responsible office and I would not attempt to do so.

Mr. Aikens: Then do you admit that you do not care whether they work or not?

Mr. MUNRO: No, that is a different matter. I am very, very concerned with that subject, but it would be quite improper for me to attempt to direct any member of the judiciary as to the manner in which he should carry out his duties. The office of judge of the Supreme Court is a very high one in this State; it is an office of even greater responsibility than that of member of Parliament. It is an office of trust and responsibility. We have gone to great pains to select the very best men available to carry out these duties, and having done that we repose our trust in them. I feel that that trust will not have been misplaced.

Mr. Aikens: Why is it that, despite the additional number of appointments to the Supreme Court and District Court benches, the time lag for cases is still as bad as, if not worse than, it was before these appointments were made?

Mr. MUNRO: It is very easy to answer that by saying that the time lag is not worse than it was before the appointments were made.

Mr. Walsh: I should like you to give some figures on that.

Mr. MUNRO: I do not think one can give precise figures on this. I noted the remarks of the hon. member for Bundaberg. As is usual, he made a very useful and thoughtful contribution to the debate, but at the same time I do not accept his invitation to place statistics on this matter before the Committee.

Mr. Walsh: Every member of the Committee should be concerned that there are nearly 20 reserved judgments in the case of one judge.

Mr. MUNRO: We are very concerned about it, but there may be particular reasons for a judge’s reserving judgments. I am not in a position to form or express an opinion about that. As I have already said, there was much sound common sense in a number of the remarks of the hon. member for Bundaberg, but on the other hand we just cannot provide statistics that would be of any value. Cases that come before the Supreme Court are not like eggs that can be graded and counted statistically by the dozen. One case might take as long as 12 or 15 other cases. Mere statistics as to the number of cases would not lead us anywhere.

Mr. Walsh: Do you think there is justification for reserving a decision for nearly two years?

Mr. MUNRO: I should say that that would be a most extraordinary state of affairs. I think it is regrettable. I feel that it would be the objective of every

member of the judiciary to clean up reserved judgments as quickly as possible. If I were doing the job, after having heard the evidence I should want to make my decision and give my judgment as quickly as I could. I would realise how very much more difficult it would be to give judgment and the reasons for it even after one month than if I gave it very shortly after the case had been heard. Every judge would know that. Judgment would not be reserved unless there were good reasons for it.

Mr. Walsh: Apart from the public aspect of it, litigants have to be considered, too.

Mr. MUNRO: Yes. I am glad that the hon. member mentioned litigants. Bear in mind that although I have said that, between the Executive and the judiciary, the responsibility for the arrangement of court procedures is a matter for the judiciary, do not let us argue for one moment that, because there may be an unusual delay in a particular case, it is due to some delay on the part of the judiciary or to the fact that a judge is not available. It must be remembered, particularly with Supreme Court cases, that there are all sorts of preliminary proceedings in the nature of interrogatories and so on, which very often take a period of months. If the legal representative of either party is dilatory in carrying out these preliminary procedures, or if one party to the action adopts delaying tactics, or even if the person who is initiating the action is not anxious to have it brought forward, then there are very considerable delays and you have a statistical position which is not in any way the responsibility either of this Executive or members of the judiciary.

Mr. Walsh: Very often these delays prevent Parliament from discussing matters of a public nature that it should discuss.

Mr. MUNRO: While it is a matter for regret if that is the position, I am sure it would be the objective of all members of the judiciary, as far as possible, to avoid such an occurrence.

To continue my reply to the interjection of the hon. member for Townsville South, let me say that when we took over the responsibility of government in 1957, there was a much greater lag in court cases. There was much more congestion in the Supreme Court at that time than there is today.

Mr. Walsh: Having said that, you must have some figures, so why not give us the figures?

Mr. MUNRO: We knew the periods of delay. Many of these things are not just a matter of arithmetic. There must be a careful consideration of all the relevant circumstances. I should say that in 1957 the strength of our Supreme Court bench was not adequate to deal with the business coming before it. We have substantially increased that strength and, at present, I should say it is adequate, although only barely adequate,

to meet the requirements. That is the substance of the position. At present, due to passing circumstances, the position is somewhat acute. That is due to the fact that, unfortunately, one member of the judiciary is overseas, and the Chief Justice is acting as Administrator of the State and is therefore unable to carry out his normal duties as Chief Justice.

Mr. Walsh: And another was on the wool committee for about nine months,

Mr. MUNRO: That was some time ago. At present another member is carrying out duties as chairman of the Committee of Inquiry into the Sugar Industry.

Mr. Aikens: Some delay is caused by greedy barristers taking too many briefs. The Bar Association does nothing about that. You might suggest that the gentleman who wrote that letter should take some action in that regard.

Mr. MUNRO: That is really not relevant to the question of judicial salaries although, to some extent, it is perhaps relevant to the matters that we have discussed.

In relation to the lag, I will complete my remarks by saying that we have done everything reasonably practicable to meet this passing problem. We have increased the permanent staff of the judiciary by one, in addition to what we regarded as the normal requirements. We knew that two members of the judiciary would be absent at the same time, and when it became known to us that a third member would be absent we made an acting appointment. Therefore, in this matter the Executive has met its responsibility.

Mr. Aikens: Are you satisfied that every judge is doing a reasonable amount of work?

Mr. MUNRO: My time is getting on and I cannot take up further time in discussing that matter.

Referring now to the basic point of the Bill, that is, relativity, I pointed out in my opening remarks that, while relativity must be the basic consideration, it is possible to consider it with considerably different backgrounds, and, when that is done, differing conclusions may be arrived at according to the particular background that is taken. I think the main attack on the amount proposed for the salary increase in the Bill was made by the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Townsville South, both of whom quoted figures. Quite naturally, the Leader of the Opposition selected the period during which this Country Party-Liberal Government has been in office. He quoted figures showing the increase in the salaries of members of the judiciary during that period compared with the increases granted to people in other occupations. The hon. member for Townsville South went a little further; he went back to 1944. He gave, perhaps, a fairly logical reason for selecting 1944, because I understand that was

the year he joined this Parliament. However, I feel bound to say that although both those comparisons may be arithmetically correct—and I have not had an opportunity to check them—they are misleading. That was not intentional in any way, because the effect of a comparison depends wholly on where one starts.

As regards 1957, I will just say in general terms that, when we examined this matter upon taking office, we found that there had been some neglect in giving justice to the members of the judiciary in their salaries. We found that in relation to many other people as well. Whenever we have found an injustice we have endeavoured to correct it.

Mr. Houston: On what figure did you base the finding that it was an injustice?

Mr. MUNRO: I can illustrate that largely by a comparison with what has been paid by other States as well as by the Commonwealth.

The choice of 1944 by the hon. member for Townsville South, while no doubt purely accidental, is very important. I have previously drawn attention to the fact that in earlier years there was a great lack of attention to revision of judicial salaries while, with some few exceptions—including perhaps members of Parliament but I will not argue about that—other members of the community had their remuneration increased. There is the significant fact that in 1874 the salary of judges was fixed at £2,000 per annum, and there was no increment until 1944, when it was increased by £250. That is rather extreme; it goes back a long way, covering a period of 70 years—notwithstanding the fact that during that time there had been decreases in the purchasing power of the pound.

Mr. Aikens: The workers' wages were fairly static over that period, too.

Mr. MUNRO: They had increases to some extent, but for 70 years there was no adjustment to judges' salaries.

Mr. Duggan: That is a valid comment, but wouldn't you agree that that applied generally throughout Australia; it was not peculiar to Queensland?

Mr. MUNRO: That might have applied throughout Australia. I am not going to argue now that we should take £2,000 in 1874 as the basis and calculate today's monetary equivalent, because I think we should then arrive at an astronomical figure. I am not using that £2,000 in 1874 as a basis at all because it is very likely that it would be out of harmony with our present-day thinking. I think the disparity between the salary of judges in 1874 and the wage of the ordinary working man was too great and was something that should be corrected. But I mention that to illustrate the point that, if you are making comparisons over a

period of years, the conclusion that you arrive at depends entirely on the period that you take for the comparison.

The two comparisons already given have been rather interesting—I have just thrown in another one—and I can sum them up by saying that I do not think any one of the three—that given by the Leader of the Opposition, the one given by the hon. member for Townsville South, or mine—is of any material help in the consideration of this problem. As I indicated earlier, there are quite a lot of surrounding circumstances and matters of this kind that have to be considered very carefully on their merits.

I had hoped to have time to give some particulars of comparisons with the other States; but I did comment, while the Leader of the Opposition was speaking, that one of the figures I heard him quote was incorrect. It was one that I happened to hear as I had this table in front of me. It was the figure of the remuneration of judges of the Supreme Court of South Australia, which, according to the latest information I have, is £5,500, not £5,000. The main reason why I made that interjection was that, like the statistics that the hon. member for Bundaberg asks for, a correct comparison cannot be made without a consideration of all the surrounding circumstances. In some States, South Australia in particular, there are not two types of judges. There are no District Courts in South Australia, and judges there are not strictly comparable with our Supreme Court or District Court judges.

Mr. Walsh: I hope you are not relying on "The Courier-Mail" for your information, because they said that members of Parliament gave themselves salary increases three years ago.

Mr. MUNRO: That is incorrect. Salaries were considered at that time by a tribunal. Ordinary members received no salary increases, although there were some adjustments in allowances.

As the time is approaching when we must proceed to the Address-in-Reply debate, I shall conclude by saying, in substantially the terms that I used at the introductory stage, that our approach to this subject has been an endeavour to consider all the basic factors. We have not taken one arithmetical figure or another without considering all the surrounding circumstances. We regard the proposed salaries as fair and reasonable, and I commend the Bill to the favourable consideration of all honourable members.

Motion (Mr. Munro) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—FIRST ALLOTTED DAY

Debate resumed from 22 August (see p. 39) on Mr. McKechnie's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (11.59 a.m.): Before proceeding with my duty as first Opposition speaker in the Address-in-Reply debate, there is one small matter that I should like to raise. I have noticed it previously and I think that this may not be an inappropriate time to direct attention to it. We have many school children of varying age groups attending here, and I notice that a number of them, particularly those of primary-school age, find difficulty in keeping perfectly quiet and still. It is natural that at that age they should be rather restless, and some of them have a tendency inadvertently to place their hands on the handrail of the gallery. Just as consistently as the children do this, a police officer, acting in accordance with instructions received by him and carrying out his duty, invariably comes along and informs the boy or girl that it is contrary to the rules of the House to do it, and so on.

I think it is a very trifling matter, but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, that you might confer with the police officers and see whether some of these minor restrictions are necessary. I was in the House when a lady—apparently a social editress, or something of that kind—wanted to rest her hat against the rail and was told to put it away. I have been to most of the Parliaments in Australia, and only a fortnight ago I attended a sitting of the Western Australian Parliament. There visitors are permitted to stand and move about as long as they do not make any noise. I am not suggesting that that practice should be followed here, but I am suggesting that this is a very minor matter that should be considered. The children may become very self-conscious about being rebuked.

Dr. Noble: There may be a fear of things dropping down.

Mr. DUGGAN: It would not do any harm if something did drop from the gallery occasionally. I think there is a difference between school children and someone who obviously has a missile to throw at a Minister; but I can understand the Minister's desire to avoid being the target, because, unhappily, he might be more subject to attack than some other members of the Ministry.

I do not want to make an issue of the matter, but I think it is a matter that you, Mr. Speaker, in your discretion, might think is worthy of consideration.

The Opposition joins in the affirmation of loyalty to the Throne. On this occasion His Excellency's speech was more notable for what it left out than what it included in regard to the various matters that would be brought before us for our attention, and the Bills that were listed did not excite a great deal of interest from anyone concerned in parliamentary government.

Like the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, I should like to pay a brief compliment to His Excellency the Governor, Sir Henry Abel Smith, and the Administrator, Sir Alan Mansfield, for their work. I do not wish to be repetitious, but I think it is acknowledged by everyone that His Excellency and Lady May have been outstandingly successful in performing their duties. The present occupant of Government House, the Administrator, is very highly respected. He is a man who, in my experience of him, is completely free from antipathies, a warm-hearted, friendly person without any "side". He has been outstandingly successful as a barrister and as a member of the Supreme Court bench, he has done a very good job in the office of Chief Justice, and, with the assistance of Lady Mansfield, he has been no less successful in the position that he now occupies.

I congratulate the mover and the seconder of the motion on their speeches, which were obviously carefully prepared and well delivered. There is a tendency here towards an undue reading of speeches. Although we give a person making his first speech in the House some latitude in regard to reading his speech, I believe that both the mover and seconder of the motion on this occasion could speak extemporaneously from notes with almost the same fluency as they read their speeches. I regret this tendency to read submissions. There is no particular reason why speeches should not be read, but if a man speaks without copious notes we know that at least the thoughts he is expressing are his own, not those in an essay prepared for him by someone else. As I said, I am sure that both hon. members have the ability to express themselves without notes, and no doubt when they engage in future debates they will not need to follow slavishly the custom that appears to have developed in recent times of the mover and seconder of this motion reading their speeches. I cannot wish them a long and happy association with this Assembly, but whilst they are here I know they will endeavour to play their part in joining with the Opposition in seeing that constructive legislation is passed.

Mr. Smith interjected.

Mr. DUGGAN: The hon. member who is so anxious to be concerned about these matters would be better occupied in addressing his remarks to his own Caucus, rather than bringing them before us. He is speaking of matters that could more conveniently

be dealt with in his own party than before this House. Certain members of the Liberal Party, in their aspirations for Cabinet office, are taking advantage of every opportunity to seek the limelight here.

I do not think it is inappropriate on this occasion—and it is important to Parliament after a general election—that we make a brief review of some of the events that led to the return of this Government. In introducing the Appropriation Bill the other day the Treasurer more or less gave us one of his customary lectures on the inappropriateness of members of Parliament engaging in post-mortems on elections. I think quite unnecessarily, he introduced into the debate some matters that could well have been left for some other occasion, and I feel it is incumbent upon me, as Leader of the Opposition, to bring together in a more permanent form some of the more salient facts of the election and of what is happening in Queensland today, in order that it will be available for the record.

I do not engage in this in any sense of being unduly temperamental. I am not engaging in this debate, in the manner in which I proceed to develop my argument, on the basis of sour grapes, bemoaning the fact that we lost the election, but one has to be factual in these matters. With the disabilities that confront us in regard to electoral boundaries—and we have suffered a large measure of injustice in those boundaries—we realise that the only way electoral justice can be obtained is for us to have an opportunity of showing the unfairness in fixing the boundaries; but it is no good crying about these things and we must have in the public image a feeling that, despite the handicaps that confront us in that regard, we have a policy that we can sell to the people. We have to accept that responsibility.

I was rebuked the other day for saying that we would succeed in winning 17 seats. To be perfectly frank, when facing a television camera one does not forecast defeat. On the figures, we had a Herculean task to perform and we were able to improve our position tremendously considering the difficulties that beset us some six or seven years ago.

That is part of a political cycle in Australia. All parties go through those periods, and the A.L.P. was singularly free from major difficulties in this regard until the split occurred on a nation-wide basis in 1957. I am not going to canvass that point very much at the moment except to say that other parties have gone through similar cycles. I believe the present Government are about to enter one now. There are already difficulties revealing themselves, and they will make it more apparent to the outside public that there has not been the political compatibility between the coalition parties that we were led to believe existed in such strong measure.

Periodic statements about the harmony that prevails in the Government's ranks are hard to square with the statements and other facts that are emerging, with the Liberal Party and its members desiring to govern in their own right and entering organisationally into predominantly Country Party fields of interest and influence, over which seeds of discord are becoming evident. We hope that, like the rain that is falling at the present time, rain will continue to fall in the political field so that these seeds will germinate in the normal way. I have no doubt—indeed everybody knows—that there is incompatibility between the coalition parties. The only reason they hang together is that they do not want to hang separately. This sort of thing is not peculiar to Queensland. It is spreading. The Country Party influence throughout Australia is declining. Consequently, it is now necessary for their leader, Mr. McEwen, to protest very vigorously at the prospect that if the next Federal elections are conducted on the present boundaries the Country Party influence in the Federal Parliament will continue to decline. For that reason there is a major difference between the coalition parties in the Federal sphere on what should be done. No doubt that will be resolved in due course somewhere along the line. In Queensland we know that a Minister of the Crown has been told to establish Liberal branches in his electorate, but he has flatly refused to do it. I am not concerned about the domestic quarrels of the coalition Government, although, as I have said before, it is more than passing strange that the blue-ribbon Country Party seat in Queensland should be held by a Liberal Minister. I am not very much concerned about it because it is not a seat we could hope to win. I cannot consider the Lockyer seat as an immediate prospective gain for the Labour Party, but I can see it becoming a prospective Liberal loss at an early date. This sort of repercussion will occur.

Following the elections an attack was made on us by the Country-Liberal Parties, aided and abetted by the Press, in which they said that we had not done at all well. To the contrary, "voting-wise" we did very well. Even people who are not affiliated with the A.L.P. admitted to me that, of the arguments during the election campaign, they thought we won more than we lost. Of course, we face the fact that though we may have won the argument we lost the decision. Notwithstanding that, we did increase our vote to the extent that it was less than 1 per cent. below the total voting of the Liberal Party and the Country Party at the last elections. That is very significant. When the split occurred in 1957 we received only 25 per cent. of the total vote within the State. We have progressively improved that figure until today it is of the order of 43.22 per cent. There has been a 70 per cent. improvement over the last six years with no corresponding increase in the Government vote. At the last elections they

increased by less than 1 per cent. whereas we increased by more than 4 per cent. This was done at a time when we had the dice loaded against us. First of all, objection was taken to our including in our policy speech the matter of three weeks' annual leave. But just before the elections the Liberal Party agreed that this was a desirable reform.

I was rebuked during the election campaign for saying that it was one of the most extraordinary features of the Industrial Commission's activities that a matter which had had such a wide impact on the economy was decided so quickly. Since the judgment was given granting three weeks' annual leave, and also because of the margins increase, there has been a tremendous increase in the price of a very extensive range of commodities throughout the State. Although the Government parties regarded the introduction of three weeks' annual leave as a matter requiring very close examination by the proper authority, which they considered to be the Industrial Commission, it was determined by the Commission in less than an hour. It is more than passing strange that hours, days, and sometimes weeks are devoted to argument before the Industrial Commission on applications for comparatively small increases in wages and remuneration generally for those engaged in industry, yet on a matter of such significance, without leaving the Bench, the members of the Commission were convinced of the necessity to grant three weeks' annual leave immediately. We have also the fact that, for the first time in some years, there was general rain throughout the State in areas that were previously depressed, particularly in the south-western part of the State. There were good rains, good crops, and good seasons, and because of circumstances beyond the control of this Government, sugar reached a record price of £100 a ton. To my memory that price had never been obtained previously. Consequently, there was great jubilation on the part of those engaged in the sugar industry where, traditionally, Labour votes come from.

I believe that, superimposed on these things, apart from the major handicap of an unjust electoral redistribution, were the actions of the Press, and the political ethics of the Government parties, as demonstrated in some of their propaganda. That merits special attention today. I realise that in an election campaign one engages in strong arguments, and very often, in the heat of the moment, things are said, which, on reflection, both parties might consider wiser left unsaid. I do not take any objection at all to a hard-hitting campaign attacking any deficiencies in the armoury of an opponent. That is only fair in a democracy, and while we may have allegations about weaknesses in a political organisation, and its fitness to govern the country, I have no criticism to offer against people who may use those attacks during an election campaign.

A Government Member: So long as they are true.

Mr. DUGGAN: Yes, so long as they are true. Statements have been made to me by members of the present Government—and I do not wish to embarrass them in any way—that genuine concern was expressed by the more reasonable, temperate members in the coalition parties at some aspects of the Government's advertising during the election campaign. I refer particularly to a series of advertisements that appeared showing the hammer and sickle imposed on Parliament House. They were issued by the Liberal Party. I want to say quite frankly that I am not squealing because we did not win the election. I want to make that quite clear, despite what others may say subsequently. But I think that a grave disservice is being done to democracy when there is created or engendered in the public mind, by the use of such advertisements, the feeling that democracy in this country is being seriously undermined. The election is over, and, whilst I do not expect any member of the Government Parties to rise to his feet and agree with me, in private, all hon. members would agree that, whilst there is a danger of international Communism, no-one, even in his most pessimistic moments, would consider that any of the major political parties was creating conditions that would make it possible for a Communist take-over in Australia, or in Queensland. The thing is too absurd. As a matter of fact, one of the richest and most rugged individuals in Queensland came to see me in Toowoomba about a matter during the election campaign, and he said to me, "As you know, I vote against the Labour Party, but just for your own satisfaction I should like you to know that the last thing I fear, if you should take over, is that there will be wholesale nationalisation and a taking away of my property and all those other things that are suggested." The advertising was extremely unethical, and I question whether, in the public interest, a newspaper should accept such an advertisement. I will deal with that in a few moments.

Along with this question of Communism, the critics of the Labour Party from time to time have drawn attention to what are known as unity tickets to show some alleged collaboration between the Labour Party and the Communist Party. I will refer to that in detail in a few moments. That is regarded as being in the public interest. But yesterday, when "The Courier-Mail" was asked to publish a paid advertisement dissociating A.L.P. men from a so-called unity ticket, the management of that newspaper bluntly refused to accept it. If it is going to be argued that these things are in the public interest, then I think this Liberal-paid advertisement is not in the public interest because there is no justification for it. There is not one single Communist member of Parliament elected anywhere and even in the last election there were only three Communist candidates for the 78 seats in Queensland, and all three were in A.L.P. strongholds. The purpose of their entry, apart from the internal propaganda value which they thought they

might get from running candidates, was to embarrass and to try to discredit the Labour Party rather than to help it.

Mr. Hughes: It is not in Parliament, it is behind the scenes.

Mr. DUGGAN: As a matter of fact, I congratulate the hon. member for Kurilpa when he talks about behind the scenes because in my association with this Parliament I do not know of any other member who has had more troubles behind the scenes since becoming a member of Parliament than the hon. member who just interjected. He has many troubles and difficulties in his own organisation and I congratulate him on the skill with which he has been able to surmount seemingly insuperable barriers to re-endorsement by his party. He should be the last one to talk about what goes on behind the scenes. The only thing I want to say to him further is that if he wants to make it apparent to those who are less skilful than he at coping with behind-the-scenes pressure, he might write a book on the subject and circulate it among hon. members, because I congratulate him on what he has been able to achieve in that direction. He was successful in surmounting his difficulties and countering the actions of those who were working against him, which caused a whole lot of meetings, lasting till midnight, by senior officials of the Liberal parties. I congratulate him on the steps he took in mobilising counter forces against moves of that sort. Of course, it is public history what went on in his electorate, and I should have thought he would be the last to talk about what goes on behind the scenes.

As I say, we have been able to increase our vote despite this smear campaign. We had another example of it, of course, which I raised on television but which I shall repeat here for the record. Many of these matters I raise today have been raised by me, in perhaps different form, in other places. It is hard to correlate them all and to get a general picture of what is going on by picking up the papers that from day to day cover an election campaign. You may remember the one that read, "You know you can trust these men", showing a photograph of the Premier and the Minister for Justice. I do not think I am breaching any confidence in saying this, but I met the Minister for Justice at a social function during the election campaign and I drew his attention to this. He said quite frankly that he would not blame people who were shown the first advertisement for not trusting him. The people responsible for Government publicity altered that photograph and published one showing more glamorous and more photogenic qualities. For the first time we saw a photograph of the Premier without his famous Kolynos smile. He showed his more serious side, indicating perhaps that he was a little concerned about things.

Their photographs were in marked contrast with those of Jack Egerton and me. I am not regarded as being particularly photogenic

but I think even my most severe critic would admit that that particular photograph did not do me even elementary justice. I am sure you will agree with my view of the retouched photo that appeared that, if that is a recent photo of the Minister for Justice, then I am surprised indeed. I should say that the one of the Premier looks more reminiscent of something taken when he took part in the First World War, with such distinction, than of his appearance in recent times. Then of course they have accentuated all the bad features of Egerton and me.

I mention these things knowing full well the sort of denials that might come from the other side. I have been too long in this political rough-and-tumble business to be unduly upset. In the heat of the moment we might say things that we would not say in calmer moments. But, despite any denials that might flow subsequently from hon. members opposite, I want to say, as one genuinely interested in democracy, irrespective of whether I am in Parliament or out of it, irrespective of whether the A.L.P. is in power or not, that we are doing a grave disservice to democracy if we cannot conduct in a democratic community an election campaign based on what are considered to be the achievements of the Government and the lack of achievements of the Opposition, or the feeling that the Opposition has not the requisite ability to carry on a programme in the interests of the State.

I realise, whether we be the Government or the Opposition, that we are apt to stress our major achievements and be less emphatic about the things of which we are not particularly proud, but there must be some balanced control. All the problems of the world today seem to be involved in the desire of many people to be distrustful of democracy. There is a great need to preserve it and, frankly, although the Government may be able to claim a victory at the election, I do not think that it was achieved by a campaign that was even reasonably fair. As the hon. member for Ithaca pointed out, much that was said was untrue. I do not mind criticism if it is due, but when it is not, and when it is manifestly untrue, and the people inserting the advertisements know it to be untrue, I think a grave disservice is done to democracy generally.

It is interesting to note that in the provincial cities we obtained 54 per cent. of the votes. On the basis of the results in other electorates, we could have expected to win all 12 seats in the provincial areas, except in one or two instances where, had there been a third candidate, the figures would have been closer. Whether the result would have been what finally transpired is something about which we can only conjecture. To say that it could have resulted in the return of the present members concerned does not alter the general picture.

The Government have been returned to power for the third time on what they were pleased to criticise when in Opposition, namely, a pronounced minority vote. The combined Country Party-Liberal vote was less than 45 per cent. It was 44·67 per cent. With one or two minor exceptions, the A.L.P. candidates who were returned were able to increase their votes considerably, and this pattern was, from an academic point of view, one of the interesting things of the election. I suppose in some measure some sitting Government members, too, were able to increase their majorities. When it is considered that sitting members on both sides of the House increased their majorities and we increased our overall vote by 4 per cent. to within closer than 1 per cent. of the combined Country Party-Liberal vote, it must be agreed that our contribution to the campaign, and our acceptance by the public, were of a very good order.

There are one or two things that I should mention for the record, because they have been rather distorted. I wish to deal for a moment with the basis on which one judges whether or not the State is developing. It is easy to have various members on this side of the House prepare statistical evidence supporting a certain point of view. That is then frequently contradicted by Government members, who produce a counter set of figures showing that certain things have been accomplished by the Government. Given time, I suppose almost anything can be proved with figures. After all, the most important way to determine development is whether the Government has been good; whether the State has been sharing in the general prosperity of the rest of the Commonwealth; whether the standard of living has been maintained; whether the population is increasing; whether the cost of living compares favourably with that of other States; whether we are getting a fair share of migrants; whether secondary industry is developing; and whether primary industry is undergoing the necessary expansion. These are the general lines upon which we might assess whether a Government has done a good job.

One of the major claims by this Government is in the field of education, and I concede that the Government has done quite a lot to meet its responsibilities in that field. However, as my colleagues and I pointed out during the election campaign, this responsibility grew out of the Second World War. Because of the great number of marriages that took place during the war, in the post-war period there was a great increase in the number of people requiring education. We know that today there is a growing realisation on the part of even the poorer people in the community of the importance of education and they want to deny themselves all sorts of little things in the home in order to give

their sons and daughters a good education. This is not peculiar to Queensland; it is nation-wide and world-wide. It is particularly important that we should accept the responsibility of equipping children for the technological age in which we live. For example, in the electrical trade—this applies to other trades, also—the minimum requirement is a Junior pass. Entry to Government offices has always been based on a Junior standard, of course, but banks, insurance companies, and business establishments, now look upon the Junior as being the minimum qualification for a boy or girl seeking employment.

We were criticised very strongly during the election campaign for allegedly disseminating false information, and, even in the post-election examination of the results, no less a person than the Treasurer took me in particular to task and said that I had been guilty of using false and misleading information during the campaign when I said that the Government had spent less on education than Labour Governments prior to 1957. Of course, I said nothing of the sort at any time, and I wrote a letter to the Treasurer, which he acknowledged in due course. I did point out that if we, as a Labour Government up till 1957, had been remiss in accepting responsibilities in the field of education and had spent less on a per-capita basis than other States, I thought that that position still obtained and if there had been justification for criticism in 1957, it applied in greater measure in 1962. As I pointed out during the election campaign, the amounts by which Queensland's expenditure in 1956-1957 per head of population fell short of similar expenditure in other States were—

| | £ | s. | d. |
|-------------------|---|----|----|
| New South Wales | 2 | 1 | 8 |
| Victoria | 1 | 15 | 4 |
| South Australia | 1 | 10 | 2 |
| Western Australia | 3 | 11 | 10 |
| Tasmania | 4 | 15 | 2 |

In other words, in 1957 all those States were spending more on a per-capita basis than we were spending in Queensland. Time prevents me from giving an explanation of those things, but such things as distance and the number of children at schools provide a partial explanation. Obviously, in a large State such as Queensland, which has small centres of population and schools of nine, ten, or twelve pupils, it is natural that the cost of maintaining schools on a per-capita basis is greater than it is in more compact and populous areas. For example, in Victoria one teacher might be required to teach 30 children, whereas in Queensland perhaps three teachers would be needed to teach the same number.

Despite the claims made during the election campaign and the credit that the Government took to itself for improvements in the field of education, the amount of expenditure per capita has declined during the six years that this Government has been in office. The

figures for 1960-1961 were the latest available during the election campaign, and whereas in 1957 Queensland was spending £2 1s. 8d. per head of population less than New South Wales on education, in 1960-1961 the Country Party-Liberal Government was spending £3 8s. 6d. less than New South Wales; whereas in 1957 we were spending £1 15s. 4d. less than Victoria, in 1960-1961 this Government was spending £2 12s. 5d. less than Victoria; whereas in 1957 we were spending £1 10s. 2d. less than South Australia, in 1960-1961 this Government was spending £3 9s. 9d. less than South Australia. The same comparison was evident in comparison with Western Australia. I wish to direct attention to those points because I think they are of great importance.

Now let us examine for a moment another field in which it is claimed that there has been outstanding development in Queensland—the unparalleled development of the State. I drew attention the other day to the false claims of this Government. They have no more clear plan for the development of this country than the Federal Government has. I pointed out that almost every government in the world today, including that of the United States, the most capitalistic country of all, have clear developmental plans for their countries. Other countries are West Germany, which has made such tremendous progress, Italy, France, and even England itself. Each country has an economic planning committee, responsible to the Government, to plan the nature of its development. In Australia it has been largely a stop-and-go policy, without any definite knowledge of what the objectives are. I previously deplored the fact that we have not done something like that in Australia. A move was made in the Federal sphere for the establishment of such a committee a few months ago, although there is widespread criticism of that committee.

In 1957 it was argued that virtual stagnation was occurring in Queensland and that people would not come here to invest in this State under a Labour Government. Now we hear talk about the tremendous and spectacular development that has occurred. I briefly mentioned this the other day and I recapitulate it here. A committee consisting of certain well-known business men, headed by Sir Leon Trout, went to England to see what could be done here for secondary industries. We had another committee, with Mr. Gibson as chairman, which has folded up. We had another committee comprising the same personnel with one other member; that, too, has folded up. We had the Economist's report; we had the people from the Northern Rivers to report on our regional development. There appears to be no clearly defined plan, on proper lines, for particular projects in this State.

When one considers the figures, one can see that there has been a very grave deterioration in Queensland's position. The latest

economic bulletin, for the nine months' period to August 1963, shows our total imports at £83,000,000 and our exports at £73,000,000.

For some time past, and until recently, the Premier has said repeatedly that we should get special Commonwealth help because we were the largest net exporter of goods overseas of any State in the Commonwealth, and he referred constantly to the fact that we were sending overseas, goods worth something like £80,000,000 to £100,000,000 a year. The position is getting progressively worse as a result of take-overs and other things bringing a flood of imports from southern manufacturers into the State.

I was able to point out during the election campaign that there were now actually fewer people in Queensland industries than there were six years ago. That was stoutly denied, but the figures support me. Statistical bulletins No. 25 of 1962, and No. 24 of 1963, which is very recent, disclose that the number of workers in Queensland in 1960-1961 was 103,440; last year the number was 100,129, a decrease of over 3,000 in that period of 12 months. I do not want to waste the time of the House dealing with any other district—the statistical returns are there—but in the metropolitan area there were 54,748 workers in 1960-1961 and the number in 1961-1962 was 53,743. Going down the list one sees that there were approximately 1,000 fewer in Moreton in 1962 than in the previous year, 200 fewer in Maryborough than in the previous year, and 129 fewer on the Darling Downs than in the previous year. Roma shows an increase of 50, largely because meatworks were established there. In the south-western area the number is down three on the previous year, and in Rockhampton it is down nearly 500 compared with the previous year.

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

Mr. DUGGAN: I am grateful to the hon. member for moving the extension and to hon. members for their indulgence.

The same thing applies to Mackay. There are now 85 fewer workers in factories in Mackay. In Townsville the number is down by 250; in Cairns it is down by over 100. The position will be accentuated there when the railway workshop closes down and with automation on the wharf. The important point is that in the 1952-1957 period, the five years preceding the defeat of the Labour Government, the number of workers engaged in industry totalled 94,024, which represented an increase in the number of employees in factories over this period of 8.4 per cent. In the following five-year period of this Government the numbers decreased by 297. That means a decrease of 0.3 per cent. compared with an increase of 8.4 per cent. in the Labour Government's preceding five years. Production in Queensland during the five-year period 1952-1957 increased by 49.5 per

cent., but under this Government it has increased by only 31.4 per cent. We do not want to be placed in the category of knockers; the Opposition wants to see secondary industry coming here. But these figures prove conclusively that there has not been the spectacular development referred to by the Government.

During its period of office the Government has committed itself to a policy of free enterprise. It has been claimed on many occasions by the Minister for Justice, who previously controlled the Prices Branch, that price control had proved a failure. We do not think it proved a failure with basic commodities. I am prepared to concede that some aspects of the price-control legislation could well have been abandoned by 1957. It is quite silly and foolish to poke one's nose into the luxury field or where competition is obviously genuine and is effecting a price reduction. But this Government has been adamant that the most effective price control is intense private competition. The hon. member for Salisbury has made a rather close and detailed study of this subject on behalf of the Opposition, and a private member's motion dealing with it stands in his name on the business sheet. I will not encroach much on what he will have to say because he will discuss the matter in detail. Under this Government there has been a great deterioration in the position "price-wise," which is indeed disquieting. Dealing with the Consumer Price Index, Statistician's Bulletin No. 38 of 1963 indicates that during the last five-year period there has been a 10.3 per cent. increase in all items in Sydney. It shows a 12.2-per cent. increase in Melbourne, an 11 per cent. increase in Adelaide, a 9.3 per cent. increase in Perth, an 11.1 per cent. increase in Hobart, and a 15.7 per cent. increase in Brisbane. That publication, released by a Commonwealth department, proves conclusively that the Government's contention that the operation of free enterprise would result in lower prices has not been borne out. The position here has been accentuated by take-overs and the increasing quantities of goods coming from the other States. The increase in Brisbane for food in the period under review was 31 per cent. greater than in Melbourne.

Let us examine for a moment, on a population basis, this claim about the development of the State. If the State was being wisely governed, and attracting industry on a large scale, it should be reflected in a population increase at least comparable with increases in the other States. We find that in Victoria the annual percentage increase in 1961, was 2.55 per cent. In New South Wales it was 2.21 per cent., in South Australia 2.54 per cent, in Western Australia 2.01 per cent, and in Queensland 1.35 per cent, which is well below the level of the other States. For Australia as a whole, the average increase for the seven years between 1954 and 1961 was 2.26 per cent. Only in one of those seven years did Queensland reach 2.28 per

cent. The Queensland average is well below that for Australia. It is the lowest figure for all the States during that period.

We must also consider the normal, natural increase in population. It has been said that the birthrate in rural areas is higher than in city areas. That is an acknowledged fact. In Queensland we have a greater measure of decentralisation than in other States and therefore our birthrate should be higher. However, we find, even if it is keeping up with normal levels of reproduction in the community, that many people have been leaving this State. As a matter of fact, during the election campaign, we found that in Cairns, the secretary of the workshop committee and the secretary of the A.E.U. had kept a record of all the employees engaged in secondary industries or workshops there who had moved from their employment. Where possible, a record was kept of where they went. It was alarming to find the extent to which so many skilled tradesmen were leaving Cairns and going to Melbourne and Sydney for employment. At present there is a cry by the Premier for skilled workers. We want more apprentices. There has even been a suggestion that we send people overseas to recruit skilled personnel to come here. That is caused by the failure to keep people in their own areas where they have an equity in a home, which helps decentralisation. However, we find that they are swelling the numbers in the capital cities in the South. These tendencies do not indicate confidence in the Government, or growth by the State. The matters I have referred to are contained in figures available for all of us to see and they present a very sorry picture.

I wanted to include in the records of the Parliament some reference to unity tickets, to which I referred a moment ago. We do not want to run away from our responsibility, but I think it is necessary to place my thoughts on record. I want to deal with some of the disquieting tendency throughout Australia concerning the means of communication being placed in fewer and fewer hands. This may well be the subject of a speech by me in this Assembly at a later date. On an examination of developments in Australia in recent years, one can only view with disquiet the extent to which newspapers, and other means of communication in the community, are being controlled by fewer and fewer owners. It is a tendency that is indeed regrettable, particularly when we find certain people dominating the newspaper field. Even in Brisbane both daily newspapers are owned by the same company. That is undesirable. As an ordinary newspaper, I have no quarrel with "The Courier-Mail" I think it is a good paper for the dissemination of news; its standard in that field is very high. I have spoken to Mr. Bray, and, compared with the Melbourne "Age" and "The Sydney Morning Herald", the standard of "The Courier-Mail" is very high. I have no quarrel with "The Courier-Mail" as a newspaper; indeed, I have no

quarrel concerning its right to lay down its editorial policy. The management have the right to publish their views as they think fit. I am concerned, however, with the danger that occurs with restricted ownership when they think that it suits them to play down or play up a particular subject on the views of the managing editor, or the owner of the paper, as the case may be. I think we have a classic example of that in the case of "The Sydney Morning Herald." I do not want to be diverted from my purpose, but it has been strongly Labour in its support in recent times. I am glad of that support because it is a very important newspaper and a very good newspaper. But I do not think I am divulging any secrets when I say that the policy of that paper no doubt is conditioned by the fact that the management is anti-Menzies rather than anti-Liberal. Consequently, if Mr. Menzies were removed from the scene it is quite likely that, as in the State elections, it would become violently anti-Labour. As far as the State is concerned, you would not get a more anti-Labour paper in the Commonwealth than "The Sydney Morning Herald."

Mr. Knox: You do not mind help, no matter where it comes from?

Mr. DUGGAN: If the quality of it is right. I am speaking on the general subject of the entry by newspapers into the television field and radio control, which I regard as undesirable because it is linked with the point that I mentioned earlier today about the attempts that have been made to discredit the Labour Party on the question of unity tickets.

The A.L.P. does not officially want to become involved in the domestic affairs of unions. We are a political organisation separate and distinct in every way, and it is laid down quite clearly that we do not want to be involved in the domestic affairs of unions. They are their own business and we do not think we should poke our nose into the internal affairs of unions. We do ask and expect that members of those unions who happen to be supporters of the A.L.P. will try to use their influence to see that an A.L.P. influence predominates in the election of their officials, and I should be the happiest person in the community if we were able to say that all of our industrial positions were held by people with Labour sympathies; but we have to recognise, whether we like it or not, that an entry has been gained to some unions by people who are not of Labour Party affiliation but who are communistic, and, in one or two cases, even Q.L.P. or Liberal.

Mr. Ramsden: But you do not object to their having a say in your policy as Parliamentary Labour Party Leader?

Mr. DUGGAN: If they are affiliated with us they have a perfect right, in the same way as those who subscribe to the hon. member's party and pay their affiliation dues and are prepared to accept the responsibilities

of membership have a right to help fashion his party. The only major difference between us in that regard is that ours have a greater right to determine the policy than the people who are behind him, because he is just a yes-man who puts up his hand to endorse what Mr. Hulme or somebody else says.

Mr. Ramsden: What I am getting at is that you are discussing influence on policy and you say you do not exert your influence on the unions but you accept the unions' influence on your party.

Mr. DUGGAN: No, we do not accept it at all. As a matter of fact, I am not going to canvass this very much at the moment but hon. members will be very interested to learn about one of the hon. member's Liberal Party colleagues. Later this afternoon I will be having a meeting with some people and one or two of the hon. member's people might be a little more careful in future in some of the claims they have made about good Labour men being branded as communist. Hon. members opposite will hear a bit more about that in the next few weeks. There is this growing tendency on their part to brand everybody in the community, even their own people, in an irresponsible way. Even such a man as Sir William Gunn does not escape. If ever there was a bigger Tory than Sir William Gunn I do not know of him, yet at a meeting of their own graziers he was lambasted and insulted.

Mr. Knox: By whom?

Mr. DUGGAN: By his own people.

Mr. Campbell: Who urged it?

Mr. DUGGAN: Surely the hon. member is not going to suggest that the A.L.P. urged it?

Mr. Campbell: Not much! (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. DUGGAN: I like the hon. member for Aspley quite well. I ask him please not to go down in my estimation by suggesting that he believes a meeting of 500 graziers was inspired by the A.L.P. As a matter of fact, if he would speak, as I did, to one or two of them he would have no doubts about who gave Sir William Gunn the greatest trouble. They are prominent members of the Liberal Party and the Country Party in Victoria. I could give their names because I have a record of them outside, not that I am very much concerned. I think it was a very unfair and unjust attack on a man who, I think, is trying to do a good job for the wool industry. I do not agree with all that he says or does; but this tendency to label everybody a communist reaches a farcical stage when a man like Sir William Gunn is labelled a communist. While I do not agree with his submissions and feel that perhaps there should be a different approach to the question, I do not think anyone can

doubt his sincerity or his desire to promote the best interests of the wool industry, which is so important to our economy. There was evidence of that in Goondiwindi as recently as two or three days ago. It is to be regretted that there is so much division in such a major sector of the economy as the wool industry. It is a pity that there is not greater unanimity of thought amongst the wool people to protect this very valuable fibre. We have been prone to say over the years that Australia rides on the sheep's back. This is still literally true. We need to do all that we can to maintain the solvency of this industry.

That, however, is getting away from the control of newspapers. After publishing this article about unity tickets, the Press would not publish any correction. It is laid down as Australian Labour Party policy that members must not knowingly, wittingly, or unwittingly, be associated with unity tickets. Once it becomes apparent that such a ticket is in existence, members have, under the rules, an obligation to dissociate themselves from it. That is what these particular men did. I have here the names and signatures of these gentlemen under the heading—

"We, the undersigned candidates, in the current Election of the Australasian Meat Industry Employees' Union (Queensland Branch), disassociate ourselves from all 'How to vote' and other pamphlets being circulated among members, with the exception of the 'How to vote' authorised by R. W. Gall, Waterview Avenue, Wynnum.

"We further state that we have not consented to our names appearing on any election material other than the 'How to vote' authorised by R. W. Gall."

Mr. R. W. Gall is a very prominent member of the Australian Labour Party in the Wynnum area.

In this matter I am authorised to say that the possibility of the existence of a so-called unity ticket was first drawn to the attention of the Queensland Central Executive by a member of the Australasian Meat Industry Employees' Union in the Rockhampton district. Contact was made with Mr. E. Foat, Secretary of the southern district of the Australasian Meat Industry Employees' Union, who commenced an immediate investigation to ascertain if a unity ticket was in fact in existence.

It appears that one was distributed in the central district and Mr. Foat, on behalf of approximately 23 candidates, endeavoured to insert an advertisement in "The Courier-Mail" on Monday, 26 August. He was told that it would be necessary to have verification of the signatures by certification by a justice of the peace. This was obtained, and Mr. Foat was then told by a representative of the advertising section that it would not be in the interests of the public to have such an advertisement inserted in "Public Notices." The advertisement was subsequently accepted

by, and published in, the Brisbane "Telegraph". Without any questioning, this newspaper published it on Tuesday, 27 August, 1963. No demur was made.

It was not considered to be not in the public interest to publish allegations of the D.L.P., of Senator Cole, and Mr. Judge. They are accepted as being in the public interest and given large headlines. When, however, untrue things are published and steps are taken by A.L.P. members to dissociate themselves from them, their material is not even accepted for publication either as news or even as a paid advertisement. I should like to know just how far the Press is entitled to go in matters of this kind.

I have had only one similar experience with a newspaper. During the 1957 election campaign a certain gentleman, who is no longer with us, published an advertisement reflecting on Mr. Gair. I dissociated myself entirely from it on behalf of the A.L.P.; I thought that that was the proper step to take. It was done by a person with whom I had nothing to do for some years and with whom there is probably a mutual unfriendliness, but I did take that action in 1957 to dissociate myself from it. Hon. members will remember the reference to "Roly Poly" Gair. I thought it was unethical and not something with which the A.L.P. should be associated, and it was withdrawn.

I mention that in justification of the attitude that I am taking now. I remember on one occasion in the 1957 campaign "The Toowoomba Chronicle" had a cartoon concerning the D.L.P. and the A.L.P. It showed a masquerading Chinese or Japanese being clubbed to death with chains before an open grave, and superimposed on a hachured section of Asia was, "The A.L.P. stands for Red China. Duggan stands for the A.L.P.," the implication being that I was a party to murdering this man with a chain. I have the original pull in my files. It was a disgraceful advertisement, and I will say for "The Toowoomba Chronicle" that it had no compunction in rejecting it. It appeared later in a modified form. Even my severest critics would not think that I would be a party to battering anyone to death by a chain, whether he be an Asian, a Calathumpian, or anybody else in the community.

The only other instance that I know of in which there was rather harsh and discriminatory treatment by newspaper proprietors in the acceptance of an advertisement relates to "The Townsville Daily Bulletin". I was up there on a couple of occasions, and I found that, even with the normal type of advertisement that we wished to insert and pay for, the editor reserved the right to amend the advertisement, although it was not of an offensive character. I do not know how far the right of newspapers extends in this regard, but my main purpose in mentioning it is to give hon. members an opportunity of considering the problem of a newspaper's saying that, in the public

interest, it had the right to reject an advertisement that I thought was very proper in the circumstances and should have been accepted by it.

The fact that the "Telegraph" accepted it in the normal way should give an indication that it did not think the advertisement should be rejected in the public interest. It might be argued by the manager of the newspaper concerned that, because it is the same company, the fact that they permitted the advertisement to appear in the "Telegraph" was all that was required of them. However, everyone knows that, although the two newspapers are owned by the one holding company, they do engage in an intensive competition for circulation. Consequently, I think that, for advertisement purposes anyway, it would be true to say that it was fit and proper that "The Courier-Mail" should have accepted it as a separate advertisement, quite apart from the fact that it had been accepted by the "Telegraph".

Mr. Aikens: "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" once accepted an advertisement from me without demur. I asked them to give it back to me so that I could have a look at it; I thought I must have made a mistake.

Mr. DUGGAN: If the hon. member's advertisements follow a similar pattern to some of his speeches in this Chamber, I would not be surprised if the editor of "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" exercised some caution before accepting them.

I do not want to impose on my privilege unnecessarily, but I thought I should raise the matter.

I have some other matters here which can be dealt with in later debates during the session. All I wish to say at this stage is that Australia is entering a new period of great promise, and if members of Parliament, both State and Federal, accept the challenge, I am certain that we shall be able to solve the problems that arise. There are grave problems amongst our near neighbours in the north; there are problems of trade and other associated problems of inflation and kindred matters. I can only express the hope that the legislation introduced during this session of Parliament will have as its purpose the improvement of the economy of the State and its development. If the Government decides to introduce legislation of that type, the Opposition will follow its customary role of being constructive in its criticism of the legislation and endeavour to play its part in assisting Queensland's development.

Mr. RAE (Gregory) (2.19 p.m.): First, I should like to congratulate the mover of the motion, the hon. member for Carnarvon, Mr. McKechnie, upon his excellent speech, in which he raised many matters for our consideration, and the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha, Mr. Lickiss, upon the able way in which he seconded it. In both of these men the State of Queensland and this

Parliament have men of excellent character. They are men who will, I am quite certain, fully justify the confidence of the people in their electorates in returning them here. I personally know both of them fairly well now, and they both exhibit enthusiasm and ability that is rarely encountered here. I am quite certain that the Government is very fortunate in having men of their calibre and ability.

Associated with the Address in Reply is the reaffirming of our allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen. I do that and convey, on behalf of the people of the Gregory electorate, which covers one-fifth of the State of Queensland, and is a very important part of it, our very great loyalty to the Throne. We are indeed fortunate in enjoying the way of life we do in times such as these.

We in the western areas of the State possess the resources to enable the economy of Australia to reach a very buoyant standard, the credit of the State being due almost entirely to the mineral, pastoral, and sugar wealth we possess.

I should have thought that the Leader of the Opposition in his speech this morning would have given a little more thought to the problems confronting Queensland, instead of occupying 40 minutes, plus an extension of time, in conveying what appeared to me to be something in the nature of a reason for Labour's having lost the election. I feel that his words would have been better directed to the Q.C.E. panel rather than to this House.

All in all, under the existing set-up the western part of our State is an extremely rich one and plays a tremendously important part in its overall economy.

At this stage of our parliamentary life, there appears to be a longer delay than is warranted between initial requests for improvements and the replies to those requests. Many of our top public servants, men in important jobs, are very capable and clever and able to carry out their duties—and they do them very well—but I should like to see an avenue provided that would permit them to see for themselves, at first hand, many of the problems that confront people in the western areas of the State. At the moment, when we put in a request for some requirement—be it for hospitals, roads, or public buildings—there is a delay that often extends to as long as 12 months. By that time the initial inquiry has lost all its merit. Perhaps at the time of the initial inquiry it could be classed as a borderline case but by the end of 12 months, owing perhaps to lack of occupation of a building, deterioration has occurred. I should like to see these men given every opportunity to see for themselves at first-hand the problems that are brought to their notice by hon. members on both sides of the House. To illustrate the point, I shall mention one specific instance, and I am pleased that the Minister for Education and Migration is in

the Chamber. I refer to premises formerly occupied in Winton by the Queensland Ambulance Transport Brigade. Those premises would be suitable for occupation by the school teachers in Winton. This matter was first brought to the Minister's notice some months ago. I was with him and members of the shire council when he inspected it.

Mr. Thackeray: Is that when you wore the 10-gallon hat?

Mr. RAE: That is one thing the hon. member could not wear. They do not make them big enough for him.

When we inspected the building we were told that it would be an excellent means of housing the junior teachers in Winton. But that is where the backwards-and-forwards procedure starts. I can never see the real reason for departmental officers having to continually inspect and report, only for somebody else to say, "That is not good enough." That goes on for a long time without anything really happening, although no doubt a great deal of expense is incurred. All this goes on yet the Minister, the shire council, the residents and I can see that in such a matter there should be more or less an on-the-spot acknowledgment of the merits and a decision. The Minister should say, "Yes, this is right." The point I am making is that I want to avoid the time lag. At the present time, young teachers in the area are obliged to pay nine or ten guineas a week to board at a hotel. It is just not good enough.

Mr. Houston: What is the cause of it?

Mr. RAE: It is something that has been handed down to us by the previous administration. It takes us a long time to catch up. We are getting over it quite well, but I should like to see quicker finality in these matters.

In this modern age we must realise the part that road transport plays and the need to provide good roads so that road transport can work smoothly with advantage to the people living in western areas. At the present time, they seem to receive more kicks than bouquets. In every phase of our life we are faced with added costs and country people, small in numbers but very strong in contributions to the Commonwealth funds, are not getting just rewards for their services. An all-weather road from Rockhampton to Winton is absolutely necessary to permit us to enjoy the reduction in the cost of living that would automatically follow. It would also promote decentralisation of Queensland to the benefit of the area from Rockhampton to Townsville inasmuch as in the past everything from the Central West has been directed to Brisbane. I should like to see this done as a means of opening up Gladstone and Rockhampton as major centres. Undoubtedly this will come when Comalco comes into operation.

Mr. Aikens: Don't you think the road should go from Townsville to Winton?

Mr. RAE: That would be all right, but the people from Townsville to Julia Creek enjoy a pretty good set-up under this Government. I am not speaking about that because the hon. member for Flinders will handle it quite adequately when the time comes. I am speaking for Gregory. I know nothing that would do more for decentralisation than an all-weather road from Winton to Rockhampton.

Mr. Aikens: It might pass right through your property.

Mr. RAE: It will be a long way from there.

I should like Ministers to give deep thought to the request of the people of Adavale, a small town that would not be known to many hon. members in the Chamber.

Mr. Dufficy: I know it.

Mr. RAE: The hon. member would know it. It is a small town with a population of approximately 200 people. In the last 14 years six floods have been recorded in the area and each one has been more severe than the last. The last catastrophe was of such magnitude that it literally took every little building in the township. Many people may say, "Well, that's that; why worry about it?" However, the important point is that these little centres 60 to 80 miles from major townships generally afford vital sources of local employment. They provide units of employment that cannot be readily obtained in the bigger towns. Any such community, however small, should be encouraged to re-establish itself so that it may make a contribution to the area it serves in the same way as it did before the disaster. This request has the backing of the Quilpie Shire Council and I urge my Government to consider the needs of these people and to bear in mind the very strong point that the re-establishment of the town is envisaged on a site three miles distant from the original site and well above flood level.

Mr. Dufficy: What is the cost likely to be?

Mr. RAE: I understand the present estimate is some £30,000. That is rather a loose figure.

Mr. Dufficy: You might find it will cost much more than that.

Mr. RAE: Even so, it should still be accepted by the Government. We can never get away from the need for centres that provide a local work force.

Mr. Aikens: And nothing is too good for the back country!

Mr. RAE: Quite right.

One of the most pressing problems associated with the man on the land at this stage of the State's development springs from the fact that some families have been living for 30 or 40 years under what can only be described as most difficult conditions because of the smallness of their blocks. It cannot be denied that it is wrong for any Government to tolerate for too long the man on

the land who is not producing, who is not getting ahead and who is not in a position to employ labour, to be creative, to be a positive stimulus to the industry and to afford good-quality sheep and cattle. A man who has been handicapped by having an area that is not a fair living area for the district should receive an additional area. I know it is a complex and vexed problem.

Mr. Dufficy: And it is contrary to the policy of your Government

Mr. RAE: That may be, but it is not contrary to my thinking.

Mr. Dufficy: I know.

Mr. RAE: And I am on my feet at the moment. The hon. member will have the chance to speak later. I think there are stations, homes, grazing areas, farms and leases in the Quilpie, Windorah, Jundah, and Stonehenge areas, and particularly in the Boulia area, which, to my mind, are completely inadequate to give a fair reward to the person who has battled on there for some 30 years. That is rather a long time. It must be soul-destroying to be saddled with these difficulties and to be denied assistance from those who ought to be able to recognise their plight. It is sickening to me as one who has lived there more or less all his life. In this set-up, I still agree, it would raise a very great bone of contention. It is not easy to determine just who is entitled and who is not. But there are many men in the Boulia area alone, an area with an 8-inch rainfall, on 21,000 acres. Alongside them are properties of quite considerable areas where they speak in terms of square miles, yet when the leases come up for renewal these people on small holdings are obliged to battle on while the large aggregations receive further terms of 30 years. I think it is very wrong.

Mr. Pizzey: Would these people be original settlers?

Mr. RAE: They have been there for 20 or 30 years. I take up their cases with the Department of Public Lands but, sympathetic and all as they are, there appears to be a rather airy-fairy attitude of, "Well, you know, they have had this and that and put in big water improvements." That is beside the point. Irrespective of whether they have or have not done that, some cognisance must be taken of the handicaps under which these men have laboured for 20 or 30 years.

We must review very fully our policy of not granting additional areas. I venture to say that 100, or fewer than that, would suffice for the entire State and would put these people in a position in which they could be of value to the community. There is nothing worse than having people who are not in a position to really develop the land and get ahead.

Mr. Dufficy: I know you are right, but why don't you convince your Government?

Mr. RAE: Time seems to go very quickly in this debate, which lends itself to everybody's coming in and having a say. I must register a very strong protest at the fact that today it is quite impossible for the man who has served his apprenticeship on the land, who has applied himself, and is fully knowledgeable of the game, ever to get a block of land unless he has oodles of money or fond parents, or an uncle or aunt or somebody, who will make it available to him. The lowest amount required is £22,000, which is a tremendous sum. That is for a first-class property, I admit, but surely we are departing from the principle of good government in respect of these people who are entitled to a fair share of the State's land.

I say this with full courage of my convictions. I say that it is wrong to have men undertaking a life on the land, going out there and working hard and endeavouring to assimilate all the essential requirements and know-how for the running of their places, and then suddenly finding, when blocks come up for ballot, that they must have £10,000, £12,000, £15,000, £18,000, or £22,000.

Mr. Dufficy: It is ridiculous. You will admit that.

Mr. RAE: I say that it is ridiculous, and I shall point out the way in which I think we are getting away from the full measure of good, sound thinking in this matter. There are people who already have had these properties for possibly 50 or 60 years, and in the last 18 years, I think, the provision of water has been made a taxation allowance. These people can put in watering facilities and they cost absolutely nothing. We have blocks surveyed and of adequate area. We have done the right thing so far as area is concerned, as the hon. member for Warrego will agree.

Mr. Dufficy: Not completely.

Mr. RAE: It will permit a man to get ahead and quickly become quite important in the sheep or cattle industry. The other aspect is that those who have had a property for 50 or 60 years, as have many of the larger companies, have received substantial taxation remissions when they put down water facilities and construct fences and various other improvements. The book value is written off over the period.

I think that the man from whom it is being taken should be given a fair go. It is all very well if the improvements are in good condition, but my experience has been that the fences, dams, bores, and so on, are very often old. I venture to say that in many cases the fences would have to be renewed in no less than four or five years. In my own case, for example, they had to be renewed immediately. The same thing applies to water improvements. The silt has to be removed from the tanks, and then you have

to go on with yard improvements and other improvements. I am not complaining about my good fortune. I should like to see similar good fortune come to every man on the land, but it is completely impossible under present conditions.

Mr. Dufficy: Your good fortune would not be possible today.

Mr. RAE: I am not coming into that. The point is that I am fortunate. And the hon. member was very fortunate to be elected to this Parliament, too.

We must take careful note of the value of these things, because it is wrong to impose a charge of £22,000 on an incoming tenant when other people have had the benefit of the earning capacity of that property for possibly 60 years, and even up to 90 years. In following this line of thinking, we should keep this in mind: that when the Scottish-Australian Company had Nive Downs and it was thrown open for ballot, the value of the homestead block was fixed at something like £18,000. An offer of £9,000 from the incoming tenant would have been accepted, but he said, "No, I will get it for less." He had to pay £11,000, but he was still happy to get it at that price. But why should £18,000 have been fixed as the amount necessary for a person to become eligible for the ballot? It is important that people should know from the word "go" exactly where they are going.

Mr. Dufficy: Why was the manager of Nive Downs, who was backed by Australian Estates, excluded from the ballot? His name was Ross McLaren.

Mr. RAE: I do not know. I think we really should look more closely into these problems, which are very real and very important. Nobody can convince me that the present procedure is right in this day and age. We have only scratched the surface in developing Queensland; we have a long way to go. Let us give people an opportunity; let us not make it completely impossible for them to take part in a ballot. I say here and now that very few families will have the £22,000 needed for the block at Quilpie, and I believe that the successful applicant will come from the Quilpie district. It is a good district, a rich district, and from it will come the type of person to make a great success of that block.

Mr. Ewan: You are paying him the provisional value of the improvements, and not enough care has been given to assessing the figure.

Mr. RAE: That is correct. Someone goes out and makes a survey and the figure is put on the lithograph. It goes through at £18,000. The company would have accepted £9,000 and he gets it for £11,000. That is a very big difference; it is quite wrong and should never have been considered.

Mr. Ewan: It debars somebody else.

Mr. RAE: Exactly. In the time at my disposal there is one matter I should like to bring to the notice of the Minister for Public Works and Local Government. Again I say that I do not want to be over-critical—I wish to be constructive—but in my area we have quite a number of problems associated with buildings under the Minister's control and direction. In this regard, I feel we are not taking enough cognisance of the fact that it is unwise to send good money after bad and to keep on spending fantastic sums in repairing buildings that are not worth it. The case I have in mind is the police station at Boulia; it has to be seen to be believed. I may be rather good at telling a story, but I will not take up time describing this ramshackle old building. Every time an inspector goes out there he says, "Yes, we can do this or that." Hon. members can believe me when I say that it is the most shocking public building in Queensland.

Mr. O'Donnell: Look at Blackall.

Mr. RAE: Blackall is magnificent. The hon. member is very fortunate.

It is in this way that I feel money is often wasted, when one bears in mind the cost of getting these people out and back. Very often they come out and back a second time and then a whole band of them will come out because, under pressure, somebody is having others get off their tails and do something about it. These costs really add up and when they get there they can very easily see that absolutely nothing can be done about repairing the building.

I mention this specific case, but the same thing occurs in many other instances. That brings me back to my original line of thought. The top men should be able to go out and see for themselves. They would then say, "I agree; we will do this or that." That would cut out this nonsense of having many people travelling hither and yon at great expense to the people who are being housed and to the State itself.

Another matter I should like to bring to the notice of the House is my fervent opinion of the wool-promotion scheme which is engaging so much public attention at present. As a man who is growing wool and endeavouring to produce a good type of fleece—at least by comparison with my neighbours, who are always amongst those who do something towards getting the figures in—I feel that Sir William Gunn, eminent, able and capable as he is, is really not quite on the line so far as this scheme is concerned. I should like to tell this Assembly publicly that, in the first place, we have in this State a wool clip that is worth £60,000,000. That is a mighty lot of money! There is already a levy of 12s. on each bale of wool. Sir William Gunn and his advisers have seen fit, as a result of their research and knowledge, to suggest that an additional £2 4s. be levied on each bale. No doubt their research and knowledge

would be very sound because I should not imagine that men of their calibre would go off half-cocked. They would have ample grounds to support their suggestions. A total of £2 16s. a bale is quite out of reason; it is out of the question for the grower. Take the case of the man in the Stanthorpe area, where a particularly fine fleece is grown. The grower in that area has only a limited number of sheep but he is able to command a very good price. By virtue of the smallness of his flock he is able to grade them so that his bales are low in weight. They may be 200 lb., 205 lb., 210 lb., with a few up to 300 lb. The position is very different in Quilpie, where we have thousands of sheep. A grower in that area gets bale after bale of accepted 3A and 2A but they are all over 300 lb. in weight, up to 500 lb. They never get bales like that in the Stanthorpe area because there is not the number of sheep or that type of wool. Perhaps there might be an argument for paying so much a pound. After all, I do believe in wool research and the promotion of wool. It is wrong for us to act like ostriches with our heads in the sand when nylon and various other synthetics are ever-threatening Australia's No. 1 product. By all means, we must promote wool, but we must do it fairly and equitably amongst all those engaged in the industry.

(Time expired.)

Mr. BAXTER (Hawthorne) (3 p.m.): I extend my personal congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, on your re-appointment to your high office. As the elected representative for Hawthorne, on behalf of each and every one of my constituents I pledge our support and loyalty to our Sovereign, Queen Elizabeth II.

I also extend congratulations to all new hon. members on both sides of the House. I give them this little piece of advice: all that they have learned outside, let them forget it. Let them go back to school again and learn how to administer for the whole of Queensland instead of the small number of people they were interested in before coming here. If they do that, although they will not have a very hard row to hoe in their electorates, they will find it much easier here.

There are many arguments that can be advanced today. The present Government has been in control of the Treasury benches for the last six years, and it is very amusing to see that they still persist in their same tomfoolery, and their same hokey-pokey approach to the propaganda they put forward in the Press; and the Press boys are 2,000 per cent. on their side. They will probably be 2,000 per cent. on our side when we are the Government.

I wish to refer to an article that appeared in "The Courier-Mail" of 19 July last in which a statement was issued by the Treasurer. He is a very flowery speaker and on numerous occasions has made statements in the House which have been publicised in

the Press and which have been refuted within a week by the Premier. On this occasion there was a statement, "Homes to all Migrants. No Wait." That sounds very attractive. The article continued—

"The State Government announced yesterday that it would abolish the waiting time for migrants to obtain Housing Commission homes in Queensland.

"The announcement by the Housing Minister (Mr. Hiley) is interpreted as a challenge by Queensland to other States, which have been attracting the majority of overseas migrants."

Let us pause for a moment and study that statement. Tradesmen have been attracted to southern States. I say that tradesmen have been chased from Queensland since this Government has been in office. Hundreds of tradesmen who have served their apprenticeship in Queensland have been hunted from this State because employment has not been available. They have had to go south. That is a contributing factor to the shortage of tradesmen for the work that is claimed to be available.

I will deal secondly with the migrant question, and firstly with our Australian-born people who are our first obligation. They are justifiably entitled to recognition in their own State. We are placed in our present position because of the maladministration of the Country Party-Liberal Government, which has condemned private enterprise and industry in Queensland in such a way that they have had to refuse to accept apprentices.

Mr. Windsor: Why did they go south?

Mr. BAXTER: The hon. member for Ithaca is obviously referring to Queensland apprentices who became tradesmen. He knows very well why they went south. It was because there was no employment for them in Queensland. The Government has driven the tradesmen from Queensland to the south and today it is reaping the reward for its maladministration of yesterday. This has happened to such an extent that Queensland has had to stoop to the level expressed in the article that I have just read. It is a terrible indictment of the Government, whose members constantly refer to Queensland's wonderful future and potential. What have they done? In their term they have done everything to prevent Queensland's progressing as it would have done if Labour had continued as the Government.

Mr. Windsor: Why did the electors put us back?

Mr. BAXTER: That is an easy question to answer. The answer is very simple and I throw it back into the lap of the hon. member, who belongs to the Liberal Party of the coalition Government, the dog that is chasing its tail. Why did this Government bring the greatest exponent of the manipulation of electoral boundaries, Sir Thomas Playford, from South Australia to Queensland three times in

18 months? And why did this Country Party-Liberal Government accept every suggestion that he offered and put it into operation so that it is now an utter impossibility in Queensland to defeat the Government because the electoral boundaries are so mal-adjusted under the tutorship of Mr. Playford, who came here to teach the so-called novices of Queensland?

Mr. Windsor: Why did Duggan say you had a 50-50 chance?

Mr. BAXTER: The situation in the House today is not 50-50, as the hon. member for Ithaca suggests; it is somewhere in the vicinity of a 75-25 per cent. basis that the Government is working on every time it goes to the polls as a result of the very good job that it did for itself in the manipulation of boundaries in the recent electoral redistribution. Let that be a lesson to the hon. member who, incidentally, is a very good friend of mine—not to interject with silly questions.

Let me return to my first subject—the allocation of houses to people coming from the South and from overseas in preference to those born here. I am not against migrants—far from it—but the very best ones are those born in Queensland to Queensland people. Let us cater for them before we cater for others. And let us do the right thing by our children as they leave school, instead of having, as we have today, among those who left school last year some 4,000 unemployed and, among those who left the year before, some 1,600.

Mr. Windsor: Why did that happen?

Mr. BAXTER: Because of the inefficient administration of those now occupying the Treasury benches. They brought it on themselves by the stupid way they behaved between 1957 and 1959. They know they did, and the old hands here who have had experience in the Government know that it is true. When this Government took office in 1957 there were approximately 6,000 unemployed. What did they do in three months, wonderful administrators that they are? They built it up to 13,000, and to 22,000 after 12 months, and there they determined to keep it. Why did they do that? Because they believe in capitalist monopolies—that is why. Why did they kill all the little fellows who had started to employ people in their industries in Queensland since 1948 and 1949? Why was everything possible done to kill them? The answer is very obvious. They might have been small and employed only four or five men, but they were the men who would have been employing 30 or 40 now under the administration of a Labour Government.

Mr. Ewan interjected.

Mr. BAXTER: The hon. member for Roma was one of the instigators of one of the biggest downfalls in Queensland. I advise

him not to interject or I shall “go to town” on that one. Now we are placed in a position in which certain people in private-enterprise industry will not fulfil their obligations to the community, and do not let it be forgotten that these representatives of the employers’ associations are equally to blame with hon. members opposite. Do hon. members know why? They failed principally because they had no faith in the Government as it was then being administered. They were not game to expand because of this lack of confidence created by the Government. They would not take on apprentices because they felt that they could not fulfil their obligations to them.

Let us now return to the statement of the Treasurer. He said, “There is now a shortage of labour in the skilled trades and the housing shortage has been largely overcome.” In November 1962, the same gentleman uttered practically the same words.

Mr. Wallace: Did he have his pink carnation then?

Mr. BAXTER: At that stage he had not qualified for the carnation.

In November last year he uttered those same words—“We have overcome the shortage of houses.” Hon. members know as well as I do that within three weeks of the Treasurer’s making that announcement we saw in glaring headlines in the Press, the Premier, from the other side of the coalition Government, stating that he would approach the Federal Government for a special loan from the Loan Council for extra money to build homes in Queensland, as we were dragging so far behind the other States in this field. It was in 1962 that the Premier had to do that, three weeks after the Treasurer, in his hocus-pocus propaganda speech, said that the housing shortage in Queensland had been overcome.

The same situation arises today. Only a few months ago the Premier and the Treasurer returned from a meeting of the Loan Council very pleased with themselves at doing such a magnificent job for Queensland. They had an exceptionally good reception and the Premier smiled and was pleased. But is he so pleased today, particularly with the housing situation? He now is very worried, as his recent statements in the Press proved, as he has now become fully aware of the fact that he and his representatives at a Loan Council meeting voted too much money away from Queensland to other States and sacrificed and prostituted the potential improvement and development of Queensland.

That line of thought is uppermost in the minds of members of the Country Party today. They are perturbed because they have been led up the garden path by those who administer the Liberal Party, who have placed lies and false declarations on the conference table in Canberra and on the table in this House. The Liberal Party is disseminating propaganda through the Press in an endeavour to pull the wool over the

eyes of not only people outside Parliament but people who are opposed to the Liberal Party in this House. For Queensland's sake, we must be very careful to look at the facts.

Spokesmen for the Liberal Party in this Chamber are prepared to brush aside the demand for houses by residents of Queensland in their desire to provide accommodation immediately for people coming here as migrants and who have no claim to priority. A statement by the Treasurer to that effect appeared in "The Courier-Mail", but in the next day's issue of the same paper, Mr. Galvin, the Housing Commissioner, said—

"The abolition of the waiting time before migrants could occupy Commission homes puts migrants on the same basis as local residents."

There are two conflicting statements. The Treasurer says that there will be no waiting. Mr. Galvin says that they will be put on the same basis as local residents.

Mr. Windsor: No waiting.

Mr. BAXTER: Some bright hon. member opposite says "No waiting". No waiting for State rental homes! I could take him to people in my electorate who have been waiting six, eight or nine months for a house, and to some who have been waiting five years. Why? Because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you live in an electorate represented by a member of the Australian Labour Party you do not get justice. If the two statements to which I have referred are correct, some victimisation must result. The statements were published in the Press, so they must have been given to the Press by someone in authority. There is something wrong somewhere. I am prepared to lay on the table of the House a list of names, if hon. members so desire. They say that there are no people with priorities. If there are people waiting for houses, I say that they are waiting because they live in an area represented by a member of the A.L.P.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. BAXTER: Hon. members opposite should not dare me to table them, because the Press will print them if I do. I am sure that hon. members opposite would not like the Press to print the names and dates appearing on the letters. When I say something in this Chamber, hon. members should know that I have information to support it.

Mr. Galvin said that houses were allotted on a priority system based on need and circumstance. How does one reconcile these conflicting statements? The Commissioner claims that allocations will be based on need and circumstance, yet the Minister in charge of housing says there will be no waiting, giving the impression that one can simply walk in and get accommodation. Just where could one get a common-sense approach between two conflicting statements like that? I am justifiably entitled to contend that it is hocus-pocus propaganda.

The Treasurer said that the reason for the statement of no delay was that we have no tradesmen, yet we have somewhere in the vicinity of 5,500 children unemployed. Why has the Government not made some effort to bring these children into employment? They cannot tell me that there have not been openings in apprenticeships, because yesterday the Premier laid on the table information that proves conclusively that the Government has not fulfilled its obligations to the people of Queensland. Hon. members opposite, as a Government, have not given a lead to private enterprise to go ahead and put children on as apprentices. They, as a Government, have not done everything in their power to investigate every line of thought for the progress of Queensland. Tomorrow is fast coming. Queensland has great potential—we will admit that—but why has it? It is because the States in the south have reached saturation point and they must look elsewhere for expansion. This Government has never made any attempt to bring into this State the industries we must have.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. BAXTER: Hon. members opposite disagree with me, but the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha, who seconded the Address-in-Reply motion, agrees with me entirely. We must look for industries.

Mr. Tooth: That is an awful shock.

Mr. BAXTER: It would be a shock to the hon. member because, for the few years that he has been in this Chamber he has been riding a white horse somewhere up in the clouds; but some day it must come down to earth. He has not yet realised that there are still people of the status from which he arose when he entered this Parliament—ordinary working-class people. That is why the Government today is not accepting its obligations; it does not realise that a State must look after the ordinary, working-class man. He is a very important factor in the community. Without him, industry cannot survive.

Mr. Windsor interjected.

Mr. BAXTER: The hon. member who interjects is the owner of a very progressive business. He has many good workmen and he does the right thing by them. He knows that his business is successful because of the ability of the little man to do his job. The hon. member for Ashgrove is totally bereft of that knowledge. He is probably a B.A., a B.S., a B.C., and all the rest of it, and he cannot get down to the level of the little fellow who works with his shirt-sleeves rolled up. That is what is wrong with the majority of Young Liberals, the representative of whom on the Government benches is the hon. member for Ashgrove. Let him realise that there are people in the world other than those of the class to which he belongs.

We must take another look at this propaganda tomfoolery that goes on about housing. I have here a very authoritative article by Harold Cox—"Canberra Comment." Hon. members opposite cannot walk away from it. They are the brilliant boys who said they would overcome the shortage of houses in Queensland. Have they overcome it? Here is a man writing an article from Canberra. This political scribe at Canberra says—

"Queensland was the only State in the Commonwealth in which the number of new home units approved for construction in the last twelve months fell below the level of the previous year."

Government members say they have overcome the shortage of houses. They have not honoured their obligations to the people who have applied for houses. If they have, why did the Treasurer, in reply to a question asked by the hon. member for Brisbane as to the number of applications awaiting attention by the Queensland Housing Commission, say that there were 2,636? The hon. gentleman is the man who, the other day, had the audacity to try to hoodwink the people of Queensland by saying that Queensland had overcome the shortage of homes. Hon. members opposite cannot walk away from the fact that the Treasurer has been untruthful. He has tried to pull the wool over the eyes of the people in August this year just as he tried to in November last year when the Premier proved him to be a stranger to the truth by asking for a special meeting of the Loan Council in order to get a special allocation to build extra homes in Queensland.

Mr. Cox, who would know very well what he was talking about, also had this to say—

"The 10,355 building approvals for homes issued in Queensland last year were actually 397 fewer than the previous year, while home building expenditure at £33·4 million was up only £600,000 for the year."

The point that is most enlightening is that last year the Government did not take full advantage of the money allocated to it to build homes in Queensland for the people wanting them. It failed to build 397 homes that were necessary to fulfil its obligations. Hon. members opposite need not try to tell me that carpenters, carpenters' labourers and all the various other tradesmen were not available. We had them, all right. They were walking about the streets unemployed. The Government did not fulfil its obligations. Some thousands of pounds were not spent. Did the Government have some ulterior motive in not using that money? Were they going to divert it into some other channel, perhaps some vote-catching scheme? Was that their idea? If they did such a despicable thing, it is a disgrace. It is a smear on the character of all of those who shared the idea. In Queensland we have a natural demand for over 10,000 homes a year. The Government did not fulfil its obligations,

because 397 were not built. The money was there to be used and it was not used. I blame maladministration from the Executive benches; from the Minister who is in charge of the Housing Commission. Somewhere along the line full advantage was not taken of the money that was available. The Minister was prepared to let people live in sub-standard dwellings, and in flats. Although they may have had certain qualifications they did not qualify for homes. Why, in many instances here, are up to nine people forced to live in homes suitable for only four or five?

Here is another good point. Mr. Cox said also that Queensland, because of its inability to fulfil its obligations and utilise to the fullest extent the money that was allocated to it, thus got no share of the nearly 10,500 increase in last year's home-building programme and very little of the rise of £37,000,000 in home-building expenditure. This year the Government was prepared to sacrifice more of the money that would justifiably have come to it. The article continues—

"By contrast Victoria got 4,500 more homes than the year before, New South Wales about 2,000, and South Australia more than 2,200."

That in itself is proof that the Government is not playing the game in the realm of housing.

Mr. Ewan: Tell us about unity tickets.

Mr. BAXTER: The unity ticket of the Country Party-Liberal Party is the only unity ticket that exists in Australia. It is the unity ticket of the Country Party-Liberal coalition. That is the unity ticket that is functioning and, I want to emphasise the only one.

I have here a very interesting article which appeared in "Sunday Truth" of 18 August. It says—

"S.A. to spend 3 times as much on building State of the future—Lags on homes.

"Although hailed on all sides as the State with the most promising future. Queensland in 1963-1964 will build fewer houses than South Australia."

Mr. Ewan: We have caught up with the lag.

Mr. BAXTER: The day the hon. member's Government catches up with the lag will be the day it builds as many homes as the A.L.P. did when in government, which was 1,500 a year more than now. The hon. member does not have to take my word for that. He can look at the statistics. If the present Government had only learned a lesson and followed our line in that avenue as it did with the building of State schools, Queensland would be much better off today.

Now we come to a very good piece in this article, which says—

“In fact, on a per capita basis South Australia's allocation under the Commonwealth-States Housing Agreement is more than three times the Queensland total.”

Why is that? Because the Government did not have the ability to legislate, or to administer sufficiently well, to utilise the money available. In the second instance it is probably because three years ago the Government's representatives stupidly went to Canberra singing to high heaven that they were taking off the kid gloves to knock everybody with the mailed fist, and then voted with the other States against special allocations coming to Queensland. The answer is probably contained somewhere in that approach. That is the “could not care less” attitude of this Government towards the people who are bereft of homes.

The Premier said that the proportion of money allocated to housing is determined by the States themselves. That is a beautiful statement to remember at some future date, and I want it to be recorded very clearly. Let me repeat it: the proportion of money allocated to housing shall be determined by the States from their own overall allocation. Let us examine what that means. It means that today this Government does not believe that everybody should be (1) fully employed, (2) fully housed, and (3) properly clothed. Those are three aspects of the present economic situation in Queensland.

This Government by its action, and the Press in their approach, have very definitely said that this Government believes we must have a pool of unemployment. That line of thought has been handed down from the white fathers in Canberra and it has been accepted here. According to it, we must not let the natural-born population of Queensland be employed and, worse than that, the 10,533 marriages each year that create a demand for a home shall not have a home made available for them because we might be able to put some pressure on those people to destroy or break down the standards of living that have been enjoyed by the people of Queensland over a period of years—a standard of living given to them by the administration of the Australian Labour Party Government. That is what we are fighting today, and the people outside are fighting to preserve the standard that has been built up for them.

In view of the actions of this Government, how can we in Queensland hold up our heads and look at the people of the other States? The Government refuses to accept its obligations and it issues to the Press statements such as those I have mentioned. In answer to the hon. member for Brisbane, the Minister for Housing today had to admit that we are more than 2,500 houses short before any other applications come forward. Every quarter our own marriages create a natural

demand for 2,000. I would like to know how far the Treasurer thought he would travel when he made the stupid statement that there would be no withholding of homes from migrants when they arrive, indeed, that they would be given preference over Australian-born applicants.

(Time expired).

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah) (3.39 p.m.): It gives hon. members on this side of the House a great deal of satisfaction to occupy again the Government benches after the recent hard-fought election. I say this not in a spirit of, “We are the victors”, but rather to suggest that it does give a certain satisfaction to know that the policy that we as a Government, under the leadership of the Premier, Mr. Nicklin, pursued during the previous three years has been accepted by the people and that they look forward with confidence to a continuation of that progressive policy during the next three years.

I should like to compliment our Leader and Premier, Mr. Nicklin. I am sure he personally as Premier contributed very considerably to the success of many party members. In a similar way I recognise that the Deputy Premier, Mr. Munro, is also held in very high regard and respect not only by Government members but also by the public generally. He gave very excellent leadership during the term of the last Parliament and also during the election campaign, which considerably helped members of the Liberal Party not only to retain their seats but also to increase their majorities very considerably.

I agree with the Leader of the Opposition when he said this morning that his party did not have a very easy task at the last election. In spite of what has been said by the previous speaker and by the Leader of the Opposition, I am quite sure that all will agree with me when I say that there has definitely been a very great surge forward in expansion and development in this State in so many ways, particularly during the term of the last Parliament.

Be that as it may, the people have given their decision and we are back in government for another three years. It now behoves us to do the best that we can in the interests of the people of this State and the State as a whole. I am quite sure that that is the desire of every member of the Government.

Before setting out ways in which I think this should be done, I should like to congratulate the mover of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. We as a party are particularly pleased to have in our ranks the hon. member for Carnarvon, Mr. McKechnie. I am sure that the hard work exhibited by him during the election campaign speaks well for the way in which he will work in the interests of the people whom he is now privileged to represent. I should also like to congratulate the seconder

of the motion, the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha, Mr. Lickiss, and the other hon. members who are in this Assembly for the first time. I am sure that they will contribute much to the debates that take place here.

On an occasion such as this I could deal at considerable length with the many projects that have been undertaken by the Government in the Barambah district in past years, but that is not the main purpose of my speech this afternoon. I shall content myself with mentioning one or two of those things in passing. It gives me a great deal of satisfaction to know that great progress has been made in education, despite the figures that the Leader of the Opposition produced this morning in an attempt to prove otherwise. It is so obvious to not only hon. members on the Government benches but also to the public as a whole that under the administration of the present Minister for Education tremendous progress and expansion has been made in this field. No amount of talking and figures will ever convince the people of this State otherwise.

That, of course, is the picture on education in all electorates. There are new schools and new high schools, and now high-school tops at Goomeri, Wondai, and later at Proston. Bus services have been extended throughout this and other electorates. Large sums of money have been spent by the Minister for Main Roads, through the local authorities, in the Barambah electorate. This has resulted in a rapidly-improving road system, and some excellent roads have been constructed in this electorate since we have been the Government. There is also the large water-reticulation scheme to cover the Proston-Hivesville district offered by the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation on behalf of the Government, which will provide water for 80 surrounding farms. It is a huge scheme, and the Government has offered, and is prepared to pay, two-thirds of its cost.

I must also mention rural electrification, which has spread recently throughout the length and breadth of the electorate and completely covered it, and the new maternity hospital at Kingaroy just completed at a cost of £100,000. These and many other things surely contradict the arguments and statements of hon. members opposite.

I was amazed when the Leader of the Opposition sought to prove that the population of Queensland was not growing as it should—in fact, was growing only very slightly—and that people were leaving the State and leaving industry. Another hon. member opposite spoke of the 10,000 homes required each year, so there must be some people remaining in industry here if we require that number of homes each year. Those statements completely contradict one another.

With all the things that are taking place here, no-one can deny that Queensland is today the top investment State in Australia. This is a complex question, but as I look

at the great opportunities for the establishment of industries in Queensland, I cannot subscribe to the theory that the flow of capital from outside Australia should be controlled or restricted, as has been suggested from time to time, particularly by hon. members opposite. Once control is imposed, I think in many respects capital is prevented from coming in, and we have great scope here for investment. Those are my personal views on that question.

It would be premature on my part, perhaps, to speak of legislation that will be introduced later in this session, so I shall content myself with drawing the attention of Ministers to certain aspects of legislation that was introduced in former Parliaments.

Firstly, being a man of the land and interested in the welfare of country people generally, I should like to raise several points for the consideration of the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation, who, unfortunately, is unable to be here today. I do not intend to go into facts and figures that I have already given to the Minister, but I wish to draw his attention again to the method used in arriving at the value of land that is being taken up on a freehold basis, the question of additional areas for freeholding, and the question of balloting in partnership.

Taking the first point, namely, the basis on which a valuation should be determined for freeholding purposes, many hon. members probably would not be aware that in the Barambah electorate there are a number of areas of leasehold land of 5,000, 6,000, or 7,000 acres. The Barambah electorate is usually thought of as an area devoted to intensive agricultural pursuits—the growing of maize, peanuts, and so on. But across the border from my electorate are many portions of leasehold land in the electorate of the hon. member for Condamine. The people on this land are naturally desirous of freeholding it, but are refraining from doing so because they are not altogether happy about the basis on which freeholding is offered to them by the Crown.

The hon. member for Condamine and I recently had an opportunity of visiting and inspecting a number of these properties and observing for ourselves the problems that exist there. The Crown valuations are far from uniform—£1 an acre on this land, 30s. an acre on that land, £2 an acre on other land—although the properties may be only six or eight miles apart. These variations are quite apparent to the landholders and people acquainted with local conditions, and they were apparent to Mr. Sullivan and myself. The valuations set by officials of the Department of Public Lands are usually twice or three times the valuations set by the Department of the Valuer-General. As I said, there is considerable variation between the different blocks. That is why I have suggested to the Minister, as I suggest again now, that the Valuer-General's values should

be the basis of freeholding, with perhaps 10, 15, or 20 per cent. increase on those values for the privilege of freeholding.

Mr. O'Donnell: You would suggest that the reverse is the case?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: No, I think that is a very fair basis on which to arrive at these valuations and to get them more uniform. I hope the Minister will consider this suggestion seriously and adopt some such scheme to get uniformity, which I think will overcome many of the problems confronting these people.

I am very happy to belong to a Government that recognises the right of people to own freehold land, whether it be an allotment, a market garden, an agricultural farm, or a living grazing area, and we should not, on the one hand, make it possible to freehold, and, on the other, allow a position to arise which discourages the utilisation of the legislation previously provided. The legislation for freeholding is good but I believe that in this session we should go a step further and give the same right to those people who have not been given the right to own a freehold living area. I know that hon. members opposite are completely opposed to this because it is against their socialistic policy.

Mr. Windsor: But they all have them themselves.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I would not doubt that; they probably have freehold allotments where they have had the opportunity of obtaining them.

There is no gainsaying the fact that if a man owns land and has a freehold title to it he will get it into production much more rapidly and will put in first-class improvements much sooner. Naturally he will be able to obtain the money to do these things if he has freehold title to the land. Surely it is in the interests of the State if we can bring land into production much more quickly.

I have a final point on the matter of balloting. I do not wish in this debate to enter into the controversy of how many workers are accepted for balloting for land. Let us start with as many as would like to enter, such as the ones the hon. member for Gregory mentioned, namely, shearers jackeroos, and boundary riders, who are debarred because of lack of finance, and many of whom would otherwise be included if the Minister would agree to allow them to ballot in partnership.

Over many years I believe this system worked very satisfactorily; for example, one to do resident work, and the other to supply the finance. I know arguments can be advanced both for and against this method of balloting for land, but is it not an advantage to give these men a chance to improve their positions through such a partnership?

Time and time again people have come to me and said that they could arrange a partnership if they could be allowed to ballot. I think that is one very good way in which we could overcome the problem to which the hon. member for Gregory referred today. It is a tragedy that many of these men could otherwise be good settlers. They have justified their right to be allowed to ballot by the fact that they have lived and worked in the country all their lives. I hope the Minister will also reconsider this aspect of the Lands Department's policy.

The second important point to which I should like to draw attention is the decline in prices of many primary commodities, such as maize, and particularly peanuts. This has been brought about by over-production, and together with the fact that mounting costs are confronting the primary producers there is a need for both State and Federal Governments to do all they can to help these producers, many of whom I represent in the South Burnett area. I give full recognition to the assistance recently announced in the Federal Budget of £3 a ton subsidy on superphosphate. That is a very excellent and practical way of giving these men assistance. A great deal of superphosphate is used in the area I represent. The 20 per cent. additional depreciation allowance on machinery is another very practical way of giving considerable assistance to the people in the area.

Mr. Bennett: Why use superphosphates if you already have over-production?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: Every farmer tries to produce to the best advantage. He gets the best crop he can in order to minimise his costs on the land he is working. It is much better to get 25 or 30 bags to the acre than 10 or 15 bags. He has the same outlay from planting to harvesting.

The low price we have been receiving because of over-production is a matter that has concerned me for some time, not only because I am a farmer but also because I represent this intensely agricultural and highly mechanised area. Most of the peanuts and maize grown in Queensland is produced there. Some of the figures were mentioned this morning. Since 1957 the price of peanuts has declined 20 per cent. Cattle prices, which were very high in 1960, are down 32 per cent. since those days. We know that the people who established the cattle industry are on a reasonable figure but since 1957 the cost-of-living index, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, has risen 14 or 15 per cent. The basic-wage index has risen 19 per cent. since 1957. These things all tend to add to the costs of the people I have the privilege to represent. That is why a more concerted effort should be made, wherever possible, to help the producers to meet the position in which they find themselves. This year the price of maize, at 11s. or 12s. a bushel, is merely what we regard as a fair price. But that price was obtained

because there is only approximately one-quarter of the harvest this year that there was last year. The intense heat-wave conditions prevailing during November, December, and January, in effect, cooked the maize. The position has been gradually worsening over the last few years. That is why I raise the matter here. That is why at our party meetings I have suggested that the Government should assist in every way possible. I am thinking mainly of rail freights. I realise that the Government is always confronted with rising costs, and with the problem of finding sufficient money for all that members of Parliament are continually demanding. The rail freights from my area in the South Burnett district are too high in relation to the price that we receive for our peanuts and maize. For that reason I again urge the Minister for Transport to take into account the serious economic problem facing these people. I ask that they be given some direct relief by an early adjustment in rail freights. I am not quarrelling with three weeks' annual leave or increased margins, but it does appear to be one of the injustices of modern living that on the one hand we can give these conditions to one section of the community when it does not always appear to be possible to grant similar advantages to other sections of the community. I have previously said that we should not necessarily look upon road transport as something that is in competition with the railways. Rather, we should look at road transport as something giving efficient service.

Mr. Houston: Do you get concessions from road-transport operators?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: We get a very flexible service, and, generally speaking, quite an efficient service, but it would help to keep the Railway Department on its toes. In the air, we have the great organisation, T.A.A., giving wonderful service to the Commonwealth and New Guinea, and we also have A.N.A., in effect, backed by the Commonwealth Government with guaranteed loans for aircraft, and so on. One service competes against the other, and each is kept efficient. I think we should gradually regard road transport versus rail transport as being on a similar basis.

Mr. Houston: Do you expect road transport to make a reduction in charges because your return is down?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I will speak about that later. I have a few notes that I should like to keep to.

I consider that road transport should pay its just dues for wear and tear on roads, and so on. The time is also opportune to allow back-loading on a reasonable rate, on the load carried, and not on the carrying capacity of the truck. I am pleased that the Premier stated in his policy speech that the Government would soon be in a position to grant such a concession to assist the primary producers.

Those are ways in which we, as the Government, can assist producers and help them to meet the lower prices they are receiving, mainly because of over-production on the one hand, and higher prices for equipment, machinery, and so on, on the other.

While the need is great for assistance to producers in the area I have the privilege to represent—I must say that we, as growers, are well established—there is a particular need—and on this occasion I do not wish to do other than mention this point—to assist people who are starting on new blocks. This need will arise to a greater extent as time goes on. As an instance, I might mention the Fitzroy Basin area. Although the Government has already given these people assistance, it may have to help them further with reduced rail freights and cheaper money. The Federal Government, too, could assist in taxation matters, because these settlers are up against tremendous odds when starting off with raw blocks.

I also have many Downs producers and grain-growers who visit me. I know that they are most anxious for the Minister to give them some assistance in rail freight reductions. I hope he will be able to examine this need in the very near future.

For my final point, I think the Government should have an all-out drive to find markets for maize and peanuts, which are grown extensively in the area I represent.

Mr. Houston: Do they have commodity boards?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: They have them in the peanut industry to some extent, and so do the maize-growers, but to a lesser extent. I will come to that in a moment. Some hon. members may say they should organise and do something for themselves. They have tried to do that, but they are not as united or as organised as the sugar people. I admire the way the sugar industry can control the amount of sugar-cane grown. If we could do that with maize, and supply the main buyers we would get a good price for it.

Wool is another wealthy industry which can, in effect, afford to pay large sums for wool promotion. The wool-growers help themselves, and the Commonwealth Government assists them. The maize and peanut-growers are on a much smaller scale, although they have a substantial industry in their own way. Not only did they provide a livelihood for hundreds of farmers throughout the South Burnett but also they kept many good, solid country towns in existence. I know that officers of the Secondary Industries Department have been to Kingaroy and, despite what was said in the Chamber this morning, they have done an excellent job for industry there. I am sure that hon. members know in their hearts that things are on the move. To confirm that one has only to look around the city and to visit the country areas.

But more organisation is needed to assist primary producers. In the Federal sphere Mr. McEwen, the Minister for Trade, and Mr. Adermann, the Minister for Primary Industry, have done a great deal to help find markets for primary producers, and they are continuing to do so. This morning Mr. Adermann announced that the department had made a £1,000,000-a-year deal in Singapore for the sale of dairy products. The statement made the other day that the Government was allowing primary industry to languish is far from true. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition referred to the peanut industry. Mr. Adermann has arranged five hearings of the Tariff Board, which is an independent body which cannot be influenced by the Government. When the Tariff Board inquired into the peanut industry they recommended that the Federal Government should pay a subsidy to manufacture and the problem was overcome by allowing the import duty free of four gallons of oil for each gallon of oil bought from the peanut industry. This had the immediate effect of bringing the price of peanut oil from 11d. to 1s. 1½d. In that way the Federal Government greatly assisted the peanut industry.

When I look back and realise that maize-growers particularly have to try to arrange their own exports, as we did last year to Japan, I feel that, while we are not organised, we should receive more assistance than we are getting. We are very appreciative of the fact that the Minister for Development, Mr. Evans, when in Japan recently made the initial contacts in connection with the sale of maize to that country. But there is something missing when we as growers have to try to deal with a big problem like this. With Mr. Roy Rachiman, the Chairman of the Board, who arranged the deal, and the State President of the Grain Growers' Association, Mr. Gordon Todd, who helped also, I attended many meetings in the South Burnett last year and again this year to try to find markets for our maize; but it appears to me that it needs a responsible Minister to go overseas to deal directly with governments and business men.

The Leader of the Opposition spoke disparagingly of Mr. Fletcher and his proposed visit to Fiji. I compliment Cabinet on that decision. Mr. Fletcher is a practical man who knows land matters and I hope he will be able to arrange for the sale of some maize and peanuts there. I am glad he is taking Mr. Faulkner, whom I know personally. He is a top business executive with a good understanding of rural problems. I would suggest that Mr. Fletcher take with him a man well versed in the maize-growers' problems and the peanut-growers' problems to see what he can do.

Mr. Aikens: Why doesn't he take you with him?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: That would be a good idea, too. We have to find markets.

I am sure all hon. members read the Press statement of 19 August in which Dr. Crissy said, "Move out and create markets." He said that the Communist countries are largely taking markets we could have. He said, "You have to go out and find markets; they do not come to you." What happened when Mr. Evans went to Japan on matters affecting coal? Things then started to happen. What happened when Mr. Morris went to England and America when he was a Minister?

Mr. Bennett: Why did you kick him out?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: We did not kick him out. He worked so hard that his health broke down. Any hon. member who speaks disparagingly of Mr. Morris and the trip that he made should think of Amoco. That alone more than justified his trip. He tried to find industries to come here and process our maize. I recall one man who came here, Mr. Stewart, the president of the giant world-wide organisation of Quaker Oats. He came out immediately after Mr. Morris's trip to get what information he could on the possibility of his coming here from America, with his £160,000,000-a-year turn-over organisation to process our maize in Queensland. He promised to send back technical men to go into this whole problem.

Mr. Houston: How long ago was that?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: A couple of years.

Mr. Aikens: Did you get anything from the visit of the Minister for Transport to Malaya?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I think something will come out of that. I feel that the Premier himself should go overseas to renew the contacts that Mr. Morris made with Quaker Oats and other organisations interested in coming here.

An Opposition Member: Do you think the Premier should take the Agent-General's job?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I am not suggesting that at all, but a lot of good could come from such a trip. I am quite sure that if the Premier went to the Middle East and other countries he could make many contacts valuable from the point of view of secondary industry and markets for the things that we process.

Mr. Aikens: They are not up at the Trades Hall.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: That is quite true. The main purchaser of our maize is Kellogg's Corn Flakes in Sydney, and we appreciate that that market is there. One reason why not many people are employed in country areas is intense mechanisation. The industry cannot stand the costs and is now, from ploughing and planting to harvesting, completely mechanised. Peanuts and maize are hardly touched by hand, and this has brought about over-production.

Mr. Houston: How do you overcome that?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: We want more markets. Kellogg's Corn Flakes cannot take all our maize and we have to find other outlets. The Government's subsidy helped us last year when maize was sent to Japan. When the first shipment went the Minister for Transport subsidised it to the extent of £1 a ton.

Mr. Houston: Do you think the Premier should go to Red China to get markets?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: No, but I think that there are plenty of other countries in which he could make contact with people interested in the things that we have to sell. I am quite sure that the hon. member would not wish him to go to Red China and that that was not in his thoughts. Much notice is taken overseas of responsible members of the Government, particularly men like the Premier. When the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity was visiting the United States. I was only with him for a few weeks but I know that he addressed many meetings and, on asking men who attended where they came from, we learnt that they had come from cities hundreds of miles away in order to hear what a Minister had to say about Queensland. In that way, a responsible man such as our Premier, who is highly regarded, could gain a great amount of publicity for Queensland and attract many industries to Queensland. I appeal to the Premier to consider seriously making such a trip in the interests of primary producers and the State. If such contacts are continued at the Premier's level, I am sure that a great deal of good will come from them and that the overall result will be in the interests of the State.

The main thoughts that I should like to leave with the House are these: that valuations for the freeholding of land should be those fixed by the Department of the Valuer-General, plus a 10 per cent., 15 per cent. or 20 per cent. increase as a privilege for freeholding; that further freeholding rights be granted as a living area; that balloting in partnership should be allowed. My second main point related to the need to assist the maize and peanut growers in the South Burnett district and in the Coalstoun Lakes, where a great proportion of the crop is grown, by lower freight rates.

Mr. Aikens: What is the good of lower freight rates if you cannot sell the maize?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: We eventually get rid of it. Like other maize-growers, I sometimes have hundreds of bags of maize out in the paddocks for weeks. Eventually one takes what the market is offering, even though the price is very low.

Mr. Duffy: When you are talking about living areas in regard to freehold, I assume you would suggest that 60,000 acres in the west, which is a living area there, should be freeholded, too?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is not entitled to make a speech.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I am sorry that the hon. member for Warrego was not here earlier to hear what I said. I will not reiterate my remarks now. He can read the report of my speech later.

My final point was that we, as a Government, should make greater efforts to find markets for our primary products and that, in this connection, the Premier should go overseas as early as possible to try to obtain these markets.

Mr. Aikens: Do you think that if the Prisons Department again fed prisoners on hominy it would affect the maize market very much?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: No. That is beside the point. I again commend the Premier and his Ministers for their hard work. I have been particularly pleased by the keen interest that they have taken in the many projects in the Barambah electorate, and the very many visits that we have had from the Premier and his Ministers—we received few if any visits from Ministers in Labour Governments—have given the electorate a new lease of life in many ways. I say that in all sincerity, because I have represented the Barambah electorate during the term of office of former Labour Governments and during the term of office of this Government, and I know, as do many hon. members opposite, that there has been a tremendous improvement in the outlook of people in country areas under the present Government.

Mr. DEAN (Sandgate) (4.19 p.m.): Once again it is with pleasure that I participate in the debate on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and take advantage of the opportunity afforded me of affirming my loyalty and that of the people in the Sandgate electorate, whom I have the privilege of representing, to Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II.

I also express my appreciation and respect to Her Majesty's representative in Queensland, His Excellency the Governor, Colonel Sir Henry Abel Smith, and compliment the Administrator, Sir Alan Mansfield, on the efficient way in which he carries out his duties and responsibilities.

Carrying on that same thought, Mr. Speaker, I offer my congratulations to you on your re-election to that very high office. I hope you will be spared to see the term completely out.

I intend to confine myself today to two subjects only, but they are, in my opinion, very important subjects. First of all, listening to His Excellency's Opening Speech, nowhere could I detect any positive move contemplated by the Government, in the near future, to give consideration to providing some protection to the people of Queensland against pernicious restrictive trade practices, monopolies, and mergers, as they are commonly referred to.

It is no use the Government's trying to evade this dangerous trend in our society by refusing to take some positive action to curb these fast-developing commercial monsters.

I ask the Government, in all seriousness, to move in all haste to take action, to the full limit of its constitutional powers, to investigate all the mergers and take-overs that are taking place in this State at the present time. I am firmly convinced that the only effective way is by controlling legislation.

Let us take a closer look at this problem and to a certain extent, analyse it. There are three ways in which people conduct and engage themselves in commercial activities: first of all, by competition; secondly, by monopoly; and finally, by restrictive practices.

Competition can be defined as follows:

"To purchase or manufacture as cheaply as one can and then sell for less than others so as to increase one's volume of trade."

Monopoly, in another sense, consists of getting by devious means or some special arrangement a major share of the market so that you eliminate your competitors, thereby allowing yourself to fix the highest price you wish, disregarding, of course, the most important fact of whether the public can afford to pay the price you fix.

Mr. Aikens: And to supply an article of the poorest quality.

Mr. DEAN: Quite so. The third way is by way of restrictive trade practices; that is, to come to some arrangement with a competitor or competitors not to enter into full competition with one another and so be able to fix prices at a level satisfactory to the particular group.

These restrictive trade practices are as old as history itself. It simply means attempts by certain commercial men to interfere, for their own personal advantage, with the industry in which they are interested. In other words, they simply corner the market and thereby destroy all vestige of competition that might have existed.

In my opinion, combinations consisting of commercial undertakings that enter into these restrictive trade practices can be accused of illegal conspiracy and of acting and trading against the public interest. In other words, their integrity as business men is very seriously in doubt.

The high prices prevailing at present must surely indicate to the Government that all these mergers and take-overs have not been essentially in the interests of the people of Queensland. The Government should beware of these take-over influences in our State and urge Queensland-owned companies to resist these trends, which no doubt will increase in intensity in the very near future.

This take-over trend is causing much concern to the people of Queensland and should be very disturbing to the Government

also. Of course, if it is allowed to continue it will eventually do much harm to the State. With rare exceptions, I would say that all it has meant has been the transfer of control and the movement of money out of the State. In very few instances has it meant an increase of capital or the establishment of a new business or industry in Queensland. It would appear that the take-over trend will continue and gather momentum as prosperity increases in Queensland. According to some people's views, it will be very difficult for some Queensland companies to combat the temptation to merge, but in the interests of Queensland they should resist it wherever they can. Some people will argue that it is a condition that has developed because of the investor interest growing in our State and that we must accept it. Frankly, I cannot accept that conception, much as I welcome new industries, new capital, new skills, and new ideas to Queensland. I say that the Government should give the utmost help and encouragement to those people who wish to come to this State to invest capital for the establishment of new industries, which, in the long run and in the main, means employing more of our people. This class of investor, the one who establishes a new industry, is the one we want. We certainly do not want the people who are merely promoters or who absorb existing organisations, adding not one penny to the prospects of Queensland but who take advantage of circumstances just to better their own personal position and their own particular commercial activity. In other words, the Government should be very careful in the selection of the right type of person that will invest capital in Queensland. When I say that, I do not wish to see Queensland, or Australia, for that matter, completely dominated by foreign capital. Let me remind the House what a visiting American trade authority warned recently in Sydney. He was Professor John Ewing, Associate Professor of International Trade and Marketing at the Stanford University of California. The Professor said that Australia could soon find itself dominated by American interests unless the flow of overseas capital was regulated. He went on to state that no matter how great the capital inflow, outside domination was not good for Australia's economy. Of course, the Federal Treasurer, Mr. Holt, did not agree with the wise professor's remarks. Mr. Holt said that the risks associated with overseas investment were minor compared with the risks of failure to populate and develop Australia. Professor Ewing also pointed out that it was nonsense to suggest that all forms of restriction dissuaded foreign investors. He cited Japan and Mexico as examples who had restricted foreign investment to partnership with local capital, thereby guaranteeing local interests. It had not stopped foreign investors from investing in either of those countries. The professor stated that a basis of 49 per cent. Australian capital to 51 per cent. foreign investment would provide all the protection our economy needed. He

said it would reduce the outflow of capital in dividends and ensure that 49 per cent. of profits would be returned to the local economy. This would prevent foreign companies, established with a combined Australian-foreign capital, from buying up the Australian shareholding and returning all dividends to overseas shareholders. Of course, these views are not shared by the presidents of the associated chambers of commerce, or Sir Leon Trout, who recently described the proposed restrictive trade legislation as discriminatory, bureaucratic, and unnecessary. However, it has been recognised for a considerable time now that restrictive trade practices distorted the competitive pattern of Australia's system of commercial enterprise. For example, let us look briefly at some of these huge recent take-overs, the most recent ones who have confined their interests to Australia in the last few years.

To give a clear example—to make myself clear and understandable on this subject—I have taken an interest in the development of the bread-manufacturing trade in Australia generally. I thought the item of bread would be an ideal commodity to show, by way of a very strong example, what a huge combine was taking over and doing to a basic commodity. I refer to the firm of George Weston Limited, which began operations in Australia in 1949. It now has assets in this country of more than £19,000,000 and is considered to be our largest bread manufacturer. This firm is an Australian subsidiary of the huge British-Canadian combine of bakers and biscuit-makers. By way of interest, let us trace the development of this combine and see what has happened since 1949. It began its operations with the take-over of the firm of Gartrell White Pty. Ltd., the largest bread and cake business in Sydney. As time went on, the company extended its interests to Melbourne, Brisbane, and Adelaide. Through Tip Top Bakeries, Westons extended its bakery business by buying subsidiaries in Canberra, Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane and Adelaide. Of local interest, we find that the Brisbane purchase included Sheerans, Currans, Dances, and the old-established firm of Websters Ltd. From all these negotiations, I think it would be of interest to place on record that it is estimated that since World War I. the Weston family fortune has been built up to £180,000,000. The Australian company reports a consolidated net profit of £291,541 for the five months ended 2 January this year. But, more enlightening still, is the profit of the company and its subsidiaries for the full year ended 2 January of £732,445. The difference in the two figures, of course, represents the proportion of profits of the combine's subsidiaries before their effective acquisition by the new holding company on 2 August, 1962. Would anyone have the temerity to suggest that this huge take-over has been instrumental in providing better and cheaper bread for the Australian family? Personally, I should say it has not.

But I would say that such take-overs have destroyed good, healthy competition. Under this form of commercial activity the Australian housewife has no choice of brand or quality. In other words, one brand, one quality. Of course, the attitude is "take it or leave it." With no alternative, the only thing the housewife can do to feed her family is to take the bread. I think we are justified in expecting a much lower-priced bread from the industry because of the utilisation of modern techniques and up-to-date machinery. Instead, what do we find? We are paying higher prices for bread each year, with very little improvement, if any, in quality.

Another noticeable trend I think worthy of mention, and worth bringing forward by way of prompting agitating thought on this very vital subject, is the noticeable trend developing in the system of take-overs of diversification from traditional fields by some companies. The firm of Queensland United Foods Ltd., the State's milk and ice-cream giant, has now bought a rum distillery, a fishing-rod making business and a timber group, namely, the Normanby Rum Distillery, Len Butterworth Holdings, and Corbett's Timbers. To my mind, this type of monopoly in the final analysis will not benefit the individual, or the people as a whole. Concentration of power of this kind is frightening because it places us at the mercy of some of these commercial giants who have practically the full say and control over our economic existence. This growing control of industry in our State should be very carefully looked into. That is especially so if any of those monopolies and combines were permitted to take money out of the State or out of Australia, and the indications are quite clear, and have been for some time, that many of them do take most of their earnings outside the Commonwealth.

Of course, the final result of all these activities and trends will be the destruction of Queensland companies, thereby retarding the progress of the State.

In regard to this problem of merger or combine, we should claim the right to expect the Government to take notice and act in the light of experience gained in other Western countries and, by way of example, let me tell you that in most advanced Western countries today, such as the United States of America, New Zealand, Canada, Great Britain, West Germany, the Scandinavian countries and France, have adopted effective measures in one form or another to combat monopolistic or anti-competitive practices and tendencies, thereby encouraging competition and growth in their own economies.

Surely a cogent, common-sense argument for an effective anti-monopoly measure in Queensland would be to enact similar legislation prohibiting combinations, etc. in restraint of trade. We have been told that a Bill to control restrictive trade practices and monopolies by means of a Federal Act should

appear in the near future, but it will be of very little use indeed unless we have identical legislation in the State to work in conjunction with that Federal Act.

I submit, therefore, that the present-day Governments have allowed themselves to be influenced too much by the pressure tactics from the Associated Chambers of Manufacturers, who have from time to time encouraged Governments to abandon the whole idea of legislative control over combines. Most of their arguments consist of assertions and counter-assertions and deliberately evade the fact that the countries I referred to earlier have found it necessary to safeguard their economies by means of legislative control. It is very regrettable that they choose to ignore this overseas experience and, of course, in all the argument put forward by these commercial interests they make little reference, if any, to the influence that restrictive practices and monopolies have on Australian economic life.

I feel that our Governments cannot excuse themselves any longer by continuing to mislead the people by giving the impression that the incidence of monopoly is somewhat of a modern creation when, by a little research, we find that in 1890 the United States and Canada pioneered in that field; Germany had legislation in the inter-war years and after 1945 various new legislative forms appeared in Scandinavia, Holland, Great Britain and Western Germany, and even the Common Market countries thought it wise to provide in Articles 85 and 86 of the Treaty of Rome for legislation to control restrictive practices affecting the trade between themselves.

Finally, I feel that, if some action is not taken by the Government in relation to this merger activity, it will have a crucial effect on determining the competitive pattern in Queensland's future industrial development. I am sure that you realise, as well as most other hon. members in the Chamber, that it is a subject of great magnitude and one on which a great deal of time could profitably be spent.

I have another subject I wish to speak on. I will only be able to touch on it briefly at this stage but I think it should awaken some interest in the Government. It is a subject of great seriousness which, in my opinion, constitutes a very grave health hazard to the State and, in particular, to this city. I refer to the pollution of the Brisbane River and Moreton Bay by the discharge of city sewerage effluent directly into these waters. I consider that the time is long overdue for the Government to enter into close co-operation with the Brisbane City Council for the establishment of an up-to-date sewage purification plant. There is little doubt in my mind—and, I feel sure, in many others—that the reaches of the river and the foreshores of the bay are being polluted. Evidence of this pollution can be seen among the mangroves and on certain

banks in the bay at low-water mark. If some action is not taken in the near future to overcome this potential health menace, I feel that a very dangerous situation could arise.

Mr. Houghton: Are you going to go through the motions and see if the Government will do something?

Mr. DEAN: I feel sure that the hon. member for Redcliffe would be able to enlarge on this to a very great extent because he has had experience with the local sewerage scheme at Redcliffe. Much to our dismay, in Sandgate we get the effluent from Redcliffe and they get the benefit of sewerage facilities.

If some action is not taken, I feel that the Government may regret it because the problem will develop into major proportions and cost many thousands of pounds, even millions, whereas at the moment there is a chance to check this menace before it goes too far. Is the Government going to wait till the pollution reaches such proportions that it may become necessary to close completely certain beaches in Moreton Bay, similar to what took place in parts of the United States where two Milwaukee beaches have been closed since 1959?

More important still is the fact that the Government has fostered and encouraged the prawning industry to operate on an extensive scale in Moreton Bay, and it needs little imagination to realise what would constitute the major food supply for the prawn in these waters. It is a common sight also to see people fishing in the Brisbane River at the main outfall of the main sewage discharge which, in my opinion, should be declared a prohibited area for fishing.

When it is considered that the original design of a sewerage scheme for Brisbane was first adopted in 1911 and it was not until 1923 that the first house connection could be made, the Government should take early and positive action in the next 12 months to see that a modern sewage purification plant is constructed, or preparation made for a sewage farm. I feel that this long and protracted delay cannot be excused any longer. So far as the principal of sewage farming is concerned, the City of Brisbane is well behind other cities of the Commonwealth when it comes to the disposal of sewage by means of the farm system.

At the present time there is ample land available for this purpose adjacent to the city. When this land is taken up for residential development or commercial undertakings, available sites will no longer exist for this very important system of sewage disposal.

A Government Member: Don't say too much because you were an alderman for many years.

Mr. DEAN: During those years I was one of the greatest champions of this system that I am bringing before the notice of the

House this afternoon. I am sorry to state that what I had to say fell on deaf ears. The major portion of my time in the Council was spent in Opposition, but I have a strong feeling today that the position will not be the same in this House. It will not be long before I am in the administration. By way of example, let me refer to some of the systems working very satisfactorily within the Commonwealth at present.

Take the city of Adelaide as an example. In 1881 the first sewage was distributed on a farm for disposal, and the method used ever since has been a system of broad irrigation, combined with intermittent and downward filtration through properly prepared grassed filter beds during the winter months. I mention that for the sake of the record, because in other places no record has been kept of schemes of this kind. The treatment plants are on the principle known as activated sludge. They have functioned satisfactorily, yielding highly purified effluents.

Another very fine example that might well be imitated by this Government is the Werribee scheme in Victoria, which serves 98 per cent. of the sewered areas. In this system it is interesting to note that, from the end of the rising mains, the sewage commences its 16-mile journey by gravitation along the main outfall sewer, which is 11 feet in diameter, to the metropolitan farm at Werribee. From information in the Victorian Year Book, 1963, it appears that the total area of this farm is 26,811 acres and that the area used for disposal is 15,859 acres, the average rainfall over 66 years being 18.83 inches. Incidentally, I think it is also very interesting to note that the net cost of sewage purification per head of population served is 4s. 10d. It must be remembered, of course, that Victoria has the population to enable it to keep costs down. Also by way of interest, the profit on cattle and sheep pastured on part of this area was £213,845. The sewage is treated by three different methods—land filtration, grass filtration, and lagoon treatment.

In the limited time at my disposal it is possible to outline only briefly the very successful sewage systems to which I have referred. My main reason for mentioning them is to impress upon the Government the urgent need to take appropriate action to prevent our main waterways from becoming completely polluted. The Government should also take heed of the advice given recently by an officer of the State Health Department, Dr. M. H. Gabriel, that action should be taken against the apparent threat of pollution. He stated further that our water supplies could be polluted by natural surface drainage and by sewage effluent, and said that it had been estimated that 25 per cent of the population of England and Wales now obtained water from rivers polluted in this way. His warning indicates that action must be taken now, not in 10 or 20 years' time. Dr. Gabriel said that in parts of the U.S.A. the percentage might

be even higher than the figure quoted for England and Wales, but that, fortunately, in Australia the problem has not reached these proportions. However, it could easily do so in the future if we do not take every possible precaution now to prevent it. He also said that he was opposed to the use of water supply reservoirs for recreational activities such as boating, fishing, and bathing, and I think he would have a great deal of support in his opposition. Over the past 12 or 18 months these activities have increased considerably, with the introduction of boats than can be transported quickly and easily, and the matter should be given urgent consideration. Dr. Gabriel pointed out that recent studies on the persistence of viruses in water indicated that reservoirs should be protected absolutely.

Advice of this sort from such a highly qualified man as Dr. Gabriel should be acted upon by the Government, which should request the State Health Department to carry out a very intensive and extensive investigation into all aspects of water pollution. I have been fearful for some time and for years have expressed concern to the relevant authorities on the consequences that could be suffered by people living in the Sandgate area through the pollution brought about by sewage and industrial effluent being discharged into the Brisbane River. We must realise also that, with the increased use of modern detergents, the problem of pollution will grow considerably. If early action is not taken, a situation could develop similar to that which occurred in parts of the U.S.A. when foam caused by the use of detergents in residue was discharged into the main drainage system of some cities in that country.

I feel that if the Government fails to take action in the near future, seaside resorts like Sandgate could become closed areas to bathing and fishing. That would be not only a tragedy to Sandgate, but also a great loss to the State of one of its premier bayside resorts.

I now wish to finish on a brighter note. I should like to say that the Sandgate electorate continues to grow and develop with ever-increasing population, and improvements in its commercial and trading facilities and public utilities. In the very near future we hope to see further dredging of Cabbage Tree Creek for the construction of a boat harbour, and also the construction of a clerk of petty sessions office and a new ambulance centre.

I feel also that it is worthy to record, in regard to our local ambulance brigade, that owing to its exceptionally high standard of efficiency and the esteem in which it is held by the local people, 90 per cent. of Sandgate electors are annual subscribers to the brigade.

Having said that, I will content myself now with hoping that what I have said on the two subjects I have dealt with will be taken notice of by the Government; that we will see legislation brought down within the next session

or two to deal with restrictive-trading practices in this State, and that we will not have to wait long before there is a Bill before the House dealing with the very vital subject of the pollution of our natural waters.

Mr. WHARTON (Burnett) (4.53 p.m.): I wish to associate myself with the Address in Reply to the Opening Speech delivered by Sir Alan Mansfield. Even though we did miss His Excellency Sir Henry Abel Smith, the opening by Sir Alan lost none of the lustre of this very impressive ceremony.

I should like at this stage to pledge the loyalty of the people of Burnett to our Most Gracious Sovereign. Sir Henry, as her representative, has made many friends in my electorate as the result of many visits he has made to that area.

I should like also to congratulate the hon. member for Carnarvon and the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha on their election to this Parliament. I congratulate them in particular on the excellent manner in which they proposed the Address in Reply to the Administrator's Speech. I congratulate all new members of the House upon their election, and I wish them a happy stay. I hope it will bear fruit not only for themselves, but for the people they represent.

I want to thank my own electors for their confidence in returning me as member for Burnett with an increased majority. I am very pleased about that. I believe it is the result of my policy of trying to assist everybody without regard to political or religious beliefs. During the time I have represented the electorate I have travelled many miles in an effort to become acquainted with as many electors as possible. I also thank those who helped me to secure re-election. Much of the credit for that is due to the policy and work of the Government in my electorate. I greatly appreciate what has been done there in the last three years. The Government's policy has been appreciated by the Burnett electors, and the policy adopted in my electorate has applied throughout the whole of the State. I was surprised to hear the Leader of the Opposition complaining about what was done at election time. There is no doubt that the policies adopted by the Government throughout the term of the last Parliament were what the people appreciated. It is not what you say just before election day, it is what is done throughout the term of the previous Parliament. The Government has done these things and they have been appreciated by the people.

I should like to comment on some of the remarks of the hon. member for Sandgate, particularly his comments regarding restrictive trade practices. It is a manner of great significance to us all. As a representative of primary-producer organisations I point out that it is a much wider subject than the hon. member implied. Farming communities find themselves in a cleft stick. At the present time they are battling against rising

costs. Later I shall show how very significant they are. Indeed they are being fostered by the Opposition. Not only are we being hit by rising costs of production but in marketing costs we are being hit by a hard buying core. Marketing organisations are feeling the pinch and they are inclined to organise to the detriment of the farmers. I make particular reference to the bacon industry. We have several bacon factories but they are finding difficulty in selling their goods because of the competitive buying. Naturally, the return to the farmer is based on the price paid.

We must not leave the primary industry section out of it when we are talking about restrictive trade practices. As a representative of primary producers' organisations let me say that we are going to take some part in it. I hope it will not be held against that section for trying to get as much as we can for the farmers.

This afternoon I should like to deal with a matter that is very dear to my heart, one which is foremost in the minds of the Government. I refer to the development of Queensland, particularly in relation to primary industries. It was very pleasing to listen to the hon. member for Barambah. I agree with the good sense he expressed. It is a little unfortunate that I had intended to deal with some of the matters he spoke about. I agree with what he said about finding markets for our primary produce.

In discussing development in Queensland I commend the Government for its practical approach to the development of secondary industries by the recent appointment of Sir David Muir as Director-General of Industry. I agree, as I am sure all hon. members will, that whatever we can do for development in this State should be done. I think all hon. members will also agree that the greatest scope for development lies in the establishment of secondary industries. Secondary industries make a great contribution to the State by increasing the working population which forms a sound basis for the home market for all classes of goods. The best markets for our primary industries are the home markets, and we should look to them first.

Through the development of secondary industries we will get more people to pay for the amenities and services and progressive needs of development such as power, sewerage, and transport facilities. These people, too, will create a market for the sale of many products used in manufacture as well as providing the indirect benefits of through-put in shipping, transport, wharfage, and so on.

I do not wish to say much more on the secondary industries aspect, as other hon. members will probably have a great deal to say about it. However, to take it a little further, as the State progresses with the expansion of our secondary industries, so too will it progress with the expansion

of primary industries. Secondary industries and primary industries are co-related, and any move to foster and expand secondary industries must be matched by a similar drive to gear up primary industry. I want to emphasise that because I believe that development must be along balanced lines. Secondary industries will develop directly in the larger cities and provincial towns. This is obviously businesslike because of the proximity to consumer markets. Secondary industries must obviously be established wherever the best markets are, and naturally they are in the larger towns. I believe that some smaller towns would benefit by the establishment of secondary industries suitable for them. I believe, too, that the greatest problem confronting secondary industries is the need for markets and marketing, and I believe that the same problem faces primary industries. Of course, secondary industries will attract more people and in turn they will take more of our primary products on the home market. However, we must find export markets as well for our surplus products. When I say that, I mean that we must find markets for our surplus products, and develop and improve our trade overseas. In fact, I go so far as to say that there are markets overseas for the primary products we have to sell. I appreciate and respect the work that primary industries and organisations have done, and are doing, in this matter, and I believe that, as a Government, we should appoint a Director of Primary Industry just as we have appointed a Director of Secondary Industries. That is very important because I believe that, for the balanced progress of the State, they must go hand in hand, and if it is good enough to develop our secondary industries it is good enough to develop our primary industries. In that way we will develop the State on balanced lines.

I am concerned in this matter because I think that our primary industries may lag behind. As I said a moment ago, costs are rising continually. Unions are seeking higher wages, higher margins, and longer leave and this will be reflected later in increased costs for the farmer. There is no question that if the greatest cost is increased—I refer to wages—then the overall cost of production must increase.

The hon. member for Salisbury had a lot to say about price control but let me point out to him that he cannot have it both ways. We cannot have very high wages and still keep very low prices. The hon. member for Salisbury probably will not appreciate this, but, if he knew his subject, he would know that many primary industries have not increased the price of their products despite increased costs. Indeed, some have reduced prices in spite of increasing costs. I refer to sugar, butter and peanuts.

Mr. Sherrington: You had better stick to the Burnett. You are out of your element on this.

Mr. WHARTON: The Burnett will continue to make a great and increasing contribution. The need today is more markets, particularly overseas. As the wage level rises so the costs of the producer increase, which bring about an increase in price to the consumer. The whole cost structure is affected.

I submit that, if costs beyond the control of producers rise, as I have just indicated, in the recent wage cost structure, then it can be expected that the primary producer is entitled to increase his price to the consumer to meet an annual cost increase. I see this as the only way in which our very efficient primary producers can hold their place with every other section in the State. If the producer does not increase the price of his goods when his costs rise, where will he finish? Naturally he must not move too far ahead and create too big a gap but he must move with the times. Every section must benefit as we go along in a balanced way. I do not complain about increasing costs and consequent rises in prices as long as all share in it. I want to stress that because I think it is important. I am concerned that primary industry should be in line with the rest of industry. The development of primary industry must proceed more or less parallel with the development of secondary industry. Hon. members opposite must bear in mind that we are all dependent on one another. We want to see the workers fully employed and earning good wages so they can buy our produce. We are all workers, only some get their money by wage while others are self-employed. We want to maintain a balance and not have one section profit at the expense of another. I am not advocating pulling anybody down. I should like to see every section stepped up. Particularly do I want to see primary industry maintained and stepped up in line with the general development of the State.

I have already emphasised the part secondary industry is playing and will continue to play in the development of Queensland and the Commonwealth. How much more important, then, is it for our primary industries in a State like this to be encouraged? Secondary industries will develop the towns and provide extra money. The expansion of primary industry will develop the wide spaces of this great State. Each in his own way will develop his assets. Producers are individuals. As secondary industries develop and more employment is provided for city workers they are able to buy better homes and enjoy better living conditions but in primary industry it is the individual producer who develops his assets, who conducts his own business, who develops his own property. Though he does that as an individual, it is being done throughout the whole State. That is an important aspect of development. It is the hard core of private enterprise. If we can develop free enterprise with people owning their own assets, we should foster it with all the power at our disposal. That is the spirit in which I suggest we should

appoint a Director-General of Primary Industry. This would help in the search for additional markets for primary products, and the ascertaining of potential markets. It would assist in establishing whether there was a need for an increase or decrease in any industry, and cater for local and overseas markets. It would help to make known increases or decreases that go with the tide of market requirements.

The sugar industry is a typical example of what can be done when an industry is well organised within itself. The market is assessed and production adjusted to it. It has been necessary to appoint a committee of inquiry to investigate markets for further expansion in that industry. The findings of that committee will have a very important bearing upon the States concerned with sugar production. Many people in my electorate, particularly round Bundaberg, are very interested in sugar. We have many very efficient producers, excellent land, a good climate, and ample manpower and water, and when the committee's inquiry is completed I hope that this area will be included in those allotted additional quotas. We have five efficient mills mechanised and geared to cater for any increased markets that may come.

The appointment of a Director-General of Primary Industry would continue and expand that work. In that way we would have no sudden inquiries, no sudden finding of markets, seeking of them, or loss of them. We would know if increased production was to be needed or whether it should decrease, and this would be a great benefit to industries other than sugar.

This same psychology on marketing could be applied to all primary industries. There are markets at present in Singapore, Madang, and Hong Kong for citrus fruits. A start has been made in the supply of Ellendale mandarins and Valencia oranges to that part of the world.

Mr. Bromley: Do you think we should form a common market with Asian countries?

Mr. WHARTON: I should not worry about that. The selling of citrus fruits at 37s. and 33s. a bushel for Ellendale mandarins and Valencia oranges is quite satisfactory, but I would not say that the market is unlimited. If there is a market there, we should go after it and cater for it because there is in the State, and in my area, an increasing market needed for citrus fruits. I believe that this is something that could be extended, and I look forward to some action along the lines that we seek. Increased production would mean increased manpower and further development of the State.

The hon. member for Barambah referred to the market for maize. There is in Japan a market for 200,000 tons of maize each year. Last year we exported only 5,000 tons. I say that that is not nearly enough for a State such as Queensland, in which maize

production can really be expanded. The sky would be the limit if we had markets at pre-negotiated prices.

I pay a tribute to the Government for reducing rail freights in its export drive. I believe that we can, with great benefit, continue the rail freight concession that enables the maize industry to take advantage of that market. As I said, markets must be assessed. If we do not have markets, we cannot sell our products.

There is also a good market in Japan and the countries of the Near East for butter, cheese, and other milk products. A start has been made in selling these products; but I believe that the market can be expanded not only in the basic lines but also in diversified dairy products, maize, and so on.

We must follow the pattern of meat production and marketing. Meat is killed where it is produced, stored in cold stores, and regulated to meet the needs of the American market. This method has been adopted only in recent years, but it is something that we could well extend because there is great scope for further trade with America in beef and many other products. I commend Amagraz for seeking a market in America. It has endeavoured to find a way of producing here in Brisbane a meat product suitable for the American retail market, and I believe that it should be given every encouragement.

As I have said, there is need for a Director-General of Primary Industry to assist the tobacco, cotton, peanut and grain-growing industries and other primary industries to find and assess export markets and assist with local marketing problems. I believe that we must take action to line primary industries up with secondary industries in this regard.

In dealing with markets, I wish to say something about pork. Pork is now being sold under rather old-fashioned marketing methods. The Act prevents the industry from selling pork in delicatessens or pre-packed-food stores such as the B.C.C., and if we could get away from the old-fashioned method of selling it at butcher shops and sell it pre-packed in places such as I have mentioned, the market for pork would increase. This would assist the industry as a whole, because if we sold more pork as pork it would assist the bacon producer and have a steadying influence on pig prices.

I have shown, I am sure, the need for the appointment of a Director-General of Primary Industry. I know that the suggestion has a great deal of merit and that such an appointment would assist in solving the main problem of marketing our products.

I wish now to say a word or two about irrigation. If we are to develop Queensland we must in some way increase our spending on irrigation projects. I appreciate the Government's difficulties. It is doing a

wonderful job with the resources available to it. At present only about £2,000,000 a year can be spent on a major dam project, and we should try to allocate an increased amount for irrigation. I know the argument will be advanced that it is not a very good return for the Government. Possibly it is not, but is it not better to have the money in the hands of the people than in the hands of the Government? When one looks at the indirect results, such as increased production, increased employment, and increased taxation, there is some merit in the expansion of irrigation projects, which provide an avenue for the Federal Government to aid in the State's development. I do not think there could be any better avenue for that than irrigation.

I do not want to deal at length with parochial matters, except to say that in my electorate we have need for considerable expansion of irrigation works. As I say, the Commonwealth Government could help by providing water storages for the Burnett, thus fostering our primary industries and helping them in their endeavour to arrive at stability and security.

I conclude by stressing the need for an increased allocation of moneys to the irrigation budget because I believe it will bring to this great State of ours and the people in it something we all desire—security.

Debate, on motion of Mr. Newton, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 5.23 p.m.
