

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**THURSDAY, 5 SEPTEMBER 1963**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

**THURSDAY, 5 SEPTEMBER, 1963**

---

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

**QUESTIONS**

COMPENSATION CLAIMS, STREET ASSAULTS.  
—Mr. Dean, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

Has his attention been drawn to the passing of a recent Act by the New Zealand Government allowing a claim for compensation to be made relating to assault by street thugs on law abiding citizens? If so, does he intend to seek further information from the New Zealand authorities with a view to proposing similar legislation to the Queensland Parliament?

Answer:—

"Enquiries disclose that there is a Bill before the New Zealand Parliament relating to the subject of the Question but the Bill is not available at the present time. However, the Honourable Member can be assured that, as soon as the Bill is available, its contents will be studied and examined."

COMPENSATION FOR SURRENDER OF LICENSE, ALBERT HOTEL, BRISBANE.—Mr. Aikens, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Justice,—

(1) Has a claim been made to the Licensing Commission by the owner, Castlemaine Perkins, for £12,425 and the licensee, R. J. Weller, for £7,000 in respect of the surrender of the license of the Albert Hotel, Brisbane, to sell liquor?

(2) If so, what moral or legal grounds exist for the claim that the temporary holders of such license should be paid £19,425?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "The Liquor Acts, 1912 to 1961" provide for the payment of compensation from The Liquor Acts Trust Fund to an owner and licensee of licensed victuallers premises upon the acceptance of the surrender of the license, and prescribe the basis for the assessment of such compensation by the Licensing Commission. The claims of the owner and licensee were heard on September 2, 1963, and the hearing was adjourned *sine die* for consideration by the Commission."

TEENAGE DRINKING OF ALCOHOL.—Mr. Dean, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Justice,—

In view of the very serious disclosures made by the Rev. Ivan Alcorn, Director of the Methodist Church Young People's Department, that teenage drinking of alcohol had increased following the introduction of Queensland's new liquor laws, as was reported in *The Courier-Mail* of September 2, will he now give consideration to ordering a full and open inquiry into the drinking conditions and the social problems associated with the drinking of alcohol in Queensland?

Answer:—

"The Honourable Member is mistaken in referring to the statements by the Rev. Ivan Alcorn as "disclosures". They are in fact merely an expression of an opinion. I am informed by the Chairman of the Licensing Commission that the evidence available to it does not support the claim that teenage drinking of alcohol had increased following the introduction of Queensland's new liquor laws. On the contrary, in terms of the new law, teenagers are excluded from "Beer gardens"

and continued attention is being paid to hotels by police officers with a view to ensuring that the provisions of The Liquor Acts, prohibiting the supply of liquor to minors, are being observed. Mr. Alcorn's further reported statement that it is impossible to police the new laws and that it would be better to revert to the liquor laws which operated previously, is also not supported by the facts. Liquor laws at any time are difficult to enforce, but in relation to this it would be more correct to point out that the laws which were in operation prior to 1961 were in some important respects not capable of enforcement. This was one of the major factors which influenced the Legislature in making important changes in the law with the objective of making the law enforcement more effective. The drinking conditions and the social problems associated with the drinking of alcohol in Queensland were examined and considered in various quarters prior to the enactment of the 1961 Amendment of the Acts. It is therefore not proposed to order a further enquiry at the present stage. The operation of the new laws, including the special educational measures to combat alcoholism and to discourage intemperance, will be closely watched and further remedial action will be instituted if found to be justified in the light of experience."

FOUR-LANE ROADWAY IN WALLANGARRA.—Mr. Duggan, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Mines,—

Has the new four-lane highway, which has been approved and surveyed and which is to be built through the town of Wallangarra, been commenced? If not, what is the approximate date of commencement of this important project?

Answer:—

"This matter was discussed with me last month by the Honourable Member for Carnarvon, who referred to it in his speech when moving the Address in Reply on August 22, 1963. No work is proposed by the Department of Main Roads for the construction of a four-lane roadway in Wallangarra, where the existing two-lane construction can be expected to cater for expected traffic requirements for many years. However, the New South Wales Department of Main Roads has notified the Commissioner of Main Roads that it proposes to erect an additional tick gate which will involve construction of a short length of divided roadway. The whole of this work, with the exception of one advance warning sign, will be within New South Wales. It is not known when the work will be put in hand."

STOCK INVESTIGATIONS SQUAD IN POLICE FORCE.—Mr. Duggan, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) What is the present strength of the stock squad of the Queensland Police?

(2) Is it a fact that there is only one stock specialist at each of the main centres?

(3) If the answer to Question (2) is in the affirmative, will he consider increasing the number of stock specialists at principal centres as the view is held by many land owners that the lack of additional experienced and trained personnel is having a damaging effect on both morale and effectiveness of these special squads?

*Answers:—*

(1) "Four."

(2) "There are no stock specialists appointed as such at any of the main centres outside Brisbane."

(3) "Whilst there are personnel at many centres throughout the State who are competent to investigate complaints in relation to stock offences, consideration will be given during the current financial year to the appointment of additional officers to investigate stock stealing offences at a number of centres to relieve the pressure on the Stock Investigation Squad at present functioning from Brisbane, and to deal more effectively and expeditiously with local requirements."

**HARBOUR DUES ON OIL AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS.**—Mr. Lloyd, pursuant to notice, asked The Treasurer,—

(1) What harbour dues will be levied on exports of Queensland oil by (a) Amoco and (b) Ampol?

(2) What is the estimated annual revenue from harbour dues on imports and exports of oil and petroleum products to and from the proposed Amoco and Ampol oil refineries?

*Answer:—*

(1 and 2) "The harbour dues payable by Amoco in respect of refinery products are those set out in the Amoco Agreement. The Honourable Member will note that, in terms of that Agreement, should the Company obtain supplies of crude oil in any other manner than by carriage by sea, e.g., supply of indigenous crudes by pipe line, the scale of harbour dues determines and a fresh scale has to be negotiated. A scale of harbour dues is yet to be finally negotiated with Ampol. There have been some preliminary discussions on this subject but final discussions have awaited the consideration and letting of tenders for the major work of dredging port approaches. Now that tenders have been let, the negotiations will be continued but neither Company is likely to be heavy users of crude oil before 1965 and I see no pressing urgency in settling the matter. The general scheduled rate of harbour dues on oil and petroleum products is at present 8s. per ton on imports and 6s. 3d. per ton on exports."

**STATISTICS IN MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS.**—Mr. Sherrington, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Labour and Industry,—

What was the total number of motor vehicles involved in accidents for the year ended June 30, 1963, and how many of these vehicles were driven by persons under the age of twenty-one years?

*Answer:—*

"The information is being obtained."

**PSYCHIATRIC WARD, TOWNSVILLE GENERAL HOSPITAL.**—Mr. Tucker, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health and Home Affairs,—

What is the present position regarding the provision of a new psychiatric ward for the Townsville General Hospital and when is it anticipated that it will be in operation?

*Answer:—*

"As there is not sufficient room available on the present Hospital Reserve at Townsville for this proposed building, the Hospitals Board is endeavouring to secure a suitable site elsewhere in the city. The Commonwealth Government has been requested to make available an area of land near the Garbutt Air Base for this purpose, but a decision in the matter has not yet been received."

**STOCK-KILLING ARRANGEMENTS, ROCKHAMPTON.**—Mr. Thackeray, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Agriculture and Forestry,—

(1) What arrangements have been entered into between the Government, the Central Queensland Meat Export Co. and Fields Pty. Ltd. for the killing arrangements of other operators who wish to have stock treated at Rockhampton?

(2) If Fields Pty. Ltd. have entered into agreements with the Government, when will this company or a subsidiary of Fields Pty. Ltd. be likely to start building operations at Rockhampton?

*Answers:—*

(1) "The Government has reached agreement in principle with the Central Queensland Meat Export Co. and T. A. Field Pty. Ltd. for the killing arrangements for operators who wish to have stock treated at Rockhampton. The broad basis of the agreement is that these two firms will slaughter on behalf of operators all meat for local consumption in the Rockhampton district abattoir

area, and in addition, facilities will be provided for operators wishing to kill for the export or other trades. The two firms have each agreed to make available to these operators up to 20 per cent. of the capacity of their respective works at all times of the year, as from commencement of the 1965 meat season. The meat is to be processed to current specifications at the rate prevailing under Queensland Meat Industry Board schedules or a higher rate if it could be shown the higher rate is justified. These must be reasonable notice of intention to slaughter by operators who use the facilities to ensure plant and labour are utilised to the fullest extent. A detailed agreement covering all points likely to arise is at present the subject of negotiations between the two firms and the Rockhampton District Abattoir Board."

(2) "It is not known when T. A. Field Pty. Ltd. will start building at Rockhampton but this cannot take place until plans are completed and tenders finalised. It is understood that land has been acquired and the planning of the new works has reached an advanced stage."

**CLOSURE OF STATE COAL MINE, OGMORE.**  
—Mr. Thackeray, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Mines,—

(1) Is it the intention of the Government to close the State mine at Ogmore? If so, what is the reason for closing the mine and what date has been arranged for its closure?

(2) Has consideration been given to providing other employment for the miners, also compensation to property owners at Ogmore?

*Answers:—*

(1) "The possibility of the closure of the State Coal Mine, Ogmore, and also of the privately owned mine at Injune has been reported in the Press. Such reports, however, did not emanate from the Government. Regarding Ogmore, I would mention that at the request of the Honourable Member for Callide I met the District President and Secretary of the Queensland Colliery Employees' Union and representatives of the Ogmore miners and discussed the matter with them. I agreed to their request that I would send the Chairman of the Queensland Coal Board and the General Manager of State Coal Mines to Central Queensland to explore the market potential of Ogmore coal. Arrangements were made to have a practical test of Ogmore coal conducted at the Rockhampton Gas Works and final details of this

test are now awaited. When these details are received a decision will be made as to any steps to be taken. I would mention that due to factors entirely beyond the control of the Government, the State Mine at Ogmore suffered a trading loss of some £13,287 for the financial year ended June 30, 1963."

(2) "As will be noted from the foregoing, no decision on this matter has yet been reached."

## OVERTIME PAID IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

### RETURN TO ORDER

The following paper was laid on the table:—

Return to an Order made by the House on 27 August last, on the motion of Mr. Gunn, showing the amount of overtime paid in each Government department (all funds) in 1962-1963.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

### PUBLICATION ON QUEENSLAND PORT FACILITIES

**Hon. T. A. HILEY** (Chatsworth—Treasurer and Minister for Housing) (11.13 a.m.), by leave: When speaking in the Supply debate I indicated that the Government intended to continue its campaign for the promotion and attraction of Queensland industries. As a further step in that campaign, I desire to inform hon. members that the Department of Harbours and Marine has compiled and published a comprehensive publication covering all Queensland port facilities. The publication includes plans of the port areas, including provision for present and future industrial expansion. I have arranged for two copies of the book to be added to the Parliamentary Library, and I lay one copy on the table of the House.

Hon. members will be aware that over recent years there have been remarkable developments in the many ports and harbours which lie along the coast of Queensland. The purpose behind this publication is not only to encourage maritime trade but also to help in the attraction of industries to the industrial areas that surround these ports. As such, it is another of the indicated steps for the attraction and promotion of Queensland industry, and I present it to the House.

Whereupon the hon. gentleman laid a copy of the book upon the table.

## OFFICIALS IN PARLIAMENT ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

### INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

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

**Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN** (Landsborough—Premier) (11.22 a.m.): I move—

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Officials in Parliament Acts, 1896 to 1961, in a certain particular.”

Mr. Hooper, this is the first opportunity I have had of addressing you since you were elected to the office of Chairman of Committees in this Parliament and I should like to take the opportunity of extending congratulations to you and wishing you well during the period of your occupancy of the office.

This Bill is a very short one and contains one principle only, which is to increase from 11 to 13 the number of Ministers that it is possible to appoint under the Officials in Parliament Acts.

In view of the ever-increasing responsibilities and duties of Ministers, brought about very largely by the intense development that has taken place in our State, it has been apparent for some time that certain action would have to be taken to give them some relief from the heavy burden of responsibilities and duties they have to undertake.

From time to time since this Government has come to office the responsibilities of the present 11 Ministers have been adjusted to spread the burden equitably among them. The time has now been reached when no further relief can be given by such action. The only real relief that now can be given to Ministers in their responsibilities on behalf of the State is by increasing the strength of the Ministry. This Bill accordingly does that.

I may say that I make no apology for introducing this Bill, which provides for the increase I have mentioned, because I believe it is in the interests of good government in Queensland. The number of Ministers has remained stationary at 11 since March, 1949, when, pursuant to an amendment of the Officials in Parliament Acts, it was increased from 10 to 11.

In 1898 the number of Ministers in Queensland was fixed at eight, and until the Legislative Council was abolished the Act provided that at least one Minister should sit in the Legislative Council. In 1920 the Theodore Government increased the number of Ministers from eight to nine. The Cabinet remained at that number until 1925, when the Gillies Administration increased it to 10. Another 24 years elapsed until, in 1949, the number was increased to the present 11 by the Government led by the late Hon. E. M. Hanlon.

Thus in a period of 43 years only two additional Ministers have been appointed, although in that period the population of the State has more than doubled and State Government expenditure from all funds has increased more than tenfold, reflecting the development of the State and a consequent enormous increase in the scope and volume of ministerial responsibility.

In that period the field of government has widened tremendously. There are many matters of public concern which are now dealt with by the Government of the day but which were not previously handled by Ministers of the Crown. One of the most notable of these is housing which, except to a limited extent, came within the purview of government activity only within comparatively recent years.

On each occasion that our political predecessors increased the size of the Cabinet they were emphatic that the administrative responsibilities of Ministers had grown to such an extent that an increase in portfolios was imperative. For example, in 1949 the then Premier, the late Hon. E. M. Hanlon, said that Ministers had an immense field of work to cover. He pointed out further that every Act passed by Parliament had to be administered and every additional Act passed meant additional work to a Minister.

Accepting that the position in 1949 was such as to justify an additional Minister, the argument for two additional Ministers is equally, if not more, cogent today than it was then.

Should any member doubt that, I invite him to examine “Hansard” for every session since 1957 and compare the volume of legislation with any preceding sessional period. He will find that over that period there has been a very big increase in the legislative programme of this Chamber, with additional heavy responsibilities for the Ministers concerned in the administration of that legislation. In the period from 1949 to the present day the volume of expenditure from all funds has increased from £51,800,000 in 1948-49 to £273,000,000, or more than fivefold. The expenditure of the State has increased to that extent in the period I have mentioned. I think you will agree, Mr. Hooper, that this represents a tremendous field of government administrative activity, especially in the period from 1957 to 1962-63, during which there has been a 66 per cent. increase in expenditure.

The volume and pace of development today is far greater than it has been at any other period of the State's history, and the stage has been reached when it is necessary that ministers should have an easing of their administrative burdens so that the ever-increasing volume of direction and control can be more equitably divided than is possible today.

The accelerated programme of development throughout the State has entailed a considerable amount of extra travelling by all Ministers, and private calls on our energies

grow ever greater as the years pass. I make bold to say that no executive in any large-scale private enterprise works harder or with more unflagging energy than do members of the present Cabinet. I am certain that an executive does not work longer hours at his desk. After all, desk work is only part of Ministers' responsibilities. For example, they have to make visits to many parts of the State—they have to make inspections of their departmental activities and study numerous reports. This is done mainly in their own time—in the evenings and at week-ends. In addition to ministerial responsibilities each Minister has his own electorate responsibilities to which he must give attention. When we consider all the factors—the growth of our State and the tremendous development taking place at present—we must realise that all these things throw an added burden on ministerial shoulders. Considering the responsibility and the amount of work to be carried out, I believe there is ample justification for an increase in the size of the Cabinet.

**Mr. Mann:** You all look all right over there.

**Mr. NICKLIN:** And we want to keep on looking all right. Possibly the hon. member would like to see a by-election.

**Mr. Duggan:** You both looked a lot better in the second photo taken during the election campaign.

**Mr. NICKLIN:** The hon. member seems to have a complex about photographs.

When we compare the past and present responsibilities and burdens of Ministers there cannot be any doubt that there is full justification for an increase in their number. Let us consider for a moment the number of Ministers in the other States. New South Wales has a Cabinet of 16 Ministers, Victoria has 14, South Australia eight, Western Australia 10, and Tasmania nine. Queensland, with a population of a little over 1,500,000, corresponds more closely with New South Wales and Victoria than with South Australia and Western Australia, both of which have populations of under 1,000,000. It may be argued that the South Australian Ministry consists of only eight members, but it should also be remembered that Queensland is almost twice the size of South Australia and has a population roughly 500,000 greater. In addition, in Queensland we have a much wider spread of population and a much wider spread of governmental activity. If we compare Queensland with South Australia we find that in South Australia the main governmental activities and responsibilities are confined to a very small portion of the State, whereas in Queensland they are spread throughout the vast extent of the State. Western Australia has a Cabinet of ten members, but its area of 975,920 square miles is largely undeveloped in comparison with Queensland, which has almost double the population of Western Australia. When we compare

Queensland with the fairly comparable States as to the number of portfolios, we find that in New South Wales and Victoria there are more portfolios, even with the increase proposed in this Bill. In fact, it will be seen that with some of our ministerial responsibilities the work done by a single member of the Queensland Cabinet is spread over two or three Cabinet members in New South Wales. The members of the Government are all confident that, as a result of the discovery of commercial oil, the building of refineries, the development of a great bauxite enterprise, and other aspects of unprecedented industrial progress, Queensland has entered an era of great expansion. Inevitably, with the growth of these activities in Queensland, there will be a growth in the responsibility of Ministers. In turn, this will necessarily entail increased work and increased responsibilities for all departments of Government administration.

I submit that an increase in the ministry is indisputably one of the first essentials for meeting this inevitable growth in the economic and social stature of the State.

**Mr. DUGGAN** (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (11.35 a.m.): I feel sure that even the members of the Government will be sympathising with the Premier in his predicament this morning. Over a number of years he has made many important contributions to the various debates in this Parliament but, quite frankly, I do not think we have ever had evidence of his being less confident and perhaps less logical than today. He certainly was labouring under a great difficulty and we can understand the reason for it.

In seeking to justify the Bill he offered a very mixed grill. He said that the Bill contained only one principle and that was to increase the representation in Cabinet from 11 members to 13. That is the principle contained in the Bill all right, but the purpose behind its introduction, of course, is merely to placate conflicting interests in a conflicting coalition. If a case had been submitted for the appointment of one additional Minister, the Opposition would have been prepared to examine the proposal to see whether the Premier could produce evidence to justify his appointment; but he has jumped boldly to two appointments and everybody—even the merest political neophyte in the community—knows that the reason for it was to preserve the existing balance of six Country Party to five Liberal Party members in the coalition Cabinet. I am surprised at the necessity for preserving that balance because of the action taken in recent times when the Liberal Party executive issued instructions that Liberal Party branches were to be established in the electorate of Lockyer as it is held by a Liberal Minister. We found the Minister, Mr. Chalk, threatening to resign if a Liberal Party organisation was created in the Lockyer electorate, because, he said, he had been supported in his campaign by Country Party supporters and he certainly was not

going to let them down. As he represents a blue-ribbon Country Party electorate and as he was supported and helped in his election to Parliament by Country Party supporters, it is extraordinary that he should be carrying a Liberal label. If the Country Party is concerned with preserving its relative strength in the Cabinet, it should be prepared to let the hon. member for Lockyer transfer his political sympathies within the Cabinet from the official Liberal Party to the Country Party, which he acknowledges privately, and indeed officially, to represent the views he holds. Then perhaps there would be a case for the appointment of only one additional Minister, and that could well have been dealt with at a joint meeting of the parties. An extraordinary climax was reached by the Premier when, in seeking to justify the introduction of the Bill, he referred to the size of the State and its population and the extent to which its revenue had increased over the years. He mentioned South Australia as a typical example of this growth, and said that if hon. members read "Hansard" they would find what a previous Premier had to say about the need for a move of this type. I have read the debate to which he referred and in it the Premier of the day put forward a long list of reasons that he considered should be accepted by the Parliament.

Let us see what the present Premier had to say about those submissions when he was Leader of the Opposition. This is what he said in 1949—

"We find that some of the other States get along with fewer Ministers than Queensland, and nobody would suggest that a State such as South Australia, for example, is not governed as well by the lesser number of Ministers there as the State of Queensland with the number of Ministers here."

That was his view then.

He went on to say—

"All the Minister is there to do is to direct the policy of his department and to see that the administrative work is carried out properly. I feel that at the present time Ministers are undertaking a great deal of work that they should not be called upon to do, work that should be delegated to officers of their department. Ministers should be more concerned with matters of high policy in their departments instead of dealing, as they do at the present time, with so many of the minor details."

He went on to say the practice had grown "in recent times" under the then Labour administration that, when letters were addressed by him to the responsible departmental officer, several Ministers elected to answer the submissions. If he felt so strongly about that, I do not know why he has not altered it. By way of example, I have had occasion to direct letters frequently to officers in the department of the Minister for

Health and Home Affairs. I have always been treated courteously by him and I have respect for him and my doing that was in no way discourteous to him, but in every case I received a reply signed by the Minister. If the Premier was so concerned about this practice of Ministers answering correspondence, he should have taken some corrective steps.

An even worse example is found in the issuing of rail passes to age pensioners. If ever there was a routine chore, it is the signing of requisitions to enable pensioners to travel by rail. The Minister must be obliged to sign hundreds of letters in connection with those requisitions. Other departments abound in similar examples.

**Mr. Aikens:** You will admit that your own Ministers did it.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** The hon. member for Townsville South would do well to read what he, too, had to say in 1949.

The Premier then said that it was not the duty of a Minister, for example, to examine all cars in the Government garage to see how they were being treated; that was a job for responsible departmental officers. He advanced numerous reasons why the proposal to increase the representation from 10 to 11 should be rejected. He then had this to say—

"I can come to only one conclusion in connection with the Bill and that is that it is entirely unnecessary."

This morning he suggested that we go to the 1949 debate to see the very cogent reasons advanced at that time for the appointment of an additional Minister, and he said that the reasons were more cogent and pressing today than they were then. It would appear that he was not particularly impressed then—or if he was, he was insincere—when he said that he could come to only one conclusion and that was that it was unnecessary.

I commend the flow of oratory that came from the hon. member for Mundingburra, as he then was, on that occasion, and compliment him on his rhetoric. He referred to all these crocodile tears over the way in which Ministers are worn down. He said that one person was an acting Minister in six portfolios, and during that period his weight increased by two stone.

The Premier wound up his peroration on that occasion by saying that if conditions were so onerous for Ministers, it was surprising that there were so many applicants for the job. We have seen exactly that same thing in the last few months. Every time one picks up a newspaper one sees every member, with the exception of the newly-elected ones, being freely put forward as breaking his neck to get into Cabinet. The hon. member for Sherwood aspires to Cabinet rank because he is president of the Father-and-Son movement and there is so much juvenile delinquency in the community. Because they want a dramatic actor, the hon.

member for Merthyr is put forward. As the Liberal Party won the last election on the story of Communist penetration, what more effective appointment of a Red-baiter could there be than the hon. member for Nundah? There is criticism of the decline in cultural standards, so the hon. member for Ashgrove comes in, he being the custodian of all the finer and aesthetic things in the community. I could continue through a whole list of hon. members. If the conditions of Ministers were so bad, that would not be so.

The then Treasurer also addressed himself to the problem. If I remember correctly, he dealt with it exclusively at the second-reading stage, and he made a point which is also germane today. It was that, with the tendency in some parts of the world to increase the number of Cabinet representatives, the work of Cabinet became cluttered up because of the number of Ministers, and there was need for an inner Cabinet, as is the case in Great Britain and in the Commonwealth Parliament. There one finds what is virtually a major Cabinet and a minor Cabinet, important matters of policy being determined by the inner group and the administration being left to people outside or to assistant Ministers. That is very true, but on that occasion the then Opposition was not prepared to listen for one moment to the argument put forward.

The whole suggestion reeks of political expediency, and the appointment of two additional Ministers will impose on the people of Queensland an extra burden of many thousands of pounds. The appointment of each Minister will mean the appointment of an additional private secretary, the provision of a ministerial office, and a ministerial car and chauffeur. If the development that is allegedly taking place under such dramatic conditions at present is in fact taking place, the appointment of an under secretary or a person equal in status to an under secretary will be needed, and later on, in accordance with Parkinson's law, these things will continue to grow and grow and grow. Consequently, no-one can say that the proposed measure will not impose a very heavy financial burden on the State.

The Premier points out all that is entailed in travelling today. As a matter of fact, the conditions for travelling are better now than they were in years gone by. The Government denies me, for reasons for which it accepts responsibility, the use of any air-travel facilities. I am not quibbling about it, but I received an invitation recently to be present at the opening of a power station at Cairns and, in my capacity as Leader of the Opposition, I could not attend because it would have taken me five days to get there and back, whereas Cabinet Ministers could go up and back in five or six hours.

**Mr. Nicklin:** You are treated much better than I was when I was Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** The Premier spoke of the need to examine these things carefully. If he asks for increased Cabinet representation on the basis that the volume of expenditure has increased from £50,000,000-odd to £250,000,000 in the intervening period, surely there is a need—I am not putting this forward at the moment, but the Premier challenged me—for an increased provision for the Leader of the Opposition too.

**Mr. Windsor:** You got a car for the first time in history.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I asked for some assistance, admittedly. I did not want to raise this point, but if it is relevant to argue that the increased volume of spending justifies the appointment of two additional Cabinet Ministers, surely there is some justification for the appointment of an additional officer to the staff of the Leader of the Opposition.

Let us see how the staff of the various departments has increased since 1956-1957. One would think that all the additional work coming in has been borne by Ministers personally and individually. As the Premier or someone else said on a former occasion, one would think that Ministers went home every night with their bags packed and loaded down. In 1956-1957 the salaried staff attached to the chief offices of the various Ministers numbered 1,701. In the Estimates for 1962-1963, which the Treasurer presented last year, provision was made for a staff of 2,824 attached to the various chief offices, an increase of 1,124.

**Mr. Ramsden:** Are you suggesting that we sack them?

**Mr. DUGGAN:** No, I am not, but I wish to spend a moment or two discussing this talk of the increased development that is occurring. I shall deal with it today in very few words, but it could well form the subject of a special speech.

Today the world is very upset by racial policies, economic internationalism, and other problems, and international capitalists are looking for countries with political stability in which to make investments. Political stability is the main reason why Australia, irrespective of what Government is in power or what party is in Opposition, is regarded by the majority of international capitalists as a safe haven for capital investment. Since the war, because of these main conditions, there has been a greater interest in Australia than was the case previously and, as a result, the injection of money on a large scale by international companies. There has been available for investment in Australia astronomical sums of money. If hon. members opposite want to have an argument on this I am quite prepared to enter it at a later date, but, with the exception of oil, I say definitely that a disproportionate amount of this added capital has been diverted to the other States. The figures prove that beyond any dispute.

So, as I say, on this question of development, I do not accept the argument that merely because the volume of money involved has increased ministerial responsibilities have increased. We had this foolish system operating in the Railway Department when I was Minister for Transport. I am not attacking station masters in particular, but their classification was determined by the volume of revenue at the particular station. Therefore, assuming freights had remained constant, in the same way wages remained at a constant level. I do not want to say that this position is peculiar to the present time—it operated also when I was a Minister in the Labour Government—but we are now passing through an inflationary period and, if the freight on, say, coal, was increased from 10s. a ton to 25s. a ton, the revenue would increase fourfold in that area and the classification of the officer would advance accordingly. Yet there would be no extra physical work involved in loading 25 tons of coal at £2 a ton than there was in loading 25 tons at 10s. a ton. No more physical work would be involved, no more mental activity or any greater physical strain, yet automatically the classification of a station master is affected because his classification is determined by the amount of money spent.

As a matter of fact, it would be a good thing in Australia generally if, instead of espousing the argument that more staff is justified when more money is being spent, the argument was adopted that it would justify more Ministers if they could do better work for less money. We should not subscribe to this idea that because we are building up a tremendous bureaucratic force in the community we must have additional Ministers.

This problem boils down to a simple question of internal policy and nothing else. What does one find in South Australia? The Premier said some years ago, when he was in Opposition, that South Australia was a well-administered State and I defy anybody to show that when they were in Opposition the Premier and other members sitting opposite did not put forward South Australia as a classic example of development. They said then that that was the State that made all the progress and they were able to make that progress with a lesser number of Ministers.

At the last election in South Australia Labour got 54 per cent. of the votes but still won only a minority of the seats. There are two Independents there, one of whom had been an A.L.P. man, and Sir Thomas Playford solved the problem by appointing one of them as Speaker and the other as a Minister. He appointed as a Minister a man who was not even a member of his party. As there was so much internal discord in South Australia because of that position, I understand he is now trying to justify a further Minister there, to placate ambitious back-benchers in his own party, as is the case in this instance. That position obtains

here, too. I feel that a case has not been put forward by the Premier to justify this increase.

Going back to the argument used by the Treasurer, which was, in many respects, a valid one, if we are to have clear thinking and analysis of the situation, we do not want to be faced with this problem of Ministers running all over the place. The Premier spoke of travelling obligations but half of these obligations are either social in nature or relate to fixing a plaque on some project that was started by a previous administration.

Even the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt came in with an objection to this practice and said that there was no purpose in it. I commend him for his forthright condemnation of the practice. Ministers make these little forays into the country on all sorts of minor matters. If the problems that the Premier mentioned are of such magnitude and are so pressing, the Ministers should be here rather than running to all these various places as they are at present, performing dances and wearing cowboy hats and all sorts of things in an effort to focus attention on the fact that Cabinet Ministers are in these areas at a particular time.

Despite what this Government has said about Comalco, if Sir Maurice Mawby, K.B., would make a declaration he would say quite definitely how far the Labour Government was prepared to go and how close the actual signing was when we left office. The same would apply with Mr. Fisher of Mt. Isa Mines Ltd.

**Government Members interjected.**

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I could justify that, but time does not permit me. I admit that in consultations of this kind, because of the magnitude of the capital involved, it may necessitate more investigation than a minor problem. I concede that, but in every case these matters are delegated to officers. For example, Sir James Holt was sent up to investigate the Clare tobacco scheme. The Minister for Health and Home Affairs sends along officers to make investigations for him. The Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity has sent out responsible officers to make inspections. They give the Minister the facts and he makes a determination on their recommendations. On occasions, of course, the Minister has to make a personal on-the-spot investigation. I agree that in some instances it is very necessary that he see for himself what is going on in the State in respect of matters over which he has a responsibility. I am not trying to knock down the justification for a Minister's being well equipped to discharge his ministerial obligations. But there is not an obligation on a Minister of the Crown to be sticking his nose into all the minor details. They should concern themselves with policy and deal with the so-called dramatic development that is going on in the

State. They can do that with a smaller number of people. I am prepared to use the argument used previously that a reallocation of duties would be a better way to deal with this matter.

The Opposition have been quite frank about this. We said that if the Premier put up a case for one Minister we would have a look at it. But we know that the reason for it is purely this blatant pressure that is being applied to preserve the balance between the parties in which there is supposed to be so much harmony. I cannot follow it. At election time we heard how close these parties were. When the Liberal Party made an offer to the Premier to merge with them completely we found that the Country Party at its conference took only 20 minutes to reject the offer unanimously. Yet they come here and talk about unanimity and harmony. The lack of it is reflected in this legislation. It is obvious how pressure politics are being applied in this instance to satisfy the voting trend in the Cabinet. The public of Queensland are being called upon to accept the considerable financial responsibility of two additional Ministers of the Crown merely to satisfy the ambition of a few back-benchers, and to give effect to the principle of the Country Party's remaining predominant in the coalition. For those and other reasons that will be advanced at the second-reading stage we say that a case has not been made out for one additional Minister, certainly not for two.

We do not accept the volume of expenditure as the criterion for the number of Cabinet Ministers that should be appointed. If that is to be the criterion the United States Cabinet or the Cabinet of the United Kingdom should consist of about 100 members. That number would be required if it were taken either on a population basis or on the basis of the volume of money handled by them. Remembering that the Minister for Defence in the United Kingdom is in control of a department spending £1,000,000,000, if the volume of money was used as the measuring stick the Parliament would be something like a Portugese Army with all generals and no privates. That is how I regard this Bill. It seeks to have a disproportionate number of generals, with only a few privates, in the coalition Government.

Progress reported.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

#### RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—THIRD ALLOTTED DAY

Debate resumed from 3 September (see p. 185) on Mr. McKechnie's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

**Mr. LLOYD (Kedron)** (12 noon): I join with other hon. members in expressing sentiments of loyalty to the Throne. In doing so, I do not intend to use that as some form of maudlin sentiment. In expressing

a resolution of loyalty I think we are expressing respect for our system of parliamentary democracy, which revolves around our democratic institutions and their responsibility, and the opportunity they have to express opinions here and receive attention at the hands of the executive Government. Just as they preserve all the rights of our democratic institutions, they also have a deep obligation to all other sections of the community.

On Tuesday last I was somewhat surprised to hear the hon. member for Sherwood, by implication, make a charge against the Australian Broadcasting Commission over a programme broadcast last week-end called "Four Corners". I do not think that any of our democratic institutions—including the R.S.S.A.I.L.A.—would believe that it is beyond reproach. Even Parliament itself must accept that it can be reproached by individuals outside Parliament. Whilst we have an almost unreserved right to criticise other sections, and other Parliaments, we must at all times accept that we have a responsibility to all people in the community. I believe that an implication that certain people in the A.B.C. were Communists, or pro-Communist, is a very serious charge—even by implication. I believe, too, that an opportunity was given to the R.S.L. through its leaders of the various State branches to inform the public of the wonderful work carried out by it. Apparently that opportunity was missed. If there are some sections in the community that believe that the R.S.L. is a gigantic social club where members simply swill beer and play two-up, it is time that the leaders of the organisation took steps to inform the public of the work that it carries out. Much work of tremendous benefit to the country, to the Government and to the social life of Australia has been undertaken by the R.S.L. At no time can we think that, as members of the R.S.L., we are beyond reproach. It would be far from the system of parliamentary democracy, or of our democratic institutions if, at any time, sufficient pressure was brought to bear by a minority in the community that induced a state of mind in members of the Public Service or officers of semi-governmental or quasi-governmental organisations, whereby they would fear to criticise any of the institutions that are part of our community.

I think a great deal of unnecessary fuss has been made about this matter which could have been simply repudiated, instead of the Prime Minister himself stepping in, as he has. If we are to protect the whole of our democratic and parliamentary institutions we must insist on the right to criticise at all times, and the right to refute any criticism that may be unfair. And no doubt there was unfair criticism levelled at the R.S.L.

**Mr. Herbert:** They did not know what was being said.

**Mr. LLOYD:** The hon. member is right, but the opportunity was there to refute the accusations on that programme. The guests on the programme had the opportunity to completely disabuse the public mind about the unfair criticism. That was given to them as guests on the programme.

**Mr. Ramsden:** No, it was not. They were not told what was being said.

**Mr. LLOYD:** Apparently they did not take the opportunity. From time to time, particularly over recent years, the A.L.P. has been subjected to unfair criticism, but the matter was not referred to the Prime Minister in an effort to have pressure to be brought to bear on some governmental or quasi-governmental organisation. I admit that there was some unfair criticism and I believe it has created an undue amount of public controversy. The obligation is as much on the society as it is on us to refute such upsetting criticism and to explain to the public the real purpose of the organisation. Since the end of the first world war the R.S.L. has done tremendous work, both for the welfare of its own members and for the national good; at the same time, it must display a sense of responsibility and ensure that its activities are beyond reproach.

I congratulate the hon. member for Tablelands on his excellent address. I believe he will prove to be a capable debater and that he will make valuable contributions to the debates of the House, which will be of great assistance not merely to his own electorate but to the State as a whole for many years to come.

Hon. members opposite who have spoken have in the main been fluent but their speeches have served to emphasise the differences of opinion existing between the members of the coalition parties. So far in the debate we have had from them an expression of an almost ultra-conservative policy, which is foreign to the basic thinking of the Country Party. One example of that was given by the hon. member for Fassifern, who became dissatisfied with the Liberal Party's domination of the coalition and resigned from the Country Party because of it. The policy of this Government is dominated by business and city interests and that will continue for as many years as it remains in office. Throughout the State increasing numbers of people are rebelling against this domination, which is against the interests of primary producers. This is the only State in the Commonwealth where the Country Party heads the Government, but its development is being threatened by pressures from the Liberal Party.

From time to time the Premier has spoken on the theme of Queensland's development and has pointed to the development of the bauxite field, the establishment of an alumina refinery at Gladstone, and the discovery of oil. It could well be said that all this development has taken place despite the

Government; it has been grinding slowly over the years. My complaint is about the snail's pace of the State's expansion in the post-war years, particularly during the past few years. It is all very well to speak of the large plants that are going to be set up for the great benefit of the people; the smaller things count just as much.

We have found from an examination of industries that have come here that there has been no increase in employment levels. In other words, as some industries come to Queensland others close down or are taken over from the South. There is substantial statistical backing for my submissions. Perhaps the best is that afforded by comparison of the importation of goods produced in other States of the Commonwealth. In the 12 months period 1956-1957 Queensland imported goods produced or manufactured in other States to the value of £125,000,000. For the period of nine months to 31 March of this year, the figure rose to £141,000,000. By the end of 12 months, no doubt the figures will disclose an increase in that period from £125,000,000 to £160,000,000 or £170,000,000. That is a considerable increase in the value of goods manufactured in other States and imported by Queensland.

It is all very well for us to speak from time to time on these matters, but we must make analyses of the figures to see just what is going on. We have just as much responsibility as have Government members to see that the State expands industrially, which it is not doing.

**Mr. Nicklin:** Do you support the "Buy Queensland Made" campaign?

**Mr. LLOYD:** Of course I support it. I can only wish that something definite was being done by the Government, instead of merely lip service, to encourage retailing establishments and monopolies to buy goods manufactured in Queensland.

**Mr. Nicklin:** That is exactly what is happening.

**Mr. LLOYD:** It is not. Let us examine the position. In the period of three months to 31 March exports of foodstuffs of animal origin from Queensland to all other States amounted to £1,626,000. We imported processed foods to the value of £2,241,550. Meat and poultry in tins imported amounted to £1,146,778. Queensland is exporting very little processed foods in comparison with what is being imported from other States.

Tobacco is a rather topical subject to introduce, and Queensland produces a considerable amount of the tobacco used in Australia. We exported unmanufactured tobacco amounting to £1,500,000, and in the same period of three months imports of manufactured tobacco totalled £3,000,000. We imported no unmanufactured tobacco, and we exported no manufactured tobacco. We grow the tobacco here but we have to go to other States to get manufactured tobacco.

In yarns, fibres, textiles, and wearing apparel, we imported £8,500,000 worth in that period of three months and had exports to the value of only £2,000,000. There has been much talk recently of expansion in the motor-car and machinery industries. In that period of three months our exports of all metal manufactured goods, including metals and ores, amounted to £8,500,000, of which copper was responsible for £4,500,000. We imported in metal manufactured goods, including motor vehicles and machinery, £28.4 million.

It is quite obvious that there is a lucrative market in Queensland for goods manufactured in other States, but the position, instead of improving, is deteriorating. I can remember when preserved fruits and jams and other commodities of that nature were produced locally.

**Mr. Nicklin:** I am sure you can't remember that.

**Mr. LLOYD:** I can remember factories at Milton and Buranda, but they have all closed down.

**Mr. Nicklin:** They did not take all the fruit available.

**Mr. LLOYD:** All I can do is invite the Premier next week-end to examine the grocery order for his own home. He will find that 90 per cent of the articles on it are made in New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania, or other States, and exported to Queensland. They could well be manufactured here.

**Mr. Hanlon:** Even biscuits.

**Mr. LLOYD:** Even packets of biscuits, as the hon. member for Baroona reminds me. This is a serious trend and one that should be giving the Government considerable concern. A careful analysis of the figures shows how little we export in manufactured goods and how much we import. It also shows how much we export in raw materials and primary products and how little of those things we import from other States. An analysis of the whole position shows that 90 per cent of Queensland's imports comprise goods manufactured from this State's primary products.

There are many means of overcoming the problem in addition to the Government's present lip-service to a "Buy Queensland Made" campaign. Certainly publicity is necessary, and if we can convince the large retailing monopolies in Queensland that they should reverse their order of buying, we shall have achieved something. However, although the natural increase in the population of Queensland has been considerable in the past 10 years, we find that many local industries, such as the manufacture of shoes, clothing, and other wearing apparel, have merely maintained their rate of production instead of increasing it, or have been taken over by southern manufacturers. I have used

this example before, but I think it is necessary to repeat it. At one time Charles Hope & Co. was making refrigerators and quite a lot of scrap panelite, which was used in the manufacture of the refrigerators and was available at a low cost to Queensland manufacturers for the production of plastic. A.C.I. found it could not compete with Queensland plastic manufacturers, so its answer was to take over Charles Hope & Co., cease manufacturing refrigerators, and export any surplus panelite to Sydney and keep it away from Queensland plastic manufacturers. I know that was not the basic reason for A.C.I.'s take-over of Charles Hope & Co., but it did mean that a certain amount of local labour was displaced. Queensland plastic manufacturers did not know from one day to the next whether they would be taken over by southern interests.

I believe it is very necessary that not only secondary industries but also primary industries should be examined very carefully at a Government level. It may even be necessary to conduct an inquiry into the requirements of primary and secondary industries. Even appointment of a royal commission might not be going too far. Although the appointment by the Government of Sir David Muir is really taken from the policy of the Australian Labour Party in the last election campaign, it is a move which could well achieve good results. A careful survey should be made of Queensland's requirements in secondary and primary industries, and it should be ascertained whether secondary industries can be established in areas in which only primary industries are now carried on. For example, let us take the areas in Queensland in which peanuts are now grown. The Queensland peanut industry is suffering as a result of the Tariff Board's refusal to apply any restrictive controls on the importation of peanuts and peanut oil. But there has never been any move in the areas in which the peanut industry is established to set up a processing industry. Neither in the Kingaroy area nor on the Atherton Tableland has any attempt been made to establish a peanut-oil industry. I believe that schemes such as that should be given very careful consideration. If necessary, farmers could form co-operatives and the Government could provide financial assistance. If it were economically possible—I am sure there are ways in which it could be made economically possible—the Government could go to the farmers and offer them sufficient capital to enable them to establish plants.

**Mr. Nicklin:** There is quite a progressive little plant processing peanuts at Tolga.

**Mr. LLOYD:** Yes, but it is not a very large one and we have to import the greater part of our peanut oil requirements.

Many other industries are in a similar position. At one time North Queensland tobacco growers had their own manufacturing plant, but eventually it went out of existence. We have an extensive tobacco industry in Queensland. It is possible that

with governmental assistance—financial and otherwise—there could be the necessary development to give a condition of full employment in this State. At the present time it seems to be the practice for retailing establishments in Queensland to do most of their buying in Sydney and Melbourne. David Jones, who control many of the large retail establishments in Brisbane, do all their buying in Sydney; Myers do theirs in Melbourne and Woolworths and B.C.C., who control large food-retailing establishments in this State, are buying in other States most of the processed foods which normally we could expect to be purchased here. I believe there has been quite an amount of frustration caused to Queensland manufacturers with the realisation that they have not been able to break through the buying ring that has been established in Queensland by southern firms. It might be possible by an educational campaign, and with the assistance of these retailers, to revert to the former system. No doubt the inefficiency of Queensland manufacturers is partly responsible for the fact that they are not selling all the goods they could produce.

By and large, responsibility for the deterioration in the rate of industrial expansion in Queensland must be placed at the door of the Government itself because of its failure to overcome the numerous problems with which it has been confronted in its period of office. Mechanisation in our primary industries, bulk handling at sugar ports, and other innovations of that kind, have displaced many employees, particularly waterside workers, and when their earnings went out of circulation it led to some retrenchment in other businesses, with the result that we now have a general depression of industry. The men who have gone out of the sugar industry, off the waterfront, and out of other industries, have not been placed elsewhere. Many of the take-overs by southern firms, which have been detrimentally affecting the situation, seem to have been ignored by the Government. I believe it could do much more than it has done to meet the situation.

Another important factor is the over-concentration by the Commonwealth Government, in its financial policies relating to Queensland, on insisting that Queensland should remain a primary-producing State. The Commonwealth Government has two questions in mind, namely, whether it can expand our national income by expanding primary industries such as cattle, wool, wheat, and sugar, or by encouraging the expansion of secondary industries here to reduce Australia's level of imports. We are placed in a serious position in this country through, year after year, importing much more than we are exporting.

**Mr. Murray:** Would you support fairly wide concessions to reduce the quantity of imports?

**Mr. LLOYD:** I expect the Commonwealth Government to make available the necessary finance to encourage the establishment in Queensland of an aluminium plant and an iron and steel works.

**Mr. Murray:** And State Government concessions to lesser industries?

**Mr. LLOYD:** Many of the agreements this Government has entered into to attract industries to Queensland have been far too weak. We have reached the stage of giving concessions that allow overseas capital to take complete control. Many of the agreements this Government has entered into—Comalco, Amoco, and now Kianga—have been with the idea that we have to give them the lot to get them to come here, whereas the Governments of other States have insisted that these companies do much more than has been insisted on in this State.

Diverting for a moment to criticise the Comalco agreement arrived at in November, 1957, it was supposed to be an agreement which would bring development to the extent of £200,000,000. I think the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity at that time said that it was second only to the Snowy Mountains Authority. We have been waiting since 1957 for that development. In Western Australia, to develop a bauxite deposit that is far less extensive than ours in Cape York, Alcoa was formed no more than 18 months or two years ago, but it has already produced its first aluminium from its smelter in Geelong. It is now completing its own electricity plant where it will use its brown coal deposits. A £10,000,000 alumina plant is being constructed in Western Australia. All these things have happened while we have been waiting for years for development. If the negotiations which apparently are proceeding with Pechiney can be brought to fruition we will have a wonderful industry that will be worth waiting for, but the delay in the development of the project has created a lot of suspicion in people's minds. I certainly hope it is not warranted. It is possible to go too far in conceding too much to many of these companies by agreements and concessions.

**Mr. Nicklin:** We will make what is being done in Western Australia look like peanuts.

**Mr. LLOYD:** I hope so. I hope this Government will be just as strict as the Commonwealth Government has been about the Gove deposits.

**Mr. Nicklin:** What happened there?

**Mr. LLOYD:** On the 10,000,000 tons of bauxite for export the Commonwealth Government insisted when the agreement was signed that the royalty would be 1s. a ton. Because the 57 square miles of the deposit were within the aboriginal tribal land of Arnhem Land the Commonwealth Government insisted that the company agree to

pay 6d. a ton into a trust fund for the welfare of the aboriginal population. We asked the Government to do something like that in 1957.

**Mr. Nicklin** interjected.

**Mr. LLOYD:** These other companies are signing agreements that are much more militant than those signed here.

Insufficient consideration has been given to the requirements of existing secondary industry, and to industrial expansion, compared with what has been done in other States. New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia have been developing rapidly. Industries in those States are absorbing a full level of employment while we have been losing people. Why should Queensland, a basically primary-producing State, be in the position where it cannot process the food she is producing? Why should we have to buy the processed article from other States, thus providing local employment there?

Let us look at what has been undertaken in main roads construction. Certainly there has been development over the last few years. Machinery is now being used extensively.

**Mr. Nicklin** interjected.

**Mr. LLOYD:** I do not think this Government has ever been embarrassed more than by the amount of money it had towards the end of last year, as the result of the ballot-box revolt in December, 1961.

It is very essential that there should be a Government inquiry into the full requirements of industry, the possibility of restrictive trade practices affecting the production of manufactured goods in Queensland, the effect on Queensland manufactures of interstate buying by retail establishments, and the possibility of secondary industry being settled in many of the primary-producing centres. That would encourage the growth of our population and we would then not suffer the losses which have occurred in past years.

I have mentioned the fact that the concentration by the Commonwealth Government on certain areas has had a very detrimental effect on Queensland. Certainly many of the projects for which it has provided large grants and lent money to the States will be of eventual good and will make some contribution to the development of Queensland. Those things are necessary, but they do not provide the answer to essential Queensland development.

Recently, Government spokesmen have stated that the Government is attempting to take all possible steps to attract tradesmen to Queensland, as if Queensland was the only State with a shortage of tradesmen. The shortage has been Australia-wide for a number of years. No less than two years ago the Commonwealth Government called a conference of trade unions, manufacturers

and governments to consider the problem and a new apprenticeship system was designed by the Commonwealth Government under which it pays to an employer an allowance for people from country districts who go to other districts to serve apprenticeships. This assistance was given because of the shortage of skilled tradesmen throughout the nation. The problem has been centred mostly in the South, and many of Queensland's skilled tradesmen are moving to the South because of the policy of over-award payments in the southern States. Employers in the South, by agreement with their employees, have paid over-award wages, but when the same requests have been made by trade unions in Queensland they have been rejected. The Commonwealth Government could give great assistance to Queensland if it treated this State as it treated Western Australia. It granted £5,000,000, over a period of five years, for development north of the 20th parallel, and insisted only that it approved the project put forward by the Government of that State. In the next three years there is to be granted a further sum of £3,500,000, again on the same basis, for projects required by the State Government. To some extent the procedure of the Commonwealth Government's moving into a State, taking over the planning, and insisting that it will make sufficient money available with matching grants only on certain conditions, abuses the sovereign powers of the State. When the Commonwealth Government insists on the type of development in a State it is disregarding completely the welfare of the State, and of the people, and is also disregarding completely any semblance of self-government which the State Government may desire.

I should like to briefly mention the operations of some of the large companies that come into Australia from time to time. The Premier may be able to correct my impression of this, and I do not want to adversely criticise any of the companies. Naturally they are entitled to take advantage of any benefits or any concession extended to them by any Government. They are only human and naturally will accept any benefits extended to them. However, even with the tremendous amount of overseas capital coming to Australia, in many cases much of the capital required for the necessary development is money borrowed from the Australian public, or from trading banks in Australia. I understand that one large overseas company established in Central Queensland has received a very substantial overdraft from the Bank of New South Wales. We find, too, that Moonie Pipe Line Pty. Ltd. is spending about £4,500,000. However, an examination of the records of this firm held by the Registrar of Firms indicates that its share capital does not exceed 1,000,000 £1 shares. It is doing very well to spend £4,000,000 with a share capital of £1,000,000. The

capital brought into this country by the company is £1,000,000 and the balance of the money to be used, for which shares are not issued, will be composed, perhaps, of debentures, or an overdraft. Several methods may be employed to get the necessary capital. This money is paid back when the profits start to roll in, and the dividends are then sent overseas. That is the insidious point in these transactions. I am not opposed to overseas capital—indeed I like to see it coming in—but I do not think that the system of overseas capital exploiting and taking profits away from Australia is operating in other parts of the world. Even in Japan there has been an insistence on a general partnership between local and overseas capital. Numerous countries in the world are insisting on the local population having a greater holding in companies that are formed by overseas enterprises. In Australia, unfortunately, that is not done. Many of these companies operate purely and simply by paying off the debenture loans they have raised or the preferential shares they have issued or the overdraft they have borrowed and then, of course, the dividends start. Those dividends are in many cases very lucrative.

The main danger that concerns us in Queensland at the present time is the domination of Country Party policy by the Liberal Party. Statements have been made by numerous hon. members, particularly new members of the Liberal Party on the rural committees, that it is necessary to have a sweeping change in land-tenure laws in this State. With the wasting assets, such as oil and mineral deposits, we can accept it that certain steps are necessary for development and expansion but, as for the land on which primary-producing industries are based, it is essential that we retain ownership within our own population. Once we hand over our land to overseas capital we will revert to the conditions of 50 or 60 or 100 years ago, with absentee owners deriving all the benefits and dividends being expatriated from the country. The members of the Country Party realise this. The Minister for Public Lands says that he prefers what he calls the "owner-driver system of land settlement". Once we relinquish the control of our land we may as well hand over the country to overseas interests because we will be depriving the people of Australia of their inheritance. It cannot be denied that the wealth of the land of the State belongs to the people of the State and, unless the Government, as their trustee, can protect it, we will lose ownership of those assets and the wealth to be derived from them.

**Mr. PILBEAM** (Rockhampton South) (12.37 p.m.): It is with pleasure that I join with previous speakers to this motion in expressing my own personal loyalty, and the loyalty of the people I represent, to Her Majesty.

I am sure the people of Central Queensland look forward to the return of His Excellency the Governor refreshed by his holiday and able to carry on in the same exemplary manner as in the past.

I should not like this occasion to pass without congratulating Sir Alan Mansfield on the able manner in which he is deputising for His Excellency.

As congratulations are in order, Mr. Speaker, let me congratulate you on your well-earned continuance in office.

I should also like to congratulate the hon. member for Greenslopes, Mr. Keith Hooper, on his election to the position of Chairman of Committees. I am quite sure he will very ably and impartially fill that office.

I have listened with a great deal of appreciation to the speeches made by new hon. members and I congratulate them all. I refer, of course, to the hon. members representing Carnarvon, Mt. Coot-tha, Clayfield and Tablelands, and I am quite sure that we will hear similarly able speeches from the hon. members for Mt. Gravatt and Port Curtis. I wish all of them a very successful and rewarding term in this Parliament.

To leave personalities, I must start my main address by congratulating this Government on its continuance of intensive Central Queensland development. All in Central Queensland have been delighted at the evidence of the support given by this Government to many major developmental schemes in the area. I refer particularly to the Comalco undertaking at Gladstone, which will be a wonderful eventuality for that port. I refer also to the Moura coal export development, which will result, in the reasonably near future, in the construction of an electric railway from the coalfield to Gladstone and in the export through the port of Gladstone of 2,000,000 tons of coal annually. We in Central Queensland are delighted with the wonderful development envisaged at Gladstone. We also learn with much appreciation in our electorate of the successful development of the brigalow-lands undertaking. Although it has had many initial difficulties to overcome, we see great development in Central Queensland as a result of the clearing and making productive of many thousands of acres that have been unproductive for years.

**Mr. Aikens:** And you have stopped an abattoir being erected. That is a feather in your cap.

**Mr. PILBEAM:** I am not wearing a cap at the moment. One thing that we can see and appreciate is the construction of the £1,000,000 power line from Rockhampton to Callide power station of the future. That is there for all to witness.

I was highly delighted to accompany the Premier recently to the opening ceremonies of two major Central Queensland projects.

They are the £23,000,000 powerhouse at Callide, which is being built by John Holland, and the large dam that has been constructed by Perini Davis, mainly to provide cooling water for the powerhouse but which also has an irrigation content.

I must congratulate the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity on his action in bringing down a road plan which has been accepted and adopted by every local authority in Queensland. Decentralised development of Queensland depends largely on the implementation of that plan. In that regard, I make a particular plea to the Minister for the construction of roads west from Rockhampton and Townsville. If we are to have decentralised development of the State, we must have accelerated construction of these two projects. It has been indicated to me by several public bodies in Central Queensland that we could well ask the Government to consider the construction of those two main highways on a five-year basis. We feel that the decentralised development of the State would be accelerated if within five years bitumen roads were constructed from Rockhampton to Longreach or Winton, and from Townsville west.

We look with great appreciation on the continued development of grain-growing in Central Queensland. It has reached a stage now at which consideration has to be given to the provision of storage and bulk-loading facilities at Central Queensland ports to handle the export of grain, which could be considerable in the future.

I must congratulate the Government on its decision regarding a Central Queensland abattoir. As the result of that decision, we find that we now will have probably four abattoirs in the Rockhampton area, or near to it, whereas formerly we had only one. We have at present the private abattoir operated by Amagrazo at Biloela, and we have a mutton abattoir in prospect at Rockhampton. Mr. Harold Morris has completed plans that have been approved by the Government, and he is calling tenders for a very modern mutton abattoir at Rockhampton. T. A. Field Pty. Ltd. have all the capital needed to construct a £2,000,000 abattoir at Nerimbera, near Rockhampton. They have their plans almost completed. They have already bought about 300 acres of land for resting paddocks and for the actual site of the abattoir, and they have secured land, which has been transferred to them, from the Rockhampton Harbour Board. In addition to the £2,000,000 abattoir that they will build, they have also undertaken to provide a public cold store at Port Alma. This will give the industry in Rockhampton and Central Queensland a big lift, because such a facility has been badly needed for some time.

I am fortified in the stand I have taken in regard to the abattoir by the latest financial report on the operations of the Brisbane

Abattoir, which contained a statement that the trading loss last year amounted to £92,000. I am also fortified by a statement by the hon. member for Townsville North, who said recently, following a rise in killing charges at the district abattoir at Townsville, that local meat would soon be priced off the plates of the poor people of that city. I am proud to say that in Rockhampton we still have the cheapest and best meat in Australia, and the graziers will soon have four meatworks to choose from where there was only one before. They wanted competition for the C.Q.M.E. Co., and I assure hon. members that I wanted it, too.

**Mr. Aikens:** You will not have cheap meat for long if you have a public abattoir.

**Mr. PILBEAM:** We will not get one, fortunately. Mr. McIntyre can confirm that I have supported T. A. Field Pty. Ltd. completely in their plans to set up a separate meatworks, and Mr. Harold Morris, who will be building a mutton abattoir in the area, has thanked me repeatedly for the help that I have given him—I will continue to give it to him—in providing opposition to the C.Q.M.E. Co. and free competition in Rockhampton and Central Queensland. Graziers have been somewhat loth to accept the fact that T. A. Field Pty. Ltd. will build a meatworks in Central Queensland. Once they do accept it, I am sure that they will support wholeheartedly the Government's decision in regard to meatworks in Central Queensland.

The principal charge that has been levelled against people who opposed the establishment of a district abattoir is that they were doing nothing to prevent large numbers of cattle going past Rockhampton's door. The way to tackle that problem is to open the Brisbane market and give a rail freight concession on carcasses to make it cheaper to send cattle on the hook than on the hoof. If that is done, we in Rockhampton will show just how many cattle go past our door and how much more employment we can provide in this industry. Cattle which now go past our door will be killed at Rockhampton and delivered in Brisbane in carcass form. Anyone who has any humanity in his nature does not like to see animals unnecessarily transported by rail, and killing cattle at Rockhampton will improve this situation.

As I usually do in the Address-in-Reply debate, I shall try to make a contribution of a constructive nature. For some time past the people of Rockhampton and Central Queensland have had foisted on to them the responsibility of developing further industries in the area. After due investigation, we submit that the industry most worthy of support in the area is the cotton industry. I know that cotton has had a rather chequered career. It has had a rather unfortunate history in Central Queensland, but I think that most of the mistakes that could be made have been made and growers are now fully aware of most of the problems that face the industry and more aware of the

best way to overcome them. So far as cotton is concerned, in the world picture it is a major industry. It is only in Australia, when compared with such industries as beef, sugar, and wool, that it becomes a poor relation. On the world scene, of all the world's textile fibres cotton represents 66½ per cent., man-made fibres 22 per cent., and wool and other minor fibres 11½ per cent.

There is, in this, no real opposition to cotton as there has been in the case of wool and the world demand for cotton is growing all the time. It is true that it is not growing as rapidly as the demand for man-made fibres but it is still growing, and the uses to which cotton is being put are continually becoming enlarged.

Fifty years ago cotton was used only for clothing material. Now it is put to a variety of other uses. For clothing about 37 per cent. of cotton is used, for household uses 25 per cent., and for industrial uses about 38 per cent.

In every country in the world that grows cotton, the crop is subsidised by the Government concerned and in every country in the world it is grown as an irrigated crop, not only as a rain crop.

These matters must be borne in mind when considering the development of the cotton industry in Australia. In the U.S.A., which grows half the world's cotton, the export of cotton carries an 8½ per cent. Government subsidy. We in Australia import most of the cotton we use from America, despite the fact that we have a suitable climate for it here and all the ingredients, particularly in Queensland and Central Queensland, that go towards a successful cotton industry.

As far as the State scene is concerned—that is, inside Australia—we find that Australian spinners use annually 95,000 bales of raw cotton and of this amount, which is used by local spinners, only 8 per cent. is grown in Australia. The amount of raw cotton that has to be imported by Australian spinners is valued at £5,500,000 annually. In addition, Australia each year imports cotton-piece goods and textiles to a value of £45,000,000. So you can see, Mr. Speaker, that there is a tremendous local market—and that is the best market for any industry—to be satisfied by local growers if the industry can be developed inside Australia.

At the present time, the local spinners are seeking to be allowed to increase their woven-goods markets from 12½ per cent. to 25 per cent., and a case is being prepared for presentation to the Tariff Board in October or November this year. If it is successful, it may well be that it will be open to Australian growers to provide a further 95,000 bales of raw cotton for Australian spinners.

As has been the case in other countries, cotton has had to be subsidised by the Government. In fact, in Australia there has been a Government-guaranteed price of 14d. a lb. for the past 10 years, divided into two periods of five years, the second of which will expire in December this year. Of that amount of 14d. a lb. that had to be provided, the Government last year provided 5d. Until fairly recently Queensland led the way in the cotton-growing States of Australia. I am bound to say that her position is now being seriously threatened by Western Australia and New South Wales. In Western Australia there is a large irrigation project on the Ord River to provide water for cotton-growers. This scheme has been financed largely by the Commonwealth Government. At the present time the growers are having their problems with insect pests and they will have an economic difficulty because of their distance from markets. As a matter of fact, it has been considered by the industry that cotton can be brought from America at a lower cost to the spinners in the eastern States of Australia than from the Ord River. It is a big difficulty. In addition, it requires a large capital outlay to establish growers on blocks along the Ord River. The Western Australian Government has indicated that it will require about £25,000 a block to put a grower on his feet, whereas in Queensland the Cotton Board figures show about £15,000 for similar sized blocks of about 600 acres.

In New South Wales, in the Namoi River district, particularly at Weewaa and Narrabri, there are very large irrigation projects. The Keepit Dam stores the equivalent of about 80 per cent. of the capacity of all the Queensland storage schemes combined. In order to make that project successful the New South Wales Government has encouraged a group of American growers with the necessary know-how to settle and grow cotton in the area. They have formed a co-operative with Australian growers, and it is significant that this year they hope to plant from 8,000 to 9,000 acres. When it is considered that they hope to produce yields of up to 2,000 lb. an acre you can see what sort of threat this will be to Queensland's position as the leading cotton-growing State. When the Namoi River project was first envisaged the growers sent their cotton to Queensland gins for processing, but now they have their own ginneries. Ironically enough they have not a plant to de-lint the seed. What is unpalatable to me is that the Queensland Cotton Board may ask the Rockhampton ginnery to de-lint some of the seed so that the New South Wales growers can plant their land.

Queensland's position as the leading cotton-growing State is being seriously threatened so we will have to pull up our socks if we want to maintain it. With a view to taking action on the matter a public meeting was held in Rockhampton recently. It was well attended by local-government representatives from all the shires where cotton is grown, including a representative from Gladstone,

and growers and representatives of the growers' organisation. They looked at the problem from two angles—the short-range and the long-range. From the long-range angle they considered that large-scale water conservation projects were absolutely essential if cotton were to be grown as a major commercial crop. In the course of their discussions they gave me the history of cotton-growing in Central Queensland. It might be interesting to hon. members if I outlined some of it on this occasion.

Cotton was first grown in Central Queensland in the early 1920's and it has been grown to a greater or lesser degree ever since. At times there have been very bad years. In 1949 the production was just over 500 bales of raw cotton and at other times it has risen to as high as 12,600 bales. This year, approximately 30 per cent. of the total production was grown under irrigation although the area irrigated would not amount to more than 7 per cent. of the total area planted with cotton. That again proves that it is necessary to have irrigation to produce cotton successfully.

So far, the history of irrigated cotton in Central Queensland has not been a very happy one. It is only in the last six years that its production has been attempted in the Callide Valley. The growers in the Callide Valley found that irrigated cotton needed an entirely different technique from rain-grown cotton. I am pleased to say that slowly and surely they are overcoming their problems. For instance, they found that irrigation caused the ground to become short of nitrogen and they had to use fertilisers recommended by the Department of Agriculture and Stock. They found, too, that if the ground was not properly graded it would become waterlogged and they had to get over that obstacle. They found pests more difficult to control in irrigated cotton than in rain-grown cotton. At present they are asking for further research in this field. They also found that different varieties, suitable for irrigation, had to be planted. This year, for the first time, they have seed suitable for irrigated cotton. Of course, they now have machine harvesting, which takes away a great deal of the cost of the harvesting procedure.

**Mr. Ewan:** What do those machines cost?

**Mr. PILBEAM:** A top-grade machine costs about £5,800.

During the first three years some areas produced yields of 1,600 lb. an acre while other rain-grown areas of cotton, sometimes in the same paddock, produced only 300 to 400 lb. an acre. In the past few years there has been a great increase in yield; in fact, some yields have been up to 2,000 lb. an acre. Growers in the Callide Valley are confidently expecting to exceed that yield this year. The Dawson Valley growers have had a similar history except that they have been experimenting with irrigated cotton for a much longer period. Even in that area they have produced some yields of up to 2,000 lb.

an acre. In one area, the Gibber Gonyah area, they have had a rather melancholy experience. There has been a great deal of distress in that area, as the hon. member for Mackenzie can tell us. In attempting to ascertain the reason for the failure in that area the excuse has been advanced that it was opened up originally as a dairy proposition and the farmers did not have the necessary know-how for producing cotton. In this area, as in the Callide Valley, problems of drainage are present and, of course, in Theodore they have had a couple of major floods, which certainly upset the economy for a period. The farmers in that area have realised their mistakes and they are doing their best to acquire the skill to overcome them.

Anyone who considers pushing the industry should recognise past mistakes and realise that they must not be allowed to continue in any future schemes; but we would be wrong if we were bogged down by mistakes of the past. We can profit by our mistakes and we should not sit down and cry over them without making any attempt to push this industry, which is of the utmost importance in the eyes of all the people of the world.

It is interesting to note, when considering the effect of irrigation, that in California there was an average yield of 1,400 lb. an acre in 1951, but as the result of an intensive research programme the yield in 1962 was lifted to 3,300 lb. an acre. So the results can be quite rewarding.

At a recent meeting in Rockhampton, the growers of the area were quite sure that their problems in developing the industry would have to be overcome in two ways: first of all, in the long range, the much-needed, large-scale irrigation projects in the areas where cotton is already being grown; then, to make up for the lag of 8 to 10 years which must occur before these large-scale projects can be put into operation, they request an intensified research programme, first of all, to make the greatest possible use of crops now in existence and, secondly, to give the farmers the know-how so that, when the big irrigation programme comes into being, they will be able to cope with it. In the past, too many inexperienced farmers have tackled the growing of cotton under irrigation and failed to make a success of it.

Some of their main requirements are set out in a letter I have here from Mr. Burrows, President of the Australian Cotton Growers' Association. They require an entomologist for cotton-pest research. They require semi-skilled and unskilled labourers or assistants for the agronomists, entomologists and the plant breeder that was supplied by the Department of Agriculture and Stock 12 months ago. They need a glasshouse for the Biloela Research Station. They also need a laboratory and a chemist for the Biloela Research Station. They need more equipment and material to be made

available to research staff when required, and they certainly need more cotton advisers for research work on cotton growing under irrigation.

I understand that a request has already been made by the Cotton Board for increased research, and, for the major irrigation projects that are destined to be developed for the industry in the Fitzroy basin, the Rockhampton and District Regional Research and Promotion Bureau has submitted a very sincere and comprehensive case to the Government of Queensland. I am very happy to say that this Government has recognised the necessity for the scheme and has compiled a case and submitted it to the Commonwealth Government for the implementation of two major dam schemes in the Fitzroy basin.

**Mr. Ewan:** Did you say they had submitted it?

**Mr. PILBEAM:** I think they are submitting it at the present time. I know the case has been compiled; we have been advised of that by the Minister.

**Mr. Davies:** Many things have been submitted to the Commonwealth Government over the last few years.

**Mr. PILBEAM:** This one is a very sound case. Lest there be any doubts as to whether there are suitable projects for the Fitzroy basin, let me quote a few extracts to hon. members. The first is from the official report of the Queensland Irrigation and Water Supply Commission issued in August, 1961. It says—

“The Fitzroy Basin offers the most favourable opportunities for long-term water conservation and irrigation development of any river system in the State.”

I quote again from the same source—

“There is no doubt that the Fitzroy Basin must eventually be one of the most highly productive areas in Queensland, if not in the whole of Australia. The convenient location, sub-tropical environment and existing basic facilities of the Fitzroy Basin provide a much more attractive setting for intensifying rural development than other more remote and less-developed areas where settlement is being contemplated, such as the Ord River and parts of the Northern Territory.”

If anyone should think I am being unfair in advocating the establishment of a major irrigation project in Central Queensland, let me quote from the Queensland Year Book for 1962, which gives the following distribution of irrigated crops in Queensland for 1960-1961:—

Southern Queensland	..	93,130 acres
Central Queensland	..	9,428 acres
Northern Queensland	..	68,488 acres

That should prove conclusively that a major water-conservation scheme in Central Queensland is well and truly justified,

especially when it is essential to the development of an industry such as this, which is of the utmost importance in the eyes of the world.

It is not only my opinion that these water-conservation schemes are desirable. The opinion of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, quoted on page 5 of the Research and Promotion Bureau's case, is—

“Already about 1,000 acres of irrigated cotton are grown in the region. Yield and quality can undoubtedly be substantially improved by better husbandry and further research. The available evidence indicates that an adequate acreage of suitable soils is likely to be found within the commendable area. The project merits serious consideration.”

With regard to the Emerald region they say—

“Construction of reservoirs on the Nogoa and Comet Rivers would provide water for the irrigation of 40,000 to 50,000 acres in a region where climatic conditions appear to be suitable for cotton and where cotton-growing problems are likely to be similar to those already partially solved in Central Queensland.”

I shall now quote the opinion of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics expressed in an article entitled “Cotton Growing in Australia. An Economic Survey, 1962.” With regard to the Dawson region it reads—

“Production at prices approaching the cost of imported cotton is a distinct possibility under irrigation, if all the problems are overcome. It should be possible to expand the industry on a sound basis when more irrigation facilities become available. As higher yield increases are possible, there exists a case for production at higher water charges, more in line with the true cost of irrigation installation.”

It refers also to a proposal for the irrigation of 82,000 acres near Emerald, 175 miles west of Rockhampton. This would permit an annual production of 20,000 acres of cotton in rotation with pastures. With a commercial yield of 1,350 lb. an acre, some 27,000,000 lb. of seed cotton could be produced annually, sufficient to support two large ginneries.

The natural corollary to the construction of ginneries is, in the long run, the establishment of spinning and weaving factories.

These proposed irrigation schemes have been investigated fully by the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission. The schemes favoured are the Emerald irrigation project, which they say will serve a total area of farms of 60,000 acres, has an estimated increased value of production of £2,600,000 annually, and can be constructed at an estimated cost of £15.5 million, and the Dawson Valley Nathan Gorge Dam project, which would serve a total area of farms of 170,000 acres, with a total estimated increase in the

annual value of production of £7·5 million, and could be constructed at an estimated capital cost of £25,000,000.

If further corroboration of the desirability of these projects is needed, I quote from a statement by Professor Munro, who is Professor of Civil Engineering at the University of Sydney and Honorary Director of Research of the Water Research Foundation of Australia, and who accompanied the Food and Agriculture Committee of the Federal Parliament on a recent tour of Central and Northern Queensland. Among other things, he had this to say on his return to Sydney—

“Planning takes time (five to ten years or more) and we should press on without much ado with the few promising projects such as the Nathan Gorge Dam and irrigation areas in the Dawson Valley.

“For an expenditure of £22,000,000 the Nathan Dam Scheme provides 2,500,000 acre-feet of irrigation storage plus 3,000,000 acre-feet of flood mitigation storage and an annual supply of 320,000 acre-feet for irrigation.

“We were happy to spend more than £400,000,000 on the Snowy Scheme to provide 1,800,000 acre-feet a year and peak load hydro power so we do not need to quibble about this kind of expenditure in the North.”

I submit that it would be a very wonderful thing for Australia as a whole if we could develop this industry. I suggest again that the natural habitat of cotton is in Central Queensland, and I assure hon. members that the people of Central Queensland, the cotton-growers, and all other people interested in the industry, will do their utmost to assist the State and Commonwealth Governments in fostering and fathering the development of the cotton industry in this part of the State.

**Mr. HANSON** (Port Curtis) (2.31 p.m.): Mr. Deputy Speaker, in associating myself with the motion before the House, I should like to extend to Mr. Speaker my heartiest congratulations upon his reappointment to the high and noble office of Speaker of this Assembly. I understand that when he was first appointed to the office of Speaker there was much wailing and gnashing of teeth among Government members. Of course, that was to be expected, because from time immemorial coalition parties have been constantly beset by machinations, intrigues, and all sorts of nefarious political devices. However, apparently Mr. Speaker has survived all this. He has come through with flying colours and, to use the vernacular, is six lengths in front, full of running. I must congratulate him upon such an outstanding performance.

I do not propose at this stage to re-state or re-affirm my loyalty to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, because it is only a few days ago that all members of this

Assembly swore an oath of allegiance to the Throne. That is not something that I would take lightly or with any degree of irresponsibility. I firmly believe that free elections every three years under a constitutional monarchy is a system of government far superior to many of the other systems prevailing throughout the world. To my mind, it is virtually an ideal set-up and is infinitely superior to the rule of dictators, autocrats, fascists, and communists, to which so many people in the world have been subjected.

I think it is only fitting on this occasion that I should make reference to my predecessor in the electorate of Port Curtis, Mr. Burrows. As hon. members know, Jim Burrows gave 16 years' wonderful service to the Port Curtis electorate. This was fully appreciated by his constituents, because in successive elections he was returned to this Assembly with an increased majority. He is a personal friend of mine, a knowledgeable man. Although, as most hon. members probably know, he had no great gifts of eloquence and at times, in the heat of debate, might have become somewhat incoherent, he had a vast knowledge of the State and its problems. He was a true Australian, and the people of Gladstone and the Port Curtis electorate miss him very much. I take this opportunity of wishing him and his wife many days of happiness and enjoyment, and I trust that at all times I will have his counsel and advice in the electorate.

I was very pleased to receive my party's endorsement, the great Australian Labour Party's endorsement, to contest the Port Curtis seat, and I wish to thank the many trade unionists and members of the Australian Labour Party who gave me their endorsement. I thank them particularly and also the many electors of Port Curtis who gave me such a large majority on 1 June.

I have a love for the Labour Party. I believe in its sentiments; I believe in its humanity; and I believe in its principles. I trust that in the years ahead, if I am to remain a member of this Assembly, I will at all times uphold its principles and that the electors will find that I am, in a humble way, trying to do my job and further its policies.

I might add, by way of passing reference, that it is somewhat pleasing to me to be elected a member of this Assembly because I take a seat on the benches with my brother-in-law, the hon. member for Baroona, Mr. Pat Hanlon. Pat and I have known each other for years. We are related by marriage and I do want to say how pleased I am to be here in Parliament with him. I trust that our parliamentary association will exist for many years. I have at all times enjoyed his friendship; I have admired his ability, and I trust he has a great future in the Australian Labour movement.

A maiden speech of this kind, I understand, is somewhat of a parish-pump speech, extolling the many virtues of and eulogising

the various parts of one's electorate. I do not wish to disappoint members on this occasions. It has been suggested to me that I should go quietly towards the half-mile and come home full of running. However, I am of a staying quality and I hope that I stay here a considerable time—I hope not on this side of the Chamber, because in three years' time we will definitely be over on that side.

**Mr. Knox:** You were going to win 17 seats at the last election.

**Mr. HANSON:** The hon. member will be losing his seat next time.

I think that I have something to really talk about. I realise fully the responsibility I incurred when I became a member of this Assembly because I represent one of the most important electorates in this State, rich in resources. It is rich in minerals, timber, agricultural and pastoral resources, whilst its industrial potential is virtually unlimited.

**Mr. Windsor** interjected.

**Mr. HANSON:** I heard the hon. member was a nice old man with a lot of ethics and charity. I had to defend him the other day because someone told me he was related to the Kellys and that his nickname was "Hands-up Bob."

Before actually going on to extol the virtues of my electorate I wish to speak on the question of seasonal employment—or unemployment—which, to me, is of paramount importance. In a few weeks' time the main industry in the main town in my electorate, Gladstone, will be virtually closing its doors. Swift Australia Co. Ltd. will probably be serving notice on many hundreds of employees of the Gladstone meat works, asking them to seek other jobs or to go on to social services and come back next year.

This state of affairs has existed in Gladstone for the last five or seven years and it is something that causes the ordinary citizen and the business man a considerable amount of concern; and I am sure that it causes the workers of Gladstone and their families much deeper concern. It certainly riles one who has a humane interest; it certainly riles one who has a deep regard for these people. I grew up with them; I know that very few of them want to go onto social services. Many of them who are physically able wish to go out and seek employment. They are willing to take any job with their hands to earn their daily bread. We of the Australian Labour Party maintain that that is their birthright and that they are quite entitled to expect full employment in the meat industry.

It is somewhat ludicrous to me to think that each year—and I am referring to the area surrounding the Gladstone and Rockhampton meat works—almost 200,000 head of cattle pass the doors of the meat works in that area. Those figures are approximate but I suggest that they are fairly accurate. Why cannot some scheme be evolved to keep those

cattle in that area and allow them to be processed through those works? That is basic thinking on my part and it is basic thinking on the part of 90 per cent. of the population of the area who are now dependent on this industry. I refer to the towns of Rockhampton and Gladstone. There should be some sane thinking on the part of the Government to see if we cannot end this state of affairs and to give the meat worker the justice that is his rightful due.

Not only the meat worker is affected; there is less work in the Railway Department and less work on the wharves. These people are entitled to employment. They are good citizens. I grew up with them and I know them to be so. I fully realise the responsibilities I incurred when I became a member of this Assembly. I fully realise it, because it is only in the last few years that we have been reluctantly recognised by the present administration as having the best port in the State. During the war years American forces engaged in the defence of this country used that port extensively. They found it had many advantages. It was used by many convoys, and ships of all classes came there. It was used a great deal as the embarkation point for the various New Guinea theatres of war. Today ships constantly call to load meat, meat products, coal and pyrites, wheat and grain sorghum, and almost all the oils and lubricants used in Central Queensland are pumped into the many oil terminals there.

Over the years I have had a long association with the Gladstone Harbour Board, of which I have been successively member, chairman, and deputy chairman. At the present time I am deputy chairman. I pay great tribute to the many men who make up the Department of Harbours and Marine, and I pay a compliment to the many men throughout the State who, mostly in a voluntary capacity, make up the various harbour boards.

Over the years in the political sphere we have often heard the word "decentralisation" used. That word, although very freely expressed, is very rarely put into effect. The various electricity boards exemplify what I am going to say about the harbour board set-up being advanced a stage further. Within the structure of the Department of Harbours and Marine, the Director or some senior officer should be appointed an ex-officio member of all boards, and should attend the more important board meetings. In that way we would get within the harbour board set-up a uniformity of administration, and we would be able to share the experience of other ports in solving problems. I think that is a very sound idea. It would activate interest among members and lead to the more expeditious handling of the myriads of small problems confronting port authorities from day to day.

Gladstone has been selected as the site for probably the largest alumina factory in the world. I understand that by 1967 it will

produce some 500,000 tons of alumina from Weipa bauxite. At this stage I wish to advance an idea of my own. It is one that is possibly prominent in the minds of many, including the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity. A few weeks ago Sir Maurice Mawby and Mr. Hibberd, chairman and managing director respectively of Comalco Pty. Ltd., visited New Zealand for the prime purpose of signing an option for a block of power exercisable up to 1967. To my mind this means that although Comalco would be a little anxious at this stage to establish an aluminium smelter in New Zealand, they have not actually decided to do so. I think we could win this particular industry to Queensland. We have here extensive coal deposits with large watersheds close to them, and in those areas power stations, designed to generate 125,000 kilowatts initially and 250,000 kilowatts in the final stage, could be established.

I understand that in New South Wales two major powerhouses are to be built shortly, one at Valls Point or Lake Macquarie, and the other at Munmoorah, both near Newcastle. The proposed station at Valls Point is to be supplied by three mines that were recently opened. Coal will be fed into the power station by conveyor belt. One can well imagine that the price of the power will be rather cheap, but it is not cheap enough to win for that area a competitive international aluminium industry. I maintain that in Queensland we can produce cheaper power than is contemplated at the Valls Point scheme which, I understand, will have a final capacity of 1,000,000 kilowatts.

We should interest ourselves in this proposal. I think that eventually it could be won for the State. With the proposed development for Gladstone, in rapidity of growth, it will rival Mt. Isa with its copper production, Townsville with its related secondary industries and Biloela with its grain production and increased coal production.

At this stage I suggest that we should consider a town-planning scheme for these areas. I am not criticising what was done many years ago—far from it. However, I think that, with the increased contemplated development that is likely to occur in these towns, a town plan will have to be investigated. The best city in the Commonwealth is Canberra and only recently it was found that there was need there for further town planning. Canberra has been developed with Commonwealth money on a scale that no local authority in any other city could ever attempt. I know that there is a town planning division in the Department of Local Government. This could be extended and related to the Housing Commission to give to new towns and new areas in towns a better class of town planning. These places could be planned for modern living so that they will meet the requirements of adequate town planning.

With the proposed new developments at Gladstone I should like to see more Crown land subdivided. I should also like to see subdivided land that is unnecessarily held by the Commonwealth and housing blocks made available for the contemplated fast-growing population. With careful planning, and with good terms and conditions, the workers in Gladstone should be able to get their land at a reasonable price. It is ridiculous to see instances throughout the State of lots of land being sold at a very high price. In many instances, the working man and the middle-class-income man are unable to acquire land of their choice, and in many cases they are priced out of the home-ownership market. It is an absolute disgrace that this state of affairs should exist.

I might add that, with the development that is likely to occur in the Gladstone district and in other areas of Central Queensland, we will be visited by many of the spivs, manipulators and land operators who, in the past few years, have set the pattern in the southern part of this State and in the southern States. At this stage I sound a note of warning. I raise my voice, and raise it most vociferously, in defence of the ordinary man in our town. We do not want the Hammonds, the Kormans and the other clique; they can keep out of it. I want that to be known.

**Mr. Windsor:** You just want the Hansons.

**Mr. HANSON:** They won't have the hon. member for Ithaca next time.

There is a matter of concern to the whole of the electorate of Port Curtis that I should like to bring to the attention of this House, and it is most urgent that I do so. I refer to the bad state of some of our country roads. Years ago roads were the responsibility of the local divisional board, or, later, the local authority. In those days a wheel tax was levied on carts and wagons, which very rarely went outside their area. Today modern vehicles can traverse the State in 36 hours.

I do not object to the Main Roads Commission's idea of putting down good roads between towns. That is something to be desired and I would not complain about expenditure of that kind. But what I do object to is the spending of money unnecessarily on deviations. I refer particularly to the 10-chain stretch around Gladstone and the Wallaville stretch near Bundaberg. It would be difficult to resist the suggestion that this was prompted by a desire to assist the heavy-transport-vehicle operators. To my mind these heavy-transport-vehicle operators are a menace and they contribute very little, comparatively, towards road-making in the State. For tourists these deviations are definitely misleading. I have known instances of people who have stayed overnight in Gladstone and have been extremely disappointed at missing the very fine town of Bundaberg.

I think this Government should spend more on roads serving the useful people of the State, including the people of my electorate. I name specifically the Boyne Valley Road stretching to Many Peaks, the Mt. Larcom to Bracewell road, and the road serving the fruit-growing district of Yarwun. They are in a pitiful state and need a little more attention than they have received over the last few years. I refer specifically to the fact—and I am pleased to see that the hon. member for Rockhampton South is in the Chamber—that very little energy has been displayed in work on the little road that connects the Bruce Highway with the Dawson Highway. It is an alternative road in flood time, but it is still unsealed. As regards the Yarwun Road, I do not think there is a road in the State that gets in a worse condition at times. The district is very prosperous and it supplies a good quality of papaw to the market. I wish at a later stage, possibly later in the year, to express some thoughts about the very discriminatory action taken by the Committee of Direction of Fruit Marketing against these people. I am very grateful to the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry for accepting the invitation I extended to him to visit this area. He has promised to do so and I am sure that, when he does, he will see the problem that confronts these people.

Next I should like to refer briefly to the plight of the dairying industry. It is something that can no longer be ignored by State or Federal Governments. But for seasonal conditions in Europe and the United Kingdom, it would be in an even more critical condition than today. Least concerned about this seem to be members of the Country Party in this Assembly, who from time to time claim to be the great champions of the dairying industry. I realise that the problem is not an easy one to solve; it seems more or less incapable of solution. I should say that no other industry suffered as much from the political demise of the Chifley administration. The low standard of living of dairy farmers in my district is appalling. Some of them do not even get the basic wage, and they are wonderful people, real Australians, very fine people. I urge that something be done for them, whether it be by way of holding an inquiry or, probably, a royal commission.

The tourist industry is very prominent in my thoughts and last night I had the privilege of reading the report of the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau for the year ended 30 June, 1963. Many people think of the tourist as a man of untold wealth who has £5 notes sticking out of his pockets and who likes to use £1 notes as Mintie papers; but the tourist is a very intelligent man. He likes a little value for his money. Central Queensland has a great tourist potential, but in the matter of transport the tourist is treated very shabbily indeed. We find on the Rockhampton-

Brisbane mail train carriages so ancient that they are, as a matter of fact, ready for the museum. In the first-class sleeping berths the beds are old, hard, and lumpy, and give the impression of being a little unhygienic. If the engine-driver opens the throttle and takes the engine to 20 miles an hour, the carriages are like horses with the stagers or, getting close to Gladstone Harbour, crabs that have shed their claws.

Mt. Morgan is the second largest town in my electorate, and depends financially on Mt. Morgan Limited. Mt. Morgan is the largest producer of gold in Queensland. Production is from 55,000 to 60,000 oz. of fine gold, and 7,000 to 8,000 tons of copper, a year. It has a potential production of 200,000 tons of pyrites a year, but has sales in view of only some 40,000 tons a year, or 20 per cent. of the total production. I suppose all hon. members know that the world price of gold has remained unaltered for the last 14 years. Gold producers throughout the State have been given generous Commonwealth assistance, but no such help is given to Mt. Morgan Limited. I suggest that to assist the mine, and eventually the town, the Commonwealth Government should buy in all new gold at £20 an oz. and that for all other transactions, such as exports, imports, and sales within the country, the price of £15 12s. 6d. an oz. should apply. This would stimulate the gold-mining industry, which was very closely connected with the earlier development and economic growth of the State.

The Commonwealth Government has been particularly generous in assisting financially companies engaged in the search for oil. I suggest that this assistance should be extended and that subsidies should be made to approved exploration parties seeking other minerals. The lone prospector is fast disappearing because many of the surface outcrops have been located and evaluated. Exploring further and deeper requires skilled teams, and a great amount of technical plant and equipment, including transport. The expenditure needed to maintain modern exploration parties in the field is very high, and there is the added expense of maintaining a very efficient headquarters base. I suggest that the Commonwealth Government should come to the assistance of the many mines and other firms engaged in approved exploration work throughout the length and breadth of this country. That is the only way in which sound development can be obtained in the mining industry.

The mine at Mt. Morgan is working at present on very low-grade material. The company has throughout the years effected economies and increased production, but I think that a little assistance should be given in the mining of pyrites. As I have already mentioned, there are sales for only 20 per cent. of the total production of 200,000 tons. Ten years ago the Commonwealth Government, in its wisdom, instituted the sulphuric acid committee, mainly to give assistance to

many of the people who were, or who were likely to be, short of sulphur. Incidentally, I should mention that pyrites contains 50 per cent. sulphur.

At that stage the future of the fertilizer industry in this country looked particularly black, simply because there was not enough sulphur available. Certain overtures were made and many producers of pyrites were asked to step up their production quickly. Unfortunately for the people in the area which I represent, chance discoveries of sulphur in the United States of America altered the position. The brimstone trade between the United States and Australia was resumed and pyrites more or less went into oblivion.

An inquiry was held and a bounty was given to those who were adversely affected by the change of policy. However, the bounty that was eventually given was not sufficient to meet the needs of the producers of pyrites, and we find that Mt. Morgan Ltd. is now in the unhappy position of being able to find markets for only 20 per cent. of its production. I believe that an increase in production of pyrites would be one means of saving Mt. Morgan. As I said before, the company is working on very low-grade material. The people of the town are wonderful people—mining people usually are—but unfortunately there is an air of pessimism in the town. No-one in his right senses would want to see Mt. Morgan suffer another reverse such as the one it suffered in the 1920's. The sale of 200,000 tons of its pyrites would mean an eventual saving in imports of 100,000 tons of brimstone—that is, sulphur—into Australia at a cost of £1,500,000, 50 per cent. of which is attributable to sea freights paid to American and other foreign shipping lines.

The establishment of a fertilizer factory at Gladstone would probably end many of these troubles. Such a factory could manufacture superphosphate and other fertilizers mixed with superphosphate, and this would provide a local market for Mt. Morgan. There are several fertilizer factories throughout the State, the main ones being at Pinkenba in Brisbane and at Cairns and Mackay in North Queensland. Unfortunately, there is no fertilizer factory in Central Queensland, which suffers much as a result. If a fertilizer factory were established in Central Queensland, the pastoral industry would be able to obtain superphosphate at a very reasonable price and there would be a great saving on the cost of freight. It would mean another industry for Gladstone and would sustain production at the Mt. Morgan mine.

We could go even a little farther. If commercial sulphuric acid were available, this could be allied with rock phosphate to produce phosphoric acid, which when mixed with ammonia becomes a dual-purpose fertilizer. It is both nitrogenous and phosphoric and, as many hon. members know, both nitrogen and phosphorous are urgently

needed for continuous cropping in the sugar-cane fields. A chemical industry eventually becomes its own best customer, and sulphuric acid could be mixed with alumina to make aluminium sulphate, which is extensively used in town water supplies.

I have put forward a few ideas that I think could be helpful to my electorate, but at this stage I wish to return to the subject of tourists. It has been brought to my attention that during the recent Army operation off Burnett Heads and Bargara fishermen were told to stay out of the area seven miles south of Lady Musgrave Island and three miles north-west of Boulte Reef. This covers the whole of the Bunker group of islands in the Barrier Reef and is adjacent to the Capricorn group, of which Heron Island is one. All Barrier Reef islands are sanctuaries, and when one goes to Heron Island as a tourist one is told by people in authority that the bird-life and wild-life on that island is to be respected.

I would say, to the credit of most tourists, that they do adhere to these ideas, although there are some who would like to get a gun and shoot a heron or some other birds or wild life on these islands. However, it has come to my notice that the Army authorities—and the Air Force authorities at times—do not exercise any restraint and will let a bomb go off anywhere and blow up any part of the Reef. The result is that, for many days, and sometimes months afterwards, fishermen have not been able to get the catches of fish that they previously got on Boulte Reef or other islands in the Bunker group. It takes many months for the fish to work back to their former habitat.

One gentleman is going to give me some very interesting photographs of the destruction of wild life on these islands. Whether or not the statements about the recent exercises are correct I do not know. I am not going to say that they are but I think this Government should ensure that the sanctuary for wild life and the beauty of the coral on this particular group of islands, should be preserved.

I am not opposed to a course of training in landing operations on these beaches but I do say it is vital to see that these particular tourist attractions—and Musgrave and several of these places could become good tourist attractions—are preserved. They are very necessary to the fishing industry and to the poor devils in my town who go out there in all types of weather in the hope of earning a living in the fishing industry. These sanctuaries should be preserved by these authorities. Anybody else who goes out there fishing has to conform to the law and I see no reason why the Army with its pukka sahibs and whatever you like should not also conform to the rules. It is up to this Government to see that it does.

**Mr. Aikens:** Did you say "tucker," or something?

**Mr. HANSON:** Pukka sahibs. The hon. member may not know them. I will point them out to him some time.

I should like now to refer to a matter that was mentioned in the Press this morning and a statement attributed to Lady Cilento. The statement was to the effect that the intelligentsia in this country seem to have in their minds the rejection of the idea of a personal God. She is possibly correct. I dare say she is correct, in a number of circumstances. I think she is correct when she says that corrupt influences should be taken away from young people and I congratulate her very much on her courage and on her stand in this direction.

If young people would consult their clergymen more—if they made a friend of their clergyman, minister, or priest—much of the delinquency that exists at present would disappear from the community. Bodge elements and the leather-jacket boys and many of the youth of this State would rather shake hands with a taipan than with a minister of religion. I want to say to them, "For goodness sake have some sense and at some time go along and shake hands with a clergyman and make him your friend." It might keep them out of all sorts of future trouble. They are the people who will some day rule this community. They are the people who will come into this Assembly, go into the Public Service and into our professions. They are the future workers of this State, and this is one way they will prevent further deterioration in the sense of delinquency.

I am very pleased that Lady Cilento had the courage to inform the intelligentsia of this country just what they are about. I trust there will be a revival and that people will appreciate the fact that they have a God.

I desire to thank all members for their kind consideration in giving me an attentive hearing. It was somewhat of an effort and I appreciate their attitude.

(Applause in public gallery.)

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the visitors in the gallery to refrain from such action in the future. Disturbances in the gallery are not permitted.

**Mr TOOTH** (Ashgrove) (3.10 p.m.): In rising to support the motion before the House, I wish to associate my constituents and myself with the expressions of loyalty to Her Majesty already made by many hon. members, and also to associate ourselves with the expressions of regard for His Excellency the Governor and Lady May Abel Smith.

I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion on their splendid contributions to our knowledge of Queensland's developmental projects. If I may at this point, I should like to congratulate my good friend the hon. member for Port Curtis on his maiden speech in this House. The fluency and the readiness with which he spoke made his speech a pleasure to listen to.

It is a pity that I cannot go so far as to congratulate him on the substance of his speech. In several respects he was woefully astray. Just to put him correct on one or two things, I wish to say that there were more roads constructed in Queensland in the last six years under this Government than there were in the preceding 20 years of A.L.P. government. Under the present system of road construction, the financial responsibility of local authorities for road-building has been halved.

As to the Weipa bauxite deposits which, of course, are of vital importance to Gladstone and to the hon. member for Port Curtis, it is of interest to remember that the application by Comalco for a franchise at Weipa lay on the table of the A.L.P. Minister for Mines for 12 months prior to the accession of this Government without any action being taken. On the other hand, when this Government came to power the franchise was granted and the necessary legislation was passed through the House in 12 weeks. That is a measure of the difference between the A.L.P. and this Government in respect of developmental projects generally in Queensland. That is why we see in Queensland today a great burst of activity, developmental energy and progress as compared with the long years of stagnation through which we passed prior to 1957.

I should like to commend my friend and electoral neighbour the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha on the rare courage he showed in his maiden speech in the House by adopting an original and not universally popular attitude to the subject of northern development. That courage was justified and those opinions were well-founded. This is shown by the favourable reception and the widespread approval that his contribution received, both within and beyond the borders of Queensland.

Northern development must be viewed in perspective as part of overall national development; not on the one hand as a hothouse flower—an exotic—requiring special conditions and special artificial stimulus, nor on the other hand as a drought-stricken desert weed worthy of neither tith nor toil in the national demesne. It must be admitted that hitherto the latter view has largely prevailed. Let us beware that in our enthusiasm we do not move to the other extreme and attempt in the North types of development which are neither suitable nor possible. The warning of the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha on this matter is timely. The North must be developed, but in the right way.

It is therefore of major satisfaction that the Government, Parliament and the Premier have taken the initiative in directing the nation's attention to this matter and in endeavouring to arouse the national will to action. It is unfortunate that, in pursuing this endeavour, the Premier should have been grossly misquoted on a nation-wide telecast

a few weeks ago. This brings me to a matter which is the subject of widespread public interest and concern at the present time, namely, the policy and presentation of the top-ranking prestige A.B.C. telecast "Four Corners". This programme has achieved such a status in Queensland that it is repeated on the day following its initial presentation. Indeed, its prestige is such that it is regarded as the authentic voice of the A.B.C.

My doubts regarding "Four Corners" and the honesty and reliability of its presentation were first aroused by the programme in which the Premier was misquoted, because to me, watching critically, the actual act of misquotation bore all the marks of cold and calculated deliberation.

**An Opposition Member:** Did you see the programme?

**Mr. TOOTH:** Of course I saw the programme. I should not be talking about it if I did not.

I thought it was done deliberately for effect, and this conviction was strengthened when I learnt subsequently that the interviewer concerned complained that he was unable to get the answers he wanted from the Premier. From then on I made it my business to watch both presentations each week-end. On the week-end of 3-4 August, I witnessed a "Four Corners" telecast that really startled me. It purported to deal with the problems of atomic warfare and nuclear disarmament, but the presentation, except for a brief interview with Professor Oliphant, was so one-sided as to be a complete travesty. It was obviously based on the policy and programme of the Communist Peace Front organisations which are so active in our midst.

**Mr. Mann:** You should be arrested for saying that.

**Mr. TOOTH:** I should be most interested to know if the hon. member for Brisbane intends to enter the lists in defence of "Four Corners".

**Mr. Mann:** I will have something to say about it.

**Mr. TOOTH:** I will be very interested to hear what the hon. member says. At this stage I wish to say what I thought and what I have done in this matter after seeing this broadcast on the Hiroshima anniversary. I thought about it for a few days and then I wrote to the chairman of the Australian Broadcasting Commission under date 15 August, in the following terms—

"Dear Dr. Darling,

"Whenever I can possibly do so I watch the A.B.C. T.V. presentation 'Four Corners', and have until recently regarded it as most authoritative and trustworthy. Two recent events, however, have disturbed me, and I am taking this opportunity to detail them to you.

"On Sunday, 14 July, in a telecast in Queensland at 1.30 p.m. a discussion concerning the development of tropical North Queensland was presented. During this presentation the Premier of Queensland was interviewed and was repeatedly pressed by the questioner to say whether he thought Asian migration into Northern Australia would be a useful factor in its development and whether he thought such migration should be permitted. Mr. Nicklin replied that it was a matter which should receive consideration, but beyond that point he did not go.

"In a subsequent part of the presentation during a joint interview with the Honourable W. McMahon, M.P., and Mr. G. Whitlam, M.P., the same interrogator raised the matter of Asian migration and pressed Mr. McMahon for his views. During his questions he stated that the Premier of Queensland, Mr. Nicklin, had expressed himself as being in favour of such migration.

"Now, I wish to state that the outline I have given above represents my recollection of what was telecast and that recollection supports me very strongly in the opinion that Mr. Nicklin's views were misrepresented during the subsequent discussion with the Honourable W. McMahon. I am fortified in this opinion by conversations I had the following day with a number of prominent gentlemen at a consular reception I attended in Brisbane where the misrepresentation of Mr. Nicklin's remarks was the subject of general comment by several of my fellow guests.

"With regard to the above matter I wish first to enquire whether it is possible for a person such as myself to be permitted to see the videotape upon which, no doubt, this interview was recorded so that one may confirm or correct the impressions gained during the single viewing of the telecast.

"In addition to this I wish to express very strongly the view that in a telecast of the status of 'Four Corners' conducted as an A.B.C. Special Feature interviewers should show the greatest discretion and responsibility when dealing with matters of delicate international concern, and that any attempt to score cheap points should be avoided, particularly in interviews with the responsible and representative members of either State or Federal Governments. It should surely be obvious that if this practice be permitted to continue a situation could easily arise which could lead to serious international ill-feeling.

"The second incident which concerns me was the way in which the anniversary of Hiroshima was presented on 'Four Corners' on Sunday, 4th August. Revulsion against nuclear war is universal and

any presentation dealing with this problem should make that clear. Nations and groups of nations may differ as to the best means of securing immunity from its terrible consequences but not, I think, on the desirableness of promoting such immunity on a world-wide basis, if that be at all possible.

"On the occasion I mentioned 'Four Corners' in my opinion presented a subtly biased version of the problem and I offer, from my recollection of the telecast, two pieces of evidence in support of this opinion.

"First a series of interviews with peace front demonstrators who abound about that time of the year were presented, but none was sought from people who are critical of these demonstrators.

"Second, at no point during a recital of the long history of negotiations to control nuclear weapons was mention made of the vital issue upon which these negotiations have repeatedly collapsed, namely, the refusal of the Russians to accept any form of international inspection or control. To omit mention of this in such a telecast surely indicates either bias or ignorance.

"I realise, Sir, that to the people concerned with the production of these programmes the 'public-interest-and-attention' value of their work is of major importance but, I respectfully submit, no attempt should be made to secure this by the sacrifice of either accuracy or impartiality."

That is the end of the letter to Dr. Darling, who immediately sent me a courteous acknowledgment of my letter and told me that he was endeavouring to secure answers to the points that I raised.

At this juncture I should like to enlarge upon some of the points I mentioned in the letter. The first is on the matter of the interviews with people during this presentation. They were almost exclusively confined to marchers in a so-called Peace Front demonstration. They were confined to people dedicated to these propositions: that the Western democracies are warmongers, that the Communist powers are champions of peace, and that it is better to be Red than dead. The fact that there are other organisations equally dedicated to peace but which do not regard peace as being synonymous with surrender was completely ignored. But more disturbing still was the failure to mention the Russian refusal to co-operate in schemes of disarmament under international inspection.

For the sake of the record, let me remind the House of some of the facts of recent history. The United States has pursued a disarmament policy for many years. She has made far-reaching, concrete proposals of which I shall cite only a few. In 1946, when the United States alone possessed

atomic weapons, she proposed, in the Baruch Plan, complete international control and inspection of atomic energy, which would have meant giving up all national atomic armaments, which she alone possessed then. This proposal was rejected by the Soviet Union.

In 1953 President Eisenhower urged the Soviet Union to make, with the United States, joint contributions to an international pool on nuclear materials, thereby reducing atomic weapons stockpiles. This proposal was never agreed to by the Soviet Union.

In 1955 President Eisenhower proposed that the Soviet Union join the United States in mutual aerial inspection to guard against surprise attack—the "open skies" proposal. This plan held great possibility for peace, security, and disarmament, but it, too, was rejected by the Soviet Union.

In March 1956 President Eisenhower proposed that the Soviet Union join the United States in an inspected programme to end all production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes and reduce existing weapons stockpiles through gradual contributions to stockpiles under international control. This, too, met with no response.

In August 1957 the United States and its allies proposed a system to prevent the use of outer space for military purposes. The Soviet Union refused to discuss this vital step.

In April 1958, in the Security Council of the United Nations, the United States responded to Soviet anxiety on bomber flights in the Arctic region by proposing a system of ground and air inspection against surprise attack. Her resolution received 10 votes in the Security Council, but the scheme was vetoed by the Soviet Union.

Of course, everyone knows why the Soviet Union will not accept international inspection. This gives them a tremendous advantage. There is no need for any system of international inspection in a free democracy because, by reason of our freedom of movement, our freedom of communication, freedom of the Press, and all the other freedoms that we possess and cherish, it is very easy indeed for an organisation that the Soviet Union can set up to find out anything that we are doing. We could not keep secret the sort of things that are being discussed in this matter of nuclear disarmament.

Under a completely regimented system such as that to be found in Russia and China, all avenues of communication are controlled. It would be quite possible for the Soviet Union and her satellite countries to enter into any agreement if there were to be no inspection, and it would be very difficult indeed to check whether the agreement was being kept. That is not now completely true. Due to new scientific means of detection, the United States and her allies can now detect, without on-the-spot inspections, all types of nuclear explosions except those

underground. That is the reason why the Soviet Union has agreed recently to a ban on all testing, except underground.

Following the completely slanted and one-sided Hiroshima telecast, I began to cast about to try to discern where the influences obviously at work in the Australian Broadcasting Commission came from. I found that the editor of "Four Corners", Mr. Allan Ashbolt, was associated with, and contributed to, the bi-monthly journal "Outlook", which is self-described as an independent socialistic review. There is nothing wrong with that Mr. Ashbolt is entitled to be associated with, and to contribute to, any journal he likes. It is a free country. But if I wish to examine the influences at work in the production of "Four Corners", I am entitled to examine Mr. Ashbolt's background. So I have had a further look at the journal that I have in my hand, "Outlook", particularly to discover in what sense it uses the word "Socialist", which, as hon. members know, is a word with many shades of meaning. To get a clue, I consulted the latest edition of this journal, the edition of August 1963, and here I found a long article on the current dispute between Communist Russia and Communist China, an article occupying the greater part of the issue. Strangely enough, it is headed "The Split in the Socialist World"—not "The Split in the Communist World"; "The Split in the Socialist World". So it is perfectly clear that, on this occasion at any rate, "Outlook" treats the words "Socialist" and "Communist" as synonymous terms.

I do not say that "Outlook" is a Communist publication. I do not know. I will say it is a very learned and very informative journal; but I will say, also, that it has an extremely strong bias towards Communism. Nor do I say that Mr. Ashbolt is a Communist; but I do say that the Hiroshima telecast seemed to show that he is strongly influenced in their favour. And this view was amply confirmed last week-end when "Four Corners" presented the R.S.L. telecast which has aroused nation-wide controversy, because last week-end the long arm of the Communist Party of Australia reached into the television studios of our national broadcasting system to strike at the R.S.L.

Is this far-fetched? Is this hysterical? Let us look at the facts. An acknowledged Communist, the editor of a Communist paper, was allowed to make a statement, uninterrupted by question or comment, designed to attack and to embarrass the R.S.L. I tried to take a few notes. I got some of his statements, not all, and I submit to the House the notes that I did take down. This gentleman, who was introduced to us, I think, as Mr. Alex Robertson, the editor of the Communist "Tribune", said this, amongst other things—

"I think we had enough of the iron hand during the war. Most of us want to get back to a fair go for one and all after the war. As to the presentation of an

idea of bans of political organisations and newspapers it is my belief that it is only a minority group which makes these decisions.

"It is my belief that this group is very ignorant or chooses to ignore the tradition of struggle for democratic rights in Australia. Maybe these people hark back to the days when Australia was a military dictatorship—in convict days when all workers were compulsory workers and even the death penalty was at hand for the military officers who ruled the country. So there you get a combination of the classical militarist brass hat position on the one hand and a kind of politics that is espoused by the wealthy and powerful groups that in fact dominate the Government and economic life in this country."

Now, Sir, let me remind you that Mr. Robertson was permitted to say all that—and indeed much more; I am not a shorthand writer, so I cannot guarantee its complete accuracy and it is certainly not the entire statement that he made—made without let or hindrance over one of the most important and highly regarded A.B.C. features.

Mr. Mann interjected.

Mr. TOOTH: There seems to be some perturbation about this on the part of members of the Opposition. I do not understand their attitude. Are they disturbed that this matter should be discussed?

Mr. Mann: We are disturbed about the freedom of the A.B.C. You got rid of Michael Charlton; now you are trying to get rid of this chap.

Mr. TOOTH: Are they worried that somebody might be embarrassed by this? I suggest they allow me to continue my speech without interruption. I am not attacking the A.L.P.; I am dealing with what I consider to be a matter of great public concern and something that should be treated in a way in which its importance dictates.

I pointed out that Mr. Robertson was allowed a completely free rein, but no such licence was accorded to Sir Raymond Huish. He was harassed with loaded questions and comments and with a sneering snigger at one of his answers thrown in for good measure. Further, Sir Raymond Huish has revealed in the Press since this incident that several of his answers—answers which could possibly have redressed the balance slightly in favour of the R.S.L.—were deleted from the programme that was finally shown.

Now, there was much more of this serious discrimination in that programme. Worst of all, I think, was an excerpt from the revue presented, I understand, in one of Sydney's King's Cross haunts. At the second viewing I took hasty notes and present it to the House as I recorded it

and recollect it. It was sung, I may say, with a wealth of satirical actions by a rather effeminate young man. These are the words of the song he sang:

"There's a place I hold very dear to me,  
A place that brings a cup of cheer to me,  
A shrine I like to call mine,  
A paradise of gold that weaves a magical spell  
A home away from home they call the R.S.L.  
We walk down and roll through slops on the floor,  
Through the empty schooner jugs that are leaving us poor,  
It is a noble citadel, the very very R.S.L.  
Roll out the barrel, let's have one drink more,  
While the barman is pulling a fast one,  
Who cares if there is another war,  
We are still fighting the last one,  
Mornings at seven and all goes well,  
God's in his heaven called the R.S.Hell."

Now, I have no brief to defend the R.S.L.—it is well able to look after itself without any assistance from me—but I am entitled to be concerned with the influences operating in the A.B.C. at the present time. I understand that the Prime Minister has called for transcripts of these presentations going back over some weeks, and at this point I am going to presume very greatly; I am going to offer the right honourable gentleman some advice. I suggest that he call for the videotapes and that he see these things as the viewers saw them because a visual presentation often points out and highlights many things which, in cold print, appear reasonably moderate and innocuous.

In concluding my remarks on this particular subject, it would be ungenerous, I feel, not to refer to the many splendid things the A.B.C. provides for the Australian public. It is, of course, a human failing to accept all the good things without comment or thanks or recognition, and to become vocal only when we are displeased. I should therefore like to pay tribute to the chairman and members of the commission, and to the managerial staff of the A.B.C., indeed to the great mass of employees in this very important adjunct to our national life, for the work they are doing in general. I feel confident that steps will be taken to ensure that the principles of objectivity and impartiality, which are written into the A.B.C.'s charter, will be maintained at all times and in all circumstances.

Before concluding, I wish to refer briefly to some matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition in his speech to this motion. The hon. gentleman referred at length to electoral ethics, or to the ethics of electoral campaigning. Seeing that he raised the matter I think it is fair to consider the ethics of our opponents in the last campaign. We look for one or two examples. First of all, well before the campaign was

launched, away back in July or August the previous year, very suddenly there blossomed out, on most of the electric light poles in the city, signs giving the names of A.L.P. candidates. These signs appeared far and wide. The A.L.P. knows, and the people responsible knew at that time, that this was a gross breach of council ordinances.

**Mr. Houston:** Didn't you ever do it?

**Mr. TOOTH:** Never.

It was known quite well that this was wrong, yet it was done on a mass basis, which indicated top-line party organisation. I do not think the particular incident is greatly important. I thought that things looked a bit untidy, and after a while the signs became dilapidated and weather-worn. I do not think it did much good to the A.L.P. nor do I think it did much harm to us. But when we are chided, as we were, by the Leader of the Opposition about unethical practices, I think we are entitled to examine the ethics of his own group. And so we had the A.L.P. deliberately and wilfully, and obviously at top command, breaching one of the city council ordinances. We saw the Labour-dominated council take no steps whatever to rectify the position. Not only did they take no steps but they stated in the council chamber, when this matter was raised by the C.M.O., that they did not intend to take any steps. They were asked whether steps were to be taken and they said, "No."

What was the next step in the little story of signs? I suppose it is really only a trivial matter. I doubt whether signs are of any value electorally at any time. Nevertheless, the next story is this: suddenly one week-end we saw appear, as if by magic, on all the picked sites of the city, very large signs urging a vote for the A.L.P. That is all right; they are entitled to do it. But the point about it is that there was no knowledge or fore-knowledge afforded to the Liberal Party or any of the other people contesting the election that this was permissible. The council decided it would be permissible as from the date the Labour Party put its signs up and seized all the best positions. That is fair enough; that is part of the spoils of war, and it was a Labour council. We are not terribly upset about that, nevertheless it was not very ethical.

Next an application was made by the headquarters of the Liberal Party for permission to put a sign on the Liberal Party headquarters building in Spring Hill. The application was submitted, and after many inquiries as to why there was no reply, the officials of the party were informed that they had not sent an application fee of £5. So, in all haste, the fiver was sent down. Then there was a further delay, and after more inquiries the Liberal Party headquarters were advised that the application was refused on the grounds that a sign of that type would not be suitable for the surroundings in that

area. I do not know who took the £1, but I do know that with the rejection notice the Liberal Party headquarters got back £4 out of the £5. They paid £1 for the privilege of being told they could not put an electoral sign on their own building. They waited for some months, and, some time in the New Year, they made a further application to do the same thing. They were requested to send a £5 fee, which they did, and then they received the same answer and got £4 back. At that stage the Liberal Party decided it was a losing proposition financially and made no further applications. That is an example of A.L.P. ethics for you. I suggest that there was no good reason for prohibiting the erection of the sign at the Liberal Party headquarters building in Spring Hill. It was utterly ridiculous.

**Mr. Mann:** It was.

**Mr. TOOTH:** I am happy that the hon. member for Brisbane agrees with me. It was stupid, childish victimisation.

After the election was over, the city council, dominated by the A.L.P., issued a summons against an anti-Labour candidate for having put up an illegal sign on an electric-light pole, which he had not done. The matter came before a stipendiary magistrate and it was incontinently tossed out on the grounds that there was no case. It was stupid, childish victimisation—malicious victimisation—by the city council.

I see that my time has drawn to a close so my further observations on electoral ethics generally, and A.L.P. ethics in particular, will have to wait for a future date.

**Mr. O'DONNELL (Barcoo) (3.49 p.m.):** I am very disappointed that certain Ministers are not present this afternoon, because I want to bring before the House a number of points that I think will be of extreme interest to them. I represent a rural electorate, completely dependent on primary production. Everyone connected with my electorate derives his or her living from the land or is connected with some activity related to the land. Consequently I shall not be stressing, as many of my colleagues have stressed, the importance of secondary industry. I assure hon. members that it is not because I do not believe in the development of Queensland through secondary industries. On the contrary, I am firmly of the belief that Queensland is desperately in need of secondary-industry impetus. However, I do not want to spend my time on that aspect.

I regret that the Minister for Education is not here today, because I should first of all like to express to him through you, Mr. Speaker, my appreciation of the work that the Director of Secondary Education, Mr. Black, is doing in the tremendous task of implementing the change in secondary education throughout Queensland, which is to take effect in 1964. He has been helpful to me, co-operative in every way, and no doubt the Minister is justifiably proud of him. Still, I

should like to put some aspects of education to the House because of situations that have arisen in my electorate. Probably they have arisen also in other electorates throughout the State.

I am concerned that we may be losing sight of the one-teacher school in this rather hurried implementation of high-school tops and separate high schools. I mentioned this to the Minister for Public Works—and I mention it in the House today—not to chide the Government but to urge it to help the people of Orion Downs to establish immediately the one-teacher school they so eagerly desire. I mention it because there are associated with this ambition certain facts with which the Minister for Public Works may not be familiar.

**Mr. Richter:** I am fully aware of the position. We are doing something about it.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I thank the Minister very much; but the point I was trying to bring out was that these people had been thrown out of their stride in the sense that they were at one time prepared to provide a provisional school and, because of various circumstances—and I do not blame the Minister in any way—they were put aside, first of all because the promise of obtaining a closed school became a possibility; then, through the intercession of other factors, that school suddenly vanished and I, too, was able to recommend to the department a closed school that I discovered in my area. But, with the Minister's assurance—and I can pass that on, I know now—it will be important to these people to obtain that desirable feature because they are, in the main, people who have gone on the land in very recent years. Certainly, they were fortunate to win ballots but, as we all know, people who go on the land under that system have many difficulties to overcome before they achieve a degree of prosperity.

I should like to bring before the House also on the subject of education a statement made by the Premier during the recent election campaign. It is a statement that I thought was too brief and accompanied by too little explanation. He made a promise that school transport to secondary schools would be considered if there were a minimum number of 12 students, which represents a reduction of eight on the previous figure of 20.

Some people have taken that literally and have quoted it to me. However, I do not think that the statement is essentially true, and people are going to be greatly disappointed because there was not added to that statement that the cost per student per day would be a consideration, as well as the distance involved.

This statement relates in particular to the one high-school problem in my electorate, which is the establishment of a junior high-school top at Alpha. This cannot be brought to fruition unless there is support from the

Jericho State School, 35 miles away. Latest figures indicate that there are 13 children prepared to make the journey daily next year. When the cost is considered on the basis of 13 children over a distance of 35 miles, I think it will be understood that the cost per student per day will be very high.

However, the Jericho Shire Council has indicated that it is prepared to co-operate by running a bus service and using the driver for work in the period between the arrival of the bus at Alpha and its departure with the children. Even then, when it is considered that there will be only 13 children, the cost may be well above what is regarded as a workable amount. Because of the peculiar geographical situation of Alpha, which is 105 miles from Emerald and almost an equal distance from Barcardine, I urge that every consideration be given to the establishment of a junior high-school top at that centre. If those two schools were allowed to combine, the situation would be resolved.

Furthermore, there will be a number of children not in a position to attend any school with a junior high-school top. This will be so in an electorate adjacent to mine. I know that it is not ethical to interfere in the affairs of another electorate, but in the electorate of Mackenzie there are children living along the railway line towards Rockhampton, and in areas close by, who will not have the opportunity to attend a high-school top. In Emerald there is a fine hostel capable of accommodating up to 80 students. With the establishment of high-school tops all round the area, I feel that this hostel will not be used to the best advantage. I suggest that these children be brought to that hostel and that the Government pay the hostel an amount per day equivalent to what would be the average amount paid for a child using transport.

**Mr. Richter:** How many children are there in the hostel at the moment?

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I think there would be over 30. It is apt to vary. That is an important point. If children could be brought in there and subsidised to the extent of the overall daily average cost of school-transport services for each child over the whole of Queensland—we appreciate their value and the fact that they are costly—I think it would resolve a very difficult situation.

**Mr. Richter:** What is the capacity of the hostel?

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I think it could accommodate up to 80 children.

**Mr. Richter:** Not at present.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I think it could, with a little better furnishing. It is a very fine hostel and it is something for which we are very grateful. At the time it seemed to be one answer to the problem; but, as the

Minister knows, a change-over in 1964 was not visualised when the hostel was established. That is what I suggest.

There is a strange anomaly to which I would draw the attention of hon. members. I hear primary producers in this House complaining about the Valuer-General's Department and how they, the hard workers, are often penalised by the Valuer-General's valuations. Strange to say, we in the country are often penalised because our communities are progressive. I should like to take Blackall, which is one of the most progressive towns in Western Queensland, as an instance. Although it has the biggest school and the biggest child population in the Central-west, apart from Longreach, it cannot support a senior high-school top. Up to date the prosperity of the town has been such that employers are able to absorb virtually all the children at junior level. Consequently, the number of pupils needed for the establishment of a senior high-school top, which has been raised to almost 15, I think, cannot be attained. I am not saying that children do not go away to other secondary schools; they do; but the number left after the business houses in the town have taken in the juniors is insufficient for the establishment of a senior high-school top. It is a very unfortunate state of affairs that a town, because of its progress and development, should be denied one of the essential sections of education, that between junior and senior. I think that should be brought before the Minister's notice to see whether some consideration can be given to such centres. I can give Blackall as an instance; no doubt other hon. members can give other instances. At Emerald we were fortunate in being able to establish, with the assistance of students drawn from the surrounding district, a senior high-school top. We are happy about that. But we know that had Emerald been a town providing more opportunities for juvenile employment, we may not have obtained a senior high-school top there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to put something before the House that you might regard as slightly revolutionary. I have always believed that examination results are the private business of the pupils or students, the parents, the education authorities, and prospective employers. The only examination results ever published in accordance with what I think is the right method were at Scholarship level. When State Scholarship results were published in the Press, one saw the names of those who had passed. Failures were eliminated and the results of successful candidates were not stated. At Junior level everyone's results go into the paper, and the same thing occurs at Senior level.

To make matters worse, the results are published in grades which can be totally deceiving and cause a great deal of heart-burning to some people. I suggest that, when we change over in 1964, the Junior

results be published along the same lines as were the Scholarship results in the past and that those who obtained scholarships have their names published in the Press.

**Dr. Noble:** How would you do that with the number of subjects they take?

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** It is quite simple, because everyone is entitled to an extension scholarship if he or she has satisfied a certain requirement.

**Dr. Noble:** They have to get through in six subjects. Say they pass in only five?

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** Then they will not have a scholarship granted by the State. Through you, Mr. Speaker, and in order to answer the Minister for Health and Home Affairs, I should like to say that it is only a scholarship winner who is of public interest because, after all, that is the important thing. If a student fails to win a scholarship his name will not be put in the paper. Each student will receive a result, not in a graded form, but with every subject carrying a percentage mark. One could go throughout Queensland and in every electorate one would find people who would have said in the past—it cannot happen in the future because teacher scholarships have been abolished—"My boy received seven A's. Why didn't he receive a teacher scholarship? The boy across the road obtained five A's and two B's and he received one."

**Mr. Murray:** Would you not agree that it would be better to have numbers instead of names? Then there would not be any of those heartburnings about which you speak.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I say that is an excellent idea.

**Mr. Murray:** Each student is given an examination number

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** Perhaps there could be a misprint in the number, but apart from that, I entirely agree with the hon. member. I say that examination results are entirely public property only when they result in scholarships or bursaries being awarded by the State or a private individual or group of individuals.

I consider that we could obviate much of this misconception by reforming the examination results, and I go further and say that we will have a more contented people. I should say also that it would help to take away that invidious position that often creeps into education when a school is advertised favourably or unfavourably in the Press by the publication of the A's, B's, or C's received.

I put this suggestion to the Minister for Education and ask him to give serious consideration to its implementation. I repeat that I do not want to see these grades. I think a student is entitled to know his per-

centage. It is arrived at so that it could be put on his certificate just as easily as A's, B's, and C's. I have had a lad go right through, and all the results on his certificates were printed in by hand—so many A's, B's, and C's. I do not think any additional labour would be involved. The circumstances that have surrounded particularly the Junior and Senior public examinations over the years must be avoided. I have always thought it was a scandalous state of affairs to bring out the Senior results on Christmas Eve when, for everyone's knowledge, we have published the happiness of some and the misery of others arising from the results of the examination.

I was very pleased to find that there was at least one member of the Liberal Party who was a little out of line with Liberal policy. I refer to the hon. member for Rockhampton South, who stood here today and urged support for the cotton-growing industry. I came here today prepared to do that. The hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha suggested that there was very little in favour of great engineering feats, but what has been said today proves that at least in Central Queensland we have a strong argument for major engineering works. Major engineering works should be carried out in the Nathan Gorge and at Nogo Gap. I think Mr. Haigh has made the statement that the two projects would cost approximately £37,000,000, which is a very large sum of money. As the hon. member for Rockhampton South mentioned many authorities and many figures, I am not going to repeat what he said in that regard. However, I want to bring before the House three important figures taken from the 1960-1961 Queensland Year Book. In Southern Queensland there were 93,130 acres under irrigation; in Central Queensland 9,428 acres; in Northern Queensland 68,488 acres. The important figure there is 9,428 acres in Central Queensland; it is 10 per cent. of the figure in Southern Queensland, and roughly 14 per cent. of the figure in Northern Queensland, which indicates clearly that this important aspect of the development of our State has been sadly neglected in Central Queensland.

We have had a great deal of discussion about the development of the beef industry in Central Queensland. We have even been told that the brigalow-lands scheme has resulted from the Commonwealth Government's acknowledging the fact that beef production is of the utmost importance to our State. We have been told that that is why the Commonwealth Government gave money for the construction of the beef roads. It is a somewhat out-dated matter now, but in the original discussions on the European Common Market the Commonwealth Government stated emphatically that it would support the beef industry in Queensland because it was the only industry in respect of which it was definite that it should not be upset by Great Britain's entering the Common Market. I mention that at this stage to

show that there is an interest, or an alleged interest, in Queensland from the point of view of the beef industry. I say that because I want to link the beef-cattle industry with the cotton industry through irrigation. I do not wish to reiterate all the points raised by the hon. member, but I missed some of his speech. The gross turnover of the Queensland Cotton Board is worth approximately £1,000,000 a year. That is important, but how much more important is it to the State to realise that that £1,000,000 could become £4,000,000 with the use of irrigation. Indeed, even more important to our economy is the fact that we could increase the value of our beef production by £7,500,000 a year in the areas I have mentioned, namely, the Dawson Valley, Nogoia and Comet areas. I am talking about the increased value of production which, added to the cotton production, would mean £11,000,000 to £12,000,000 in solid cash to this State. Possibly we do not realise that Australians are among the top users of cotton in the world on consumption per person. It is extremely important to realise that. I have here the import figures for 1960. Our raw-cotton imports were in excess of 96,000 bales with an approximate value of £6,000,000 and, in addition, we bought cotton goods from overseas to the value of about £47,000,000. Therefore, in this country there is a cotton business worth over £50,000,000 a year.

Why should we be reluctant to undertake major engineering projects in Central Queensland? The area has everything that is required. It has the important asset of frost, and the soil is fertile. It is admitted that many problems have still to be overcome, but generally speaking we are producing our cotton under dry-farming conditions. As the hon. member for Rockhampton South said, if we start now, it will be 10 years before we can achieve the necessary rate of production. Let us start now. Do not let this opportunity pass by. While we are dilly-dallying, the people in New South Wales and Western Australia will not be dilly-dallying. Even now, knowing that those two States are on the go, we realise that Queensland will not be able to obtain all the Australian business, but at least we should be able to participate extensively. If we had irrigation, together with research work over the years, we could extend the cotton industry into a major primary industry, on a fully-developed basis, which is of the utmost importance. We cannot do better than that, but we cannot do it while Central Queensland is receiving a very poor deal with irrigation. The cotton industry can become what John Dunmore Lang forecast well over 100 years ago when he said, "Cooksland, the future cotton field of Australia." At the same time, we would be helping our beef-raising industry.

It has been definitely proved that irrigated pastures are far better than native grasses and improved pastures. Moreover, I want

hon. members to understand that New South Wales and Victoria and, to a lesser extent, the other States, are increasing their cattle numbers and improving their beef-production techniques. We have to watch out that we are not left behind. Should the other States utilise their irrigation fully, we will find very little of the southern beef market left to us and, into the bargain, the opportunity that now exists to break through in the cotton industry will be missed.

I turn now to references that have been made in the House to dieselisation and the reorganisation of the Railway Department. I deplore the fact that the reorganisation of this important department, mainly due to dieselisation, has caused worry to any single employee in the industry. I am sorry to say that I have had several instances of people who have been so inconvenienced by this reorganisation that not only have they had to shift from the centres in which they have settled but also have had to move to other centres at considerable expense to themselves—to sell their homes and, in some cases, move to areas where facilities and amenities equal to those they had enjoyed were not available. I ask the Minister for Transport to treat every such case of transfer with more than ordinary sympathy and to try to avoid the transfer if possible. It is very important to hold in country towns the people who have settled there. Dieselisation in its full effect is now revealed as an agent that is countering decentralisation. I am very concerned about the people involved. Unfortunately, I cannot do anything for them. It is only a sympathetic department that can.

There has been considerable reference in the House to the telecast of the "Four Corners" programme and I have heard many points of view expressed. I have heard great sympathy expressed for the R.S.L.—and it is an organisation for which I have the greatest respect—but there is one aspect of the activities of this House that I deplore. I think it is disgraceful that members on the Government side have been very vociferous in attacking criticism, or what they call criticism, of the R.S.L. per medium of the telecast programme known as "Four Corners" while, on the other hand, they have the audacity to stand up and point the finger of scorn at hon. members on this side of the House wearing the R.S.L. badge. I deprecate this behaviour and think it disgraceful. While such unethical practices are going on, the best place for the cleaning up is at home, and this is the home. If returned soldiers cannot be treated with more respect than that shown by the hon. member for Nundah, I am very, very disappointed. I am equally disappointed that we have people who can stand up there and, on the one hand, defend the R.S.L. and, on the other, point the finger of derision, scorn, and criticism at members of it.

**Mr. AIKENS** (Townsville South) (4.26 p.m.): Quite recently an elector of mine called at my home and asked my assistance

in what appeared to be at first hand quite a simple and routine matter. He had been to a doctor in town who referred him to another doctor. He went to that other doctor, received an account and paid it, and later claimed from his own medical benefits organisation. This organisation rejected the claim because the doctor to whom the man had been referred is not a qualified medical practitioner in Queensland.

I started some inquiries that I think will startle the House and all who have the interest of the people at heart and who have been told for some time glowing stories of our university set-up, the qualifications of the professors and lecturers, the way in which they devote their time and lives exclusively to their work, and the way in which perhaps they are over-worked and under-paid.

When this man produced the account from the doctor to whom he had been referred, I noticed in the heading, in very black letters, "Dr. Edward Scott, B.A., Ph.D., A.B.Ps.S., M.A.C.E." and, in small English lettering, "Psychologist" with the address "24 Gilbert Crescent, North Ward, Townsville." The account was for 11 guineas, being 5 guineas for the first visit, 3 guineas for the second visit, and 3 guineas for the third visit. Incidentally, if any Opposition or Government member would like a copy of the heading of this account rendered for professional fees, he is at liberty to have one. I have had photographs taken and hon. members can examine the heading for themselves and see whether or not an ordinary citizen would believe, as this man did, that Dr. Edward Scott was a duly qualified medical practitioner.

I am not going to mention the name of the man who came to see me. I do that not because he is afraid of his name being mentioned, but the patient was his young daughter and I do not want his name sullied by anything said in this House or any implication made about her because she went to this particular person. That is the only reason why I do not mention this man's name.

I said to him, "Where did you see this Dr. Edward Scott?" He said, "I saw him at the University in Fulham Road." I said, "That is a peculiar place to see a doctor. I did not know that any doctors had consulting rooms at the North Queensland University." He said, "That's where I saw him with my daughter, and that's where quite a lot of other people see him." It is quite obvious that many other people have seen him, because I shall read some correspondence later that will prove that point to the hilt. I said, "Just a moment. Let me look at that." At first glance I thought that Dr. Edward Scott was a duly qualified medical practitioner, and then I saw that his letters were B.A., Ph.D., A.B.Ps.S., M.A.C.E.

The man showed me a long letter that he had received from his medical benefits society, which is the Manchester Unity

Friendly Society. Incidentally, it had paid him his medical benefits refund in Townsville and had then sent the claim down to the head office in Brisbane, and the man received a letter from the head office saying that he would have to return his medical benefits refund. The letter from the Queensland secretary of the Manchester Unity Friendly Society said, among other things—

"Various claims have been submitted for services by this person, Dr. Edward Scott, and claims have been refused as he is not a registered medical practitioner."

I sent all this on to the Minister for Health and Home Affairs, Dr. Noble. I told him that I had informed the person concerned that I knew the letters "B.A." meant Bachelor of Arts and that the letters "Ph.D." meant Doctor of Philosophy, but that I did not know what the other letters meant. The Minister wrote to me on 8 August, 1963— that shows how recent it is—and said, among other things—

"I would advise that Dr. Scott is not the holder of a medical degree registrable in Queensland and, therefore, . . . would not be entitled to any payment from the Medical Benefit Fund."

Of course, he was referring to the patient. Then he went on to say—

"The degree A.B.Ps.S. means 'Associate of the British Psychological Society' and M.A.C.E. means 'Member of the Australian College of Education'."

So I conducted some further inquiries and found, to my astonishment, that I knew this so-called Dr. Edward Scott. I had seen and heard him last year, or the year before, make a particularly fine speech at the Pimlico High School speech night, when he spoke on education. On making inquiries from the university, I found that Dr. Edward Scott, as he calls himself and advertises himself on his account for professional services, is the senior lecturer in education at the North Queensland University at Townsville. I made further inquiries concerning him and was told that his salary as senior lecturer in education at the North Queensland University is £2,520 a year, that he gets an allowance of £180, a further £150 as student counsellor, a further £30 regional allowance, or a total of £2,880, and that the terms of his employment state that he is not allowed to receive money from outside unless granted permission.

This man practises psychology, and we all know just what a mumbo-jumbo branch of medical science that is; we all know the mental muck that psychologists vomit. I cannot imagine that this man would be allowed to set up in business as a doctor and use as a consulting room any part of the Townsville University if he had not first received the permission of those who control the university, that is, the University Senate.

Because of the serious implications of this matter, because of the fact that 999 men out of 1,000—and again I offer any member of the Opposition who wants it a photograph of the heading of his professional services bill, if we can call anything submitted by the medical profession a bill—on seeing this heading and receiving this account would consider that he was a duly qualified medical practitioner, I raise it for the consideration of hon. members. Bear in mind, he is not in the ordinary general practitioner class. You cannot go to him for a guinea or 30s. a visit. Anyone can see the original account received by this man. Of course, I ask anyone who looks at it not to disclose the name of the man for the sake of his daughter. The account is for 5 guineas for the first consultation, 3 guineas for the second, and 3 guineas for the third. I doubt if the Minister for Health and Home Affairs or the hon. member for Bowen ever got 5 guineas a consultation in their lives, and they are both competent medical practitioners of long experience, so this man is well above their class.

Because of that, and because I want this matter cleared up, I first of all want the Minister for Education and Migration to conduct some inquiries. Having made my inquiries at that particular level and having established that Dr. Edward Scott, as he calls himself, in addition to his £2,880 a year job at Townsville University as senior lecturer in education, has this very lucrative sideline as a psychologist at the University as Dr. Edward Scott, I went further and made some inquiries. I regret that I cannot get any documentary evidence of this, but I want the Minister for Education and Migration to inquire into it. I will be quite happy to accept any result got by him.

I have been informed by parents that this same Dr. Edward Scott would go along to the schools in Townsville—primary as well as secondary schools—and address classes of pupils. He would submit them to the imbecilic psychology tests with which we are all so sickeningly familiar, and the next thing the parents would know was that they would each get a letter from Dr. Edward Scott telling them that their daughter—by name—or son—by name—was suffering from some strange polysyllabic psychological complaint and suggesting that they interview him, presumably at 5 guineas and 3 guineas a time.

I have had parents admit to me that that was a fact and that they became quite scared and flustered when they got this letter from Dr. Edward Scott, and further that they did go along to see him and paid him a pretty substantial fee. I said to them, "I am going to bring this matter up in Parliament because I think it is a shocking thing," but when I asked them to give me a receipt from Dr. Scott or an affidavit, they said they would not do that because they did not want anyone to know their name. They did not want anyone to know that they had fallen for this obvious medical confidence trick.

But here we have this account. There is no doubt about this one, and there is no doubt either that I submitted it to the Minister for Health and Home Affairs. He knows all about this man because he apparently has checked up on him.

Because I want to get this thing as straight as I possibly can, I am going to do something very unusual for me. I have prepared here a series of questions that I should like the House to consider—and particularly the Minister for Education and Migration and the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—and because I do not want any charges of extravagance or irrelevance laid against me, I am going to read them as I have carefully had them typed. They read—

"Is the position of Senior Lecturer of Education at the Townsville University College such a sinecure that the occupant of that job can also run a lucrative sideline as Psychologist?"

"Although the address on his professional letterhead shows his private address, why does he consult his 'patients' at the University? And do the University authorities know of this use of his University office? If so, what is their reaction to it?"

"The Manchester Unity Friendly Society is not among the largest in the Medical Benefit field, yet their Brisbane Secretary states that: 'Various claims have been submitted for services by this person, Dr. Edward Scott, etc.'"

and I have already read that from the letter that I wrote to Dr. Noble—

"What would be the number of claims submitted by 'patients' enrolled under some of the bigger Benefit schemes such as Medical Benefits, etc.? How many 'patients' has Scott treated?"

"This patient was referred to Dr. Edward Scott . . ."

and this is the important point from Dr. Noble's point of view—

". . . by a registered medical practitioner with a big private practice yet why did this doctor send this child to an unregistered practitioner in psychology when there is a registered psychiatrist with a big private practice also attached to the Townsville General Hospital as a part-time specialist in that field in the person of Dr. Richards?"

"In view of the attitude of the Australian Medical Association on the question of unregistered practitioners in medicine—such as chiropractors and osteopaths—what do they think of 'patients' being referred to the unregistered Dr. Edward Scott by their members seemingly in preference to a registered doctor practising the same specialty? And what qualifications, accepted by the medical profession, does Dr. Edward Scott hold?"

"Where members of the University staff are permitted to engage in other occupations, professions and callings, is any supervision and/or control of such staff practised by the University authorities to ensure that a competent and efficient service is rendered to the public, who may be the clients, patients or customers of such staff members?"

"What qualifying examinations have to be passed by anyone setting up in practice as a psychologist in Queensland, and who sets, and determines the results, of such examinations?"

"Are University staff members who practice a profession, in addition to their university duties, allowed to use the University buildings as consulting rooms, and, if so, will this concession also apply to university staff members who set themselves up in an additional business, such as estate agent, pest exterminator, chiroprapist, S.P. bookmaker, tinsmith, etc.?"

"Are teachers at Government primary and secondary schools granted the same concessions with regard to establishing themselves in additional professions and businesses, as are enjoyed by staff employed by universities, including the use of schoolrooms as consulting rooms, offices, workshops and the like, and if not, why not?"

"Is it a breach of any law—or medical professional ethics—for a qualified medical practitioner to refer a patient to an unqualified medical practitioner for treatment? And where such a reference is made, will the patient be clearly informed that any charges made by the unqualified person will not be subject to refund under any medical benefits scheme or allowable as a deduction for income-tax purposes?"

This is a matter that the Minister for Health and Home Affairs, in consultation with the Minister for Justice, might well look into:

"If a patient so referred by a qualified medical practitioner to an unqualified one, suffers damage as a result due to negligence or lack of skill of the unqualified practitioner, against which of them will any subsequent civil action for damages be taken?"

"Will the Government ensure that any person who advertises himself or herself—by letterhead or otherwise—to be a doctor, be made to clearly state on such advertisement that he or she is not a doctor of medicine, and is not qualified to practise as such?"

That is the position with regard to this person who calls himself Dr. Edward Scott, advertises himself as such, on his letterhead and so deludes the people into thinking that he is a qualified medical practitioner. Patients are being referred to him in Townsville by qualified medical practitioners. He interviews and has consultations with his patients

in his offices at the Townsville University building. He charges them exorbitant fees, from five guineas down to three guineas. The patients who go to him think that they are going to a qualified medical man. They are disillusioned only when they receive back from their medical benefits fund a notification that he is not a qualified medical practitioner and therefore they are not entitled to any refund under the medical benefits scheme. Of course, if they claim the fees they have paid to him as an income-tax deduction they are again told that his fees are not allowable because he is not a qualified medical practitioner. I think this is about the most serious thing that has ever happened in this particular field in Queensland.

I cannot for a moment imagine that he is doing this without the University authorities knowing about it. I am assuming that he is doing it with the full knowledge, support and concurrence of the University authorities. I want to know why. As I asked in this series of questions, if he can do it—if he can run a lucrative sideline, profession or business at his offices at the University—can the other members of the professorial and lecturing staff at the University run their particular sideline, and can teachers at primary and secondary schools run profitable sidelines from the schools at which they are employed? This cries aloud for investigation because people are being deluded and fleeced. They are not getting any benefits from it. I will not dilate or enlarge on that and give hon. members my opinion of psychologists. Perhaps I could give them a humorous story about those who advertise themselves as doctors. Although it is very humorous and is one of the best-known stories in English literature, there is a vein of seriousness in it that I commend to everyone. This famous story was told by Stephen Leacock, who was one of the most erudite men ever in the British Empire. His name was associated with the McGill University in Canada. When he was a young man he earned his Doctorate of Philosophy and in order to celebrate the event he went on a voyage on one of the well-known trans-Atlantic liners. Being young and a little vain, he could not resist booking his passage as Dr. Leacock. When he boarded the ship he saw a glorious creature, a stage actress. In those days women did not dress as skimpily as they do today and, being a young man with hot blood he thought how glorious it would be to feel, or even to see, this glorious creature's thigh. One day he was leaning over the rail when a steward hurried up to him and, after presenting the captain's compliments, said, "Dr. Leacock, the captain would like you to come down to the cabin of this glorious creature and attend to her. She has fallen down the stairs and injured her thigh." Then, in the way that only Stephen Leacock could tell it, he said how he was torn between his natural desire to see this glorious creature's thigh, and his moral obligation to confess that he was not a doctor of medicine. Then, after a

short but sharp mental struggle, the carnal side of him won, and he hurried after the steward into this glorious creature's cabin only to find, to his intense dismay, that he had been forestalled by a doctor of divinity. (Laughter.)

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. AIKENS:** As I said, that is humorous but there is an underlying vein of seriousness in it. The Minister for Education and Migration, I understand, was recently granted an honorary doctorate by the University. I do not know if he is an honorary doctor of divinity, an honorary doctor of biology, or an honorary doctor of physiology or entymology.

**Mr. Duggan:** In laws, I understand.

**Mr. AIKENS:** An honorary doctor of laws? They could have done better than that for him; he would not voluntarily, I hope, want to be associated with the legal fraternity. I am sure that anyone who gave him an honorary doctorate of laws was not a friend of his. Anyway, let us accept that he is a doctor of laws. If Scott and these other "doctors" can get away with it, what is to prevent him from setting himself up in his office at the Treasury Building, or even here in the Cabinet room, as Dr. J. C. A. Pizey, and interviewing customers and patients at 5 guineas and 3 guineas a time?

If it is good enough for a senior lecturer in education at the university to do that, when, as the Minister for Health and Home Affairs has said, he is neither a qualified doctor nor a registrable doctor, what is to stop the Minister for Education and Migration from doing it, or anyone else who happens to have any form of doctorate? It is a very serious matter and I am confident that, now that I have told the House about it, something will be done. Scott must be stopped. This is my attitude: either Scott is stopped or everyone at the university, every senior teacher in primary or secondary school, and everyone who works for the Government in any capacity at all, should have the right to set up a sideline in his office.

Now that I have made those remarks, I want to make a few comments on an interjection the other day by the hon. member for Maryborough, who asked me how I got on at the last election. I will tell him and I will make a few observations about the election that I hope may be of some benefit to members of the Opposition. I have never known an election campaign to be conducted on such an extensive, intensive, expensive and massive basis as the one conducted against me at the last election.

The Labour Party started off last September, nine months before polling day. They plastered the town with huge placards. They inundated the city with posters, brochures, pamphlets and free calendars. Underneath the house of my A.L.P. opponent, Mr. Trower, they had a huge room set up

with a full-scale map of Townsville, and the whole affair was run on exactly the same lines as a military operation. They had coloured flags stuck in here, and coloured buttons stuck in there, to show where the placards were to go, and which areas of the town had to be visited by door-to-door canvassers. They started addressing street meetings way back in last September. Not only did they have street meetings but they broadcast over the air several times every week. Tucker, of course, spent all his time for the first six or seven months in the South Townsville electorate. They not only went from door to door themselves but also had a horde of sandshoe followers going from door to door, and they spent—and this is something they probably think I do not know, but I have my friends in the A.L.P.—the sum of £2,962 in order to defeat me at the last State election. Of that sum £2,000 came from Brisbane as the Townsville quota of the £35,000 paid to the A.L.P. by the road-transport hauliers. I assume that the Townsville branches of the A.L.P. raised the other £982 in the various ways that political and other organisations go about raising money. They fought it as a combined campaign. Their slogans were, "Vote Tucker and Trower. Put Labour in Power.", "Don't be a sucker. Vote Trower and Tucker", and so on. I have never seen such an intensive campaign.

I did not begin my campaign until 17 May this year. I gave them all that start. By that time, of course, the A.L.P. had stepped up its campaign to six or seven street corner meetings a day and six or seven radio broadcasts. They were never off the television. On television they were known as Ada and Elsie. My opponent was quite clean and responsible and respectable, apart from the ordinary rough stuff that is thrown from one side to the other. I never mentioned his name and I doubt that he ever mentioned mine. So I have no complaint against Trower himself. For a while we were not going to do anything; we were going to give them a completely free and open go and see how well they could do in the safest Labour seat in Queensland, Townsville South.

**Mr. Evans:** Why would the road hauliers want the A.L.P. to win?

**Mr. AIKENS:** The road hauliers donated £35,000 to the A.L.P. here and the Townsville quota from it was £2,000.

**Mr. Evans:** Why would they want them in?

**Mr. AIKENS:** The Minister had better ask the road hauliers that. They wanted the railway men out of work. At one of my meetings at Oonoonba an interjector asked me, "What about the wages and conditions of the railway men?", and I replied, "Look here, my friend, I am an old railway man and my sympathies are with railway men; but if Labour is elected to power with John Duggan as Leader on 1 June, you need

not worry about the wages and conditions of railway men because there won't be any railways in three years' time; the road-transport operators will have the lot." And that is the attitude the railway men of Townsville took.

So, as I said, I started my election campaign on 17 May this year. I had two short radio talks; I had three 5-minute appearances on television; I addressed eight street meetings at night, and I put a few very small advertisements in the obscure pages of the "Townsville Bulletin".

On polling day the A.L.P. booths had workers to burn. They had quite ornate booths; at every polling place, as a matter of fact, I think they should have come under the building workers' award, some of them were so palatial. We did not have a booth. I had either one man or two men at each polling place merely handing out "How-to-Vote" cards. I had no scrutineers at all. So the A.L.P. had all the open go in the world. My campaign cost our party £246 4s. 10d. against their £2,982. I took a lead from the first polling and cantered in with nearly 3,000 votes to spare. Again I was elected to the safest Labour seat in Queensland.

**Mr. Mann** interjected.

**Mr. AIKENS:** In speaking of the Labour Party and Townsville, I will say that I was assisted materially in this campaign by the fact that at the election in 1960 the hon. member for Brisbane came to Townsville to help my opponent. Unfortunately on this occasion he did not come up. I should say that that was worth 1,000 votes to the Labour candidate.

Townsville has always been known as the most highly-industrialised and the most militant-working-class city in Queensland. Ever since the blacks were bad it has been the citadel of Labour, yet on 1 June last, out of 27,000 valid votes cast in the city of Townsville, 16,000 were cast by people who refused to vote for the A.L.P. Between them Trower and Tucker could muster only 11,000 out of 27,000 votes in a city that was once the strongest Labour city in Australia. Instead of being complacent, elated, and exhilarated by the election campaign in Townsville, the Labour Party should show some deep concern over the way in which party support has drifted away there.

I am sorry that Mr. Tucker is not present—I am not going to say anything against him because he said nothing about me during the campaign and I never mentioned him—but he is really the Q.L.P. representative for Townsville North. He had to rely on the Q.L.P. preferences to beat an unknown, modest, and retiring Liberal Party candidate secured at the last moment. A man named Bonnett was the Liberal Party candidate. Dr. Dorney ran for the Q.L.P., there was an Independent whom we will forget because he polled only about 200 votes, and Mr. Tucker. I will admit that in Townsville North there is one small Tory

pocket in North Ward and a couple of small borderline areas in Belgian Gardens and Magnetic Island, but the rest of Townsville North is almost as solidly Labour as is Townsville South. Nevertheless, in an electorate such as that Mr. Tucker had to wait nearly six weeks after polling day to find out whether he was to be the member for Townsville North.

When the figures came out, it was apparent that the only thing that saved him was the position of the Liberal candidate on the ballot paper. There was a Liberal candidate at the top of the ballot paper, followed by the Q.L.P. candidate and then Mr. Tucker, again dismissing the Independent. To vote as the Q.L.P. wanted, one had to place 2, 1, 3, and 4 down the ballot paper in that order, which is an unusual and unnatural way to vote. The Liberal Party vote went straight down the ballot paper from 1 to 4.

Hon. members opposite claim to have the interest of the Labour Party at heart. Do they know that if Dr. Dorney, the Q.L.P. candidate, had run second in the No. 1 vote, he would have beaten Mr. Tucker by 500 votes on Liberal Party preferences? The only thing that saved Mr. Tucker was the fact that Q.L.P. voters had to vote 2, 1, 3, 4 down the paper, which is an unnatural way of voting. There was a leakage of preferences and 900 Q.L.P. No. 2 preferences went to Tucker instead of Bonnett.

That is now the position in Townsville, whereas previously I have known Labour men win seats in Townsville without going near the place during the election campaigns. Now they are able to muster only 11,000 out of 27,000 votes, and I could virtually sit on the canvas chair on my veranda at home, give the A.L.P. candidate nine months' start in the most extensive, intensive, and massive campaign ever waged against me, and beat him easily by 3,000 votes. On this occasion, Mr. Tucker, in North Townsville, had to wait for six weeks in fear, trembling, trepidation, and apprehension, and rely on Q.L.P. preferences to be returned to the House. So that, rather than be elated about what happened in Townsville South, hon. members opposite should be very deeply concerned.

**Mr. Mann:** I will be going up there next time. We will get you.

**Mr. AIKENS:** I wish the hon. member had come up during this election campaign. If he had appeared it would have been worth 1,000 votes to me.

I want to tell hon. members opposite quite seriously what is wrong with the A.L.P. not only here in Queensland but in Australia, in the Commonwealth sphere and in every State sphere. Hon. members opposite know that what I am about to say is true because they have been in the Labour movement,

as distinct from the present set-up in the A.L.P., as long as I have. The trouble in the A.L.P. has brought down State Labour Government after State Labour Government and it has brought down a Federal Labour Government—when I say “Labour Government” I mean A.L.P. Government—and it will bring down every A.L.P. Government, whether in the State or Federal sphere, until hon. members opposite do something about it.

The trade unions on which the Labour Party is founded—and quite rightly so—insist on the right to interfere with and control the political wing of the party, and they do it. But they deny the political wing of the A.L.P. the right to even investigate the trade-union movement. They certainly deny the political wing the right to see that the trade-union movement is as clean as everyone would like it to be, and we know what the trade-union movement is like in Australia today. With few exceptions, almost all trade-union leaders are self-elected, either by corrupt ballots or by the system of voting, and when we talk about the unions controlling the A.L.P., it is no longer the rank and file of the unions who control the A.L.P. That is why the rank and file of the unions are drifting away from hon. members opposite. That is why the rank-and-file unionists in Townsville South vote for me. That is why they do not vote for Tucker. That is why they do not vote for A.L.P. candidates anywhere.

The people who arrogate to themselves the right to speak for the trade-union movement are the self-elected officials of the trade-union movement, and when we see, as we do, a trade union that is controlled and dominated by Communist trade-union officials allowed to affiliate with the A.L.P., naturally those officials know that they cannot send along any known Communists, or even suspected Communists, as delegates to the central executive of the A.L.P., so they send along men on whom they know they can rely to do the right thing. When a union is controlled by Communist officials and it sends one, two, or three delegates, as the case may be, to the central executive of the A.L.P. in Queensland, hon. members opposite know how long the delegates will last on the executive if they do not do what their Communist-official bosses of the unions tell them to do. They are there simply as agents not for the rank and file members of the trade union, who are predominantly anti-Communist, but for the self-elected Communist officials of the particular union.

It is the same with the A.W.U. Its officials are not Communists, but they are elected by corrupt ballots; they are self-elected. Anyone who goes along to the Q.C.E. as a delegate representing the A.W.U. must do what the corruptly-elected officials of the A.W.U. tell him to do, otherwise he will not be a delegate to the Q.C.E. for very long.

I repeat that the trade unions self-elected officials claim and exercise the right to interfere with and dictate the policy of the political wing of the A.L.P., and they deny the political wing the right to clean up the trade unions and to interfere in trade-union affairs. That lop-sided arrangement brought down the Scullin Government, the Lang Government, the Cain Government, and governments in every State in Australia and in the Federal sphere, as we see if we read the history of the Australian Labour movement right through, and it will continue to bring them down unless members of the A.L.P. do something about it.

The fact that hon. members opposite are sitting listening to me quietly and seriously indicates to me—I do not have to be told, anyway; I know that they know—that what I have said is quite true. What they are going to do about it, I do not know. Let them ask themselves, getting right back to my original argument, “Why is it that in the strongest trade-union town in Queensland”—out of a population of 54,000 people in Townsville, I am prepared to bet that 22,000 would be trade-unionists—

**Mr. Bennett:** Who is on the executive of the North Queensland Labour Party?

**Mr. AIKENS:** The hon. member is not, thank goodness! I am glad he mentioned that because since the election there has been a bums' rush away from the A.L.P. in Townsville. Since the election we have received applications from 11 A.L.P. members to join the North Queensland Labour Party. We rejected eight and accepted three because, after the last Federal election, when the Labour Party in Queensland wiped the floor with the Menzies Government, there was a rush into the A.L.P. Some people thought the A.L.P. was on the march. They thought the A.L.P. was going to win the last State election. They thought there would be jobs for this one and jobs for that one. Little Peter would go into the railway, little Frankie into the Public Service, big Jimmy onto the hospital board and someone else somewhere else. But when the figures were published on 1 June, when they realised that the anti-Tory performance put up in the Federal election was not repeated in the State election, they commenced running away. As I say, there is a bums' rush away from the A.L.P. in Queensland. If hon. members like to have the names, come down to my room and I will let them have a look at the names of the 11 members of the A.L.P.—everyone a good worker for the A.L.P. up to 1 June—who have, since election day, applied to join the North Queensland Labour Party.

(Time expired.)

Debate, on motion of Mr. Houston, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 5.7 p.m.