

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 10 SEPTEMBER 1963**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## TUESDAY, 10 SEPTEMBER, 1963

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

### QUESTIONS

TEACHING OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AT UNIVERSITY.—Mr. Dean, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

With reference to the statement in *The Courier-Mail* of July 25, made by Sir Fred J. Schonell, Vice-Chancellor of the Queensland University, that there is a need for the teaching of Asian languages in this State and that in England, Leeds University has a department of Chinese studies, Sheffield University a department of Japanese studies and Hull University a school of Asian studies, and that all this is going on in a country so many thousands of miles away from Asia and he considered that we ought to be getting off the mark better here in Queensland, what foreign languages are being taught at the Queensland University?

*Answer:—*

“French, German, Russian, Latin and Greek are taught to degree standard. The Institute of Modern Languages provides instruction in French, German, Modern Greek, Chinese, Japanese, Hindi, Indonesian, Malay, Russian, Spanish, Italian and Hebrew.”

COST OF BRISBANE TOWN PLAN.—Mr. Sherrington, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Public Works,—

(1) What was the total cost involved in the preparation of the Brisbane Town Plan?

(2) How much of this cost was borne by (a) the Brisbane City Council and (b) the State Government?

*Answers:—*

(1) “I am informed that the claims submitted by Brisbane City Council to the Treasury Department total £251,395 10s. 4d. to June 30, 1963.”

(2) “The Council meets 80 per cent. and the State 20 per cent. of the cost.”

NORTH QUEENSLAND APPOINTMENT TO PAROLE BOARD.—Mr. Tucker, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Justice,—

Will he again give consideration to the appointment of a citizen of Townsville or of some other part of North Queensland to the Parole Board in order that the board might have first hand knowledge of the prisoners in H.M. Prison, Stuart, who make applications?

*Answer:—*

“The Offenders Probation and Parole Act of 1959” provides that the Parole Board shall consist of a Judge of the Supreme Court, the Under Secretary Department of Justice, the Comptroller-General of Prisons, and three members one of whom shall be a duly qualified medical practitioner or a psychologist and one a woman. The applications which come before the Parole Board contain adequate information regarding each applicant and all of the reports and recommendations by classification committees and by prison officers are considered by the individual members of the board prior to the board’s meeting. Individual members of the board would not need to have first-hand knowledge of a prisoner. The applications of prisoners who are serving their sentence in Southern Queensland gaols are dealt with in precisely the same manner as those by prisoners who are serving their sentence at H.M. Prison, Townsville. The present Parole Board is functioning very efficiently and I do not contemplate any change in the personnel in the near future.”

REPORT OF GOVERNMENT PARTY COMMITTEE ON LAND VALUATIONS.—Mr. Duggan, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Public Works,—

(1) When can a report be expected from the special committee appointed to study land valuations, of which committee he was appointed chairman on August 30, 1961?

(2) In view of the statement by the deputy chairman, Mr. Gaven, that the committee would meet every week, how many times has this committee met during the past two years?

(3) Has this committee now been wound-up and, if so, will he furnish to this House a copy of the final recommendations made by that committee?

*Answers:—*

(1 and 2) “The committee referred to by the Honourable Member is not a special committee. It comprises Government Members and reports to the Government Party meetings on Local Government matters.”

(3) “No.”

SALARY INCREASES, STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES.—Mr. Hanlon, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Justice,—

(1) What was the salary of a stipendiary magistrate as at (a) August 3, 1957, (b) April 10, 1958, (c) July 4, 1960 and (d) September 5, 1963?

(2) What was the extent per annum of the most recent increase received by magistrates and from what date did it take effect?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "Since August 3, 1957, the salaries payable to the Chief Stipendiary Magistrate and Stipendiary Magistrates throughout the State have been varied as set out in the schedule hereunder. These classifications are subject to varying rates of cost of living adjustment, the present rate being £39 per annum in addition to the classified salary.

SCHEDULE					
Brisbane					
		Chief Stipendiary Magistrate		Other Magistrates	
		£	£	£	£
3-8-57	.. ..	2,550	2,800	2,250	2,500
1-9-58	.. ..	2,800	3,200	2,450	2,900
4-7-60	.. ..	Maximum	3,840	3,460	3,510
1-1-63	.. ..	Maximum	4,090	3,635	3,685

  

		Division I Magistrate		Division II Magistrate		Division III Magistrate	
		£	£	£	£	£	£
3-8-57		2,070	2,250	1,950	2,100	1,845	1,975
1-9-58		2,230	2,600	2,030	2,400	1,930	2,300
4-7-60		3,105	3,175	2,855	2,925	2,730	2,800
1-1-63		3,280	3,350	3,030	3,100	2,905	2,975

**MACHINERY AND SCAFFOLDING INSPECTORS.**—Mr. Newton, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Labour and Industry,—

Have any additional inspectors been appointed by the Machinery and Scaffolding Department to keep a constant check on plant and scaffolding being used by the oil development companies throughout the State?

Answer:—

"The Chief Inspector of Machinery and Scaffolding advises that the inspection of plant and scaffolding being used by oil development companies in so far as matters coming within the provisions of The Inspection of Machinery Acts and The Inspection of Scaffolding Acts are concerned, is being adequately handled by the existing inspectorial staff at the present time. The position is being closely watched and should it be considered at any time additional inspectors are required for this work in the interests of safety, appropriate action will be taken. I would also inform the Honourable Member that active consideration is already being given to appropriate inspectorial requirements in regard to the supervision of the manufacture, installation, testing and operation of equipment in regard to the two oil refineries being established here."

**PRICES ADVISORY BOARD.**—Mr. Sherrington, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Labour and Industry,—

(1) Has his attention been drawn to an article appearing in the Brisbane *Telegraph* on Friday, August 30, entitled, "Do you live in a high price Zone", in which was pointed out the discrepancy in the retail prices of various commodities in different suburbs of Brisbane?

(2) Has he referred this matter to the Prices Commissioner for investigation?

(3) Who are the members of the Prices Advisory Board and when was the last meeting of the board held?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "No."

(3) "The present Members of the Board are—Chairman, Mr. H. O. Muhl, Under Secretary, Department of Labour and Industry; Deputy Chairman, Mr. A. T. Fullagar, Commissioner of Prices; Member, Mr. A. A. Ross, Department of Agriculture and Stock. The last meeting was held on December 14, 1959."

**TELECAST FOR JUNIOR UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION STUDENTS.**—Mr. Aikens, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) Has his attention been drawn to an article on page 6 of *The Courier-Mail* of September 4 wherein it was stated that the Australian Broadcasting Commission was going to repeat a television serial over Channel 2 for the benefit of students sitting for the Junior University examination this year?

(2) Was the Education Department consulted on the matter and, if so, what provision will be made to give country students outside the A.B.C. Television viewing range the same opportunity and benefit as the metropolitan students within it?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "The Education Department was informed of the decision of the A.B.C., but realised that, as Television was not yet widespread throughout the State, the viewing audience would be very restricted. The novel, "Pride and Prejudice", is set for general reading only and, as there is a wide selection of novels to choose from, it is anticipated that only a small percentage of candidates would have selected this novel."

**NORTHGATE AND BANYO RAILWAY WORKSHOPS.**—Mr. Melloy, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport,—

(1) Is it proposed to close down the dilapidated, white ant-eaten and overcrowded but well equipped Northgate Railway Workshops and transfer machinery and workers to new workshops at Banyo? If so, when and, if not, why not?

(2) Is it proposed to dispose of any Railway buildings at Banyo or Northgate, either completed or uncompleted, by sale, lease or rental? If so, to whom are such buildings to be disposed?

(3) Are any negotiations in progress or proposed with any prospective buyer or lessee of any buildings at Banyo or Northgate? If so, with whom?

*Answer:—*

(1, 2 and 3) "The information sought by the Honourable Member concerns matters of policy on which I shall make a statement in due course. However, I would point out to the Honourable Member that if, perchance, his political immaturity has been responsible for his apparent delusion, which causes him to endeavour to reflect on this Government for what he has very rightly described as "the dilapidated white-ant eaten and overcrowded Northgate Workshops", such buildings were a legacy inherited by me from thirty years of Labour rule. Whilst steps were taken by the present administration to eradicate the white-ants, it was only after many did not succumb to the normal treatment that it was found such ants had, in fact, become so impregnated over the years that they had developed into a species known as crimson—or slight red ants—which the Honourable Member will appreciate are much more difficult to eradicate from any type of structure."

**LEVEL-CROSSING WARNING DEVICE, HIGH STREET, GARBUTT.**—Mr. Tucker, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport,—

Could he give an indication when warning lights are likely to be installed at the High Street level-crossing in Garbutt, Townsville?

*Answer:—*

"The Department is proceeding, as quickly as available funds will permit, to provide boom gates or warning lights at various rail crossings throughout the State. I am, however, unable to indicate when High Street, Garbutt, will receive attention."

**RETURN TRANSPORT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN, TOWNVILLE TO MAGNETIC ISLAND.**—Mr. Tucker, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

Has any decision yet been reached with regard to my request for a special boat to transport school children from Townsville to their homes on Magnetic Island each afternoon in order to avoid the present three-hours waiting period?

*Answer:—*

"The Regional Director is investigating this matter and has reported that the effective number using the boat at present is 13 pupils. The cost of providing a separate service for so few would be prohibitive and is not warranted. A survey of prospective enrolments in 1964 and later years is being made."

**VISITS TO DAJARRA BY ITINERANT DENTIST FROM CLONCURRY.**—Mr. Inch, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health and Home Affairs,—

(1) As the Dajarra State School only receives an infrequent visit from the rail dental clinic will he endeavour to arrange for regular visits by the flying dentist to this school?

(2) Will he also endeavour to arrange more frequent visits to this school by a sister from the School Health Services?

*Answers:—*

(1) "The matter of regular visits to Dajarra by the itinerant dentist from Cloncurry has previously been investigated. In the absence of facilities at Dajarra by way of a dental surgery, water, electricity, &c., the itinerant dentist would be able to carry out only examinations, and possibly urgent extractions for the relief of pain. It was considered by the Cloncurry Hospitals Board that the people (both adults and children) of Duchess, Dajarra, and Kajabbi, can be better and more effectively served by periodical visits by the Dental Rail Clinic rather than by visits by the itinerant dentist from Cloncurry and the maintenance of permanent equipment for dentistry at these centres. The Rail Dental Clinic is at present at Dajarra, and previous visits were made at 1955, 1958, and 1962. The appointment of an additional school dentist in the coastal area based on Mackay which has been approved, will relieve the present Rail Dental Clinic of a considerable portion of its present itinerary, and will enable more frequent visits to be made to the outback areas, including Dajarra."

(2) "The School Health Services Sister visited Dajarra State School in 1959 and 1961. The school is on the sister's next western itinerary, and will receive a visit in about four to six weeks' time. The frequency of the school sister's visits is dependent upon the maintenance of the staff establishment, but every endeavour will be made to reduce the time between visits in this area."

**SINGLE TEACHERS QUARTERS AT DAJARRA STATE SCHOOL.**—Mr. Inch, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) As two assistant teachers are now compelled to occupy the single man's accommodation at the Dajarra State School, will he arrange for the Department to provide an extension to these quarters?

(2) Has any investigation been made into the possibility of installing septic systems at this school and residence and, if so, what is the result?

*Answers:—*

(1) "Plans have been completed for the extension of the single teachers quarters at Dajarra State School and an estimate of cost of the work is expected to be available at an early date. Consideration will then be given to approving of this project in relation to funds available for works of this nature."

(2) "A request for the installation of a septic system at the Dajarra State School and official residence has been noted for allotment to an architectural officer for investigation and preparation of plan."

**ACCOMMODATION AT HIGH SCHOOLS, WYNNUM DISTRICT.**—Mr. Gunn, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) With the increased enrolment of students at the Wynnum High School for the 1964 school-year, has the Department made any provision for additional classroom accommodation?

(2) How many secondary students will be enrolled within the Wynnum district for the new school-year?

(3) How many students will be accommodated at the Wynnum North High School now in the course of construction?

*Answers:—*

(1) "With the opening of a new school at Wynnum North the distribution of new enrolments between the two schools can only be estimated as yet. Surveys have been made in all parts of the State to ensure that adequate accommodation is provided for the beginning of the 1964 school year."

(2) "Grade 8, 685; Grade 9, 550; Grade 10, 410; Grade 11, 95; Grade 12, 75; Total, 1,815."

(3) "Grade 8, 260; Grade 9, 195; Total, 455."

**TRAFFIC AND PEDESTRIAN LIGHTS, MAIN STREET, KANGAROO POINT.**—Mr. Bromley, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Labour and Industry,—

(1) When were the traffic and pedestrian lights erected in Main Street, Kangaroo Point?

(2) Can he indicate when they will be put into operation?

(3) If there is no immediate action pending with regard to the operation of the traffic lights, will he give consideration in view of the danger hazards which exist to pedestrians in this street to having pedestrian-actuated lights in operation without delay?

*Answers:—*

(1) "With the exception of making the appropriate timing settings within the controller for the purpose of allocating right of way to conflicting directions, and also to provide progressive operation along Main Street, these signals were completed during the week ended August 20, 1963."

(2) "The appropriate time settings as mentioned in Question (1) above are under preparation by the Traffic Engineer, and it is anticipated that these lights will be put into operation in approximately two weeks."

(3) "See Answer to Question No. (2). It is not technically possible to bring in pedestrian operated lights without complete operation of these signals. I would also add that the delay in the completion of these installations has been due to the fact that the supplier of the controller equipment also held the contract for the supply of controller equipment required for the installation of traffic signals at school crossings. Component parts for both lots of controllers were ordered from the United States of America by the Australian contractor late in 1962, but labour troubles on the waterfront in New York delayed shipment for some considerable time. The delay necessitated the use of the first shipment of components in the manufacture of controllers for the school crossing signalisation programme instead of for the controllers for Main Street."

**STATISTICS IN MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS.**—Mr. Sherrington 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?—*(Originally asked September 5, 1963.)*

Answer:—

“Total number of motor vehicles involved in accidents, 33,809; of which drivers under 21 years of age numbered 5,840. In this total figure, 2,081 did not state age. Total number of motor cycles involved in accidents, 1,130; of which riders under 21 years of age numbered 597. In this case, 37 did not have age stated.”

#### PAPERS

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

Report—

The Council of the Queensland Institute of Medical Research for the year 1962-1963.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

The Co-operative Housing Societies Acts, 1958 to 1962.

The Medical Acts, 1939 to 1958.

The City of Brisbane Market Acts, 1960 to 1962.

The Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Acts, 1926 to 1962.

Regulations under—

The Public Service Acts, 1922 to 1960.

The Electrical Workers and Contractors Act of 1962.

The Queensland Marine Acts, 1958 to 1963.

Report—

Queensland Government Trade Mission to South-East Asia and Japan.

#### MINISTERIAL EXPENSES

##### 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. Marsden, of expenses of Ministers for the year 1962-1963.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

##### DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY; MINISTER FOR PUBLIC LANDS AND IRRIGATION

**Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN** (Landsborough—Premier): I desire to inform the House that, in connection with the visit overseas of the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation, His Excellency the Administrator of the Government, in pursuance of the provisions of Section 8 of the Officials in Parliament Acts, 1896 to 1959, has authorised and empowered the Honourable George Francis Reuben Nicklin, Premier and Chief Secretary, to perform and exercise all or any of the

duties, powers, and authorities imposed or conferred upon the Honourable the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation by any Act, rule, practice, or ordinance, on and from 6 September, 1963, and until the return to Queensland of the Honourable Alan Roy Fletcher.

I lay upon the table of the House a copy of the “Queensland Government Gazette Extraordinary” of 5 September, 1963, notifying these arrangements.

Whereupon the hon. gentleman laid the “Government Gazette Extraordinary” upon the table.

#### QUEENSLAND INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL RESEARCH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

##### INITIATION

**Hon. H. W. NOBLE** (Yeronga—Minister for Health and Home Affairs): I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Queensland Institute of Medical Research Act of 1945, in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

#### FLUORIDATION OF PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIES BILL

**Hon. H. W. NOBLE** (Yeronga—Minister for Health and Home Affairs): I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill relating to the addition of fluorine to public water supplies.”

Motion agreed to.

#### CLEAN AIR BILL

**Hon. H. W. NOBLE** (Yeronga—Minister for Health and Home Affairs): I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill relating to the prevention and minimising of air pollution and for purposes connected therewith.”

Motion agreed to.

#### SUPREME COURT ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

##### SECOND READING

**Hon. A. W. MUNRO** (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (11.26 a.m.): I move—

“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

This is a very simple Bill and contains only a single principle, to increase the salaries of the Chief Justice and the puisne judges of the Supreme Court. It was fully explained at the introductory stage.

**Mr. DUGGAN** (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (11.27 a.m.): I do not think it is necessary to elaborate greatly on what was said at the introductory stage of the Bill. It is true, as the Minister has pointed out, that provision is made for increasing the Chief Justice's salary by £600 a year and the salaries of the other members of the Supreme Court judiciary by £500 a year. The Minister indicated during the introductory stage that the determination of these increases had been made following an investigation of what was being paid in other States. He said that he thought some sort of sensible compromise had been effected between the varying State rates. I pointed out on that occasion, and I repeat today, that the Opposition do not particularly want to level criticism at the general wage structure in the community, or to take advantage of our desire to criticise the methods of determining wages in the community generally, for the purpose of attacking any member or members of the Supreme Court judiciary on the salaries that it is proposed to grant them. I pointed out also that this afforded us an opportunity of focussing attention on this matter which would otherwise be denied to us unless we took advantage of the Address-in-Reply debate or the Budget debate, and that we thought those occasions might be better reserved for other general matters.

In this instance I think the judges are entitled to receive a reasonable increase, as are other sections in the community. However, we question whether the basis of arriving at the salaries has been scientific. It seems that it has been on a hit-or-miss basis. The Government apparently thinks that some round figure of £300 or £400 may be appropriate. As I pointed out on Tuesday, Supreme Court judges do virtually the same job in every State in the Commonwealth. Whether they are in a large State or a small State the range of their jurisdiction involves the same type of offences and the cases are the same, whether they comprise a murder charge or an important civil action or, perhaps, a matter that requires the interpretation of an Act of Parliament. In any one of those cases in the Supreme Court the qualifications necessary to make a proper assessment of the issues before the court are virtually the same. However, I pointed out that, in the case of a fitter or artisan, while there may be a variation in the basic wage determined by the cost of living criterion, the margin or award is uniform throughout the Commonwealth.

I do not suppose the emoluments of Supreme Court judges bear any relationship to the basic wage. If the principle is to compare like with like, perhaps we should do that. But I think it is time some attempt was made to stabilise the position with these higher salaries. The trade-union movement, and indeed the Labour movement generally, feels that, if increased productivity and profitability can be obtained in the economy, the workers are entitled

to a share in the general improvement. If, through automation, labour-saving devices and other such means, it is possible for firms to increase their output and the measure of their profit-making, it is not unfair or unreasonable to ask that employees in industry should share in the benefits. That has not occurred.

I do not want to develop this argument at any great length. I merely wish to point out that the Labour movement is not so much opposed to some stabilisation in the economy, but it feels that the workers are entitled to share in those increases in productivity and profitability.

Without digressing too far, it would seem to me to be not only incomprehensible but also unjust that, while a large firm like Mount Isa Mines Ltd. records a profit of £5,000,000, this Parliament should impose a prohibition against granting workers an increase in the lead bonus.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I think the hon. gentleman is getting very wide of the mark.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I mention that only in passing. The Labour movement agrees that there should be some stability but, to certain elements in the Public Service and the judiciary and other higher salaried officers, there seems to be a tendency to keep on giving these disproportionate increases, which cause a good deal of industrial disquiet and unrest in the community, and add considerably to our charges generally. When we find increases in emoluments to the relatively high order of those contained in this Bill, we must point out that somewhere along the line there should be a pause in the tendency to award very high increases to a section of the community. There appears to be little consistency in these matters. When the Premier introduced a Bill the other day to provide additional Ministers, he indicated that South Australia could not be taken as an example because of its smaller area and population than Queensland's; but that is not the position with the salaries of Supreme Court judges. The Minister said they were somewhat higher than South Australia's and somewhat lower than those of the more populous States of New South Wales and Victoria.

It is not my purpose to criticise the judges. We have in the judiciary some very fine men indeed, and probably we are very fortunate to have them. But I do not think the measuring rod is always applied as well as it should be. With salaries of this sort we should get the best men in the profession. I do not want to focus attention on any particular appointments, but I think that probably we have occasionally fallen down somewhat in this regard. I do not want to be playing party politics on this matter. It might be said that other governments, of other composition perhaps, are susceptible to a charge of this kind. I merely make the general observation that the salaries currently payable and

the non-contributory pension should ensure our having the very best men on the Supreme Court bench and indeed on the High Court. There should be no other consideration than the desire to get the very best men. The mere taking of silk should not enter into the matter. I do not want these remarks to be linked with any particular person, but I think the Minister for Justice himself drew attention to certain members of the profession taking silk and being learned in the law. It does not necessarily follow from the fact that a man has taken silk that he is best equipped to be a Supreme Court judge. Some people elect, for reasons best known to themselves, to take silk, when they can demand higher fees and have the assistance of junior counsel. Consequently, it is a matter for individual determination. I understand that the approval of the Chief Justice is sought and then an application is made to the Minister for Justice. Now that the salaries have been increased to high levels, we should see the very best men attracted to the judiciary.

Whilst salaries are one consideration, I think that members of the judiciary should also be free of unwarranted attacks. I do not think that anyone should be protected from attack merely because he happens to be a Supreme Court judge if there is evidence that he lacks some important qualification, the necessary judgment, or has fallen down on some important responsibility. It is fitting in such cases that attention be focused on them, and we do not want to adopt a complacent attitude and say that anyone is beyond criticism. However, there should not be criticism unless there is some substantial evidence warranting it, and, when there is, criticism should not be levelled generally but only in specific cases where there is justification for it.

The Opposition does not intend to oppose the actual proposal before the House but merely to issue a general warning and request to the Government to see whether in some way there can be a stabilisation of this tendency to grant very large salary increases. Frankly, I feel that, in the interest of the economy of the country as a whole, it is getting completely out of hand. Each time an adjustment is made, the discrepancy becomes greater.

**Mr. Hughes:** What is the answer to the question of determining what a man is worth? It is pretty difficult to justify a man's earning £150 a week.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I suppose the same thing applies to members of Parliament. People outside say, "What are they worth?" Seeing that the question of parliamentary salaries has been discussed in the Press lately, some hon. members opposite would have some difficulty in justifying a basic wage determination. That, however, is only a personal opinion and it is difficult to say what salaries

should be in these cases. There is no doubt that this matter has caused some disquiet in the public mind.

I said that I do not think criticism should be levelled loosely at judges of the Supreme Court. The privileges, rank, status, and procedures attaching to the judiciary are things that have been handed down over many years. The three status professions in England going back hundreds of years were the law, the Army, and the church. It is difficult to determine how much mental exercise is required of judges. No-one can say with certainty how much work they do at night in their homes. No-one knows the extent of their reading and when it is done. No doubt all of us, whether Cabinet Minister, Leader of the Opposition, or private member, have to do this, too. I know that I use all sorts of odd hours to read or make notes or do similar work. I might do it when I come home late at night from a meeting. Last night I read till the small hours of the morning to prepare some information. We all do that.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I hope the hon. gentleman will not attempt to make this a general discourse on the salaries of members of Parliament and other people in the community. He is strictly limited to a discussion on the salaries of judges.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** Exactly; that is what I am dealing with. I was dealing with the difficulty of knowing to what extent members of the Supreme Court bench work at all sorts of odd hours. I said that it was difficult to do that, and compared it with the difficulty of determining the hours of work put in by a member of Parliament. I was dealing exclusively with the salaries of Supreme Court judges.

The question was raised by one hon. member—it has been mentioned by other hon. members on one or two earlier occasions—of mounting delays in the Supreme Court and whether this was due to any slackness on the part of the judges or to a lack of facilities available to them. When a man is paid a high salary, we want to see that his services are applied as much as can fairly be expected to the discharge of his duties, and evidence has certainly accumulated of a banking up of reserved decisions, and so on, in this instance. I am not in a position to indicate who is to blame for this or how extensive it is, but I have had a discussion about it with some members of the legal profession and they seem to share the disquiet about the backlog of cases awaiting determination. I think it is a not inappropriate time, therefore, to direct attention to this problem. Surely discussions in Parliament on this Bill are not to be circumscribed to the extent that we can discuss only whether the salaries should be increased by £400, £500, £600, or £1,000. If they are, it makes it very difficult to make any sort of contribution to the debate.

As I said, the Opposition does not want to discriminate against the judges and say that, if someone else has received a comparable increase, the judges are not entitled to a similar increase. But the Minister has told us that, having gone into all the circumstances, the Government has decided that the remuneration provided for in the Bill is fair, and that is the only basis that has been put before us for the increase. As the salaries have now reached £6,000 a year for judges and in excess of that amount for the Chief Justice—

**Mr. Smith:** £7,000 for the Chief Justice and £6,400 for the other judges.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** Yes. I thank the hon. member for Windsor for the information. Consequently, we want to see that the services, skills and experience of these men are used to the very best advantage.

With those general observations, I indicate that the Opposition does not intend to vote against the Bill but has exercised the right of mentioning, through me, one or two important principles that are of interest to the community generally.

**Mr. AIKENS** (Townsville South) (11.43 a.m.): In dealing with the question of the salary for a certain position or a certain person, I think it is quite within the Standing Orders and germane to the debate to discuss whether or not, in the opinion of members of Parliament, the particular person is earning the salary paid to him. I hark back to a remark by the Minister for Justice at the introductory stage, when he said—I may not be using his exact words—that it was not for him or the Executive Government to tell judges what they should do. In the opinion of the Minister, judges are completely independent, and control their own courts and conduct their own business as they see fit in accordance, presumably, with the customs and traditions of the judiciary that go back over the centuries. That being so, and as the Minister has admitted that the Executive Government, and presumably this Parliament, has no power to tell a judge what he should or should not do, I think it would be quite within the Standing Orders for me to suggest some things that the judges should do.

I think we all realise that our judicial system is cluttered up with archaic customs and conventions that have become cobwebbed and that, consequently, the wheels of justice are turning more and more slowly each year. If one goes into a court and sees a judge in his scarlet robes and wig and the sheriff, the associate, the tipstaff and the baristers at the bar table ridiculously garbed according to the customs of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, one might be pardoned for wondering why there was not a gaily-caparisoned charger outside, together with a coat of mail, to complete the Gilbert and Sullivan atmosphere of the court. I think the judges should advise the Minister

for Justice that the time has long since passed for a complete revision of the manner in which court cases are conducted. We should do away with all the archaic and cobwebbed traditions of the past and realise that we are living in the year 1963.

Then, again, I read an article in the "Telegraph" yesterday which was inspired by the remarks I made about the judiciary a couple of weeks ago—

**Mr. Smith** interjected.

**Mr. AIKENS:** The hon. member for Windsor keeps interjecting. I have no doubt that if this Government remains in office long enough he will be appointed to the Supreme Court bench. We know him; we have heard him; we know his ability and we know his capabilities. What a tragedy it will be if he is ever elevated to the Supreme Court bench.

Let me say this: not only should the wheels of justice be oiled in the conduct of cases, but I think we should also do away with the archaic idea that in a criminal case the prisoner is already tried and convicted before he enters the court.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The hon. member is developing his argument right outside the bounds of this Bill. I ask him to confine his remarks to the main feature of the Bill, namely, the salaries to be paid to Supreme Court judges. We do not want a general discussion on law courts and how they are controlled and conducted.

**Mr. AIKENS:** Mr. Speaker, you were in conversation with an hon. member when I made my introductory remarks. I pointed out then that the Minister for Justice claims that the conduct of the courts is purely and simply the privilege of the judges and I said, "If we are discussing the salaries of judges, surely we should be able to discuss what judges do to receive those salaries." I am merely intimating that judges make suggestions to the Executive Council through the Minister for Justice that these moves be instituted—that it is part of their job—to clean the cobwebs away from the courts. It is part of their job not only to try cases, not only to be independent, not only to be learned in law, not only to be impartial, but also to see that the wheels of justice are appropriately oiled and the processes of justice are brought up to twentieth-century conception of justice instead of remaining at the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century conception of justice. I am merely suggesting that all the judges should do that as part of the job for which we are about to pay them these munificent salaries.

I do not think anyone could justify the fact that when a man is brought into the Supreme Court on a criminal charge he must stand in the dock; he is not even allowed to sit down in the dock unless he asks special permission of the judge to do so, and when he does sit down he sits out of sight.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I think the hon. gentleman must agree that control of the courts lies in the hands of the judges. They do so according to the law as it is laid down and in dealing with this Bill there is no reason for a discussion on the control of courts.

**Mr. Smith:** He has been reading up on technique in case he is ever there himself.

**Mr. AIKENS:** If the hon. member for Windsor would keep out of it and let you, Mr. Speaker, and I discuss the matter he might learn something about law.

This is not a question of law; if it was, I would be completely out of order. It is purely and simply a question of custom with the judges themselves over the years, and I am merely suggesting that the judges advise the Attorney-General that we in Queensland should set an example. We know, of course, that the Attorney-General made the amazing statement the other day, in his introductory speech, that parliamentarians in Queensland do not have the same measure of freedom as those in Great Britain. That, I think, is a stark condemnation of his own Government emanating from his own lips.

**Mr. Munro:** I did not say that at all. What I said was that the *lex Parliamentii* in the United Kingdom did not have full application in Queensland. That is what I said, and nothing more.

**Mr. AIKENS:** The Minister was talking of parliamentary privilege and the freedom of Parliament, and he said with all the overplausibility we know and the plethora of adjectives he generally uses, that parliamentarians in this House have not the same freedom to criticise judges as they have in the House of Commons. That is what he said in plain, unabridged language.

However, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your ruling and I do not want to disregard it; but I really believe, in view of the fact that, according to the Minister for Justice, no-one else can do it, we should make some suggestion to the judges that they should talk. I do not care where they meet. I am not going to suggest they meet at the Queensland Club, their chosen meeting place, but somewhere or other, and discuss among themselves and with the Minister for Justice the very urgent need to bring some measure of sanity, ordinary common sense, decency, and humanity into the conduct of cases in our courts. Why should a man be placed in the dock before he is found guilty? Why should he be referred to as "the accused"? Why can't he sit at the bar table alongside his barrister, just as the police officers sit alongside the Crown Prosecutor? Why isn't he given the same fair open go as the Crown? Of course, if I cared to develop the argument I would ask why the Crown Prosecutor is not given the same right—

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. AIKENS:** I know, Mr. Speaker, that it is interminable. We would enter into an argument that could take up perhaps two or three days. But I am happy that you have given me the opportunity to bring to the attention of the judges that at least I consider that the job for which we are about to pay them a sum of money which, in my opinion, some of them do not deserve, is not simply to sit on the bench. Their job is not merely to try cases; their job is not only to carry on the traditions that they have inherited down the centuries. Their job is to advise this Government and this Parliament as to how the wheels of justice can be properly greased, and how the processes of law and of justice can be brought closer to our conception of justice than those that have been handed down from 500 or 600 years ago.

**Hon. A. W. MUNRO** (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (11.52 a.m.), in reply: I propose to reply very briefly, for two reasons: one is the state of the clock and the other is the fact that a great deal of what has been said this morning is not really relevant to the principles of the Bill.

In his remarks I think the Leader of the Opposition dealt with three matters. He made some general comments of fairly considerable interest about the general wage structure in this State. In reply to those remarks I merely say that that is not a subject matter of this Bill, which deals only with salaries of judges of the Supreme Court of Queensland. The wage structure generally is a matter that comes under our industrial conciliation and arbitration laws.

The Leader of the Opposition then endeavoured to make certain comparisons between the wage structure and the salaries to be fixed in terms of the Bill. I do not want to proceed with any detailed examination of that matter, but it is very appropriate to point out that in his remarks today, and in his earlier remarks at the introductory stage, the Leader of the Opposition either overlooked, or failed to give due weight to, two very important considerations. The first is that at the time this Government took office there was a very considerable lag in what ordinarily should have been the proper adjustment of salaries of judges of the Supreme Court. At one stage a period of 70 years had elapsed without any adjustment in the salaries of judges of the Supreme Court. Let me point out one way in which comparisons are very misleading. If we go back approximately 70 years we come to a time when there was no income tax. If we go back for a shorter period the graduation of income tax is not nearly so great as it is at present. At the present time when one reaches a higher scale of salary a very big part, sometimes the greater part, of any adjustment is absorbed in income tax. I mention that merely as one of the relevant considerations

if we are comparing the position of a person on a reasonably high salary with that of another whose salary is not in the same grade.

The third point that the Leader of the Opposition made dealt with the other States. If I understood him correctly, he more or less suggested that we should deal with this matter on the basis of like with like. I shall not extend that discussion except to ask: Where we have five other States and no two of them are similar, how can we apply the principle of like with like? In such circumstances there is only one sensible approach, and that is to view the situation as a whole. I have already made it clear that we considered all the evidence available to us. We considered the rates of remuneration in all the other States and, as a result of our consideration, we arrived at what we thought was fair, just and reasonable in all the circumstances.

I have only a few minutes in which to deal with the remarks of the hon. member for Townsville South. I will perhaps first concede that there may be some of the procedures of our courts of justice that have, to some extent, become outmoded by the passage of time and could be streamlined in certain respects. Nevertheless, on the fundamental basis of the approach of the hon. member for Townsville South I must disagree with him, because he has shown by his remarks on this occasion, and on many other occasions, that he lacks a full realisation of the importance of the fact that the judiciary of this State, or of any other State or country, should be completely independent of the Executive. As a reason for that statement I will mention only one point, namely, that the judiciary are not there merely to give judgment on issues between one citizen and another. They are there also to protect the community generally; to protect the community against an Executive Government that may become despotic; that may take some action beyond its powers, or beyond the will of Parliament. They are there also as a safeguard on the actions of Parliament, because a State Parliament under a Federal system of government may enact legislation beyond its powers. It is the function and the responsibility of the judiciary to provide safeguards in those circumstances. For that reason, it would be completely wrong for the political head of any ministerial department to attempt to direct judges of the Supreme Court. For those and other reasons, I think that the terms of this Bill are quite fair and proper in the circumstances.

Motion (Mr. Munro) agreed to.

#### COMMITTEE

(Mr. Gaven, South Coast, in the chair.)

Clauses 1 to 3, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

#### RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—FOURTH ALLOTTED DAY

Debate resumed from 5 September (see p. 238) on Mr. McKechnie's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba) (11.59 a.m.): In joining in this debate on the Address-in-Reply motion, I want to associate the people of the Bulimba electorate with the declaration of allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen. It is customary, of course, for members of Parliament to express their loyalty at the swearing-in ceremony, but the average person has only rare occasion to do so. It is my privilege to do it on his behalf.

It is also customary in the Address-in-Reply debate to spend some time talking about one's own electorate, and I will have a lot to say today about Bulimba. Although the Bulimba electorate is only relatively small in area—just over 12 square miles—it is a district which, if given the opportunity, will play a major part in the development of the city and of the State. It is blessed with a wonderful river frontage and is a district which lends itself first of all to industrial development and also to residential development. Unfortunately, owing to its geography and to a complete lack of understanding of its problems by the Brisbane City Council and various departments of the Government, its development has been allowed to become rather stagnant. I seek the indulgence of the House while I raise a few matters about part of the Bulimba electorate not so much with the idea of trying to sell the electorate as to bring to the notice of the Government, and of the Brisbane City Council for that matter, that they are handling the problem of the stagnation of the district wrongly. I want to try to point out to them ways and means of solving it.

I refer first to what is commonly known as the Dobby Creek area. In fact it is the Bulimba Creek area of the Bulimba electorate. As many hon. members know, Bulimba Creek starts in the district known as Kuraby and flows through Eight Mile Plains, Rochedale, Carina, Murarrie, Hemmant, and then into the river. Unfortunately the creek has been allowed over the years to become so overgrown with mangroves that the older residents hardly recognise it today as the stream they knew years ago. The mangroves have brought about many problems. Their roots have grown out into the stream, allowing the silt and so on to build up and impede the free flow of the waters, both from the tidal influence and from the fresh or storm-water run-off. I can remember, more than 20 years ago, when the creek was a popular swimming place for the young people of the districts of Bulimba, Hemmant, Murarrie and Tingalpa, and even up as far as Carina. I can also remember that on many happy occasions we caught many mullet and crabs off the bank there. But today the creek has

deteriorated into, to say the least, a complete stinking mess. What to do about it will be the subject of my contribution today.

I do not want to suggest that action taken by previous councils was completely wrong. For instance, when the councils gave various meat firms and a tannery permission to build their establishments on the banks of the creek, the decision, in the circumstances known at the time, may have been quite wise. If you cast your mind back you will recall that it was then a free-flowing creek subject to tidal conditions. Regularly the tide came in and went out, and with a rather fast flow, which often was increased by the natural fresh water coming into the creek from the watershed.

**Mr. Houghton:** Is it still tidal?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** It is still tidal, but I shall tell the hon. member as I proceed how the situation has deteriorated. When those industries started, their waste water, with all that it contained, was drained into the creek, but it did no harm because the flow of water carried the waste to the river, where it was dispersed. The chemicals in the waste caused no problem because of the large volume of water in the river. Unfortunately the mangroves have built up, the creek has silted, the industries have grown and, with them, the amount of effluent, and the problem is becoming acute. Anyone who cares to look at the map will find that the creek twists so much that it looks like a small intestine. I am sure that the Minister concerned is fully aware of this. When I mentioned at a meeting that the creek looked like a small intestine, I was told, "Yes, that is true, and it also stinks worse than one that has been dead for a few days." I thought that that was a quite appropriate observation.

Because of this twisting and turning of the creek and the growth of mangroves, the free flow of the creek has been completely lost. The effluent is now going into the creek and staying there and causing a stench that has to be smelt to be believed. Anyone driving along Wynnum Road knows how the stench gets into his car and how difficult it is to get it out. I have seen the hon. member for Ithaca passing by on many occasions.

**Mr. Windsor:** I would not live at Bulimba for all the tea in China.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** That is the reason why. It affects paint work; I have statistical proof to support that assertion.

As a result of this inconvenience, an association was formed just after the Tingalpa area became part of the Bulimba electorate. A committee that was set up went to considerable trouble to investigate the causes of the pollution, and the assistance was sought of various Government departments.

In September through to November, 1960, a petition was prepared on which were many hundreds of names. In fact, I think there were 1,118 names on it. It was presented to the Premier's secretary and on 24 November, 1960, the Premier promised to have the matter looked into. From November, 1960, till now is quite a few months; in fact, it is nearly three years. I waited till now to give everyone an opportunity of doing something before I made the whole matter public.

Although in November, 1960, the Premier said that he was going to have the matter looked into and that he felt sure it could be rectified and safely left in his hands, he passed the matter over to the Minister for Health and Home Affairs. I am glad to see that the Minister is in the House now because, although it is not of major importance to him, it is at least of minor importance because his department is involved.

The upshot was that although the Premier promised to have the matter investigated and rectified, the conditions today are worse than they were three years ago. The problem remains and will get worse unless the Government takes action. It is true that the buck has been passed to the Brisbane City Council. The Minister for Health and Home Affairs told the Government, and also the association at Tingalpa and me, that it was up to the council to see that its regulations were enforced and to prosecute the firms who were polluting the stream. That is not the answer. After all, these people have their businesses there. It is true that they are putting effluent into the creek; but it is also true that some of the firms are doing their best to overcome the problem. For example, I believe that in one instance £20,000 has been, or is to be, spent on a project designed to purify the effluent. It should be remembered, however, that not only the public, but also the firm concerned, will benefit by that expenditure because the process used will reclaim fats that would otherwise be lost. I understand that another firm is going to quite a lot of trouble to investigate ways and means of preventing noxious effluent from going into the creek. A tannery is having considerable difficulty in finding a method of purifying the effluent that it must, of necessity, drain into the creek, and opinions that have been expressed to me indicate that it is this effluent which is the main cause of the trouble.

I suggest that the Government could come into the fight in this way and not try to put the whole burden on to the council's shoulders. The council can prosecute only if it can be shown that the firms are deliberately doing something that could be detrimental to the health of the people. But if the firms are putting into the creek effluent that is, to the best of their ability, clean but still noxious, surely the Government can try to find why the position is worse now than it was years ago. The answer, of course, is the

additional water flowing into the creek, and on behalf of the people in the area I ask the Government to make the Department of Harbours and Marine accept its responsibility. The creek is tidal beyond the area where the main industries are situated, and I believe that the Department of Harbours and Marine should clear the creek of mangroves. Once there is a free flow of water in the creek the effluent will be taken away, and the council can then make sure that only the cleanest possible effluent is put into it. This would overcome the immediate problem of the stench, the effect on paintwork and silverware, and the other things that I have mentioned, and would also be of benefit to the city of Brisbane and to Queensland generally.

Because of the stench and the effect on paintwork that I have mentioned, both the Town Planning Committee and the Queensland Housing Commission have condemned the area. I believe it is completely wrong to condemn areas in which people have built their homes and spent their lives, and any Government which stands by and allows the assets of people to be depreciated should take stock of its position and take action to see that the people concerned receive justice.

The effects of the creek's not flowing freely are also felt at Carina and Eight Mile Plains. A few years ago ground at Carina adjacent to the creek was sold for £500 or £600 an allotment. Neither the purchaser, the vendor, the city council, nor anyone else, complained. Behind that ground was another large area known as Mayfield Hill, on which the Mayfield school has been established. This ground was subdivided and sold and the water from the roads and gutters in that subdivision now flows into Bulimba Creek. Because of the mangroves that clutter up the mouth of the creek, the water cannot get away and the area becomes flooded in heavy rain. After the last heavy rain a doctor could not get into the area to visit a family that was in need of medical attention. Hon. members may recall that the last rain we had in Brisbane was heavy but not of long duration and the great volume of water could not get away. Farther up, towards the source of the creek, more estates are being developed and water is being channelled into the creek. All this is adding to the tendency to flooding and the next heavy rain we get in that area—that is, between the road to the South Coast and the mouth of the creek—will possibly cause flooding where there has not been flooding before.

We hear talk of development of Serpentine Creek—and I have no quarrel with that—but if the Government cleared this creek out it would overcome most of the problems and would enable them to put on the market industrial sites second to none in Brisbane. Already an oil refinery is to be started there and it will bring with it other chemical industries. As a result of those industries being established other smaller industries will start up as suppliers

to the major industries. At the present time, all the way from Lytton and Hemmant into Tingalpa or Murarrie, whichever way one may go, there is an abundance of land in need of reclamation work which could be done rather cheaply.

This creek has as many bends and twists as an intestine but if they are straightened out—and in some cases it can be done by driving through only a few yards without much effort—its total length could be reduced by at least 75 per cent. between Wynnum Road and the Brisbane River.

I know one of the Federal members who flew over that area a few years ago and I have seen the photographs taken on that occasion. I was astounded to see the large number of industrial sites that could become available there. I ask the Government not only to investigate the area but to get on with the job of reclamation as well.

Another difficulty has arisen over a mistaken belief on a problem associated with this creek. I said earlier that the Town Planning Committee had the mistaken belief that this creek and the area surrounding it should be allowed to stagnate because of the odour that emanates from it. The stench from the creek and the oxidation and discolouration caused by the gas coming from the water occur only to a certain height. If one is down near the level of the bed of the creek one gets the full effect but a few feet higher there is no effect at all. For instance, one could go a mile away from the creek to a low-lying area and, so to speak, cop the lot, yet a few yards from the creek at a higher level there is no smell at all. Unfortunately, the powers that be do not understand that; or, if they do, they have not given it much thought. Because of that, they have zoned the Murarrie district, or part of it, not suitable for residential purposes.

**Mr. Houghton:** Was that done in town planning?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** The whole district from Murarrie is virtually in two sections, separated by the railway line. The lower part is a Housing Commission area. From memory there are 166 houses in the area, 119 for rent and 47 being purchased. Those houses are affected by this problem arising from the creek. In Murarrie, towards the river between the railway line and Lytton Road—which is a higher area where there are very few Housing Commission homes but quite a number of privately-owned homes—that is, where the school is situated—the area has been declared in the proposed town plan as suitable for light industrial purposes. In other words the people who have homes there have been told, "You can have a factory built next door to your home and you cannot do anything about it." The worst feature of it is that vacant land on the other side of the main road, Queensport Road, contains 100 acres which should be made available

for housing, but the land has been condemned because of the mistaken belief that it is affected by the creek. That is far from the truth. I have here a subdivisional plan, for which the owners paid, which shows that 400-odd houses could be constructed there. Not only would the cleaning up of the creek be to the advantage of the people who are affected by it, but it would also remove the mistaken belief that the area not affected is affected. Here is open land less than five miles from the G.P.O., between the residential districts of Cannon Hill and Wynnum, which has been declared non-urban. Because of the town plan the people who own that land cannot do anything with it. I have a few examples here to show how the people are affected. In one case there is an area of 86 acres, with a bitumen road, water and electricity passing the door, which is available for either private housing or Housing Commission homes. The owners are prepared to negotiate with the Housing Commission. I am not interested in who buys this land, who sells it, or the price. I am interested in two things only: industrial development of the area and the comfort of the people concerned. Prior to the revaluation this area was valued at £1,305; its present valuation is £6,525. The owners cannot do anything with it. Who would want to buy it when it is zoned as non-urban land and cannot be used for any purpose? What justice is there when we hold back a district's development?

Without labouring the point I ask the Government, particularly the Department of Harbours and Marine, to stop passing the buck as to whose responsibility the area is and whose responsibility Bulimba Creek is. I maintain that the responsibility is completely the Government's. It would be in the interests of Brisbane and, indeed, the interests of the State, for the Government to investigate the position. I do not want to take up time now by giving detailed information, but if any departmental officer wants such information I shall be pleased to give it to him so that this area can grow, as it should grow, into a fully developed area.

**Mr. Windsor:** Do you think it would be a costly job?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I do not think it would be a costly job. The ground is low-lying, with no rock formation. The fact that there is a brickworks there indicates a solidness of earth, but that would enable an open drain or open-cut to go through. I have talked with people who have lived in the area for very many years and they have assured me that when tracks have been cut to drain their properties they have been quite successful. The Moonie pipeline will be going through this area very shortly. I suggest to the Government that if it wants to test the soil and check the type of soil the creek runs through, that would be a wonderful opportunity for doing so, without

cost. All that is needed is a man on the spot while the Moonie pipeline trench is being dug. In that way the Government would get an idea of how easy it is to make shortcuts to eliminate many of the bends in the creek.

There are a few other matters I should like to mention while I am on my feet. One concerns statements by hon. members who have spoken before me in this debate, particularly the hon. member for Nundah and the hon. member for Ashgrove who, on almost every occasion tell us that there are Communists under every chair and behind every bush. Earlier in the day it was strange to hear even the Minister for Transport implying that Communist white ants were at work. As we look across the Chamber we see the Treasurer with his large red carnation. I hope the hon. members to whom I refer do not think that because he wears a red carnation he too has been tainted by these alleged Communist activities.

**Mr. Davies:** Certainly he must be suspect.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** According to the arguments of the hon. members for Nundah and Ashgrove he must be suspect. If red ants, or white ants, are suspect then the Treasurer must be suspect. I am greatly concerned with these suggestions that everything that happens, and everyone who speaks or is associated with things that happen, is actuated by red influence. I am deeply concerned to hear the suggestions that everyone who supports the A.L.P., if he talks about some social improvement, is tainted, in some way or other, by some Communist influence.

**Mr. Ewan:** You do not think you should be judged by the company you keep?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** If I should be judged by the company I keep, then God help some hon. members of the Country Party. However, I will not embarrass the hon. member. As to the company I keep, I keep the company I believe I should keep; if anyone does not like it, that is too bad. I strongly object to the people who, by innuendo and insinuation, suggest that this person or that person is a Communist. If the hon. members concerned wish to make capital out of it, that is all right, but why take up the valuable time of the House abusing people who are often not in a position to reply? To make it worse, they use any item of news to try to gain their point.

The hon. member for Nundah particularly was worried because the Labour Party was not doing enough to rid Australia, and Queensland especially, of Communist influence. I ask him what the Liberal Party has ever done, over the years it has been in existence and we know that is not very long. It has done nothing. As the hon. member for Belmont reminds me, not one of its candidates has contested a union election. There are many of them in the

unions. In fact, members of my union have stood as Liberal Party candidates. Have they ever contested a seat on the union executive, the State council, or any other position? Of course not. There can be only one reason, namely, that they know full well there are no Communists in the union of which I am a member. They also know full well that the average worker does not accept that their political philosophy is interested in the welfare of the great majority of the people.

I believe that the Liberal Party does more to foster Communism than any other section of the community, what with its unemployment, its high prices and its shortage of housing. I could go on to give many more examples of the line of thought they are encouraging. After all, if people are frustrated, if they cannot get what they regard as their entitlement and if they feel the Government has let them down, they turn to other things. While we have a high ratio of unemployed—and, after all, one unemployed person is one too many—they must become disgruntled.

**Mr. Davies:** Holt said we must have a pool of unemployed.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** That is the general Liberal line, and no member of the Government has denied it at any stage.

I challenge the hon. member for Nundah and the hon. member for Ashgrove to tell us, when they next rise to speak, what they have done to overcome the Communist problem in Queensland, if they believe it to be as bad as they make out and if they believe so many people are associated with the party. But the last State election did not show that the Communist Party is growing in strength; rather it showed that it is decreasing as a political force.

It is strange that the Liberals make charges about the fostering of Communism throughout the world while at the same time they are not behind the door in selling wheat or some other product to Red China. At a school a few months ago I saw under a desk a tube of coloured pencils bearing the words "Made in Communist China". So some firm in Brisbane is trading with China.

**Mr. Sullivan:** Don't you think we should sell to China?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I do not say that at all. I know there is a difference between the Country Party and the Liberals. The hon. member will note that I blamed the Liberals. I know, as Mr. Holt says, that the coalition of the parties is like a marriage, but, like some marriages that hon. members know about, it is the Liberals who are wearing the pants.

**Mr. Hanson:** Red pants, too!

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I have no quarrel with selling commodities to countries where we can get payment because naturally we have to trade to exist; but I do not like the

hypocrisy of these members standing up in the Chamber and saying, "We want nothing to do with Communism; we shudder at the thought of fostering Communism in any shape or form", while the very conditions they are imposing on the people foster it and they support regimes outside Australia by trading with them.

The hon. member for Ashgrove complained about the "Four Corners" television programme. I did not see the programme so I will not enter into the debate on it; but from the way he spoke I wondered whether he was defending the Returned Soldiers' League and the way it was treated or whether he was defending some of his political friends who happen to be members of the Returned Soldiers' League. I think the latter was more the case. He did not seem to be very worried about the Returned Soldiers' League; he seemed to be more concerned about some of his own personal friends associated with it.

It is no good saying people do not use organisations, because over the years we have had Liberal Party candidates who have openly boasted, "Vote for me because of my association with these organisations."

If the hon. member for Ashgrove and the hon. member for Nundah are so concerned about Communism, I suggest they tell us something of what they have done to overcome the Communist menace.

One other matter that I wish to mention before resuming my seat is the provision of assembly halls at high schools. I have spoken on this subject on other occasions but I feel that one cannot speak on it too often. As all hon. members are aware, next year the new Queensland secondary-school syllabus will be introduced. In it are many references to practical examples of play-acting, meetings, and the like. Unfortunately there is, as our schools are built today, very little opportunity for all students to congregate in one area. In fact, so bad is it that most high schools today have their speech nights in the open air. Platforms, on which the invited guests and speakers sit, are erected in the school grounds.

I realise that the building of assembly halls would cost a great deal, but I still feel that the heart of a school should be the common place of meeting. The assembly hall should be not only a place of meeting but also a place of recreation. As the Minister for Education and Migration is now in the House, I take the opportunity of suggesting to him that officers of the Department of Education and of the Department of Public Works look into the possibility of building at high schools the stage portions of assembly halls, for a start. I am sure that full assembly halls could be planned but only the stage portions provided initially. The children would be able to practise on the stages, at their own schools, plays and the various other things wisely required by the syllabus, and the final performances for parents and visitors could be given in the open air.

I have noticed that one particular high school has endeavoured to carry on over the years by travelling some considerable distance to a private hall for the holding of its functions. However, the hall is not always available. The school produces a play and then finds that the hall has been booked by other public organisations.

I urge the Minister to give this matter serious consideration. I am sure that a method could be evolved by the Department of Public Works and the school committees by means of which these things could be obtained now. If the particular high school in which I am interested started to save for the building of an assembly hall, which I think is absolutely essential, it would be 15 years before we had sufficient capital to build it on our own. During that time there would be many other things to be provided. It is not the school itself that is being denied the use of such a facility, but the children attending it. Our main object should be to provide not only a building but one of a suitable type.

It may be said that a lot of classrooms and other things are required. It is not much use providing a syllabus of training, no matter how good, if it cannot be put into effect. It is no use merely suggesting that children should learn the works of Shakespeare and other writers. Is it not far better if they are able to turn small items into something worth while? I believe that that should become Government policy and be put into effect immediately.

**Mr. EWAN (Roma) (12.40 p.m.):** In speaking to the motion now before the House, I take the opportunity to reaffirm my personal loyalty and the loyalty of the people of the Roma electorate to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.

I express my sincere congratulations to His Excellency the Administrator, Sir Alan Mansfield, on his splendid address delivered at the opening of this, the first session of the Thirty-seventh Parliament of Queensland. The subject matter, covering the stewardship of this Government, clearly indicates the wonderful progress and development that have been achieved in almost every sphere of human endeavour and which are being reflected in the personal advancement and well-being of all sections of the community.

I also wish to extend to you, Mr. Speaker, my congratulations on your reappointment to the high office that you have occupied with great dignity and efficiency for the last three years. I take the opportunity, too, of extending my congratulations, through you, to the new Chairman of Committees, the hon. member for Greenslopes, Mr. Keith Hooper. I trust that he will enjoy the full co-operation of all members of this Assembly in his difficult task.

It was a pleasure to listen to the speeches of the new hon. members for Carnarvon and Mt. Coot-tha, who so ably moved and

seconded the motion now under discussion. I was also very impressed by the speech of the new hon. member for Clayfield, and I look forward to the maiden speech of the new hon. member for Mt. Gravatt. All the new hon. members on the Government side have indicated that they have a full understanding of their responsibilities and the overall requirements of the State. I wish them well and trust that they will enjoy long and rewarding terms in this Assembly.

On the Opposition side, I also congratulate the new hon. members for Port Curtis and Tablelands on their election. After having listened carefully to their maiden speeches, I should like to say that they have indicated that they have ability far in advance of that of most of the more experienced members of the Opposition in this Chamber. It seems to me that possibly it augurs well for future debates, because we might get at least some sense from the Opposition benches.

At this stage, Mr. Speaker, I wish to place on record my sincere thanks to the electors of the Roma electorate for continuing to repose their confidence in me as their Parliamentary representative, and I am deeply grateful to them for the solid mandate which they gave me on this occasion, representing 61 per cent. of the total votes cast as against 44 per cent. in the 1960 election.

I now intend to deal with several matters affecting the Roma electorate in particular. I shall endeavour not to do it in a parochial way, as seems to be the custom of hon. members opposite, but endeavour to tie in Roma's extensive proven and potential natural advantages with the overall State picture and as part of the unprecedented development of Queensland that has resulted from the sound administration of this Government since 1957.

The foundations of a greater Queensland have been laid, and it is our proud destiny that we should, with every means at our disposal, endeavour to establish sound economic industries on a well-balanced basis in the many areas of the State that lend themselves by natural advantages and capacity for development, rather than concentrate on a few areas which, because of population, demand preferential treatment. Let us, as a Government, continue to attract industry and capital by extending encouragement and incentive and the right of a fair return on an investment to people from all parts of Australia, and, indeed, from all the countries of the world practising democracy. That this has been our policy is evident from the great expansion of mining enterprises at Mt. Isa, Weipa, and Kianga-Moura; the decision by Comalco to build a £35,000,000 alumina plant at Gladstone; the discovery of oil at Moonie and Roma, the pipeline to Brisbane, and the establishment of oil refineries, and so on. All this has been done with private capital, enterprise, and know-how. We are definitely on the right track, and let nothing cause us to deviate from our course. Any

tendency to Government domination or undue interference with the ordinary course of private industry must be resisted at all costs if Queensland is to accelerate its development.

Rather than embark on one or two huge schemes of doubtful benefit, let us confine ourselves to the provision of roads, communications, schools, and hospitals, the protection of our natural resources, and just and equitable treatment of mankind by the provision of suitable housing and employment conditions. If we do that, I feel that this Government, and any Government, would be fulfilling its duty to the overall benefit of the State and its people.

A fine example of assistance to private industry was created in the Roma electorate—and on this point I wish to congratulate the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—by the provision of 25 houses for occupation by the employees of the Roma Meatworks Pty. Ltd. This company agreed to guarantee and accept responsibility for the payment of rent for a period of 10 years, including any periods of vacancy, and for maintenance costs other than those occasioned by fair wear and tear. The provision of these homes will enable the company, which employs approximately 110 men, to be assured of reasonable employment stability and employee contentment and desire for continuous employment.

Another fine example of Government assistance to industry is the provision of the beef-roads scheme which is now being undertaken. This will enable cattle from the Barkly Tableland, the Gulf, and the Peninsula to be transported to fattening areas and thence by road or rail to meatworks, as well as provide an outlet for starving stock in times of drought. This is a scheme for which I personally worked very hard from 1945 to 1950, when I was president of the Maranoa Grazier's Association, and in 1953 I made direct approaches to the Commonwealth Government, with the assistance of Sir Arthur Fadden and Mr. W. J. Brimblecombe, Federal member for Maranoa. In fact, I made several speeches in this House on the subject and they, of course, are recorded in "Hansard". Having myself failed, may I extend my congratulations and personal appreciation to this Government for its success, in the full knowledge that the beef-roads scheme will undoubtedly do more than any other possible course of action in increasing beef production to a substantial degree, as well as greatly curtailing drought losses from time to time. The whole of Queensland, and indeed Australia, will thereby greatly benefit.

These roads, together with other roads constructed by this Government, will also assist in wool and sheep production and will be the means of saving large numbers of sheep in drought periods. Let it not be forgotten, in the excitement of a rapidly developing State, that wool, sheep and cattle still remain the greatest sources of income

in this State, far exceeding that of any other commodity, particularly from an export-income point of view. Here are the figures issued by the Treasurer in Bulletin No. 20, dated August 1963: wool £61,874,000; mutton £5,689,000; beef £57,868,000; a grand total of £125,431,000. Their nearest competitor is sugar, with an estimated return of £100,000,000, but this estimate is based on the extraordinary circumstances presently prevailing on the overseas sugar market.

Another matter affecting sheep and wool production in the Roma electorate, as well as in all other sheep areas of the State, is the eradication of dingoes and wild dogs inside the barrier fence, which is almost 3,500 miles long and is now rapidly nearing completion. The basis of its construction is that the Government supplies the netting and other materials and the land-holder erects a skeleton fence and attaches the netting. He is paid approximately £8 a mile a year for maintenance. The land-holders pay an annual precept, which is collected by the local authority, to cover costs, etc. Unfortunately for the success of this scheme, apart from other defects, a considerable area of dog-infested country has been enclosed by the barrier fence. The dogs therein must be eliminated if any great benefit is to accrue from the scheme. There are many methods of doing this, but I believe the most effective is by group-netting within the barrier fence area so that owners will be able to concentrate on the complete and total destruction of all dogs within the areas that have been group-netted. This method was used very successfully when hundreds of holdings were netted in the late 1920's and early 1930's, extending from Mitchell right out to Quilpie and Cunnamulla, and right across to St. George. In those days, of course, the Government supplied us with netting wire, etc., under the Wire and Wire Netting Advances Act of 1933. The cost of supplying that netting was repayable over a period of 20 years. It was recouped in 20 annual instalments. If I remember correctly, the interest rate was somewhere about 4½ per cent. The annual instalments were a first charge on the property and they did not interfere at all with mortgages and the like. Unfortunately that scheme is not now operative; it has been out of use for some time. I claim unequivocally that, apart from the allowance of the cost of water provision as a taxation deduction, that scheme did more than anything else for the development of these areas.

We know full well that at the present time advances can be applied for through the Agricultural Bank, but this enables the land-holder to purchase netting, etc., only at retail prices, not direct from the manufacturer at wholesale prices. The difference is tremendous. Under the old scheme the Government bought its netting requirements direct from the manufacturer—Rylance or Lysaghts—at the wholesale price. With bulk

purchases of netting wire and all other requirements, including tie wire, barbed wire and the like, by the Government at wholesale prices, at present prices it would cost £257 to erect one mile of fencing. At the retail price that the land-holder would be compelled to pay it would cost him today £316 a mile, or £61 a mile more than he would have paid under the old scheme. Even on the smallest property, with about 10 miles of fencing, that would mean an additional £600. Even 30, 40 or 50 miles of fencing do not enclose the big areas out there. To enclose 30,000 acres takes about 40 miles of netting. It can be realised why the present system is unpopular and why there are so few applications for netting under these conditions. I would suggest that due consideration be given to the reintroduction of the provisions of the 1933 Wire and Wire Netting Advances Act, which would give impetus and incentive to those people within the present dingo barrier fence to form groups to bring about the destruction and complete elimination of dingoes and wild dogs inside their group-netted areas. That is the only way we will get more benefit from the construction of the present dingo barrier fence. My submission has the full support of public meetings held at Yuleba and Eumamurrin, in my electorate, and practical landholders have discussed it very fully with Mr. Brebner, the Superintendent of Stock Routes and Pest Destruction.

**Mr. Gaven:** They are with you all the way.

**Mr. EWAN:** I am very pleased to note that the hon. member for South Coast subscribes to that. He is a very experienced gentleman.

After many years of unremitting effort, and at great cost, oil has at last been discovered in the Roma electorate. In tests the Richmond No. 1 well, approximately 9 miles south of Roma, has produced 800 barrels a day. Many other wells are to be drilled and I venture to suggest that every hon. member in the Chamber and, indeed, everyone in Queensland, and Australia, joins with me in expressing the fervent hope that these efforts will meet with unqualified success. Should success be achieved in proving the apparently unlimited natural-gas resources in the Roma and Injune areas economic, it will call for the highest expert investigation as to its use commercially in the area of its source, or as near as possible to it. As is well known, the Roma electric authority is using the natural gas from the Timbury Hill well for generation purposes and, in a short time, will be supplying electricity to Mitchell, Muckadilla, Amby, Surat, Wallumbilla, and other towns down as far as Yuleba, as well as a considerable number of rural areas in the Roma electorate. It is confidently expected that with the use of natural gas the Roma powerhouse will be able to supply electricity at a much cheaper rate per unit than any other

powerhouse in Queensland. If this is so in actual fact, the project will lend itself to State-wide distribution similar to the Snowy River project, which is now feeding electricity to the border towns of New South Wales and Queensland.

Last Thursday I listened carefully and attentively to the hon. member for Townsville South when he dealt with cotton production in the Fitzroy River basin. He quoted at length from a case prepared by the Rockhampton and District Regional Research and Promotion Bureau which, I understand, has been submitted to the Government for consideration. The hon. member, with great courtesy, made this case available to me for my consideration and I am deeply indebted to him for it. He made a splendid address in accordance with the information supplied to him by the bureau. I am delighted that he has been sufficiently interested in the welfare of the State to help me to assist my people by submitting the whole case to me for my consideration. Apart from my appreciation of the efforts of local bodies of enthusiastic people espousing a cause for the advancement of their particular towns or districts, my deep interest in the whole matter stems from the fact that the Nathan Gorge dam site, north of Taroom, is in my electorate. I have personally inspected the site and, in conjunction with many Taroom landholders with vast local experience, I have considered its probable effect—both economic and physical—on the district's welfare and industry, in the knowledge that vast areas, including the greater part of the Taroom township, would be submerged if the proposed dam was built, and remembering that it constituted a threat to the advancement of the town for a considerable number of years. This threat was somewhat lessened with the advent of the present Government in 1957. Since then, Taroom and the surrounding district have enjoyed spectacular development and progress unparalleled in their history.

I was very impressed by the dissertation of the hon. member for Rockhampton South and by the views of the Rockhampton and District Regional Research Promotion Bureau, headed by Mr. M. A. South and Mr. F. S. Rudd, as chairman and manager. I would perhaps have shared their enthusiasm had it not been for the fact that since my boyhood days, during World War I and shortly afterwards, I saw thousands of acres planted with cotton in abortive attempts to establish cotton-growing as an economic industry, both with and without irrigation, in the Warwick, Inglewood, Yelarbon, Texas and Goondiwindi districts. In later years I saw, a similar attempt at St. George under irrigation. More recently, in the last few years, I have seen attempts to establish it at Wandoan and Taroom. Most of these attempts have proved abortive and those that could have been classed as somewhat successful could only be regarded as very doubtful propositions economically. Of

course, I admit that, with the scientific advances in agriculture that have taken place in latter years, it is possible that this line of thinking will be altered; but, as a practical man, I would want to see small-scale, long-term experiments carried out before agreeing to any such large-scale expenditure as on the construction of the £40,500,000 Fitzroy irrigation scheme embracing the Nathan Gorge Dam near Taroom and also the Nogoia Dam near Emerald.

It is indeed interesting to note that this Government has given an American company—the Southern Cross Cotton Co., I understand—the go-ahead to try to produce cotton on a 600-acre lease in the St. George area. My good friend and colleague Mr. Beardmore, the hon. member for Balonne, would know all about this. I understand they are to establish 80 acres of cotton in the first year and at least 150 acres thereafter. The principals are reputed to be very experienced and practical Californian cotton-growers and I would suggest that their efforts will be very, very closely watched as, if they are successful, it could lead to the establishment of cotton as an important crop on the 12,000 acres capable of irrigation in the St. George area.

I understand that great efforts were made to grow cotton on the existing irrigation areas of Theodore and Gibber Gunyah. Unfortunately, they could not be classed as successful. Of course, those areas are situated in the Fitzroy basin. I would suggest—and give my wholehearted support to—the carrying out of long-term experiments in those areas by practical and experienced cotton agriculturists in an effort to determine once and for all whether it could become a practical and economic industry in those areas. From information that has been supplied to me about the Gibber Gunyah scheme, I understand that the total cost for water alone for the 17 farmers settled there worked out at anything from £20,000 to £25,000 a farm. I have been further informed on fairly reliable authority that it has been proved uneconomic under the existing methods and conditions applying to the growing of cotton in those areas. In fact, many of the farms are for sale. If my informant is correct, I understand that one of these farms, after being adjusted by this Government on a more economic basis than existed when the Labour Party introduced this scheme, has been sold for approximately £12,000, and there are quite a few on the market now. To my way of thinking, this indicates that the farmers there are not very happy with their prospects.

Some years ago, at the request of practical men, I inspected the Theodore irrigation scheme where it was decided to grow cotton. On the advice of theorists, it was surveyed under the Labour Government into irrigation blocks of 12, 15, 17, and 28 acres. Of course, it was a colossal failure. A cheese factory was built there but it had to be closed because adequate supplies of milk could not be maintained.

On reading through this case so admirably prepared by the Rockhampton District Regional Research and Promotion Bureau, I find on page 11 that the capital investment necessary to finance their proposed irrigation scheme is £40,500,000. Of course, they admit that this figure is beyond the resources of the Queensland Government, but they very conveniently say that approaches could be made to the Commonwealth Government to find this money and finance the whole scheme. On page 13 it is stated that the scheme involves the establishment of 621 farms, and on pages 9 and 10 it is claimed that 230,000 acres would be irrigated. The area of each farm would thus be approximately 370 acres.

With a capital expenditure of £40,500,000, each farm, for water alone, would be capitalised at £65,217. That is without homes, fencing, machinery, stock, &c. Surely this must appear to anyone's mind an impossible economic proposition. Even if interest and redemption were to be made over a period of 100 years, it still could not be economic. In view of what I have said, is it any wonder that I have received many telegrams of protest from my constituents in the Taroom district? Here are a few examples—

"Bitter protest throughout district to South's mention Nathan Gorge front page Country Life March 28th."

"Entire district seeking information Government plan Nathan Gorge. Business retarded progress halted."

"In view of Government latest decision re Nathan Gorge we seek information of scheme because of extensive finance invested in Taroom-Wandoan districts."

Let me now indicate the feelings of the people in the Taroom district. Here is a letter that I have received from responsible people, whom I shall name—

"Following our telegram re Nathan Gorge, we write to you to further explain our protest to Mr. South's £40,000,000 project for Rockhampton and Fitzroy Basin Scheme.

"It would appear in South's ambition and ego to make Rockhampton a large and very important city in the history of Queensland through the Fitzroy Basin, he is insensible of the great natural potential and production of the Upper Dawson, or in other words, the Taroom-Wandoan area.

"Mr. South states, 'The Fitzroy Basin is already the premier beef cattle and cotton growing area in Australia.' If this is so, why make an attempt to dam the Dawson River at the Nathan Gorge which would inundate thousands of acres of first class grazing and farming lands and deprive Queensland of some of the best beef, wool and grain that is produced in Australia?"

"We already have an example of an irrigation scheme in the Lower Dawson; namely Theodore. However, as we have no desire to make any disparaging comments

about our neighbouring town, it is suggested that an invitation be issued to Mr. South and any other person desirous of damming the Nathan Gorge to visit Theodore and inspect the irrigation project and then travel on to Taroom and Wandoan and inspect the grazing and farming lands of these districts and the great potential of the Upper Dawson.

"Sir, to give you some idea of the production of this area and what effect the Nathan Gorge dammed up would have on the fattening areas. For twelve months ending March, 1963, 42,000 fat cattle passed through the clearing dip at Wandoan and for the same period, a grand total of 82,300 went through the dip; most of these cattle are then railed to their destination, store cattle going as far as Beaudesert.

"Now, then, let us for a moment assume that the Dawson River was dammed at Nathan Gorge and these hundreds of thousands of acres of grazing and farming lands went under water, what we ask you, 'What would happen to Wandoan as a beef fattening district, also the beef fattening areas of Taroom that are growing in number every year; also those cattle areas that have to buy ticky cattle close to their markets?' Wandoan and many other large and noted cattle centres draw their cattle from the Taroom markets, which, by the way, is one of the best cattle store markets in Queensland.

"As mentioned elsewhere, we not only produce high quality beef, but also wool and grain of the highest standard; now, then, if these valuable commodities can be produced off dry areas, 'How much more could be produced with irrigation?'

"If there is finance to be spent on irrigation, let it be spent wisely. Why inundate good pasture and farming lands when it could be put to greater production, and this could be achieved by a series of small weirs in the Upper Dawson catchment area.

"We trust, Sir, that our protest to any attempt to dam the Nathan Gorge will be read in the House, printed in 'Hansard,' and that wise counsel will at all times prevail in this matter of the Nathan Gorge. We can assure you that any attempt to interfere with our lands that have won fame throughout the State will be bitterly objected to by all residents of Taroom and Wandoan districts and those cattlemen from other districts who have for years purchased their store and fat cattle requirements from Taroom.

"There are graziers who are anxious to improve their property, particularly for cultivation, with the object of crop fattening, but, with this Nathan Gorge scheme hanging over their heads, they are afraid to make any attempt at such because it may be a large amount of finance and labour wasted. There is no

doubt that the talk and press reports of this Nathan Gorge is holding back the progress of this excellent district. Surely something can be done to encourage progress and not retard it.

"Yours faithfully,

- (Sgd.) Thos. J. Carroll, President,  
Taroom Progress Association;
- " G. Baird, Secretary, Taroom Progress Association;
- " J. Hendry, Manager, A. W. Adam & Sons, Merchants;
- " S. M. Staines, President, Graziers' Association, Taroom;
- " W. Kearnan, Secretary, Taroom Branch, Queensland Country Party;
- " R. V. Kallquist, President, Taroom Sub-branch, R.S.S.A.I.L.A."

I believe in irrigation, but it must be practical and economical, not associated with huge, spectacular schemes that are recommended without a full consideration of their implications or the justification for embarking upon them. It must be generally accepted that a certain amount of absorption of existing settlements and road systems can be expected in irrigation schemes, but cognisance must be taken of the area capable of irrigation and its true potential. It is also necessary to compare the potentialities of the irrigable area with those of the area that must necessarily be submerged.

I believe that the adoption of smaller and less spectacular schemes than that envisaged at Nathan Gorge would give far better results over the years. It is contended by practical men who have lived on the Dawson over the last 40 years that there is an area of 84,000 acres in the Taroom district capable of irrigation by the construction of smaller and more economic dams at Hornet Bank, Palm Tree Creek, and Robinson Creek, that is much superior to anything that will be irrigated if the present proposals are proceeded with. Furthermore, water from these smaller dams would be available to irrigate great areas of land farther down the Dawson near Rockhampton.

All I ask on behalf of my Taroom constituents is that their statements and contentions be investigated fully and fairly before any decision is arrived at in conformity with suggestions submitted by the Rockhampton and District Regional Research and Promotion Bureau. In making this valid and reasonable request, may I indicate to the House the publicity that this Bureau is receiving in the Rockhampton Press. I have here a great volume of Press cuttings relating to a meeting which 70 people attended. It was given great publicity, and statements and requests that the Commonwealth Government be asked to embark on this scheme were fully reported.

May I now be permitted to ask why, with all these voluminous Press reports, the hon. member for Mackenzie, who was present at the meeting, did not get the same publicity? It must be remembered that the whole of the area envisaged in the Nathan Gorge Scheme is in his electorate. Why were his remarks not quoted?

The hon. member for Mackenzie said that he would not agree to give this scheme his blessing until it had been the subject of a full-scale, top-level investigation covering all aspects of the proposals. In other words, he said he would support irrigation development, or any other development for that matter, which had a sound basis in a scheme that would not place people in the same position as the farmers in the Gibber Gunyah area. Surely that is a sound and proper approach to the whole problem, and in those circumstances I join fully and unequivocally with the stand by the hon. member for Mackenzie.

Before I conclude, I should like to discuss one other matter in the limited time at my disposal. It is the provision of a very necessary road from Injune through Arcadia, which is now being developed as part of the Fitzroy Basin scheme, and right up to the road that runs across to Rolleston. That would enable people at Arcadia to have access to one of the best markets in Queensland.

It might interest members of the Rockhampton and District Regional Research and Promotion Bureau to know that cattle from their area can be, and are being, marketed at the Roma meatworks, after all transport costs have been paid, at approximately £2 to £3 a head better than can be obtained from the sale of the same cattle at Rockhampton.

So, it comes back to my remarks that no Government should be stampeded into a proposal merely because of a welter of propaganda, unless it is practical and economic. I sincerely hope that full consideration will be given to the contentions expressed by me today on behalf of my constituents in the Taroom and Wandoan districts.

**Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee)** (2.33 p.m.): First of all, I wish to ally myself with the expressions of loyalty made by other hon. members to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth and also to express loyalty to the electors of Nudgee who have returned me once again as their representative in no uncertain manner. It is also on their behalf that I extend the pledge of loyalty to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth.

I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your return to office, not only because of the high honour of that office but because I feel that anyone who runs the gauntlet of selection in the Country-Liberal Parties and comes out unscathed is deserving of all the congratulations one can muster.

To the new members on both sides of the House I extend my congratulations on their efforts so far. I am particularly pleased with the speeches of the new recruits to the ranks of the Opposition, the hon. member for Port Curtis and the hon. member for Tablelands. I am particularly pleased at the speech of the hon. member for Tablelands because in the last session of the previous Parliament the then member for Tablelands, in his final speech, reminded me of a similar speech that he made in similar circumstances in the Federal House. When he made his last speech in the final session of the previous Parliament I said that it could be his farewell to this House. Events have proved that forecast to be true because he was well and truly defeated by the present hon. member for Tablelands.

The hon. member for Gregory shed crocodile tears on behalf of the graziers and pastoralists of Queensland, as did also the hon. member for Roma. In all their speeches those hon. members sing a song of woe for the pastoralists and graziers. Following the speech of the hon. member for Gregory, I took note of the estates left by various graziers and pastoralists during the last couple of months. As far as can be ascertained, the list I prepared indicates that, despite the complaints and grievances expressed by Country Party members, no grazier ever dies a poor man. I will not give the names of the various deceased graziers, but this list shows that respectively they left personal estates of £114,000, £86,168, £52,986, £54,879, £296,235 with a realty of £184,000-odd, and £186,185. If any person in any section of the community leaves this life with assets worth hundreds of thousands of pounds, I do not think we need waste any time sympathising with him on the hard life he has lived. Instead we should shed tears for the many workers who are in receipt of the age pension when they die. Despite the remarks of various hon. members on the other side, it is quite apparent that one section of the community has no financial worries. On this side we are vitally concerned with the many people throughout the State who are reduced to poverty. Every action of ours, and every speech made in this Chamber, is directed towards bringing the plight of the ordinary person in the community to the notice of the Government. Not always, but very often what we say falls on deaf ears. By some means or other they are the people who will eventually control the future of this country.

At all times this Government boasts of its efforts to bring about the development of the State, but nowhere are we able to find any legislation enacted by it that has been directed to, or has resulted in, the development of the State. The Government has been very fortunate during the last 12 months. It would appear that certain developments in this State will result in a

certain amount of prosperity, but this will not come as the result of activities or legislation of the Government.

**Mr. Armstrong:** What has done it?

**Mr. MELLOY:** I will tell the hon. member in due course. Government members are simply jumping on the bandwagon. The Government is living from day to day on the development of the State and is not initiating any work or industry that will result in further development.

**Mr. Armstrong:** Nonsense!

**Mr. MELLOY:** It is not nonsense. Members of the Government should come down out of the clouds and develop the State by legislation and by example. The Premier should face the facts of life, particularly political life. He should realise that there is more to governing the State of Queensland than sitting in his chair waiting to keep social engagements. The country needs dynamic leadership, which it is not getting. It is not sufficient for the Premier to come into the House occasionally to make official pronouncements. We have only to look around at the Cabinet Ministers on the front bench.

**Mr. Sherrington:** There are none here.

**Mr. MELLOY:** That point is well taken. When they are here we can look round at those on the front bench trying to impress the people of the State with pronouncements and announcements, but not with any action. They have tried to claim credit for many of the developments in the State, most of which have come about by natural processes, such as the discovery of oil, the discovery of bauxite, and the discovery of excellent deposits of coal. They were not put there by members of the Government nor were they developed by members of the Government, but Government members hop on the bandwagon and point to these things as showing how they have developed Queensland. Many projects that are of very doubtful value to the State have been sponsored by the Government. The Liberal member for Mt. Coot-tha hit the nail on the head in his speech. He was reported as follows—

"The Liberal Party's rural committee chairman told State Parliament yesterday that proper development of North Australia was much more than a matter of 'screaming to the Commonwealth for unknown millions of pounds to spend on spectacular but futile projects which sooner or later must blow up in our faces'."

That is true of many of the projects that have been sponsored by this Government.

**Mr. Armstrong:** You said only a moment ago it was unsponsored.

**Mr. MELLOY:** The hon. member is telling me that I said previously that this Government has done nothing.

**Mr. Armstrong:** That is right.

**Mr. MELLOY:** I said that this Government had done nothing to ensure the future development of the State. The statement that I have just read confirms my submission because the inference from it is that the Government has sponsored projects that are likely to blow up in our faces at a later date.

This State will develop in the next few years, not as a result of the Government's efforts or the administration of Queensland by the Country Party-Liberal coalition, but purely as a result of money coming into the State from overseas. They are the people who will develop the resources of the State, and the members of the Government will jump on the bandwagon and attempt to take credit for it. Overseas investors are looking to Queensland as a place for investment mainly because of the disturbed state of other countries and investments in them. Through developments in places like Egypt, where their assets have been nationalised or taken over by the Government, they have been forced to seek fresh fields and they feel that in Queensland, where at least we have a democratic system of government, their investments and their money will be safe. This Government is taking the credit for the influx of that foreign capital. If it were not for the influx of foreign capital, this Government would be crying out to the Commonwealth for more money, as it did in the past three years.

Incidentally, while I am on that—we had, according to the Treasurer, a surplus of £70,000-odd in the last 12 months. How fortuitous for this Government was the Commonwealth Government's special grant of £3,500,000 to £4,500,000 for the relief of unemployment! If it had not been for that money and if they had had to rely on the income and expenditure they had budgeted for, they would have had a deficit of £2,000,000 or £3,000,000 instead of that surplus. It was the special grant from the Commonwealth Government that saved them and not any legislation or administration of their own.

The Premier and his Ministers have shown a great propensity for making grandiose statements about the State's development. But where have all these things led? Let us consider some of them. In 1957, when this Government took office, the Minister for Labour and Industry, Mr. Morris, drafted a five-year plan for the development of the State. Today, six years later, we are only just recovering to a degree from a severe attack of unemployment. At the end of the five-year plan Queensland was the State with the highest percentage of unemployment in the Commonwealth. What happened to Morris's five-year plan that was going to develop Queensland?

Later, the Premier, Mr. Nicklin, when addressing the Central and North Queensland Graziers' Association, stated that "a halt had been called to the haphazard

development of the State". "In future" he said, "Queensland and its people would know where they were going." He said the keynote of future development would be decentralisation of population and, with it, industrial expansion. Let us have a look at this decentralisation of population. The latest figures from the Commonwealth Statistician show that between December, 1960, and December, 1962, the Brisbane metropolitan population increased by 59,075. In the same period, the population of the remainder of the State decreased by 10,716. The Premier said that we were going to have a decentralised population, and added that the people of Queensland would now know where they were going. They certainly knew where they had to go; they had to leave the country areas and migrate to the city in search of employment which, on reaching there, they found unfortunately did not exist. All that, was caused by the failure of the Government to take any positive or constructive action to cope with the problem of rising unemployment in this State.

Mr. Morris was always a great one for making very profound statements on the development of Queensland. On 25 May, 1959, he burst into the headlines with this statement—

"Things moving today would bring Queensland to the greatest industrial development it had known."

He then went on to say—

"This would be borne out by the end of 1959."

Those plans must have gone astray somewhere because it will be remembered that the end of 1959 saw the beginning of the drift into the slough of unemployment experienced over the next couple of years.

Like every other Minister and hon. member on the other side of the House, Mr. Morris was never daunted, and in February, 1962, he set up a committee of eight wise men to "really put Queensland on the industrial map". After the first meeting of that committee the Minister soared into the seventh heaven of enthusiasm when he described that meeting as "the most inspiring I have ever attended". We heard of the appointment of this committee of eight wise men, but we have heard or seen nothing of any results achieved by it. It was just another attempt by the Government to govern by committee, having realised their inability to do so themselves. Despite their telling the people that the Liberal and Country Parties were composed of business men who would administer and control the State in a businesslike manner, it did not take them very long to realise that they were not the astute business men that they thought they were. They found that they were not so capable of running the State, and began almost immediately to bring in outside bodies for advice and assistance.

The Government went even further with this policy of government by committee in engaging the services of an overseas organisation for an economic intelligence survey of the State. This cost £8,000, and where are the results? This step merely showed, despite the potential and natural resources of the State, the Government's inability to govern, even with the assistance and advice of experts brought from all over Australia and from overseas.

After having this economic survey conducted, why was it not acted upon? Perhaps the findings were not to the liking of the Government. But that was not the end of it, and I can, and shall, continue because I want to illustrate the inability of the Government to govern the State and show the extent to which it has relied on outside sources for advice which is not necessarily followed.

A survey of possible secondary industries was made for the Government in 1962 by the Hunter Valley Research Foundation. Again we have heard nothing of the results of that investigation, so perhaps the Government is ignoring the advice given to it by the Foundation.

To give a further instance, in July last year the Commonwealth Government's expert on secondary industries, Mr. F. J. McGuinness, was seconded to the Queensland Department of Labour and Industry in an attempt to increase investment in secondary industries in this State. What has happened to Mr. McGuinness's recommendations? Is he still investigating? The people of Queensland know nothing about his investigations, nor has this House been told anything about them. We can accept, I think, that any recommendations that he does make to the Government will be pigeon-holed, as have been the recommendations made to it by every other outside body of advisers.

All this points to one thing: that the Government is not capable of governing and is incapable of accepting or benefiting from the advice given to it by experts and organisations imported specially to give it advice. After all these investigations by experts, the manager of the Queensland Chamber of Manufactures, in commenting upon the great increase in the quantity of manufactured goods being imported into Queensland from other States, said—

"The Chamber of Manufactures believes that the State's general and industrial development has been held back too long through the Queensland Government's inability to realise what must be done to attract industries."

After all the claims that have been made by the Government about the industrial development that is taking place in Queensland, there we have the leader of the Queensland Chamber of Manufactures criticising and condemning the Government for its failure to attract industry to this State.

I wish to refer now to the Sydney Trade Fair. Queensland had a section, or an exhibit, at that fair. If the State is to take part in trade fairs, it should do so properly or not at all, and in my opinion the Queensland section at the Sydney Trade Fair was not properly established or conducted. When we take part in a trade fair, we do so for one of several purposes—to advertise the State, to attract industries to the State, or to seek business. If we have to compete with nations from all over the world—that is big business—we should not go into it half-heartedly as we did recently in Sydney. I think the other Australian States realised the importance of the trade fair and stayed out of it. Western Australia was the only other State to exhibit at the Sydney Trade Fair and its section left the Queensland section for dead. I do not like criticising work done by the State in matters of that sort, but, as I said, if we are to do something, let us do it properly.

That section of the State Fair would have done nothing whatever for Queensland. It certainly would not have attracted business from the other States of Australia in competition with other sections that were set up by overseas nations. Queensland could not possibly compete with the United States, Japan, or European countries, in the exhibits they had in the Sydney Trade Fair. Unless we can do better next time, for goodness sake let us keep out of it and restrict our efforts to more orthodox ones, or, if we are going to engage in these trade exhibits, let us go overseas and do it. We could not compete against southern States or other nations because they were there to sell and not to buy. Queensland had nothing she could sell them and they were not interested in buying from Queensland; they were interested only in selling their own goods.

Over the last three or four years this Government has been relying on three or four projects in the State to bolster the view that it is developing Queensland. Let us look at the four major undertakings for which it claims credit. The first is the Mt. Isa railway rehabilitation scheme, which was commenced by the Australian Labour Party and financed by the Commonwealth Government, not by the Queensland Government. The Queensland Government cannot claim any credit for that scheme. Queensland has provided the labour for it, but that is all.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, that you appear slightly amused but I can assure you that the House is not amused and the State is not amused at the shortcomings of this Government.

**Mr. Smith** interjected.

**Mr. MELLOY:** The hon. member would not be able to come by anything.

Another matter for which the Government is claiming credit is the beef-roads scheme in North Queensland. What have

these roads done for Queensland up to this stage, and what credit can this Government take because of them? These roads have been under criticism for the last few months. It has been said that they are not of such a substantial construction as to stand up to continued use, and I understand that some of the grazing interests are not using them but prefer instead to send their stock overland to railheads. They are not using the roads that have been provided.

**Mr. Lloyd:** And they tell me they are costing substantial sums for maintenance.

**Mr. MELLOY:** That is so. As I pointed out, the construction of these roads is faulty, and a severe wet season will play havoc with them.

Similarly, the Government cannot claim credit for the discovery of bauxite and substantial sources of coal. What is the good of this Government claiming credit for the discovery or development of these resources? They are all being developed by overseas capital and, as I said before, this Government is purely and simply jumping on the band wagon in these projects.

The same thing will happen with oil. I noticed in the Press the other day that a royalty of 10 per cent. is to be collected at the well head. It could not be collected at any lower source from an income point of view than at the well head. That has been the experience overseas. Any number of things can happen when the royalty is levied at the well head. For example, we could have the Nicklin-Evans Co. developing the oil field and bringing oil to the surface, and then selling it to the Nicklin-Noble Pipeline Co. They, in turn, could sell it to the Nicklin-Munro Refining Co.

I do not say that these will be the figures; they are given merely as an illustration. The point is that they can sell it at the well head for about 2s. 0d. a barrel, and after a series of swaps or sales down the line the refining company can sell it back to the Nicklin-Evans Distributing Co. for about 6s. 0d. a barrel who, in turn, will sell it to the public at about £50 a barrel. The Nicklin-Evans Co., although they will be selling it to the refinery at 2s. 0d. a barrel, will be subsequently selling it to the public at an enormous profit. That is what is happening overseas. It is a matter that the Government should take a very close look at in order to find the most advantageous point of sale in the production and distribution of oil.

The Government claims credit for the development of the Fitzroy Basin. Here we have the same position again. The development of that area will not benefit the State as a whole, nor will it benefit to any great extent the ordinary person in the community. Again, the money for the development of this area has come from the Commonwealth Government. Already there is some doubt about the success of the development of the

area as some of those who went onto the land are now moving off it. We still do not know whether the scheme will come to fruition or whether it will be another one of those projects mentioned the other day by the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha.

The State needs initiative, brains and great energy for its development. The Government has provided none of these. Everything it touches seems to be only half done. The Minister for Labour and Industry is to spend £180,000 on the Normanby intersection. He might as well spit in the ocean. To relieve the traffic problem at the Normanby skilful engineering planning is required. One has only to look at what has been done with road junctions in America to realise what should be done at the Normanby intersection. In five years' time any improvements made with the £180,000 will be worthless. We will have a few additional roads and traffic lights, but that is not the solution to the problem. A series of tunnels would be a much better solution, but I fear that we are going to have even greater congestion after the £180,000 has been spent.

As my time has almost expired I will have to rush through two other matters I wanted to deal with—the Herberton Hospital inquiry and the purging of the electoral rolls. I have read the report of the Herberton Hospital Committee of Inquiry. As a result, I would say that the expense incurred in holding the inquiry was an absolute waste. Money was wasted by the Government and the inquiry also imposed considerable expense on other organisations in the State, too. I understand that it cost the nurses' association about £4,500 in legal fees. That is entirely wrong. The whole problem could have been solved by the Minister in the very early stages. If he had acted promptly I think he could have averted the trouble at Herberton.

**Mr. Smith:** If you were on the inquiry would you have given a different report from those furnished?

**Mr. MELLOY:** In the very early stages I would have transferred both people concerned at Herberton to different hospitals. That would have been the solution. It was obviously a personal problem.

**Dr. Noble:** The Minister would not have the power to do that. That power rests with the board.

**Mr. MELLOY:** The Minister could have exercised his power. He knows full well what happens in a hospital like that. He knows the relationship that springs up between doctors, nurses, and sisters.

**Dr. NOBLE:** I rise to a point of order. I think the hon. member is imputing an improper motive.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** My attention was diverted by the Opposition Whip and I did not hear the remark passed by the hon. member. If he has made a disparaging remark about the Minister I ask him to withdraw it.

**Mr. MELLOY:** If I did, I will be only too pleased to withdraw it. I said that the Minister was aware of the relationship that developed between doctors, nurses and sisters. It happens in private practice. Medical men and other professional men and their assistants reach a personal relationship where they refer to each other by Christian names and so on. I worked in hospitals for a number of years with medical and dental men, and I know the relationship that exists. My point is that it is all right so long as the relationship is on a personal basis. However, the trouble occurs when someone turns nasty. That is what happened at Herberton. For some months each party in the dispute developed a following in the hospital, and it spread into the township. That should never have been allowed to develop. The Minister should have intervened long before that stage was reached. The solution would have been to transfer the parties involved at a very early stage.

(Time expired.)

**Dr. DELAMOTHE (Bowen) (3.15 p.m.):** I should like to reiterate once more the expression of the feelings of loyalty held by the people of my area in North Queensland.

I should also like to wish the Governor well in the well-earned holiday that he is at present enjoying. We look forward to his return next month when he will once more be among us carrying out his official duties.

I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your reappointment and I congratulate the new Minister on his election to the front bench. I congratulate the new Chairman of Committees, and, finally, all those new hon. members from the various parties who are making their first appearance in the House after the election. I believe, after listening to their maiden speeches, that they will be an adornment to the House and that they will add something to the deliberations of this Assembly.

At this stage it is customary to comment upon some of the remarks of the preceding speaker, but I am very much afraid that he is just a poor, mixed-up kid who should attend Professor Trackeray's School for Labour Politicians in Rockhampton. The previous speaker complained, of course, that this Government had done nothing, but he complained in the next breath that too much money was coming in from outside sources, including the Commonwealth Government.

**Mr. Melloy:** Yes, but this Government cannot claim credit for that.

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** There is such a thing as creating a climate for investment, which has never existed before in the history of Queensland.

**Mr. Melloy:** You did not create the oil or the bauxite.

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** I remind the hon. member, who got his electioneering speech mixed up with his Address-in-Reply speech,

of all the extra finance, and works flowing from that finance, such as the things he mentioned, which he said the Government had nothing whatsoever to do with. That, of course, is a complete misapprehension on his part, and I do not think it calls for any answer from me because I have a lot of important things to say.

First of all, I congratulate the Premier on the speed with which he came to the defence of North Queensland when it was pointed out to him that appearing in the Commonwealth Year Book for several years had been a very erroneous criticism of the North. Apparently this criticism arose from an article in a medical journal by Professor H. K. Lee, late Professor of Physiology at the University of Queensland—an article written from a purely physiological angle. It was seized on by a person unknown and it appeared for a considerable period in the Commonwealth Year Book. Long ago, of course, it should have been expunged from it because the same Professor in 1947—just seven years after this physiological article—wrote a book entitled “Human Climatology and Tropical Settlement,” and he summed up his conclusions in 1947 on the social aspects of climatology in the words of Omar Khayyam—

“Myself when young did eagerly frequent  
Doctor and Saint, and heard great  
argument

About it and about; but evermore  
Came out by the same door wherein I  
went.”

This change from physiological assessment to experienced doubt came about, of course, as a result of the experiences of hundreds of thousands of service men who were stationed in tropical areas in North Queensland and New Guinea during the war period. This gave physiologists and researchers a vast field of material from which to assess the effect of climate on a white population. That, of course, was not necessary because for 100 years white people have been living in North Queensland. They have been working, raising families, and living into happy and healthy old age. If that were not enough, since the beginning of this century the sugar industry in North Queensland has been based entirely on the use of white labour.

I do want to take this opportunity of backing the Premier in his defence of the North and to congratulate him upon it, because we in the North, although very hard-shelled and able to take a lot of criticism, are sensitive to criticism of the excellence of our natural attributes.

**Mr. Hanlon:** What do you think of the Premier's suggestion that we should examine the importation of Asiatics for the North?

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** I do not believe that that statement was ever made by the Premier.

**Mr. Hanlon:** That is exactly what he said.

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** I should now like to express some of my thoughts on the development of North Queensland. Because it is a subject on which there has been discussion up and down the country, I believe it is right that somebody from North Queensland should express publicly his point of view, and there is no more public place than this parliamentary Chamber.

Throughout North Queensland there are devoted people gathered together in research and promotion bureaus and similar organisations, searching for, and assessing, the attributes of their particular areas. As the previous speaker so well pointed out, Government instrumentalities have reinforced this local interest, and together a whole mass of useful information, on which development can be based, has been collected. However, I think that we have to look at things as they are. Much as we want secondary industries, just as every other part of the State desires and works for them, I believe that we have to look at North Queensland sensibly and realise that up till now it has depended for its undoubted wealth entirely on the products of primary industries or the industries associated with the processing of those products, including minerals. These industries have been prosperous and wealth-producing for not only individuals but also the State, as a very large proportion of the earnings of North Queensland finds its way, via the Federal Treasury, back into the hands of the State Treasurer. Industries such as the sugar, wool, cattle and mining industries in North Queensland all contribute very greatly to the surplus of exports over imports that assists not only to support South-east Queensland but also to provide finance for machinery and raw materials for industrialised States in the South.

We are very fortunate in North Queensland in being equipped, through the agency and planning of the present Government, with a great power grid, capable of supplying far more than our present-day requirements, which is a basic need in attracting industry of any kind. Only last Saturday the Premier opened the hydro-electric power station which is the latest milestone in the development of the Barron River Hydro-Electric Extension Project. The next step in the expansion of electricity supplies will be taken in my own electorate, and preliminary preparations are already being made for a coal-fired power station at Collinsville. Because of the very large coal deposits in the area, it seems quite certain that this first powerhouse, large as it is, will be only the forerunner of more and bigger powerhouses in the area.

Primary industries in North Queensland have solved most of their problems—I refer particularly to the sugar industry and the wool industry—but the meat industry has one outstanding problem. This is the curse of the cattle tick. It may interest hon. members to know that today we have about 6,000,000 head of beef cattle in Queensland and in 1895 we also had about 6,000,000 cattle.

The cattle tick first appeared in Queensland in the Burketown area on the Gulf of Carpentaria, on the Boorooloola cattle track. By the early 1900's it had spread to the Townsville, Cairns, and Mackay areas, and very shortly afterwards spread as far south as the Queensland-New South Wales border. Tick fever made a dramatic entry into North Queensland, because it decimated the herds and made paupers of their owners. If one speaks to the pioneers who are still alive, or to their sons, one finds that it was quite common for people to have 1,000 head of cattle before the tick came and to be cut down to a matter of hundreds almost overnight.

**Mr. Mann:** That is from redwater.

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** From tick fever. Unfortunately, the meat industry in Queensland is fairly widely spread throughout tick-infested areas.

**Mr. Aikens:** Why is it that some areas are free from the tick?

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** If the hon. member will allow me to continue, I will perhaps deal with that question, which is an interesting one. However, I wish to develop my point because I am leading up to something important. About six-sevenths of the beef cattle in Queensland are located in tick-infested areas. It was assessed by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics a few years back that the annual loss in Queensland from ticks amounted to about £10,000,000. That is the annual loss for the whole of the State, but, as most of the beef cattle are in North and Central Queensland, most of that loss is sustained in those areas.

This continuous annual loss has affected the North Queensland beef industry and, do not forget that in the last financial year the beef industry in Queensland brought in something like £40,000,000. A loss of £10,000,000 in production, increased by the destruction of ticky hides and so on, is too big a proportion of our annual production to waste and go on wasting.

Since the very beginning an attempt has been made to contain the tick and control it by various forms of dipping and spraying, in the early days arsenic and then through the D.D.Ts. to the later organic-phosphate dips, but the emphasis has been on trying to control it, with the result that today the whole labour force of many stations is being utilised in dipping cattle every few weeks.

I believe that the time has come for a crash programme to be instituted to eradicate this pest and scourge from the cattle industry of the North. I believe that, just as a carefully documented case was presented by this Government to the Federal Government that resulted in the necessary moneys becoming available for the reconstruction of the Mt. Isa railway line, just as an equally well documented case was presented to the Federal Government that

resulted in the necessary finance for the beef roads, just as we have the C.S.I.R.O., a Federal department, carrying out research into tropical pastures in the North—all these things will be of little use unless we stop this continuous annual wastage—I believe that a similar carefully documented case would result in raising the necessary finance on a State-Federal basis to institute a crash programme for training scientists or hiring them from overseas, rather than persisting in this attempt to control something that has been going on since about 1902.

**Mr. Aikens:** Don't you think that the ultimate solution will be found in the introduction into the beast's blood of some micro-organism to kill the tick?

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** I believe that we may well leave that to the scientists. They have in recent times solved the problem of pleuro. Today, by a crash programme of inoculation, most of the beef cattle in North Queensland have been rendered immune to pleuro by the injection of vaccine. I do not know what is the solution of the tick problem. It could be an injection, vaccination, or some chemical or other, but we cannot, for North Queensland's sake, for the State's sake, and for Australia's sake, continue to absorb this very large loss imposed upon the meat industry in the North. It does not apply only to North and Central Queensland and, in its approach to the Federal Government for the necessary finance for this crash programme, the Government could point out that the Commonwealth is interested not only from the State point of view but also from the point of view of the Northern Territory and the Kimberley area of Western Australia. There is a necessity to solve the problem because so much of our meat production is exported overseas, thus helping the overseas trade balance. The tick is reducing the productivity of the cattle industry and is preventing an increase in cattle numbers. I pointed out previously that in 1895 the number of cattle in the State was the same as it is today.

For the various reasons I have advanced I press most strongly on the State Government the need to give consideration to organising, either through its own or Federal instrumentalities, or a combination of both, a crash programme over the next five years in order to solve the problem once and for all. The result of such a solution would be equivalent in monetary return, in spread of population and increased employment, to the establishment of several large secondary industries in North Queensland. It would have exactly the same effect as if, as someone mentioned recently, we had the Comalco aluminium industries in North Queensland. I press on the Government the urgent need to look at this matter in the light in which I have presented it. There are many hon. members with a sound intimate knowledge of the problem of ticks on their own proper-

ties, and so a wealth of expert knowledge will be available to the Government if it is willing to take advantage of it.

**Mr. Mann:** Have you any figures to show what is the loss in the Gulf country from pleuro and redwater?

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** The loss to the whole of Queensland is £10,000,000. When I point out that six-sevenths of the beef-cattle in Queensland are in tick-infested areas the hon. member could say that the loss due to the tick in North and Central Queensland is six-sevenths of £10,000,000, and he would be very close. That is based on figures compiled by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The figures are readily available, and I believe they are quite acceptable and referable.

I could go on talking about North Queensland today, tomorrow, and next week, but so that I will not be accused of being parochial I come now to a couple of problems that are of Queensland-wide interest—more than interest, they are social problems of the greatest importance, across which a veil of secrecy, deliberate or otherwise, seems constantly to be drawn. In the newspapers we see reference to various forms of juvenile delinquency. People raise their hands in helpless horror as to what they are to do about it. But the two by-products or the two, shall we say, penalties of curiosity of youth are never met. Perhaps it is a relic of puritanical times. I refer to the tremendous increase in this State in the incidence of social diseases and of ex-nuptial births.

**Mr. Aikens:** Why don't you say "venereal diseases" straight out?

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** I should like to give some figures because, to me as a medical man they, are really appalling. My whole training as a professional man urges me to bring this matter forward so that some reparative or preventive action may be taken. In 1944, in the middle of the war, those of us who were on the spot and not away in the Forces will remember how appalled we were at the very high incidence of ex-nuptial births. In fact, they represented 7·1 per cent. of all births; one out of every 14 births in 1944 was ex-nuptial. By 1951 the rate had fallen to 4·8 per cent., a very satisfactory decline. But for 1962, the year just finished, the rate was 6·9 per cent., the total number of ex-nuptial births being 2,470. In the first three months of 1963 the total ex-nuptial births—that is, for January, February and March of this year—was 661, and the percentage was 7·1, back to the figure for the very worst period during war-time. Surely an increase of such a nature must be viewed with the utmost alarm. Those of us who read history will remember that the first indication of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire was unbridled licentiousness of this nature.

I am about to tell hon. members of the most appalling part of this problem. In 1959 there were 32 ex-nuptial births concerning children of 15 years and under. In 1962, the latest year available, that figure had risen to 62. In the 16-year-old to 20-year-old class, the figure for ex-nuptial births in 1959 was 634. Three years later, in 1962, it had risen to 807.

**An Opposition Member:** Blimey! Look what the Government has done.

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** Let us treat this matter with the seriousness it deserves.

When we add to that figure the 1,382 children who were born within the first nine months of marriage, the total ex-nuptial conception rate is increased to two out of three births. When we consider that ex-nuptial conception is resulting in the birth of two out of every three children from mothers under the age of 20, the problem becomes appalling. I do not believe that we can any longer hide the problem with a veil of secrecy. It is incumbent on all of us to view this matter with the greatest concern. As a corollary, there has been a similar appalling rise in the number of—as the hon. member for Townsville South recognises so well—social or venereal disease cases. The total number of reported cases in 1959-1960 was 1,021. In the year just finished, 1962-1963, the number rose to 1,473. That is an increase of over 40 per cent. in three years. We cannot sit by and allow that sort of thing to go on.

In 1959-1960 there was one case reported in a child under the age of 15 years and three years later there were 30 cases in children under 15. Do not tell me that hon. members, men of the world as they are, cannot but feel appalled and urged to do something to solve what is undoubtedly the worst social problem of the present day.

Let me give the House a little further information. In 1959-1960 there were 237 cases reported in the 16-20-year class while three years later, in 1962-1963, 476 cases were reported. So the rate of reportings has doubled in three years.

**Mr. Smith:** Is there any greater incidence in the metropolitan area than in country areas?

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** I think we can leave that safely aside.

**Mr. Aikens:** You have not any figures of abortions?

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** No. I should like very much to have them, too. The figures of ex-nuptial births, for example, relate to live births. Goodness me, we should all like to know how many conceptions did not come to maturity through one reason or another. In addition to the general overall picture of ex-nuptial births, I have a couple of figures that might be of interest. In

1962 the number of births in the 12-year-old class was two and in the 40-years-and-over class there were 69 ex-nuptial births.

I feel compelled to strike a note of warning. This is not the time or the place to propose solutions. By the figures I have given and the words I have used I have sought to pinpoint the problems as a community problem. Various social agencies and various Government departments do all they possibly can to rehabilitate these young victims of curiosity, victims of bad training, victims of bad companions; but in most cases they do not get the chance to operate till after the event. It is the prevention of these things that is important, not rehabilitation after the damage is done. It is a community problem. These kids—and they are kids—do not belong to this Government; they do not belong to the Opposition; they belong to the families of this State. It is a family problem, and I pose the question in conclusion: what are the families of this State going to do about it?

**Mr. HANLON** (Baroona) (3.50 p.m.): In conformity with the practice of most hon. members, I desire to take the opportunity provided under the Standing Orders to raise in this debate several matters that are of particular interest to me.

Firstly, however, on this occasion I feel that I should make some reference to the motion itself as such and, secondly, I think I should make some reference to the fundamental divergence of viewpoint, which has emerged in this debate, between the Liberal Party and the Country Party. I think it mirrors a divergence of viewpoint and a basic incompatibility between those parties which is producing a growing tension among them, not merely in this State, but throughout Australia.

Further, I am compelled to refer to what the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha described as what he expected would be startling views (to which I refer as alarming views) advanced when seconding this motion. Quite frankly, I never expected to hear put forward in this day and age the classical recapitulation by the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha of the Brisbane Line-approach of almost three decades ago.

This motion has been moved against a background of sponsorship by the Country Party-Liberal Government, which was returned at the recent election after an election campaign, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, that must have reached an all-time low in the propaganda used against the Australian Labour Party. What is this motion that we are debating? I know that I, in common with other hon. members, like to take the opportunity to refer to various matters of interest to me, but what is the actual motion? Surely, as my friend and colleague the hon. member for Port Curtis pointed out, it is more than merely a repetition of the individual oath of allegiance that we all took a few weeks

ago. As the hon. member for Kedron pointed out, it is more than the expression of maudlin sentiment towards the person of Her Majesty. I believe, as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition pointed out, that this motion is an affirmation of respect for, and faith in, our system of parliamentary democracy. I shall quote from the actual terms of the motion. It reads—

“We, Her Majesty’s loyal and dutiful subjects, . . .”

(I ask hon. members to note those words)—

“ . . . the Members of the Legislature of Queensland, in Parliament assembled, desire to assure Your Excellency of our continued loyalty. . . ”

(I stress that word)—

“ . . . and affection towards the Throne and Person of our Most Gracious Sovereign, and to tender our thanks to Your Excellency for the Speech with which you have been pleased to open the present Session.

“The various measures to which Your Excellency has referred, and all other matters that may be brought before us, will receive our most careful consideration, and it shall be our earnest endeavour so to deal with them that our labours may tend to the advancement and prosperity of the State.”

Those terms are familiar to us, but from time to time, irrespective of the party in Government, amendments have been moved to that motion by the Opposition of the day with the object of focusing attention on some particular matter. To my mind the actual motion itself has never been challenged in this Parliament by any party or individual. The motion has never been called into question; it has always had the unanimous endorsement of Parliament throughout the history of Queensland.

Why is this so? It is because it is recognised as a motion that expresses faith in our system of parliamentary democracy. It signifies the bond that joins us together, irrespective of party, as one democratic Parliament. It is a bond of loyalty to our country expressed in the traditional terms of allegiance to the Throne. Is it not then a matter for regret that, associated with the motion on this occasion, among hon. members opposite there are some who give lip service only to it, and from whom the submission of the motion to Parliament in these terms is arrant humbug and hypocrisy? I make no apology for that statement in reference to members associated through the Liberal Party with this example, already referred to by my Leader, of gross political vandalism, amounting to gross contempt of this Parliament in publishing during the last election campaign a photograph of this parliamentary building, authorised by Mr. Charles Porter on behalf of the Liberal Party and urging support of that party, superimposed on it being the hammer-and-sickle insignia.

Some hon. members opposite, particularly the hon. members for Ashgrove and Nundah, to whom I think these remarks might apply, find this amusing. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I do not find amusing a photograph of this parliamentary building with the hammer-and-sickle insignia imposed on it. I say to you directly that I ask you, as Speaker of the House, to indicate in the position of responsibility to this Parliament and to its members that you hold, and which you held when this advertisement appeared in the Press, whether you regard the dignity of the Parliament as grossly attacked and the Parliament itself held in contempt, which I say it is, by the use, or misuse, of such a photograph of Parliament House in this way; not to mention aspects of Section 381 of the Criminal Code, which might well be examined in this regard because of the provision that it makes for dealing with the unlawful publication of any scandalous defamatory matter touching the conduct of any member, or members, of this House. I can assure you that I regard this sort of advertisement by the Liberal Party as scandalous defamatory matter as far as I am concerned individually or as far as any other member of the Australian Labour Party in this House is concerned.

I am directing myself to you in this matter, Mr. Speaker, because I believe it would be absolutely futile to put the question to hon. members opposite, many of whom are, at least indirectly, parties to this advertisement by the Liberal Party organisation. I well remember that last year, when the Leader of the Opposition posed a question of breach of privilege in this Assembly, this gutless imitation of a Government in this House had so little respect—

**Government Members** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. HANLON:** Hon. members opposite are very offended. Well, I am offended too.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The hon. member is using rather extravagant language in referring to Government members. I ask him to withdraw his statement.

**Mr. HANLON:** I am quite happy to withdraw it. I should hate to offend the poor gentle souls who despoil a photograph of Parliament House and the character of people on this side of the Chamber in an advertisement of this type. When you consider what I am putting to you, Mr. Speaker, if you consider that to call hon. members opposite a gutless imitation of a Government is offensive, I hope you will give similar consideration to the action taken by the Liberal Party in this State against Parliament and A.L.P. members.

When the question of a breach of privilege in the Parliament was raised last year, this collection of representatives who form a Government in Queensland, lacking any intestinal fortitude—if you will allow me to

rephrase my remark to meet your requirements—had so little respect for the Parliament that they carried by their numbers a resolution, not to say whether or not there was a breach of privilege but “That the House do pass to the next business.” They did not say one thing or the other. I hope that you will not hide behind any device in this matter, Mr. Speaker, because it has been put to me by a number of people that your silence condones this type of thing, and I say to you that if an advertisement such as that by the Liberal Party is condoned by you as Speaker of the Parliament, if Mr. Charles Porter or Mr. Joe Blow or anybody else can so take the symbol of Parliamentary democracy in this State, despoil it in any fashion that he sees fit, and have his action condoned by the Speaker of the Parliament, the dignity of Parliament is indeed at a low ebb under your speakership.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I trust that the hon. member will give the Speaker and the Chair an opportunity to reply. He is casting a nasty aspersion against the Chair and I think his language has been very extravagant. I have been very tolerant, but I am not going to tolerate it very much longer.

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

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I will give my answer at the correct time. I think the hon. member's language is extravagant, and he is making an accusation against the Chair.

**Mr. HANLON:** I am very sorry if you have drawn that inference from my remarks. I think I said “if it is so condoned”. If you had taken some action in this matter before you were asked to by me, I would not have made these remarks, and I think the responsibility was on you to do so.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I will be the one to judge whether I should take action. If I do, it will not be because of the hon. member's representations.

**Mr. HANLON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I understand that the practice in these matters—the correct practice in the House of Commons or any other Parliament—is to draw the attention of the Speaker to it, and I took this first opportunity to do so.

I was going to say that I am sure some members of the Liberal Party are very much ashamed of themselves in this matter. Certainly, the Deputy Premier of this State, the Minister for Justice in this Parliament, appeared to be ashamed of the Liberal Party when he was tackled about the matter on the “Meet the Press” programme during the election campaign. When he was asked about this advertisement he said that he was not aware of it.

Seeing that we are all so touchy today—apparently everybody is touchy, although members of the Australian Labour Party are not expected to be; members of the Liberal-Country Party, Mr. Speaker and others can

be touchy but members of the Australian Labour Party cannot—I am not going to say that the Minister for Justice, the Leader of the Liberal Party, was dishonest when he said on “Meet the Press” that he was not aware of this advertisement. However, I do say that if he was honest in saying he was not aware of it he is certainly the dumbest political leader this State has ever seen. At least he had the decency to be ashamed of it.

What was the message that the Liberal Party intended to convey from this advertisement? It was that the Australian Labour Party, if returned to power in this State under the leadership of Mr. John Duggan, supported by members of the Australian Labour Party sitting in this House, would be under the influence of some ideology that was foreign to Australia. As I said in the election campaign, I have here the policy speech delivered by Mr. Duggan and I challenge any member of this Parliament on the opposite side or on the cross benches, or anyone outside, to show me anything in it that they consider to be un-Australian. It is 100 per cent. Australian; it is 100 per cent. Labour and it contains nothing whatever to indicate any influence from outside this country. It refers, among other things, to three weeks' leave, something that the court has now seen fit to grant; it refers to the problem of juvenile employment; it refers to a desire to see that our apprenticeship system is improved in accordance with advances in our society, something that it has taken this Government six years to think about; it refers to the problem of transport in this State under the present administration; it refers to education; it refers to the need for more universities and library services, and for an additional agricultural college; it refers to housing that the family man can afford, and so on; it refers to legal aid, something that was originally raised in the Australian Labour Party's policy in 1957, something else that six years afterwards, the Liberal-Country Party has now adopted. They should have taken some action years ago to assist deserted wives and others in need of legal aid. All these things constitute a policy of which the Australian Labour Party is very proud.

**Mr. Smith:** Would you answer one question? Explain why you say you put in legal aid in 1957 when you were the Government—

**Mr. HANLON:** The hon. member wants to make a speech. He is a rectum orator; he speaks from his seat. I suggest that he speak from his feet.

**Mr. SMITH:** I rise to a point of order. I asked, as I am entitled to, a question of the hon. member and I suggest that he, having accepted the question, is required to answer it.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! Hon. members on my left, I will rule on any point of order. I consider there is a point of order. The hon. member for Windsor asked a question, the hon. member for Baroona paused and listened to that question, and then—

**Mr. Mann:** He is not obliged to answer.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! He is not obliged to answer but he did pause and listen to the question.

**Mr. HANLON:** I have no objection to answering a question. That is why I paused to let the hon. member ask his question; but he then started to make a speech that I considered he should make in his own time, not in mine.

I take the opportunity to congratulate two new hon. members on this side, the hon. members for Tablelands and Port Curtis, for the magnificent way they opened their speech-making in this Chamber. The hon. member for Tablelands followed on the hon. member for Clayfield who is—rightly so—very highly regarded by the Liberal Party, to the extent that he has come into this Parliament from the Federal Parliament with the support of a great body of Liberal opinion. It is no reflection on Mr. Murray to say that the hon. member for Tablelands lost nothing in following on that hon. member when he spoke of the needs of his electorate and of the State generally. Unfortunately, I did not have the opportunity to hear most of the speech of the hon. member for Port Curtis, but having read it, I can see why he was widely congratulated on it by so many people both inside and outside the House. Both hon. members displayed that they come here with a love of their electorates, faith in their electorates, and a desire to help the people in them and the State generally through the A.L.P. in this Parliament. I am sure that they will play very prominent parts in the future of this Parliament and the future of the A.L.P.

I congratulate the hon. member for Carnarvon and the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha, as mover and seconder of the motion, although I found myself very much at odds with the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha in much of what he said. When the motion was moved and seconded it became very obvious that there is this divergence of opinion between the Liberal Party and the Country Party on basic issues. The hon. member for Carnarvon gave us a very interesting summary of the needs of his electorate, and the background to his electorate, which is certainly very varied. For the greater part of his time he told us of the necessity to build dams and provide water for irrigation. He spoke of £2,400,000 for the Coolmunda dam, and went on to give an exposition on the Border Rivers scheme. He spoke also of a dam on the Dumaresq River to cost £6,500,000, and at a later stage a still larger dam on the Mole River at a cost of £12,500,000, to irrigate a further 63,000 acres.

He was followed by the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha, from the Liberal Party, who immediately complained of the clamour in this country for large spending on dams. Obviously, the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha was not only at odds with his Country Party colleague, but he proceeded to challenge Government policy in this regard by speaking discouragingly of the worth of any joint Commonwealth-State authority, as suggested by the Premier, in the development of Northern Australia.

I was amazed to hear from the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha the old Brisbane Line approach of some 25 to 30 years ago. He was telling us about the reasons that are advanced for developing Northern Australia. He said—

“The empty spaces are a temptation to a possible invader, or would help an invader, or that the failure of Australia to use the northern areas can be seized on by our neighbours to the North as a ground for persuading some unspecified body to force Australia to hand over the unused land.”

He went on to say later—

“With all the requirements of modern war to be transported overseas it would most likely help, not hinder, an invader to have food, housing and water in settled areas.”

Is not that the same outlook that prompted the Federal Government's thinking in this country in the 1930's? Did they not say, “We do not want to develop Queensland, we do not want to people Queensland, because we want to be able to pull out, if necessary, and abandon the northern half of Australia in the event of an attack being launched against this country from the North.”? Is not that why the people of this country emptied out the Menzies administration in the early 1940's when this country was threatened? The hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha apparently thought he may have suggested something like that because he was at pains to say that he hoped hon. members did not take it that he was declaring himself against developing the North. He said, in general terms, that he was dedicated to the development of Australia's north, and Queensland's north, but just like the Liberal Party, and the people who largely fashioned his speech, such as Mr. Hulme, the present president of the Liberal Party in this State, he wants development in Queensland on a basis that will enable absentees from the State to suck off the profits from pastoral development as has been done for many, many years. We all know of the draining off of income from pastoral development in the State that has taken place for many years. Apparently that is the type of development that the hon. member and the Liberal Party think is in the best interests of Queensland. That is not the type of development that I consider to be in the best interests of the State.

We all know that there is room for much development, pasture improvement, and so on, as instanced by the hon. member, but we also want development such as we have seen at Mount Isa, which brings people to the area and develops it for those who are living there in comparatively large numbers.

The hon. member for Clayfield told us about the need to guarantee industries so as to bring them to the State. As is well known, the Australian Labour Party guaranteed Mt. Isa Mines Ltd. when it was developing the deposits in the North-west of the State. But for the guarantees given by the A.L.P. in those days, Mount Isa would not have been developed. From what I can gather from the speech of the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha he does not want that type of development in North Queensland, nor does the Liberal Party, because it will only help people who may launch an invasion on the north of Australia. He wants the northern part of the country unsettled, or largely unsettled, so that, in the event of an invasion of this country from the north, the people in the south of Australia, not embarrassed by any obligation to defend closely-settled areas, can evacuate their riches from the area and then make a settlement with someone round about the border of Queensland or a little farther south. We have pointed to the way that we, the Labour Party, would develop the North to help the people of the State. We want development, but we also want people in the State, and we want some return to our own people who are creating the development in the State.

In the post-war period the Labour Government launched the Mareeba-Dimbulah project. Even His Excellency the Administrator pointed out in his speech that a total of 450 farms are now supplied with water from the Tinaroo Falls Dam. He said that tobacco plantings for 1962-1963 increased by 1,500 acres to 11,100 acres and the crop sold for £6,500,000, an increase of £1,000,000 on the previous year. That is obviously not the type of development the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha was referring to when he told us about these grandiose schemes that will explode in our faces. That was one of the development schemes in the post-war period of the Labour Government in Queensland for which we received no assistance from the Commonwealth—not one penny of assistance from the Commonwealth Government for that scheme. However, as the hon. member for Tablelands told us, it has resulted in the development of one of the most thriving areas in Queensland. The Mareeba-Dimbulah area, with the associated development there, benefits other areas in the North as well.

The previous speaker, the hon. member for Bowen, told us what the present Government has done. He said that the Premier was opening the first stage of the Barron River hydro-electric scheme last week, or next week-end, or whenever it was. He did not

say that it was only because of the development carried out at Tinaroo Falls by the Australian Labour Party Government in this State that that scheme was so well advanced that it could be proceeded with without the necessity of constructing another dam at Flaggy Creek for some time. This Government tries to take credit for all that sort of thing, but inevitably you find, when you trace the projects back, that they revert to the planning, or the actual development already created in the North, by the previous Government.

When I speak of what is needed for the development of Queensland, I refer also to the plans put forward by the Leader of the Opposition in his policy speech and the discussions that took place between him and the Federal Labour Leader, Mr. Calwell, and the Deputy Leader, Mr. Whitlam, about our desire to ensure that a fully integrated aluminium set-up is developed in this State, and developed very quickly.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition pointed out that it is almost six years since the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity introduced the Weipa agreement into this House. On that occasion the Minister told us of the vast development that was to take place at Weipa. He spoke of the township there and of the many thousands of people who would live there. But from time to time during those six years, whenever an hon. member on this side of the Chamber has queried him about what was actually being done at Weipa that was not simply the development of a port there for the export of the bauxite, he has soundly abused anyone who has suggested that the alumina plant was not going to be constructed at Weipa. I think as recently as last year, on one night he objected violently when the hon. member for Cairns said that there was no intention in the minds of Comalco of proceeding with an alumina plant at Weipa, that they were already making inquiries in other parts of Queensland, yet a couple of months before the election we had the announcement that the alumina plant was going not to Weipa but to Gladstone. That, of course, is very good news for the port of Gladstone, one of the best ports in this country, which has suffered over the years from political discrimination—and I do not excuse our own Governments, from time to time; it is a long overdue step for Gladstone—but I still would like the Minister for Development to give the House some statement as to just what concrete arrangements have been made for the progress of the aluminium industry in Queensland, not only the construction of an alumina plant (apparently still in the blue-print stage at Gladstone) but also the possibility, as expressed by the State and Federal parties, of endeavouring to capture, as the hon. member for Port Curtis said, the aluminium smelter also, using the power facilities that should be available with the coal deposits of Central Queensland.

The Minister for Development talked about hawking agreements and so forth. Lord knows, if any agreement has been hawked anywhere, the Weipa agreement has certainly been hawked in the last six years. We have seen successively several different organisations—admittedly, big organisations—coming in and going out of the Weipa project as though it were a public toilet. We have seen the Reynolds group and the Kaiser Corporation. Now we find the Alcan people are coming in, and there is a report that a French aluminium group, which signed an agreement with the Federal Government in relation to the Gove deposits, is also combining with Comalco in the development of the Queensland industry.

As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition pointed out, when we find that, in the meantime, we have Alcoa and these people at Geelong and in Western Australia, having given Queensland several years' start on the bauxite and aluminium industry, already test-running their smelter at Geelong and so on and providing, within the next 12 months, for the actual operation of an alumina plant in Western Australia to supply Geelong, we wonder how long this position can be allowed to continue in Queensland without some definite indication that these people mean business. We find that there are so many of these organisations coming in. It is true that much capital is required, and nobody would suggest that any tinpot organisation could undertake the development of an alumina plant, let alone a complete aluminium industry, in this State.

When we find so many people coming into it, we wonder whether there is another marking-time process going on in the development of bauxite deposits. The Minister should inform the House of the latest position. On 18 February there was the announcement by the Prime Minister concerning the £45,000,000 alumina plant to process the bauxite deposits of the Gove Peninsula in Arnhem Land in the Northern Territory. They were to be developed by the French company that made the agreement with the Federal Government. At the time of that announcement, the Minister said that there was difficulty all over the world in the marketing of aluminium. This will not help the Australian position.

I feel that the people of this State, particularly those in the Gladstone area, are entitled to some information from the Minister on what is being done. We have seen recently some hold-up in miners' rights and so on in the area that we are told is to be used by Comalco. Everyone hopes that this will get under way quickly and thus reduce the advantage gained by Victoria and Western Australia in the development of the deposits in Western Australia. If our experience of what happened at Weipa is any guide, we must keep urging the Government to keep Parliament fully informed on what is going on.

There is another matter that I wish to raise today. I have found in my electorate, as no doubt other hon. members have found in theirs, that, because of the economic position since the credit squeeze, for one reason or another, more and more people are obliged to depend on assistance by way of State relief and State aid from the State Children Department. I regret that in a period in which there have been increases of £30-odd a week to the judiciary and corresponding increases to top public servants and similar people, the Government has not seen fit to increase payments of State relief through the State Relief Office since, to my knowledge, at least 8 February, 1952. State relief payments have been at the rate of £1 3s. 6d. for one person dependent thereon, £2 7s. for two persons, and 10s. a week for each additional person dependent on relief, plus small amounts payable for milk money and so on where there are children under the age of 14 years.

State aid through the State Children Department affects not only people destitute for one reason or another, but deserted wives. Publicity has been given recently to the growing number of women in this unfortunate position through desertion. Those with families are obliged to care for them, and they depend largely on assistance given not only by the Commonwealth Government through the Department of Social Services, but also State aid. State aid through the State Children Department has been at the rate of £1 5s. since 7 November, 1954. On that date it was increased from £1, which amount had operated from 3 February, 1952. I suggest that the Government should look into the possibility of increasing the payment of State relief and State aid. The amounts provided are well out of date when the present value of money is taken into account, and increases in the basic wage, and so on, have left these people at a very great disadvantage. It is not easy for anyone to maintain a family on State aid or State relief at any time, and I ask the Government to take urgent action in that respect.

I also suggest to the Government that it should take up with the Commonwealth Government the need to do away with the Victorian idea that when a man is imprisoned his wife is not entitled to any social services assistance for six months after the date of his imprisonment. That is the present position. I do not want it to be thought that I am saying that I have many people in my electorate who go to gaol, but it has been brought to my attention repeatedly that people are in very desperate situations because the Commonwealth Government refuses to grant assistance until a person has served six months' imprisonment. In many instances the term of imprisonment is six months or less than six months, and the only income that a wife has in the meantime is from State relief. In the case of a woman with three children the family income would be only about £3 7s. a week, and I think

this Government could well ask the Commonwealth Government to relax that rule of the Department of Social Services. As I said, I think it is outdated, in fact mediaeval, to refuse assistance to women and children because a man happens to be in prison. Surely it is not suggested that a man would deliberately go to prison to obtain the very meagre relief available from the Department of Social Services. If the Commonwealth Government is not prepared to do that, I suggest that the State should increase the State relief payment to the amount that would be received if a person were drawing social services from the Commonwealth department.

The hon. member for Bowen, Dr. Delamothé, referred to some problems that he thought should be aired in regard to the growing incidence of social diseases, ex-nuptial births, and so on. I think that the way in which our economy has been directed during the last 10 to 20 years, in the post-war period, is partly responsible for this. More and more we have seen the working wife—the woman of the house having to go out and work because wages have not kept up with costs. It is quite true that people might say, "In many instances they do not have to go out to work. They work to get what might be regarded as luxuries, such as television sets, motor-cars, and so on." However, in many cases our employment is based on the demand for these consumer goods created by more women going out to work, and all these things must be taken into consideration when dealing with questions of this type. It is only natural that, if a mother is obliged to seek employment, the children of the family do not receive the attention that they would if she stayed at home. I do not say that that is necessarily co-related with the problem raised by the hon. member for Bowen, but I think it is something that must be taken into account. It is not only a matter of criticising the young people in this regard. I know that the hon. member for Bowen wanted Parliament to take some notice of the problem, and I hope that, in dealing with it, we will not overlook the need to go back to the fundamental question of economic circumstances.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON** (Salisbury) (4.29 p.m.): Like other members of this Assembly, I wish to associate myself with the expression of loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen contained in the motion.

I should also like to have recorded my sincere appreciation of the untiring efforts of my many A.L.P. supporters, my campaign director, and my campaign secretary, in the recent election campaign, which resulted in my being returned as the member for Salisbury. I cannot speak too highly of the work of these people associated with the Labour Party, who give so freely of their time to support not the particular candidate, but the organisation, in which they have complete faith. Surveying the vast empty

spaces on the Government benches at present, I think it is pertinent to observe that, since all the Cabinet hopefuls have completed their preliminaries, it is quite obvious that they are leaving to the Australian Labour Party Opposition the carrying of this debate through its entire length.

During my term as member for Salisbury I have heard many speeches in this House; I have heard many ideas and grandiose schemes propounded by various members representing different electorates. For example, there was the scheme of the hon. member for Merthyr, which has now become known as "Sam's Subway". Several grandiose and airy-fairy schemes have been brought to the attention of this Assembly, but today I rise to speak on those matters that affect the little people. In other words, I rise to speak of those matters of importance to the people whom I represent, matters which are to them very important indeed.

I deal first of all with the claim of the Treasurer that this Government has solved the housing problem in this State. I feel that the Treasurer has deliberately misled this Chamber on this question, because in answer to many of my representations, I still receive the standard letter that the applicant cannot be granted a house because of the number of persons with a higher priority rating.

If the Government had solved this problem of housing why does it have a formula of priority on which it works to assess the housing needs of people? It would seem that, because the Treasurer has convinced himself, if nobody else, that he has solved the housing problem, he has now reached the stage where he considers there are so many houses in Queensland that it is time he sold some of them to oil companies for demolition.

I refer to a question that I addressed to the Treasurer early in this session when I inquired about the purchase price of a Housing Commission home in the Inala area that was sold to an oil company. To my astonishment, he replied that he did not intend to divulge what the Commission got for the sale of this property.

I do not think that that sort of answer is good enough, because, after all, these funds, which are provided under the Commonwealth-States Housing Agreement, are provided for the purpose of making housing available in this State and for no other purpose. I do not think it is good enough for this Government, through its Housing Commission, to enter into a speculative market in oil-company sites.

I have perused the complete Commonwealth-States Housing Agreement, and, as a result of that perusal, I accuse the Treasurer of the misuse of public funds. Nowhere in that agreement does it provide for the Treasurer to enter into the speculative market of selling homes for demolition to provide

sites for use by oil companies. It is indeed shocking to see beautiful Housing Commission homes, two or three years old, being demolished merely to provide sites for an oil company. In this particular instance it is far more shocking when it is realised that a study of the map of the Inala area shows that within 50 yards of this site there already exists blocks of land zoned for industrial use which would have accommodated a petrol station. The Treasurer cannot produce any argument to support the action taken by the Housing Commission in disposing of a State rental home for demolition to suit the desires of an oil company.

If the Minister has any doubt about the authenticity of my statement I refer him to the four sections of State-owned land in Wirraway Parade—Sections 11, 10, 362, and 363—all of which could have amply accommodated a petrol station, and all of which are within 50 to 100 yards of the present site. It is quite obvious from the answer given by the Treasurer that this is not to be an isolated instance, because he said he would not disclose the information I sought, as it could prejudice further negotiations by the Housing Commission with the oil company. I could excuse this action if no other property was available, and if sites for petrol stations had not been provided for in the designing and planning of the civic centre at Inala. But I cannot excuse this action when land already exists for that purpose. This Government has condoned the pulling down of a State rental home.

**Mr. Baxter:** At what profit?

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** The Treasurer is not prepared to disclose it.

**Mr. Baxter:** £80,000?

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** From my experience of some of the private deals of oil companies, it varies. I have known them to pay £30,000. It may be that the Treasurer will argue that because of the sale of this land he is now able to build two or three additional houses, but I say that once a Housing Commission home is demolished it is lost for all time. I say without fear of contradiction that the Treasurer has a lot to answer for in his action through the Housing Commission in this matter.

In the course of this debate the hon. member for Belmont quite rightly drew the attention of the Assembly to the alarming decline in the number of apprenticeships. He pointed out the dangers of young people being induced to serve in the armed forces, because any trade they might acquire there is not recognised when they resume civilian life. He also drew attention to the plight of apprentices because of their wage structure. As I have already indicated that I wished to speak on matters which affect the little people, I feel that I should carry a little further the argument advanced by the hon. member for Belmont. In doing

so I wish to draw attention particularly to the pitiful allowances or wages paid to apprentices in Queensland. It is very enlightening to read the "Queensland Government Industrial Gazette" dated Thursday, 6 June, 1963, in which are set out the various wages and awards as at that date. A study of the wages paid to juniors in this State reveals that an apprentice is placed in an invidious position when his wage structure is compared with that of those in semi-skilled and unskilled callings.

If we take the starting wage for juniors under a few of the awards we find that a junior at 16 years of age, which is the equivalent of the entry of an apprentice into his indentures, employed under the Aerated Water Manufacturing Award receives £6 12s. 2d. Under the Bacon Manufacturing and Curing Award (Darling Downs) he receives £8 9s. 8d. In the Bag Making Award the rate is £7 16s. 9d.; under the Carting Trades Award it is £7 0s. 6d.; for bank officers it is £407 5s. a year or £7 16s. 7d. a week. Under the Clerks' Award it is £7 0s. 6d.; and under the Shop Assistants' Award it is £8 13s. When those figures are compared with the starting wage for an electrical apprentice at 16 years of age, we find that he receives £5 19s. 7d. Apprentices in the building workers' group receive £6 2s. 3d. It seems that one of the reasons why young people are not being attracted to the various trades is the miserable pittance paid to them, particularly in the first three years of their apprenticeship.

If we compare the wage of a shop assistant with that salary of an electrical trades mechanic, we find that the shop assistant between the age of 16 and 17 receives 50 per cent. of the adult male rate, that is, £8 15s. I have already pointed out that an electrical apprentice at the same age receives £5 19s. 7d. In his second year the shop assistant jumps to 55 per cent. of the adult male rate, while the electrical apprentice, having started at 30 per cent., rises to 37 per cent., or £7 7s. 5d. In his third year the shop assistant receives 65 per cent. of the adult rate, or £11 9s. 6d., and the third year electrical trades apprentice receives 47 per cent. of the adult rate, or £9 7s. 3d. In the 19 to 20-year-old group, the equivalent of the fourth-year apprentice, the shop assistant receives 75 per cent. of the adult male wage, or £13 2s. 6d. a week, while the electrical apprentice rises to 67 per cent. of the adult male rate, or £13 7s. Finally, in the 20 to 21-year-old group, the shop assistant receives 85 per cent. of the adult rate, or £14 17s. 6d., while the fifth-year electrical apprentice receives 83 per cent. of the adult rate, or £16 10s. 9d.

To carry the comparison a little further, I turn now to the Brewery Employees' Award. An 18-year-old person employed under that award, the equivalent of a third-year apprentice, receives 65 per cent. of

the adult wage, or £11 2s. 4d. a week, while the third-year apprentice in the electrical trade receives £9 7s. 3d. a week.

I may point out that while I have quoted the electrical trade—and I happen to be a member of that union—those comparisons are general throughout all the trades—the metal trades, the building trades group, and so on. There would be a variation of only a few shillings. Nevertheless, the wage structure follows the same pattern.

Let me give the comparison of the yearly income of the two groups. The shop assistant in his first year receives £458 while the electrical trades apprentice receives £310 18s. 4d., or £147 1s. 8d. less.

In the second year the wages of the shop assistant go up to £500 10s. while that of the electrical trades apprentice rises to £383 1s. 8d., or £117 8s. 4d. less.

Into the third year, the shop assistant gets £591 10s. while the electrical trades apprentice gets £486 17s., of £104 13s. less.

Adding those figures, we find that in the first three years of apprenticeship the apprentice receives £369 13s. less than the shop assistant. Is it any wonder that we are not attracting young people to apprenticeships?

In recent years there has grown up a generation of children who, to their credit, take an intelligent interest in their surroundings and have a desire to acquire many things that were beyond the reach of the apprentice or the young person of previous generations. We see the modern trend towards owning motor-cars, and so on. Is it any wonder that a young person, when he sees such a vast difference between the remuneration offered by a trade or profession and that offered in a semi-skilled or unskilled calling, feels that he has no incentive to enter a trade or profession? It is unfortunate that this should happen during his impressionable years, while he feels the desire to obtain the greatest possible remuneration for his labour. In his immaturity he is unable to assess that, if he does enter a trade or profession, he will eventually receive an adequate remuneration for his labours.

Several members of the Government have expressed alarm at the dearth of tradesmen in this State and I do not think it is difficult to realise why we are not attracting young people to the trades and professions. One has only to study the points I have raised in this debate. The "Queensland Industrial Gazette" is full of similar examples. I have quoted merely a few, which I think amply illustrate the general pattern of the plight of apprentices in Queensland. I think it has reached a stage where it should become a matter of Government concern, because it will affect the future of the State. The time has come to put aside the outmoded struggle by the trade unions to obtain wage justice for their apprentices. The time has come

for this Government to investigate fully the wage structure for the juniors in the community and to legislate to provide that apprentices in a trade or calling shall receive a wage equivalent to those paid under the awards covering the various semi-skilled and unskilled callings.

If the new principle of work evaluation is to be used, how can it be argued that the value to an employer of a trade apprentice is any less than that of a person in a semi-skilled or unskilled job? I offer the opinion that, after serving his probationary period of three months, the value of the work of an apprentice must compare with that done by a person in a calling not covered by the apprenticeship system.

**Mr. Newton:** He has a higher standard of education, too.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** As the hon. member for Belmont reminds me, a higher standard of education is required of the apprentice. In most trades education to Junior standard is required for entrance. In addition to receiving much lower wages, the apprentice has to attend evening classes without having a proper meal, and is, all in all, at a considerable disadvantage compared with a shop assistant or clerk, or similar worker.

I wish to deal briefly with the training of apprentices. In a modern society I do not think it is good enough to subject our young people to an extensive training programme sustained by, as the hon. member for Belmont said, a pie in one hand and a soft drink in the other. Modern society demands that we do better than this for our young people.

The time is long overdue for the institution of day-time training for apprentices. It may be that the Minister will argue that, because of the altered school syllabus and the drain on the finances of the State in providing accommodation for primary and secondary-school children, he is unable to provide the accommodation or teachers required for the day-time training of apprentices. I think that he should at least give consideration to day-time examinations. I do not think that any junior can do his best after having worked for a full eight hours and loitered round town till 7 o'clock at night without a decent meal. I do not see how, following that, his results can be a true reflection of his ability. I suggest to the Minister that, if he cannot institute day-time training for apprentices, an imperative step in the interests of apprentices is the introduction of day-time examinations at which they can do their best.

Having said that, I wish to pass to another matter that I feel is of great importance to the little people of this State. I have raised it on several occasions and, in true cavalier fashion, the Minister for Justice has brushed my representations aside. However, in an endeavour to convince the Minister of what is going on in this State in undesirable trade practices and advertising, if he does not know

it, I have brought into the House a few samples of what I consider to be blatant misleading of the public by the use of various means of advertising and packages.

**Mr. Smith:** Here they come.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** The hon. member for Windsor says, "Here they come."

**Mr. Smith:** I am just prompting you.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I do not need any prompting from the hon. member. I should hate to take a brief from him because I know I would be entirely misled. The only thing that I have heard him speak of is the creation of a Disneyland of government buildings round the city. This subject is far too important for me to allow myself to be side-tracked by a person of the intelligence of the hon. member for Windsor.

This is a packet of dessert raisins that my wife purchased at Maroochydore last Christmas. Upon a superficial examination of the packet, one might reasonably expect it to contain a fair number of raisins. As a matter of interest, on outside measurements the packet's capacity is 51 cubic inches.

**Mr. Smith:** A bit like yourself.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** If the hon. member for Windsor wishes to side-track me, I might tell him that the box is now completely empty—just like his head.

On opening the carton, this type of thing, which has a capacity of only 25 cubic inches, was exposed. If that is not a blatant misrepresentation of an article, I do not know what is.

**Mr. Campbell:** What is the weight of it?

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Never mind about the weight. If the hon. member will wait, I will show him what action the Government should have taken.

Here is an article used by most speakers in debates in this Assembly. I might say that after using it I have changed to another brand. It is a packet of Irish Moss jubes. I think it is called "giant size". If one takes the packet out of the box, one finds that it seems to fill the box quite reasonably. However, if one shakes the packet, one finds that it will fit into the box without any trouble and that in fact the box is only half full.

Then we come to tooth-paste. I will not mention the brand particularly, because this is common to all brands of tooth-paste. The box is labelled "Giant". I do not know whether it describes what is inside the box as "giant", or whether it is a tooth-paste made especially for giants. Again we find that the tube does not even half-fill the box.

I asked the Minister for Justice whether there had been any conferences on this subject between the Ministers for Justice of the various States and he merely said, "No."

To go a little further, here I have a brand of hair tonic and again the bottle nowhere near fills the box. But unfortunately it does not end there. The glass in the bottle is so thick that the actual contents fill a standard chemist's bottle containing two ounces.

It is all very well for hon. members opposite to sit there like a lot of giggling school girls. If they are happy about the laws of Queensland and the advertising practices that are allowed in this State, then I can only say that the electors in the electorates they represent have been grossly misled. It is very unfortunate that they have returned men of such a calibre to Parliament.

Then we come to another aspect of tooth-pastes, soap powders, and so on—the old story of “9d. off”. Nobody has ever been able to find out what the 9d. is off. This type of advertising has been appearing on packages such as this for a long time, but the Government is content not to do anything about it.

This is a brand of hand-cream that is used by many women in Queensland. Again the tube nowhere near fills the carton. By comparison, while they are marketing that carton, it will be found that the hand-cream fits quite easily into one of these smaller tooth-paste cartons without the aid of phoney lid to give it a large appearance. I do not mind if hon. members opposite get a little enjoyment out of my remarks. It is quite evident that they have not the interest of the public at heart. Their idea of justice is based on what Big Business can dish out to the people of the State.

Whilst there has been an amount of amusement here, let me read to the Chamber an extract from the Weights and Measures Act, in which it is stated—

“Any person who by means of words, description or other indication, direct, or indirect, makes any false declaration or statement, or misleads any person as to the weight, measure, or number, of any article sold or delivered by him, is guilty of an offence.”

If that section of the Act is not enough, why has not the Minister taken action under the Act by which he has the power of “prescribing standard specifications of capacity for bottles or other packages used in the sale of any prescribed article in Queensland”? It is quite apparent that most members of the Government here today, who sit there like giggling school girls, have not made a study of this matter. They are quite happy to accept the fact that these people can mislead the public. These people can do what they like in the field of advertising and Government members are quite happy about it.

It is quite evident, too, that because members of the Government are steeped in the tradition of private enterprise, they are

quite happy to take anything that private enterprise cares to dish out to them, either as members of this House or as members of the buying public.

I have given notice of a motion dealing with price control and I am still hopeful that the Government will give me an opportunity of debating this subject. I will be happy to bring along a few more examples of just how Big Business has misled and fleeced the public of Queensland from 1957 to the present time, and how it has been allowed to go unchecked by the Government while, at the same time, there is legislation on the statute books that, if they wished to enforce it, would give them control over the undesirable practices that are taking place.

**Mr. Ramsden:** Just like Centenary Park?

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I had the opportunity of speaking at the opening of Centenary Park. Quite frankly, the reason I ceased going there was that somebody told me that the hon. member for Merthyr was going to speak there and I just could not stand that on Sunday afternoon.

I now want to draw the attention of the House to the shocking condition of the State electoral rolls used in the last State election. When I say that, I do not refer to the compilation of the rolls so far as it refers to names being left off, because I think the Leader of the Opposition has quite adequately dealt with that matter. I want to complain particularly about the printing of the rolls. Because the rolls are printed in their present form of single-line spacing, no returning officer in this State could reasonably vouch for whether or not a person had voted.

A study of the rolls shows that in the space provided for the returning officer to enter the voting details for each elector, at the top of the column the line is immediately beneath the voter's name but at the bottom of the page it is almost at the top of the person's name or considerably below. I know the excuse has been advanced that the cost of lead in spacer bars was making it prohibitive to print rolls in double-line spacing, but there are new processes today which obviate the need to use so much lead in compiling pages for the rolls. What I have pointed out is consistent with the fact that, since the introduction of this type of printing in the compilation of the rolls, many people have been called on to explain why they failed to vote. Before any future elections are held a complete study should be made of what effect the printing of the rolls in this manner has had on the opportunity of the electoral officer to certify beyond reasonable doubt that a person has or has not voted. It is no use the Government's offering the excuse about the cost of lead because I know that there is a cheaper process to provide double-line spacing. I urge the Government to take a serious look at this matter before the next elections.

Before concluding, I want to say that the recent election was one of the dirtiest and filthiest I have ever taken part in. The hon. member for Baroona and several other speakers on this side have drawn attention to some of the devices used by our opponents not only to discredit candidates as members of the Labour Party but also to cast reflections on their personal integrity. I am very happy that the people of my electorate gave the complete answer to anybody who attempts to attack the personal probity of a member of this House.

Recently I picked up a newspaper and read—

“Shall the Socialistic Government with its Red Objective and Bitter Class-Conscious Ideals be returned to power, or shall it be, at once, replaced by a Free Government dominated by the Ideals of Justice to every class and equality of opportunity for all?”

When I read that I thought to myself, “I did not see that during the recent campaign”, but when I looked at it again I saw that it was “The Brisbane Courier” of 2 May, 1923. They were bashing out this moth-eaten type of propaganda 40 years ago. A pamphlet recently issued in my own electorate drew attention to the hopeless position of the Labour Party because of its Red domination. It is obvious that the only qualification you need to become a representative of the Liberal Party, and a candidate for that party, is to be able to get up and bellow out to the electorate what its candidates have been handing out for the last 40 years.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. BROMLEY** (Norman) (5.10 p.m.): I intend to be rather restrained on this occasion. Perhaps that may be to the satisfaction of some hon. members opposite, but later in the year I may be back to my old form. I should like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your re-election. In doing so, may I offer my congratulations also to the hon. member for Greenslopes, Mr. Keith Hooper, on his election as Chairman of Committees.

Several hon. members on the Government benches have spoken in glowing terms of the fact that the anti-Labour Government has been returned to the Treasury benches. I am sure they have been speaking with their tongues in their cheeks, because I have figures that prove, as the hon. member for Hawthorne has pointed out, that the boundaries are rigged as only this Government and the Premier of South Australia, Sir Thomas Playford, know how. Without doubt, the Queensland coalition Government is a minority Government. I have here an authentic table of votes showing the 1963 State general election results. To prove my point that this Government is a minority coalition Government, we find that in all Queensland districts the votes for the A.L.P. totalled 337,861, a percentage of 43·22. On the valid votes, the percentage was 43·89 for the total of 77

seats contested. The Liberal Party received 183,181 votes, or a total of 23·4 per cent. of the total votes cast and 23·79 per cent. of the valid votes. The Liberal Party contested 37 seats. The Country Party received a total of 156,594 votes, or 20·03 per cent., which brings the total of the Liberal and Country Party votes to 43·47 per cent. compared with the Labour Party's 43·89 per cent. of the valid votes cast. Of course, that proves what I said, and the “Telegraph” published similar figures.

To carry on with this table, I should like to point out that the average votes per seat mean that the A.L.P. had to receive 13,514 votes to gain a seat against the Liberal Party's 9,159 votes and the Country Party's small figure of only 6,023 votes. We can see from those figures that it took well over twice the total number of Country Party votes for the A.L.P. to gain a seat.

**Mr. Smith:** How many did you say the A.L.P. had to get to win a seat?

**Mr. BROMLEY:** It required 13,514 votes for an A.L.P. candidate to gain a seat. That is the average vote. That is for the information of the hon. member for Windsor. Later on I will take him aside and explain it in detail. I do not want to waste my time with his interjection. I know that generally he is interested in trying to learn a few facts, but at present I shall confine my remarks to the subject I have under discussion.

**Mr. Sullivan:** How many votes did you say for the Country Party?

**Mr. BROMLEY:** The Country Party candidate needed only 6,023 votes. If hon. members would like to queue up at the end of my speech I shall give them some of the figures. Hon. members opposite are always interested in these cogent remarks I have to make because they know that these figures are factual and naturally they want to improve their knowledge. I just wanted to prove the point—and figures do not lie—that the coalition Government is a minority Government.

Now I want to place on record my thanks to the people of my electorate. I thank the people of Norman for showing their faith in me by returning me as their member with, very pleasingly and very naturally, an overwhelming increase in my absolute majority. I publicly thank my army of helpers, my supporters in the Australian Labour Party and supporters who were one-time supporters of the Liberal Party, who rallied to me and assisted me, believing that I was their representative who believed in the good of the people and in the good of the masses of the people.

To continue where the hon. member for Salisbury left off—in spite of the filthy, guttersnipe tactics (and I believe those are the only words by which one can describe those tactics) of my opponents and the Liberal Party in general, and, in particular,

the typical Fascist type of propaganda they expounded, my electors had faith in me and for that I am thankful.

Just before the swearing-in formalities of this Parliament on 21 August, I thought with a great deal of pride of other times when I have sworn my allegiance to my country and the reigning monarch. I refer, of course, in particular to the day when I first joined the Army prior to the 1939-1945 war. It may seem strange to you, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps to other hon. members in the Chamber, that I speak of these things; but I am endeavouring to make a point. I spoke of the tactics my opponents endeavoured to use, and did use but without success, in the last election campaign. For the purposes of record, and to refute the rotten allegations of my opponents during the election campaign, I want to point out to hon. members here assembled that I am one of a family of 10 children—six boys and four girls. Those six boys joined the A.I.F. and served overseas and three sons-in-law of my late father also served overseas. Most hon. members present knew my father, or knew of my father, who saw active service in three world wars. Thomas Bromley served in the South African War. He put his age up as a young man and served the full time. In the 1914-1918 war he saw four years' active service, and he saw active service in the A.I.F. before I did in the 1939-45 war. I regret to have to record in "Hansard" the passing of such a great man, a man we were proud of and a man who was proud of us because he believed, as all in our family believe, in our allegiance and faithfulness to the country and our Sovereign. I want to place that on record, although, as I say, Mr. Speaker, it may seem strange to you.

I did receive—and I am thankful for them—letters of condolence from many hon. members of this Assembly. In particular, perhaps I might mention one that I received from a former army colleague of my father, Mr. Hooper. As I stated, I am merely trying to make a point. Perhaps later more of what I have been speaking of in relation to these rotten allegations may be heard in places other than Parliament House.

Before proceeding, I want to refer to something as further proof of my point concerning the type of propaganda that members of the coalition parties use to win elections. They have various filthy methods such as the use of the Communist angle and the gerrymandering of electorates, as I pointed out a while ago. Recently, as hon. members know, we have been receiving correspondence from the Reciprocal Trade Federation of the United Kingdom. One letter that reached me concerned a dish-washing machine. From memory, I think the brand was Colstan. The price and specifications of the machine were quoted. Having an inquiring nature, and, unlike hon. members opposite, ever-ready to learn, I decided to look at it when I went to the

Brisbane Exhibition. It was being displayed by Finney Isles & Co. Ltd. Although I may not have had any intention of purchasing one, certainly I may have been an ambassador for the selling of these machines.

I made my way to the stand and, lo and behold, there I saw the hon. member for Nundah, who was in the House this afternoon, and the hon. member for Merthyr, Mr. Ramsden, and also another so-called Liberal member, talking to a young salesgirl. I went along and Mr. Ramsden, who was talking to this young salesgirl, said, "Fred, I would like you to meet a niece of mine." For obvious reasons, I shall not mention the girl's name, because she is employed in Brisbane and I wish to protect her name. What I want to point out is the shocking way in which members of the so-called Liberal Party are endeavouring to indoctrinate the minds of young people with their filthy, rotten allegations and slander concerning the Communist-taint in relation to citizens.

Sam Ramsden said, "Fred, I would like you to meet a niece of mine." Then he said, "This is the Labour member for Norman, Mr. Bromley." I was wearing my R.S.L. badge, of which I am very proud. Incidentally, I am a trustee of the R.S.L. This young lady looked deliberately at my badge and said, "You should be wearing the hammer and sickle, shouldn't you?" I treated that remark with the contempt that it deserved. Hon. members opposite may chuckle and laugh, but I think that that is a disgraceful state of affairs. I have already told the House of my war record and that of my family.

**Mr. Smith:** She probably knew your political record.

**Mr. BROMLEY:** In answer to that interjection, I point out that the hon. member for Merthyr did say, "This is Mr. Bromley, the Labour member for Norman." I do not think that that type of salesmanship, if I might call it that, on the part of the young lady would sell many washing machines or dish-washing machines, or induce customers to purchase from that particular firm.

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** I rise to a point of order in view of the insinuation of the hon. member for Norman that the young lady made her statement, "You ought to be wearing a hammer and sickle", because she had been indoctrinated by a group of Liberals. I want to put it on record that she had not been indoctrinated by us. When I introduced the hon. member as a member of the A.L.P. her natural reaction was to say, "Where is your hammer and sickle?" I cannot be blamed if the A.L.P. has left itself this public image.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. BROMLEY:** I do not think that is a point of order. I simply stated the facts; therefore, there is no point of order. The hon. member knows that, Mr. Speaker, and if I had time I would seek your permission to interrupt my speech to go over and punch him on the nose.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. BROMLEY:** I think I have made my point, and I believe that hon. members opposite should think of these things before again degrading themselves and sinking to the use of the low type of propaganda that they have used in the past. As the hon. member for Salisbury pointed out, this sort of thing has been going on for about 70 years, ever since the formation of the great Australian Labour Party. But the Australian Labour Party is altogether different from a coalition government, which is a marriage of convenience between two political parties. It is the only party which has governed, and can and will in the near future, govern in its own right, not only in Queensland but in the Federal Parliament too.

There are many items that one would like to discuss to some extent during the Address-in-Reply debate. Unfortunately, each would take a great part of the time allotted, so I propose to deal briefly with subjects that are of interest to a majority of the people. Let me point out how the Government has fallen down on its job in providing what I believe is the main interest of the majority of the people—security. I have often spoken of security, which is a small word that has great meaning to very many people.

I wish to deal first with a current problem, the problem of the aboriginal people of Australia. Through the persistent and insistent demands made by myself and others, things are at last looking up for our aboriginals. I am very grateful for that; no doubt the aboriginals, too, are grateful. However, in my opinion, there is still a great deal to be done before the complete assimilation and integration of these people is achieved. Section 51 of the Australian Constitution provides—

“Legislative powers of the Parliament. The Parliament shall, subject to this Constitution, have power to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of the Commonwealth with respect to:—”

and subsection 26 says—

“The people of any race, other than the aboriginal race in any State, for whom it is deemed necessary to make special laws:”.

Under the provisions of Standing Order No. 17, the debate was adjourned.

The House adjourned at 5.31 p.m.