

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 24 SEPTEMBER 1963**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## TUESDAY, 24 SEPTEMBER, 1963

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

### ASSENT TO BILLS

Assent to the following Bills reported by Mr. Speaker:—

Officials in Parliament Acts Amendment Bill.

Statutory Salaries and Allowances Bill.

District Courts Acts Amendment Bill.

Supreme Court Acts Amendment Bill.

Queensland Law Society Acts Amendment Bill.

### QUESTIONS

LICENSING OF REAL ESTATE SALESMEN.—Mr. Dean, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier:—

In view of the increasing incidence of unscrupulous house and land salesmen who operate at week-ends and who impart misleading information to innocent people, will he give consideration to having a licensing system introduced for all salesmen of real estate?

*Answer:—*

“The advisability of licensing real estate salesmen (as distinct from real estate agents) received careful consideration prior to the comprehensive amendments to The Auctioneers, Real Estate Agents, Debt Collectors and Motor Dealers Acts, 1960. However, action in this regard was not taken as it was considered that certain practical difficulties would limit the effectiveness of such legislation. This and other related matters were included among subjects discussed at a recent deputation with my colleague the Minister for Justice by the Real Estate Institute of Queensland. Various matters discussed in the course of that deputation are receiving consideration. In this connection, I might mention that the mere licensing of salesmen would not in itself ensure ethical standards of conduct. Real estate agents generally are required to be licensed and are subject to the requirements of The Auctioneers, Real Estate Agents, Debt Collectors and Motor Dealers Acts.”

SURRENDER OF BLOCKS, LAND DEVELOPMENT (FITZROY BASIN) SCHEME.—Mr. Duggan, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Public Lands:—

(1) Are successful applicants for land under the Land Development (Fitzroy Basin) Scheme denied the return of deposit, if forced to surrender on medical grounds the block they have been allotted?

(2) What would be the average Departmental cost involved in the surrender of a block of land under this Scheme?

(3) While admitting that this land is only available to persons with considerable financial backing, will he consider the return of this money in cases where surrender is forced upon the holder through ill-health, which is confirmed by a medical certificate?

*Answers:—*

(1) “No. See also Answer to (3).”

(2) “The average cost of preparing a block for selection where it is possible to deal with the block as part of a group is something over £60. If a block is surrendered it can usually be advertised for selection again in conjunction with another group of blocks but it is then necessary to make special provision for it on the new lithograph and additional costs would be involved. These additional costs would be difficult to estimate accurately but would not be less than about £30 per block.”

(3) “Each case is decided on its merits. If enquiries show that the health condition to which the selector’s inability to proceed has been attributed was in evidence prior to the date of the application but was not disclosed in his application, then a refund of the deposits lodged would be unlikely. In view of the number of applicants who firmly intend proceeding if they are successful in a ballot, it is considered reasonable that some deterrent should be available against people drawing blocks when they have no definite intention of proceeding with their application. Apart from the additional expense involved where a block is surrendered, there is the other aspect of delay in development of the block.”

CLOSURE OF ANTIGUA RAILWAY STATION.—Mr. Davies, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport:—

(1) Is it intended to close the Antigua railway station and, if so, when?

(2) How many tons of cane were forwarded to Maryborough from this station during the last crushing season and how many tons are available to be forwarded from this centre this year?

(3) How many feet of timber were forwarded from this centre during the last twelve months?

(4) If this station is to be closed, how will the postal services be affected?

*Answers:—*

(1) "Yes, as from completion of business on Monday, October 7, 1963."

(2) "4,218 tons of sugar-cane were railed from Antigua during the 1962 sugar season. The quantity to be railed from that station during the 1963 sugar season is expected to approximate the tonnage railed during the 1962 sugar season."

(3) "Nil."

(4) "The Postmaster-General's Department has been informed of the closure to enable that Department to make alternative arrangements for the carrying out of the postal services. I would point out to the Honourable Member that Antigua is in the electorate of the Honourable the Minister for Education who has already presented a petition to me requesting further consideration of the position."

REVENUE FROM ON-COURSE AND OFF-COURSE BETTING.—Mr. Hanlon, pursuant to notice, asked The Treasurer,—

(1) In view of the opinions expressed by him on November 30, 1961, in introducing amendments to the Racing and Betting Act that the dominant purpose of the Bill was in relation to Off-course betting and that the Government was seeking a way in which the illegal trade could be harnessed, is it not anomalous that some two years later under the same Act, as then and later amended by his Government they are deriving two to three times the revenue from On-course turnover by way of taxation, then introduced, as they are from the now legalised Off-course sources?

(2) Is there not a sound basis for returning to the Clubs, as requested by them, an increased percentage of the On-course turnover tax?

*Answer:—*

(1 and 2) "Any intentions in this and other financial matters are contained in the Annual Budget Speech."

TOWNSVILLE CENTENARY CELEBRATIONS.—Mr. Tucker, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

As the year 1964 is the centenary of the city of Townsville, will he give consideration to a special allocation of funds for the purpose of allowing State departments in Townsville to actively participate in the centenary celebrations by way of lighting and decorating of State buildings and for the inclusion of decorated floats in centenary marches?

*Answer:—*

"On submission of a proposal by the organisers of the Townsville Centenary Celebrations, the Government will be happy to consider participating in a

Centenary procession as well as schemes for illumination and decoration of the city."

INSTALLATION OF LIGHTED OVERHEAD SIGNS AT PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS.—Mr. Sherrington, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Labour and Industry,—

In the interest of the safety of pedestrians and as a means of assisting in the prevention of road accidents at night, will he give consideration to the flood-lighting of pedestrian crossings together with warning devices of the approach to a pedestrian crossing either by way of overhead illuminated signs placed approximately 100 yards prior to the crossing or the use of luminous painted signs on the roadway, warning that a pedestrian crossing is ahead?

*Answer:—*

"On August 2 I asked the Chairman, Traffic Commission, to investigate the desirability and practicability of installing lighted overhead signs at pedestrian crossings and am now awaiting his report."

REGISTRATION OF STOCKBROKERS.—Mr. O'Donnell, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Justice,—

(1) Are stockbrokers who handle millions of pounds of investors' money registered or licensed by Act of Parliament?

(2) If the Answer to Question (1) is in the negative, what qualifications are necessary for appointment to the stock exchange?

(3) If the Answer to Question (1) is in the negative, and in view of the fact that many hundreds of small investors seek advice of stockbrokers before investing in public companies, will he consider some form of licensing for public protection?

(4) To whom and to what authority are stockbrokers answerable?

*Answers:—*

(1) "Regulation 24 of the regulations under "The Stamp Acts, 1894 to 1962," prohibits any broker or agent from carrying on the business of dealing in stocks or marketable securities unless he is registered by the Commissioner of Stamp Duties, as a broker, for the purposes of those Acts. The provisions dealing with applications, assurances to be given by applicants, and registration are to be found in Regulations 26 and 27 of these Regulations. Stockbrokers may be registered as such under the Stamp Acts although not members of a recognised Stock Exchange."

(2 to 4) "See Answer to Question (1). However, for the information of the Honourable Member, I may mention that the Brisbane Stock Exchange is one of the recognised Stock Exchanges in Australia. I am advised by the Manager of the

Brisbane Stock Exchange that members of the recognised Stock Exchanges are chosen very carefully and that their financial positions are investigated and must be adequate to cover the class of business they carry on from time to time. Members of the Australian Associated Stock Exchanges are answerable primarily to their own governing body, but are also subject to the law generally. They are subject to rules and regulations which are designed to ensure a free and active market for shares with the greatest practicable protection for the public, and to provide for investigation of any allegation of professional misconduct made against a member. The committee of the Brisbane Stock Exchange has power to punish breaches, to suspend a member, or cancel his membership in suitable cases. In this connection I must also point out that no Act of Parliament could possibly prevent the making of unwise investments and investments which involve a risk of loss. However, there is no doubt that the Australian Associated Stock Exchanges have done a commendable job over a long period of years in drawing up and policing requirements for the listing of companies, thus affording a considerable measure of protection to investors. Similarly there are extensive provisions in the Companies Act designed to protect the interests of investors and other persons having dealings with companies."

VETERINARY OFFICER, BARCALDINE.—  
Mr. O'Donnell, pursuant to notice, asked  
The Minister for Agriculture and Forestry,—

When he stated in Answer to my Question on September 19 that vacancies exist for veterinary officers at Emerald, Toowoomba, Goondiwindi, Brisbane, Maryborough and Cloncurry, why did he omit the centre of Barcardine?

*Answer:—*

"A veterinary officer was appointed to Longreach in 1961. This officer's district extends to Jericho in the east, Tambo in the south and to Winton and the Northern Territory in the north and west. It includes Barcardine. Longreach was selected as the officer's headquarters in preference to Barcardine because it is more centrally situated."

SUPPLY OF CABINET TIMBER, NORTH QUEENSLAND.—Mr. Wallis-Smith, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Agriculture and Forestry,—

In view of the constant harvesting of cabinet timbers from the natural forests of North Queensland, will he consider a replanting scheme in order to maintain supplies in the future?

*Answer:—*

"The Government is aware of the desirability of maintaining and improving the production from the rain forest areas of North Queensland. Research work has

shown that the best method of achieving this is not by clearing and planting, but by a natural regeneration system which improves the composition of the forest and increases the rate of growth of the smaller trees of desirable species already on the area. In some areas enrichment plantings are carried out to augment the stocking of the better species. The acreage of rain forest in North Queensland which has been given silvicultural treatment over the past four years is—1959-1960, 1,360 acres; 1960-1961, 1,560 acres; 1961-1962, 2,030 acres; 1962-1963, 2,778 acres. Expenditure of money on this class of work is necessarily restricted to areas permanently reserved for the production of timber, i.e. State Forests. The bulk of the remaining rain forest in North Queensland is not State Forest at present, but action is now current to increase the acreage of such reservations."

STUDY OF HIRE-PURCHASE IN NEW SECONDARY SCHOOL CURRICULUM.—Mr. Bromley, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

In view of the need for young people to learn the intricacies, methods and the proper use of hire-purchase and associate buying of necessities, will this be a part of the new curriculum in secondary education? If not, will he give consideration to the inclusion of this very necessary adjunct to present-day learning, particularly, if arrangements could be made with a knowledgeable lecturer from reputable hire-purchase companies to attend high schools to teach this subject to students?

*Answer:—*

"The study of hire-purchase and of other methods of acquiring goods is included in the new secondary school curriculum."

FINE INFLICTED ON G. J. HOLMES FOR DRUNKEN-DRIVING.—Mr. Aikens, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Justice,—

(1) In the Brisbane Traffic Court on September 18, was a man named Gregory James Holmes convicted of drunken-driving by Mr. Noone, S.M.?

(2) Was Holmes fined £35 and allowed to pay such fine at the rate of £2 per week, the first payment to start in eight weeks time?

(3) Was Holmes represented in Court by (a) a solicitor and (b) a prominent barrister?

(4) If the Answers to Questions (1), (2) and (3) are in the affirmative, why was a drunken driver who could afford such legal representation (a) given less than the usual fine and (b) granted such generous terms for the payment of it?

*Answers:—*

(1) "Holmes was convicted of the offence that while under the influence of liquor or a drug he was in charge of a motor vehicle."

(2) "Yes."

(3) "The defendant was represented by counsel instructed by a solicitor."

(4) "In relation to offences generally there is no such thing as a 'usual' fine. The matter of the penalty imposed in any case and the time for payment is one for determination by the Court in conformity with the law."

**PUBLICATION OF NEWSPAPER *Free-thinker*.**—Mr. Aikens, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Justice,—

(1) Were two men, Richard Neville and Richard Walsh, recently fined in a Sydney Magistrate's Court for publishing an extract from Queensland *Hansard*?

(2) Did the Magistrate rule and impose the penalty because he considered the extract an obscene publication?

(3) Was the extract from Queensland *Hansard* a newspaper named *Freethinker* read by me in the course of a speech?

(4) Was this newspaper *Freethinker* referred to, (a) published by a man named Humphrey McQueen and (b) circulated at the Queensland University? If so, was any action taken against McQueen under the Queensland obscenity laws and, if not, why not?

*Answers:—*

(1) "The Department of Justice has no record of the proceedings in the case which is stated in the Question to have been a case in a Sydney Magistrate's Court."

(2 to 4) "See Answer to Question (1)."

## PAPERS

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

Report—

Golden Casket Art Union for the year 1962-1963.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

The State Electricity Commission Acts, 1937 to 1962.

The Southern Electric Authority of Queensland Acts, 1952 to 1958.

## FEES PAID BY CROWN TO BARRISTERS AND SOLICITORS

### 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. Houston, showing all payments made by the Government to barristers and solicitors during the 1962-1963 financial year.

## AUSTRALIAN CONSULAR OFFICERS' NOTARIAL POWERS AND EVIDENCE ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

### INITIATION

**Hon. A. W. MUNRO** (Toowong—Minister for Justice): 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 Australian Consular Officers' Notarial Powers and Evidence Acts, 1946 to 1953, in a certain particular."

Motion agreed to.

## MEDICAL ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

### INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

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

**Hon. H. W. NOBLE** (Yeronga—Minister for Health and Home Affairs) (11.25 a.m.): I move—

"That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Medical Acts, 1939 to 1958, in certain particulars."

Certain anomalies have been revealed in the administration of the Medical Acts, 1939 to 1958, and it is evident that the legislation should be amended in some respects to bring it up to date to meet changing circumstances. The Bill will effect the necessary corrections and amendments.

The first amendment concerns the registration in Queensland of medical practitioners who have obtained qualifications outside the State. The existing provisions of the Act permit the registration here of medical practitioners whose primary qualifications are not equivalent to the standard of the graduates of the faculty of medicine of the University of Queensland, but because these persons hold post-graduate qualifications obtained in certain recognised areas, an application from such a person for registration as a legally qualified practitioner authorised to practise in Queensland cannot be refused. In effect, the Act provides for

the registration in Queensland of persons holding post-graduate qualifications obtained in Great Britain, Northern Ireland, the Dominion of New Zealand, and the Commonwealth of Australia without holding primary degrees, diplomas, or certificates obtained in those places. The first amendment seeks to rectify this matter. The addition to the definitions contained in the Act of a definition to clarify the meaning of "primary" is complementary to this first amendment.

The second amendment deals with the question of reciprocity with South Africa in the matter of recognition of medical degrees. Queensland qualifications have been recognised in South Africa since 1948, and until 1955, when the Act was amended, the holders of qualifications obtained in South Africa were entitled to registration under the Medical Acts of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and, that being so, were also entitled to registration in Queensland. However, the 1955 amendment of the Queensland legislation repealed the provision requiring the Board to register persons registered under the Medical Acts of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and substituted recognition of qualifications obtained in Great Britain, Northern Ireland, the Dominion of New Zealand or the Commonwealth of Australia. The result has been, of course, that from the date of the passing of the Medical Acts Amendment Act of 1955 up to the present time, South African qualifications have not been recognised for registration in Queensland.

The professors of medicine, surgery and obstetrics of the University of Queensland are of the opinion that the degrees in medicine obtained in the South African University medical schools are equal in status to the degree in medicine issued by the University of Queensland, and, in the light of an approach made by the South African Medical and Dental Council, it is now proposed to restore recognition for registration purposes of persons holding degrees in medicine obtained at universities in the Republic of South Africa recognised by the South African Medical and Dental Council.

**Mr. Bromley:** Does this reciprocity include dentists?

**Dr. NOBLE:** At the moment it would not.

The next amendment concerns overseas students, including those nominated in pursuance of the aims and objects of the Colombo Plan, who come to Australia to undertake post-graduate study. Some of these overseas students hold medical qualifications which are not recognised in Australia for the purposes of registration as medical practitioners, but in order to enable them to carry out duties connected with their studies it is desirable that some form of registration be granted to them. The Post-graduate Medical Education Committee

has requested that they be granted registration for the purpose of their studies. The Bill makes the necessary provision for this registration, which will be limited to the purposes for which it is required. Any requests for the registration of students will come from institutions or organisations interested in post-graduate teaching in medicine or branches of medicine, and such bodies will have satisfied themselves as to the suitability of the student for post-graduate training. The registration envisaged will not grant any rights to full registration to practise as a medical practitioner in Queensland, and the amending provision to which I referred earlier, dealing with the non-registration to practise in Queensland of persons who have not the requisite primary qualifications, will ensure that there will be no danger of any of these students who may obtain post-graduate qualifications becoming eligible to be registered to practise in Queensland by virtue of those post-graduate qualifications only.

**Mr. Bromley:** Does this mean that they can practise only in Government-controlled hospitals?

**Dr. NOBLE:** That is right. They will go into one of the medical schools and be allowed to practise there under the supervision of the post-graduate teachers.

The last of the proposed amendments concerns the provision for registration of a medical practitioner as a specialist. As it now stands, the Act requires that an applicant for specialist registration furnish a degree or diploma in a speciality issued by a university or other institution "legally authorised" to grant such degree or diploma. However, some well-recognised institutions, for example, the Australian College of Radiologists and Pathologists, the Royal Australasian Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons and the Australasian Association of Psychiatrists, are not legally authorised in this sense.

Diplomas issued by these organisations have been accepted by the Medical Board of Queensland, and the applicants have been registered as specialists in the speciality covered by the diploma or degree held by them. It is felt that, on the one hand, the Act should be amended to provide legal recognition of such qualifications in the past, and also to provide that they be acceptable for specialist registration henceforth. In addition, it is felt desirable that some measure be laid down as to the quantum of experience necessary to indicate the ability to practise as a specialist, with the added provision that most of the time spent during the qualifying period shall be spent practising the speciality.

**Mr. DUGGAN** (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (11.33 p.m.): I intend to be rather brief at this stage

because I wish to study in more detail the outline given by the Minister and to try to observe the full effect of the proposed alterations.

It is natural that, over a period of time, any Act passed for the purpose of controlling such an important section of the population as the medical profession perhaps needs some review, and I do not for one moment deny the Minister the right to make recommendations along these lines in the light of experience and practice.

I suppose it would be not unfair to say that the Australian Medical Association is certainly a very tightly-knit body with very strong disciplinary powers, that it certainly lays down a very exacting code of ethics and enforces those standards very strictly; but there are some people who think it is perhaps one of the most effective trade-union organisations in the country in its powers to discipline its members and to obtain unanimity of opinion once a decision is reached by the controlling body. I have had the pleasure and privilege of being present at some annual meetings of this association, I have had the opportunity of being in contact with some of the people who are in control of it, and I have watched with a good deal of interest the work that is accomplished by the association and also the aims and objectives that are frequently mentioned by the incoming president or the retiring president, as the case may be.

During his period in control of this department I think the Minister has set out in some respects to improve the standards applying in some of the professions that come within his jurisdiction. As I have said before, the Australian Labour Party does not desire to become associated with any movement likely to lower professional standards. We do, however, feel that great care should be taken to see that professional fences are not erected that confer disproportionate benefits upon those within their shelter. I have not been able to discover, nor do I expect to be able to, any acts of this association that could be considered unethical or against the public interest.

It is true that sometimes members of this association band together, as do many others, not only for the promulgation of ethical professional standards but also for the laying down of a code of conduct and scale of fees, and other matters thought to be in the best interests of members. There does seem to be a desire among practitioners generally to accept strictly all decisions arrived at. I sometimes feel that members of the controlling body deal a little unsympathetically and harshly with some people who have come into collision with the council on certain matters, and once a person collides with it it is hard for him to obtain effective redress.

I have had my attention drawn particularly to cases of foreign-trained doctors who have come here and had a good deal of trouble in having their degrees recognised. Even when their qualifications have been accepted, they have been regarded in some cases somewhat as outcasts in the profession. The Minister will know that during the war years in particular some gained what might be called preferential postings through the absence of doctors on war service, and this was not looked upon very favourably by the council.

I should like to examine in greater detail at a later stage the first amendment outlined by the Minister. Previously some people who came to Australia, provided they were able to satisfy post-graduate qualifications, were eligible for registration notwithstanding that their primary standard did not enable it. It seems to me to be rather a moot point in what respect the absence of some predetermined primary qualification should debar a person who can satisfy the examining body that his post-graduate qualifications are of a sufficiently high standard.

I do not know what these deficiencies are but I do not think I would be unfair to the Minister, who has been a member of the medical profession for a number of years, if I suggested that he could well have extreme difficulty at this stage in passing some of the primary examinations. Many people who have been actively practising their professions for a number of years would find it difficult if they were now forced to sit for examinations at primary standard.

To digress for a moment from the medical profession, there was a period in my life during which I was anxious to study law, but I found that the preliminary examination would have been much more difficult for me than the intermediate or final examinations, as it required standards quite beyond me because I did not have a secondary education. The knowledge required of Latin and certain other subjects would have made it very difficult for me to pass the preliminary examination.

I am not suggesting that we should ignore some of these primary examination qualifications, but I think it only fair to say that I doubt whether a very high percentage of practising medical men would be able to pass now some of the examinations set in the early part of the medical course. Any inability to do this is, however, more than compensated for by the general knowledge and experience that they have gained whilst following their profession.

I should like to know to what extent evidence is available that justifies the exclusion from registration of people who have been able to pass examinations based on post-graduate standards. I believe that those who set examinations for post-graduates, knowing that there may be some deficiency in the

primary qualifications, would set very high standards. I do not think for one moment that the Council of the Australian Medical Association would be anxious to facilitate the entry of people practising the medical profession in other countries to the local association in Queensland unless it was firmly convinced that they possessed all the requisite qualifications. That would be contrary to the history of such matters, because, as I said, if anything there has been a reluctance on the part of the Council to accept some people from overseas. I do not suggest that we should do other than preserve our standards. However, I often wonder about some of the standards that we set, particularly for adults as distinct from those who go through the first, second, third and fourth years of a course at the university, and what sort of a medical service is supplied in the country from which the people come. All members of the great human family are biologically similar, and they suffer from similar complaints. I can well understand that in some of the backward countries it is preferable to have semi-trained personnel dealing with some complaints; but when it is suggested that the standard is deplorably low in some countries in Europe, in particular, I wonder what service is given to the people of those countries.

This brings me to the next point—reciprocity. It seems to me that if some mutual arrangement for reciprocity can be made between various countries, there will be no limitation of or prohibition on registration being effected. I am not in a position to develop fully the argument on this point, but it seems to me that the standards could well be higher in certain countries than they are in other countries with which there is a reciprocal arrangement. This could mean that a person in a country not having reciprocal rights could possess qualifications higher than those of a person in a country with which reciprocity exists. South Africa was mentioned particularly, and I suppose the change there was brought about by South Africa's withdrawal from the British Commonwealth of Nations.

**Dr. Noble:** It was not noticed at the time of the amendment of the Act.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** There may be a reason for that. The fact that South African authorities recognise a Queensland degree gives them some reason for consideration, I suppose. I wonder what basis is laid down when the reciprocal arrangements are entered into; whether there is a uniformly high standard, or whether there is a disposition to accept certain people. I do not know. Mention of dentists was made by way of interjection—I do not want to be irrelevant—and some time ago my attention was drawn to the case of a person who had been practising in Hong Kong for a number of years and who was regarded as being a specialist in his profession. He made a good deal of money, then lost it because

of the march of Communism in parts of China, particularly in Shanghai, and he had extreme difficulty in establishing to the satisfaction of the authorities here his right to practise. The position is somewhat similar in the medical profession.

We have reached a curious position in regard to the third amendment, which relates to overseas students. I suppose that, to raise their standards to a level higher than they are at present, it is necessary for them to come here and do post-graduate work. Unless registration is effected, of course, students will be denied that opportunity. But, after all, in some instances patients are also involved in this advanced training. I will not use the term "practised upon"; nevertheless, there are cases in which the only qualifying factor appears to be that the post-graduate students will be under some form of supervision while they are doing their work. Patients are being treated, or examined, or diagnosed, or whatever may be the particular function of the student, although some of the students do not possess the required standard that enables them to practise in this State. The only safeguarding provision is that they practise under supervision. I must confess I do not know any alternative. If the supervision is adequate and effective, I do not suppose one could quarrel very much with it.

It does seem, however, that the question I raised earlier about the primary qualification is one the Minister should consider. The Minister says on the one hand that there are safeguards, for instance, with Colombo students doing post-graduate study under supervision. If it is competent for those students to reach the prescribed post-graduate standard but not be permitted to practice here because they lack the primary qualifications, there must be a measure of unfairness in it. After all, what is the purpose of their coming here? They come here because it is acknowledged, in the first instance that they can benefit by the post-graduate experience.

It seems to me to be a characteristic of the post-war period that doctors seek post-graduate experience. There was a period when very few medical practitioners in Australia, and particularly in Queensland, worried about post-graduate work, except in the field of specialisation; but today it is a common occurrence for people, having completed the medical course and the required period of training at a public hospital, or after having been in private practice two or three years, to go overseas for post-graduate training. There is a veritable exodus of these people overseas to well-known international medical schools. I welcome such a step. It is very gratifying to find, in the case of the Toowoomba General Hospital, that over a period of 15 years we have had very distinguished young men possessed of degrees such as Fellow of the Royal College

of Surgeons and Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, in contrast to their predecessors, who were very experienced general practitioners but did not take the opportunity at an early age to do post-graduate work. It appears to be a common feature today for these young people, gravitating from general hospitals or private practices, as the case may be, to undertake post-graduate study.

The point is that post-graduate study makes them competent to practise in the community, or perhaps to specialise in a particular aspect of medicine; but, as I say, if Colombo Plan students can come here—admitting that they may be deficient in primary qualifications—and under supervision, assuming that it is adequate and effective—and the Minister, no doubt, will assure the Committee that it is—reach some predetermined post-graduate-qualification standard, then it seems to me that there may be some sort of a case for registration only in so far as it may perhaps confer on the students the possibility of getting reciprocal rights somewhere else. I realise at present, with our colour discrimination, that that may not be possible. Hon. members will no doubt know of the instance of the dentist in Mareeba who came from Fiji. It may be difficult similarly for a medical student from, say, Ceylon to satisfy the authorities that he should be permitted to practise here unless he becomes a naturalised British subject. If people from those areas do reach the required standard, perhaps with reciprocity with other members of the British Commonwealth where there is no colour bar or distinction, it may be possible to allow them to practise but I should like the Minister to indicate just how the lack of primary qualifications cancels out the benefits conferred by post-graduate qualifications. I think it is fairly important.

After those general observations I will content myself with dealing with the last amendment that the Minister proposes, namely, registration of particular specialists. He mentioned that there was no recognition of the Royal College of Australian Physicians. I do not know whether it applies to the Royal College of Australian Psychiatrists, but here we have the extraordinary situation that, apparently without any statutory authority, these people have been recognised and given the right to practise as psychiatrists and physicians.

**Dr. Noble:** That was discovered about 12 months ago.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I am quite sure that if a foreign doctor lacking certain technical qualifications came into this country and the Australian Medical Association got onto him, it would not take 12 months; they would act with very great speed. They would discipline him. I do not want the Minister to misunderstand me on this point. I do not suggest that these people do not possess the qualifications of a specialist. I will accept without reservation that probably even under the amendment these people would be

registered in exactly the same way. The point I am making is that this practice has gone on with the approval of the Australian Medical Association's Council because they considered that evidence had been submitted to them which justified the rights of these people to practise as specialists, when in fact there was no authority to confer those particular qualifications on them. Now action is being very properly taken to rectify that defect. If there is a defect the proper step to take is to amend the law. I am not quarreling with that.

**Dr. Noble:** I think that we are the only State in Australia with registration of specialists.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** That may be a good thing, it may be a bad thing; I do not know. I had occasion to quarrel with the Minister some time ago about the training of pharmacists. At that time he brought into the Chamber a very imposing amount of evidence to show that the failure rate in the early stages of the pharmacy course was appalling. He submitted very compelling information. But I thought that to jump from Junior standard to university standard in one go was making a rather marked advance. The members of the Pharmaceutical Association, or whatever they call themselves, were all in favour of it, because they automatically obtained registration. On another occasion the Minister said that one of the reasons for university status being accorded to these people as a pre-requisite for their entering the Pharmaceutical College was that they would have to do a certain amount of scientific research. I said "Bunkum" to that, because I did not think 2 per cent. of chemists in Queensland would do research work. The big Australian drug houses and international drug companies with representatives here might well have a panel of highly trained personnel who would do that, but the ordinary practitioner does not. The Minister then changed his ground and said that they were concerned about selling methods. If that is so, these people could have done a business management course.

**Dr. Noble:** It has proved a very popular course at the university.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** All these registrations are welcomed by those who are already in.

**Dr. Noble:** There are a number of undergraduate pharmacy students at the university now.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I am not denying that. All I am pointing out is that in the reasons the Minister gave at that time he acted like a magician. He kept pulling different arguments from his hat. He came in in a very easy sort of way and tried to sell us the prospectus of this sort of proposal but when it came under scrutiny he started to pull out of the hat another argument which he had not used in the first place.

That may well be the case here. I am pressing now for some declaration on this point to prevent a repetition of it.

With the reservations I have made I am prepared to accept the general argument that the Minister has outlined as perhaps being reasonable in the light of the administrative experience of those responsible for the functioning of the Council of the Australian Medical Association, and others affected by the amendments. After we have had a look at the Bill and have had an opportunity of reading the Minister's remarks, we will have a better chance to assess the value of what is proposed.

**Mr. AIKENS** (Townsville South) (11.55 a.m.): There are a couple of points in the Bill that rather appeal to my sense of humour. Firstly, in accordance with the Bill, we will have medical reciprocity with South Africa. The Minister then told us that Colombo Plan students were to come to Queensland and take their post-graduate courses and possibly qualify here as fully-fledged doctors. Having passed all the requisite examinations they would then be eligible for reciprocity with South Africa. I should like him to tell us what arrangements he has made, or is prepared to make, to have coloured doctors who pass all the requisite examinations in Queensland—and are fully-fledged doctors in Queensland—permitted to practise in South Africa as fully-fledged coloured doctors. I should like him to tell us if he has given any thought to that particular matter.

**Dr. Noble:** What can I do about that?

**Mr. AIKENS:** The Minister could refuse reciprocity while South Africa practises racial segregation. That is what he could do about it and that is what I suggest he should do.

**Dr. Noble:** We would take a coloured person from South Africa and let him practise here if he was qualified.

**Mr. AIKENS:** The Minister would take a coloured doctor from South Africa and let him practise here, but will South Africa let a fully-qualified coloured Queenslander go there and practise? Of course it would not. The Minister knows very well it would not. This reciprocity with South Africa is pure bunkum and the Minister knows it is bunkum. At the present time I think the Minister should withhold reciprocity with South Africa until he has an assurance that our doctors, irrespective of the colour of their skins, have exactly the same reciprocity as we are prepared to give their doctors.

When the Bill was introduced, knowing it was a medical Bill, from my experience in this Chamber I realised it was not in the interests of the public and not in the interests of patients, but purely and simply in the interests of the medical profession.

Apparently it closes up certain loopholes, not in the interests of the public, but in the interests of the medical profession. We know, of course, that the Australian Medical Association has a code of ethics. Unfortunately, more often than not, this association confuses etiquette with ethics. We know that, in order to practise psychiatry as a specialist, a person must be registered by some psychiatric organisation in Australia, the name of which was given by the Minister. The other day I referred to the case in Townsville of a doctor of philosophy who is practising as a psychologist. Incidentally, I should like the Minister to know that I place psychology in exactly the same category as teacup reading. This man is a doctor of philosophy practising as a psychologist and is not a registered medical practitioner. He cannot be registered as a medical practitioner because he has not the necessary qualifications. Yet, when I exposed him in the Chamber—and naturally it had quite a bit of Press coverage in North Queensland—three eminent Townsville doctors publicly admitted that they were sending their patients to this unqualified medical practitioner for treatment by psychology.

**Dr. Noble:** Not for treatment.

**Mr. AIKENS:** Yes, for treatment. What were they getting for their five guineas a time, if it was not treatment?

**Dr. Noble:** Psychological assessment.

**Mr. AIKENS:** I had the case of one unfortunate working man who was sent to him by a doctor.

**Dr. Noble:** I'll bet you would be scared to go to him.

**Mr. AIKENS:** I'll bet he would be scared to come to me for my psychological assessment of him.

A registered medical practitioner, a man of high standing—and I hold him in high regard—said to this man, "You go along and see Dr. Edward Scott." He did not tell the patient that this Dr. Edward Scott was not a medical practitioner. This man went to see Dr. Edward Scott at the university, where he practises his branch of medicine. Before I go any further I should like to ask the Minister if psychology is a branch of medicine.

**Dr. Noble:** It is an adjunct.

**Mr. AIKENS:** If it is an adjunct of medicine can it be practised by an unregistered medical practitioner?

**Dr. Noble:** We have a psychologist attached to our welfare and guidance clinics. He does the psychological assessments.

Progress reported.

## ADDRESS IN REPLY

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—SEVENTH  
ALLOTTED DAY

Debate resumed from 19 September (see p. 451) on Mr. McKechnie's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

**Hon. A. T. DEWAR** (Wavell—Minister for Labour and Industry) (12.1 p.m.): I desire to associate myself with the expressions of loyalty of other hon. members to the person of Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, and congratulation of Sir Henry Abel Smith for the manner in which he applies himself to his task as Governor and representative of Her Majesty in this State.

In particular, I should like to pay tribute to the work of the Administrator, Sir Alan Mansfield, who has acted in that capacity during the period of Sir Henry's leave. He has carried out his duties in an exemplary manner. He is a great Queenslander who believes in and loves this State and he has applied himself in a way that has endeared him to the hearts of all Queenslanders.

I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Carnarvon and the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha, the mover and seconder of this motion, on their contributions to the debate. I think it is obvious that from these two new hon. members we can look forward to a high standard as they learn more of the procedures of this Parliament. Obviously they know their State; they believe in it, and that to me is more than half the battle because too few people in the State believe in Queensland. There is a reason for it and I will deal with it later.

My only reason for entering the debate is to reply to some comments by a few members of the Opposition on matters that impinge on the responsibility I now hold. Their comments were so wide of the mark and so completely devoid of any semblance of truth that I decided it was proper for me to reply to them.

The hon. member for South Brisbane, in his usual intemperate type of speech, commented on traffic problems and said, "I sincerely believe this Government has done virtually nothing to relieve the traffic problems that exist in Brisbane." I propose to analyse his remarks. I believe this Government's record on traffic is a fantastic one considering the overall demands for money made on every portfolio. The Minister for Health does not get enough money; the Minister for Education does not get enough money, nor does the Minister in charge of Main Roads, and so on. Each facet of government is hampered through lack of sufficient funds. That is because the State is a young and lusty growing infant. Not for many years to come will there be enough money to develop the State. So it is obvious to anyone who is prepared to think about it that in an

atmosphere of insufficient overall funds to develop this State adequately the record of this Government in traffic is fantastic. But the fact that it became necessary to do so much—and we do not for a moment suggest that we are doing enough—is due entirely to the complete and utter neglect of the State by the previous Government.

Whilst in office for so many years, the Australian Labour Party not only neglected traffic but, in keeping with its attitude to the public at large, was also completely unaware of, and quite disregarded, public safety. I shall mention some of the things that have been done that we think have added up to an alleviation of the traffic problem. Traffic lights installed in Brisbane in particular since the Traffic Commission was appointed number 61, including 28 at school pedestrian crossings. The number operating previously was seven, one of which has been discontinued.

We have established the opportunity now for controlling traffic at Sunday schools throughout the State. One member of the Opposition, namely, the hon. member for Salisbury, showed a great interest in this matter, and it is something that I also was interested in and took steps some three years ago to have instituted. When I became a Minister it was easier for me to see to it. It was investigated, and I am happy to state that we have now been able to do this.

A total of 288 zebra crossings and 367 two-line pedestrian crossings have been established since 1958. Prior to that, there were only 16 zebra crossings in the whole State. It is estimated that prior to 1957 there were 700 signs in operation in Brisbane. Since 1 January, 1959, 9,300 have been erected in Brisbane and 8,300 in other areas of the State.

Under the previous Government there were 13 one-way streets. Since the formation of the Traffic Commission, 14 additional one-way streets have come into operation. Mr. Wilbur Smith, a member of Wilbur Smith Associates, of Connecticut, U.S.A., recently visited this city. He is a leading traffic planner and he stated in the Brisbane "Telegraph" of 12 September that Brisbane was well ahead of all other Australian capitals in traffic planning. That is the statement of an expert.

What I have recounted is evidence of what has been done, yet the hon. member for South Brisbane says that the Government has done virtually nothing about traffic. He spoke about the extensive installation of traffic lights and said that at the same time wages have to be paid for policemen to assist the lights. Of course, a police officer is rostered for duty between the hours of 7.30 a.m. and 11 p.m. from Monday to Saturday at the more important intersections controlled by traffic lights. The duty of such officer is to prevent intersection blockages, prohibit turnings at such lights, and

enforce compliance with light signals by motorists and pedestrians. He is by no means confined to performance of duty at one spot alone. He may extend his activities for some distance should the occasion arise to attend to maintaining orderly traffic flow, enforcement of traffic laws, complaints and accidents, or any other phase of police duty. If traffic lights were not provided, a police officer would of necessity be required to remain on point duty for the whole period attending to the control of traffic and would be prevented from attending to other matters that may from time to time require police attention.

It must be obvious to all that there will be times, particularly in the early mornings and late afternoons, when the whole concentration of traffic is to or from the city, when a piece of mechanical equipment such as a set of traffic lights, which has no brain and cannot adjust itself to abnormal conditions, cannot give the elasticity provided by a uniformed officer on duty.

If there were any meat in what has been said by the hon. member for South Brisbane about the record of this Government in traffic control, surely the figures would indicate it. They do not, however, support his assertions.

**Mr. Herbert:** It is a pity he isn't here.

**Mr. DEWAR:** He is seldom in the House, so it is obvious that there must be many speeches that he does not hear.

Let us look at the record of traffic accidents in the Brisbane metropolitan area during the last 10 or 12 years. In 1952-1953, when 255,025 vehicles were registered in Queensland, there were 101 traffic deaths in the metropolitan area. Those figures remained static up till 1955, when they rose to 106, and then to 109 in the following year. In 1957-1958 the number of deaths jumped to 120, with a vehicle registration in Queensland of 346,000.

At that time the Government brought into being a Traffic Commission and a traffic code for the State and began to apply itself to the task of alleviating traffic problems in the interests of the people. What do we find? In the very first year of the operation of a traffic code in Queensland, the number of deaths from traffic accidents dropped from 120 to 90. It then went to 101, back to 90, and then up to 101 again by the end of 1962, when the vehicle registration was 436,000 for the State. So, taking the 10-year period from 1952 to 1962, the traffic deaths in 1952-1953 were 101, with a registration of 255,000 vehicles, and 10 years later the traffic deaths were still 101 with 436,000 registered vehicles. That is the record of the Government in traffic matters.

In the last 12 months the figures have again skyrocketed, and in the Brisbane metropolitan area 122 deaths have resulted from traffic accidents, with a State-wide vehicle registration of 462,831. What do the figures

show? They show that in 1956 there were 106 traffic deaths, with a metropolitan vehicle registration of 114,900 vehicles; in the 12 months ended June last there were 122 deaths, with an estimated registration of 162,900 vehicles. The increase in traffic fatalities is 15 per cent., whilst the increase in vehicle registrations is 41.75 per cent. For the State the increase in fatalities is 40.93 per cent., with a similar increase, 41.75 per cent., in the registration of vehicles. Therefore, in the Brisbane metropolitan area, where it is essential to embark on much more extreme measures of traffic control, where there is a higher density of traffic than there is in country towns or on open roads, traffic fatalities have increased by only 15 per cent. against an overall State average of 40 per cent. A large number of the traffic accidents during the last two years in particular, when there has been an upsurge in the number of accidents, have occurred in remote places where no-one in the world would attempt to apply traffic controls other than speed limits and a white line down the centre of the road. In fact, a big percentage of the accidents in the past 12 months has occurred as a result of trees uprooting themselves from the side of the road and moving into the centre of the road.

During the period to which I have referred there has been an increase of 81 per cent. in vehicle registrations in the State, yet in the Brisbane metropolitan area there has been an increase of only 15 per cent. in the number of fatal accidents recorded. I throw those figures in the teeth of the hon. member for South Brisbane, who said that nothing has been done. As a result of the action taken by the Government in traffic control and the money that has been spent—during the life of this Government approximately £1,000,000 has been spent—the lives of many Queenslanders have been saved; but the hon. member for South Brisbane is not even remotely interested in that.

**Mr. Newton:** Who is paying for that?

**Mr. DEWAR:** It does not matter who is contributing the money. The charge was that we, as a Government, have done nothing. I am pleased to note that, at least, many Opposition members do not agree with the hon. member for South Brisbane because, in the three months from 1 June no fewer than 59 individual applications have been received from members of the Opposition for the alleviation of some problem in their electorates. So it is obvious that, while the hon. member for South Brisbane does not consider that anything is being done, the majority of members of the Opposition, including the hon. member for Salisbury, the hon. member for Nudgee, and the hon. member for Belmont, are aware that the Government is doing something. They are making continuous representations in these matters, so they are well and truly out of step with the hon. member for South Brisbane.

The hon. member for South Brisbane went on then to deal with Main Street and stated that he had made continuous representations on it. The only letter on the file from the hon. member for South Brisbane in respect of a pedestrian underpass at Main Street is dated 9th June, 1960, and he signed it as an alderman. Yet he gets up in this House and says, "I have been making representations for years about this pedestrian underpass." As I say, there is only one letter on the file that was written by him.

**Mr. Davies:** Why should he write again?

**Mr. DEWAR:** Why shouldn't he? His representations were not even related to what was finally done. The traffic signals in Main Street, at Bell, Baines and Princess Streets will, I hope, be switched on late this week or early next week.

The hon. member for South Brisbane also complained bitterly about the fact that contracts were not let to one man. He said, "Why don't they let the contract to one man? Then there will be no hold-up." That simply shows that if the hon. member for South Brisbane spent a little more time in this House he might know something about what is happening in the government of the State. There is one very good reason why the contracts are not let to one man. Firstly, the controllers are not made in Australia; so, on his argument, he would suggest that we buy all this equipment from America and import it into Australia so that we can get it all made at the one place. We break up these component parts such as the lights, the arms, the signals, and everything we can break up, so that we can give the optimum number of Queensland organisations the opportunity of tendering for the supply of the equipment. Again the hon. member for South Brisbane is not interested in helping Queensland first.

**Mr. Bromley:** What is the principal firm that you get them from?

**Mr. DEWAR:** I do not handle the individual buying. I will get the information the hon. member wants.

**Mr. Hanlon:** They have been standing there for a long time.

**Mr. DEWAR:** I do not deny that. In answer to a question by the hon. member for Norman about two weeks ago, I explained that as a result of the Government's decision to go ahead with pedestrian crossings at schools that we considered were important, we utilised the controllers that we had for Main Street to save the lives of kiddies. As a result, we had to wait for further controllers to come from America. A water-side strike upset shipping and the controllers were delayed. If we are to be condemned because of that, by all means condemn us; we do not mind.

I have not a great deal of time and I want to deal with some of the other irrelevancies that have been raised.

**Mr. Houston:** What about the Shafston Avenue junction?

**Mr. DEWAR:** The Shafston Avenue-Main Street junction project, is part of the overall project to cost £45,000 and will be dealt with in the second phase of the parkatarea work. We know that the pedestrian underpass and traffic lights in Main Street are not a great deal of help until the Shafston Avenue junction is attended to. These things have to be done in logical sequence, and the work is being done now. The resumptions are on the way. Five properties on the corner are to be resumed. It is expected that Shafston Avenue will be attended to in the next few months.

A number of hon. members opposite made charges against the Government about unemployment. At the time of the election campaign the Leader of the Opposition stated that when we became the Government there were 7,500 people unemployed in Queensland. That is correct. Those were the figures for August, 1957. The figures for August, 1963, showed 8,447 unemployed. That is not a great difference. Although there were 900 more people unemployed I can say without fear of contradiction that up to 1,000 of that total figure were registered married women whose husbands are working. Because of the new conditions that apply in Queensland—the aura of buoyancy that exists—many married women are applying for jobs as the opportunity is there for them to get work. For that reason the figures are slightly inflated. A fortnight ago, at the end of August, the number of unemployed adult males for the entire State was 3,664. That number includes the unemployables and handicapped people for whom it will always be difficult to get jobs. That is the lowest figure for unemployed adult males since November, 1956—12 months before Labour was thrown out of office. In December, 1956, the figure was 4,610.

**Mr. Aikens:** Does it include pensioners who are applying for part-time work?

**Mr. DEWAR:** I am not sure about that. I will have to check that for the hon. member.

I want to go back in time now. No doubt there will be some howls of anguish when I do. I have been here for nearly 14 years, during which time I have constantly had to put up with stories about the Moore Government. When it suited Labour members they went back in time, and I want to go back in time now, but not as far back as the Moore Government. I am going to read from the "Queensland Government Gazette" of 3 April, 1940. Bear in mind that today the unemployment percentage figure is 1.4, and included in that percentage are married women who are registered for work, even though their husbands may be working. The following appeared in the "Queensland Government Gazette" of 3 April, 1940, which is

a decision of 29 March, 1940, of the Industrial Court of Queensland, arising from an application to the Court by the Australian Workers' Union and other unions (in this case, unlike the decision of 21 March, 1941, the applications were dismissed):—

"The unemployment index has been reconstructed since the basic wage was declared in July, 1939, and the trend is shown by the new index as follows—"

Then follow the unemployment figures for 1939 into 1940, when this country was at war, when there was full employment, when hundreds of Queenslanders had rallied to the flag and joined the Australian Imperial Forces. Under a Labour Government in Queensland the following were the unemployment percentage figures—

February, 1939	.. .. .	6.7
March, 1939	.. .. .	6.1
April, 1939	.. .. .	6.0
May, 1939	.. .. .	5.3
June, 1939	.. .. .	5.2
July, 1939	.. .. .	4.7
August, 1939	.. .. .	5.3
September, 1939	.. .. .	6.1
October, 1939	.. .. .	6.5

Australia was then at war, mind you! There was full employment and men were in the Forces!

Still under a Labour Government, the percentages continue—

November, 1939	.. .. .	6.4
December, 1939	.. .. .	6.7
January, 1940	.. .. .	5.8

Those are the unemployment figures when the Leader of the Opposition was a member of this House. I was not a member then, but I have no knowledge that the Labour Party of the day decried the fact that 5 and 6 per cent. of Queenslanders were unemployed. However, when there were 3 per cent. unemployed, at the height of our unemployment month of January, they said that the State was in the doldrums. So much for the honesty of purpose of members of the Opposition.

**Mr. Hanlon:** The work force was different from what it is today.

**Mr. DEWAR:** According to hon. members opposite there has to be a difference; there has to be a sinister reason for having so many unemployed.

I now wish to discuss the attitude of the hon. member for Nudgee to the Sydney Trade Fair.

**Mr. Ramsden:** Do you agree with what I said about it?

**Mr. DEWAR:** I read what the hon. member said. He was too kind! I do not know how long the hon. member for Nudgee was there: I can only assess that on that he has to say. I was in personal touch with all the planning, invited the firms, attended to the whole of the space, buying and everything else to do with that

fair. It may not be generally known that it is held in the Sydney Showgrounds. The Royal Easter Show in Sydney was held in about the middle of April. I did not go to Sydney to look at the space offered to us until a week after the Show. The building I looked at was a cattle pavilion with seven prize Hereford bulls and a lot of the stuff that the Labour Party indulges in all over the floor. That was our pavilion! A completely new floor had to be laid and I think it was a very good effort. To the best of my knowledge not one firm that participated in the fair was unhappy with the results. We know of positive business that has been written in Fiji, New Zealand and New South Wales as a result of exhibits at the fair. We also know that the managing director of a Burmese firm, Myasein Co. Ltd., after going through the Queensland pavilion made a trip to Queensland and visited a firm in Dalby and placed an order for £6,000 worth of farm equipment. I spoke to the representatives of one firm who sold £40,000 worth of machinery to clients with whom they had had no previous contact. All these things have been done despite the statements of the hon. member for Nudgee that it was a shockingly poor effort, that if we did not do it properly we should do nothing at all, and so on and so on, ad nauseam. The hon. member has no knowledge of the negotiations and discussions that have followed Queensland's display in the pavilion, or of the record business done by the Tourist Bureau office in Sydney during the month following the fair. He would not know that, but he is prepared to say that it was a poor show and that we should not have had it. He would not have a clue about anything to do with the fair. Despite the shocking neglect of this State by the Government to which he was proud to belong, he is not prepared to give credit for any forward movement that has taken place. He would not know, either, that the firm of Mitsubishi, one of the largest in Japan, had representatives in Sydney at the Trade Fair. They made a special trip to the Queensland pavilion, made full inquiries, and took particulars of the design and how things were exhibited, and said that the next Japanese fair in Sydney would be modelled along the same lines. The hon. member would not know that, but he stands on the floor of the House and makes these statements.

I had one main idea in going into the Sydney Trade Fair. I felt it was essential that we as a State should let people outside Queensland know that we were not still the cinderella State that Labour created. We thought it was time to let the world know, as far as we could spread the knowledge, that we are a State that is going places, and we took the step primarily for that purpose. Secondly, I wanted to go into the Sydney Trade Fair to let Queenslanders know that they had something to be proud of in their State, to get rid of the dead, palsied hand that Labour had laid

over this panorama of Queensland, and to give Queenslanders something to be proud of in the knowledge of what they have in their State. And I believe we succeeded. But the hon. member for Nudgee would not know. I had confirmation of my belief when, two weeks ago, I called on Mr. Wood, the director of the publicity section of the Department of Trade, which is responsible for the whole of the publicity of Australian products in every part of the world. The hon. member for Nudgee would not know that Mr. Wood congratulated Queensland on the excellence of its exhibit. He wanted to know the name of the architect who designed it and he said that, in his opinion, it was the best-presented pavilion in the entire fair. Those are the opinions of people who are not biased by political outlook but who have the right to speak for themselves.

Only two weeks ago in Mackay the proprietor of South Molle, Mr. Bauer, at the opening of the new Tourist Bureau in that centre, said to me, "You will be pleased to know that there were six New South Wales tourists on my island last month and the first thing they said to me on their arrival, when we sat down to have a drink and a talk, was how pleased they were that the Queensland Government had gone into the Sydney Trade Fair, and they congratulated Queensland on the excellence of that pavilion." These are unsolicited testimonials. I am not concerned with parroting stuff that is served up by people who have an interest in saying something nice. These are independent people who have expressed their opinions and I am prepared to accept that they know a little of what they are talking about.

As for the comparison with Western Australia—I congratulate the Western Australian Government on their exhibit. I saw over it with Mr. Court, the Minister for Development there, and he in turn had a look at ours. He congratulated us. For finesse, for that little extra polish, that added touch, the Western Australian exhibit was better than ours; but it was not better than ours—Mr. Court admitted this to me—in the comprehensive nature of the presentation of the State, and that is precisely what we set out to achieve. We set out to give people outside the State the knowledge and understanding that Queensland was not just a State that had a lot of wool and a lot of wheat and a lot of sugar. We set out to paint a comprehensive pattern of what Queensland had, and, from what Mr. Court, the Minister in charge of the Western Australian pavilion, had to say, I am satisfied that we achieved our objective. At least we achieved this for certain: we removed for all time—at least while this Government stays in power—the impression that Queensland is a cinderella State and one that has nothing to give. We removed that for all time, because the people today are with this Government in the promotion of the State and that is why

we were returned in 1963 as strong as we were in 1960. The people did not vote for the A.L.P. in 1963. In fact, they gave the A.L.P. away, and, please God, in the interests of this State, for a long time to come the A.L.P. will stay in the oblivion in which it now finds itself.

**Mr. BYRNE** (Mourilyan) (12.36 p.m.): A privilege that we enjoy at this time is pledging our loyalty to Her Majesty and the Throne, and on this occasion I do so on behalf of the electors of Mourilyan whom I have the privilege of representing.

I also wish to pay a tribute to His Excellency the Governor, His Excellency the Administrator, and to you, Mr. Speaker, on your re-election to your high office. We meet you both inside and outside this Chamber and, although there are times when we may have differences of opinion in the House, we find you outside to be an excellent gentleman. I congratulate also the Chairman of Committees on his appointment, and the new members on both sides of the House on their election. I offer congratulations also to the new Minister, Mr. Row, who is a North Queensland and a man in whom I have great confidence. I believe that he will be an excellent administrator.

I desire to speak today on a few matters that I think are worth bringing forward in the House. After listening to the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat, one would think that there was no need for Parliament because of all the good things that he said the Government had done for Queensland. He said that the Government had achieved all the things that he mentioned, but we on this side do not agree with him.

In land matters, which is a subject on which I propose to speak today, the policy of the Government in the far northern part of Queensland has been an abject failure. The Government has been in office for six years but cannot point to any increases in population in the far northern part of Queensland outside the city of Townsville. In the Mourilyan area there are fewer electors on the roll than there were previously, and I do not think that the other electorates in that part of the State are in any better state. In fact, populations are remaining stationary, if not declining.

I should like the Government to point out where settlement has been increased as a result of its efforts. It has no appreciation of the position, particularly in regard to the opening of land for settlement in the Far North. Instead of there being any improvement, I think that considerable harm is being done, and I shall endeavour to show why as I proceed. A great opportunity for settlement existed in the Tully and Innisfail areas. Government policy has been to open at infrequent intervals small parcels of

land which attract a very large number of applicants. Ballots are held, but they do not satisfy the great number of land-hungry people that exist in the North.

Consistent appeals have been made by the public for the opening of areas for cattle fattening, banana growing, and other forms of primary industry, but all to no avail, except in cases in which only a few pieces of land are opened. Over the years hon. members on this side of the House have even made very strong pleas for the opening of marginal land in North Queensland. The Government held the view that it would not open some land because it was wanted for the preservation of forests, or for some other reason.

I have spoken over the radio and written in the Press on this matter from time to time. When the Government had this particular land round Tully, its reasons for refusing to open it were that it was required for the possible production of sugar, for timber preservation, and for reforestation. Nothing at all has been done about reforestation, or what little has been done has been useless. I heard this morning that it is not proposed to carry on this work. We were told also that this land was required for reserves, and so on.

Let me digress for a moment and deal with the Government's insincerity in the matter of land settlement.

**Mr. Pizzey:** You will agree that more land has been opened up recently than was opened up in years gone by?

**Mr. BYRNE:** I shall deal with that later.

About four years ago there was a small sawmill at Carruchan, which was formerly in my electorate—I do not like going outside my own area—and it was burnt down. The owners were Brown & Broad Ltd., a Brisbane firm, and "The Courier-Mail" this morning seems to indicate that they are only a subsidiary of Hancock & Gore Ltd. Brown & Broad Ltd. possessed a very valuable licence for the harvesting of timber, and when the sawmill was operating over 100 men were employed there. The fire occurred and those men were dismissed overnight and scattered to the four winds, and they have never been re-employed. At the same time, Brown & Broad Ltd. have been allowed to retain the licence to harvest timber.

On 19 September I asked the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry a question about this matter, to which he replied—

"(1) On a previous occasion a former House was informed that Brown and Broad had advised that orders had been placed for machinery for rebuilding the Carruchan Sawmill at an early date. Rebuilding operations have not commenced.

"(2) The sawmill licence is current until September 30, 1963. The question of renewal or otherwise will be decided after considering all information available."

I ask hon. members to note that date, 30 September. For the Minister to give me a reply such as that, suggesting that machinery could not be supplied for the purpose of rebuilding, is a lot of rot and nonsense. I will show hon. members why in a few minutes. The person responsible for supplying that information to the Minister should be asked to review his answer to the question that I directed to the Minister. Just fancy no new machinery being available to rebuild a sawmill!

Let me now put the opposite point of view. Last December a sawmill at Tully was destroyed by fire, and in the following April, four months later, an up-to-date sawmill recommenced operations. The sawmiller kept on as many as possible of the men who were engaged at the sawmill before the fire occurred, and he put in new machinery and new equipment. The building, 160 feet long and 60 feet wide, was constructed mainly of steel, with a concrete floor and steel trusses to support the roof, and the equipment comprised Canadian benches, a sawdust disposal plant, and so on, and new offices and other structural improvements were included. In four months he was able to erect this modern sawmill. On the other hand Brown & Broad Ltd. have to consider giving orders for new machinery. Who would believe that? Nobody would believe it. It is false and irresponsible, and again I suggest that the person who gave that information to the Minister should be asked to review the situation.

It is stated in "The Courier-Mail" this morning—this is probably the crux of the matter—that Hancock & Gore Ltd. may suffer a loss and may not pay an interim dividend. The article also states that Brown & Broad Ltd. are a major timber and plywood subsidiary of the Hancock & Gore group, so I should have centred my question to the Minister on Hancock & Gore Ltd., not Brown & Broad Ltd. The article also announces that an advanced stage has been reached in negotiations for the sale of Brown & Broad Ltd. to a group headed by Kauri Timber Ltd. They plan to buy 145,412 15s. ordinary shares in Brown & Broad Ltd. and I want to know if this timber licence will form part of the assets that Brown & Broad Ltd. will sell to this new company. It is obvious that it will and it is quite obvious, too, that Brown & Broad Ltd. have no intention of ever rebuilding this sawmill. It seeks to dispose of this valuable timber licence to the concern that is trying to purchase it. If this Government, having granted the timber licence to Brown & Broad Ltd. allows it to form part of their assets to be sold to the new company, it should hang its head in shame.

It is stated in the Press that the sale of these shares would improve the liquid position of Hancock & Gore Ltd. Of course it would, but where do Brown & Broad Ltd. go from there? They will go out of existence, and the Government will consider, by

30 September, whether or not it will renew the licence. From the information now available it is obvious that a timber licence will be granted to the company that is trying to buy out Brown & Broad Ltd.

Reverting to settlement, local people with capital to invest are leaving the district. I refer now to Innisfail and Tully. Why is that occurring? It is a valuable and profitable district. It is because there are no opportunities for settlement and because they can employ their capital to better advantage elsewhere. There is no opportunity for these farmers' sons to get onto the land. They are continually asking for certain lands to be opened up so that they may settle on it and build a home and so forth, but there are no opportunities. I say it is very detrimental to the district because no other avenue for employment exists. We should not have these complaints, and more of this land should be opened for selection.

The Government did open for selection a few years ago an area in my electorate called Munro Hill, which comprised 2,000 acres and was cut up into two blocks of 1,000 acres each. There were 250 applicants for each of those blocks, and the court house at Innisfail resembled the showground on Show Day. Everyone was trying to get over the other fellow in order that he might press his case for obtaining one of these blocks.

**Mr. Murray:** Would you like to outline the conditions of those applications?

**Mr. BYRNE:** I have not that information here.

**Mr. Murray:** You remember the conditions?

**Mr. BYRNE:** No, I have not the particulars, and I do not want to be diverted.

**Mr. Murray:** It is very important to this issue.

**Mr. BYRNE:** All right, let me proceed. Some of those 250 applicants certainly were not suitable. They had to have £50 deposit; but I should say the great majority of them were capable of carrying out their obligations under the terms of settlement. One of the successful applicants was a young man with experience and capital. He had been successful on the farm where he had been working. He went onto the place, developed it, settled it, improved it, constructed a home and did everything possible to make a success of the venture.

The other block went to an applicant without any experience and he forfeited it after three years. His forfeited block was made available for selection but, because of the terms and conditions on this occasion—in contrast to what happened previously—the number of applicants was considerably reduced. In my opinion the conditions were unreasonably restrictive. Applicants had to have £6,000. Many who would be good applicants could not find that amount of money. In addition, even though they

may have had all the qualifications and capital, if they had an interest in a partnership in other land they were not eligible. The working man has been completely eliminated. How could anyone expect a working man in those districts to have £6,000 or securities to that extent? When we impose restrictive conditions obviously we reduce the number of applicants. That is what has happened in this instance. My point is that if you put up a reasonable proposal you will be overrun with applicants. How many applicants were there for the 400 acres that were made available at Silkwood? Over 600. Fancy 600 applicants for 400 acres! Even if 50 per cent. of them were unsuitable applicants, it would still leave 300 suitable, land-hungry people who want to get onto the land. What chance has the ordinary person of getting a piece of land? That illustration shows that the people are land-hungry. They want to settle; they want to produce something; they want to build homes; they want to bring up their families. They are prepared to spend all their capital, but they have to live unsatisfied and in discontent because of the conditions imposed. It would appear obvious that the Government wants settlement from the favoured class—men with money and influence, men who can tap resources of capital, and so on.

Now comes the bolt from the blue. I want to deal with King Ranch. Earlier this year the Government announced that it proposed to grant a huge tract of land to the King Ranch company. Whether it is an Australian or an American company, I do not know.

**Mr. Murray:** An international meat-packer.

**Mr. BYRNE:** Therefore it is not a wholly Australian company. It does not make much difference because all these companies are tied up. These meat companies acquire 51 per cent. of the shares and put in their own policy. It does not make any difference. The Government is going to give this international company the land that I have been urging for donkey's years in this Parliament should be opened up. The Government is going to give this company which is not wholly Australian 51,000 acres of land at a price which I will deal with shortly. The Government is going to sell 51,000 acres of land in the Tully Valley to an international company for a song. If someone sang a good song or put on a good comic act maybe he would have been given the land for nothing.

**Mr. Murray:** What is the price?

**Mr. BYRNE:** I am coming to that in a few minutes.

Much emphasis has been placed on the fact that it is swampy land. Dozens of times I have mentioned that part of it is swampy, but part of it is good land. Part of it is worth far more than what the Government is prepared to sell it for. In the past I have asked time and time again

that the land be opened up. Our people in Tully and Innisfail, and others applying for land, should have been given a chance to settle on the 51,000 acres which the Government is selling at a ridiculous price to an international meat company.

**Mr. Murray:** For 26 years your Government did absolutely nothing.

**Mr. BYRNE:** It was wanted for sugar; that is the reason. We thought it would be opened for sugar. Now, when it is decided that it is not required for sugar, or for reforestation, the Government finds that the best thing to be done with it is to give it to an international meat company for a song, when there are people who were born and reared in the district who could claim it as a natural heritage. We will be offered the excuse that it is swampy land, but even if it is swampy land I ask the Government to give us a go at it. The Government is presenting it to this international meat company. Certain improvements will have to be carried out, namely, drainage and so on. The Government cannot justify its action by saying that the King Ranch people are to spend £1,000,000 on it. What guarantee has the Government that they will spend £1,000,000? There does not seem to be any provision for it. I accept the Minister's invitation to look at the file and I appreciate his offer. It is said that it is not a proposition for anyone else because it is swampy. Undoubtedly certain parts are swampy, but what about the millable timber that is being taken off the land at present? The Premier has said that some of the timber will have to be sacrificed. Why sacrifice anything for an international meat company, or anyone else?

Let us look at the terms and conditions. Initially the land is to be rented at about 9d. an acre for a period of years and then the rent rises. Afterwards there is a right to freehold about 34,000 acres at £1 an acre—£34,000 for that area of land in the Tully Valley! Does anybody realise the ridiculous opportunities for freeholding land at £1 an acre, even if it is swampy? Then there is a right to freehold 17,000 acres at £5 an acre. Fancy that! The Government could get £100 an acre for some of it. If the King Ranch people wanted to sell 17,000 acres at £5 an acre they would be rushed for it. The prices are absolutely ridiculous; they average £2 6s. 8d. an acre. Even 40 years ago land was selling for £30, £40 and £50 an acre in the Tully area, yet the Government has the temerity and the hide to give away the valuable assets of the State to an international meat packing company. I am accepting the statement by the hon. member for Clayfield that it is an international meat packing company. I hope he is correct. Such a ridiculous proposal must surely condemn the Government because it is giving away the people's estate and is prepared to sacrifice the timber, and so on. What will happen when the freehold title is given to the company? One can well imagine what will happen. Once it becomes freehold it

can be resold at £100 an acre and more to our people. People with land for sale in the Tully area are prepared to give options for sale at £100 to £150 an acre. One can well imagine that something in the State of Denmark must have been very wrong when someone was able to advise the Government to sell the land at £1 and £5 an acre, averaging £2 6s. 8d. an acre. In my opinion it is completely wrong.

**Mr. Murray:** The richest land in the Commonwealth.

**Mr. BYRNE:** I am very pleased to hear that interjection from the hon. member for Clayfield. He says that this land is the richest in the Commonwealth. I do not doubt it. If the richest land in the Commonwealth is available for £2 6s. 8d. an acre, what am I doing here as a member of Parliament? What is to prevent the King Ranch concern from selling the land they already hold at a ridiculously high figure after improving it to some extent? I suggest that it would be worth from £100 to £150 an acre after improvement and yet they can buy it from this Government at the low price of £2 6s. 8d. an acre. If that is a pattern of settlement for North Queensland I cannot understand it. Why should such a huge tract of country be handed over to a foreign concern when so many of our own people want land? Could not this same class of transaction be applied to other parts of North Queensland and even to the West? Suppose, for example, an area of 51,000 acres was made available in the Warrego electorate, or in Gregory or Barcoo, and the freehold title was valued at £2 6s. 8d. an acre. Do you for one moment think that there would not be a rush for that land? Of course there would! Is not that likely to happen at any time, as it has happened in my area?

It is no use decrying our land and saying it is of no value and therefore giving people the opportunity to purchase it at a ridiculously low price. Why should we give away our valuable land? I refer once more to the statement of the hon. member for Clayfield that this is perhaps the richest land in the whole of Australia. Of course it is. But what influences were brought to bear so that this irresponsible and ridiculous transaction favoured a company that is not even of Australian origin? It may be that the King Ranch concern have promises of further land. Who is to say that they have not been given a promise that, in the event of their effecting improvements to the land they already have title to by way of lease, they will be given opportunities to select another large area?

This idea of being over-generous with our land is very wrong and should cease. We should be guided by overseas experience. American concerns with their capital and one thing and another have taken over large areas in Canada and other parts of the world and the people of those countries have not the opportunity to exploit their own land. Why

should our land be given to such companies when we have our own people to look after? It would be interesting to learn all the details of the transaction. From what I have heard, there is something unsavoury about it. I do not for a moment suggest that the Minister is involved. He is a personal friend of mine and is above suspicion. But there are some features of the transaction that should be brought to light and we should have been given the opportunity to debate the matter in Parliament. Instead, it was completed when Parliament was in recess and there was no opportunity for us to debate the pros and cons in this Assembly. I say it was altogether wrong to do it in those circumstances. If our young men have to stand idly by and see the land that they regard as their natural heritage going, to their detriment, to some foreign concern or large financial institution, there is something wrong.

Our own young men have grown up on this land and worked on it, and naturally they should be entitled to it. Why were they not given opportunities to select any of this area of 51,000 acres? Why are these people on the land if they are not to be entitled to select blocks in the area in which they live? Would it not have been better to give this area of 51,000 acres to 40 or 50 families? The young man who selected an area of 1,000 acres on Munro Hill has shown what a success such a venture can be. If he can go onto a piece of land, erect his own home, and bring up a family on it as a worthy member of the community, another 40 or 50 men could do the same thing. They have, however, been denied this right.

That is what I am very concerned about. I believe that those who live in the district are entitled to select land in that area, and that no preferential treatment should be given to anybody else. I believe that 40 or 50 families would spend just as much as the King Ranch concern propose to spend. After all, one has to consider the employment that they will provide. I have no objection to their coming in, but I do object to their receiving 51,000 acres at a ridiculous price. If they have something to show us in the breeding of cattle, or something special of advantage to us, let them have an area; but do not give them 51,000 acres and refuse to open any additional land so that our own people can get some.

No doubt King Ranch will be able to employ a certain number of people, but I suggest seriously that their employees will be about 10 blackfellows and no more. At present what labour are they employing? Practically none at all. No doubt King Ranch can develop the land in a shorter time than could 50 families, but if one man and his family take up a piece of land they are obliged to improve it and the return to the State is far more valuable than if the profits are taken out of North Queensland and distributed to American shareholders.

I have lived in the Tully area for the past 35 years. I know these young people who are growing up and I want to see them given opportunities, but under this system they have absolutely no chance. It is easy to understand why they leave the district, which is perhaps the most fertile in the entire Commonwealth, to come to the South and invest their capital. If they had a chance to get a piece of land in the North, obviously they would remain there. These are the people that we want to stay on the land and rear their families on it. They have 10 times the value of King Ranch or any similar concern.

It might be suggested that the shire council and local bodies were of the opinion that these people should come in. I would say that, from a point of view of interest, that would be so and that some people might have thought it was a good thing, but after all, when everything is cut and dried and arranged beforehand, what is the use of objecting? It is finished and completed. What is the good of raising any objection when it has been decided to sell our land at £2 6s. 8d. an acre? As I suggested a short while ago, if the Minister would give members of Parliament the right to select an area in any part of Queensland at £2 6s. 8d. an acre, many of us would jump at the opportunity. My point is that the transaction is wrong in principle and from any other point of view that one cares to look at it. It will not provide employment for the people of North Queensland, and we are denying the people of the district the right to ask for this particular land. As I said, it is a valuable part of North Queensland and we had an excellent opportunity to promote settlement. What has been done? Absolutely nothing. People are leaving the district because they are not being given an opportunity to settle on the land to which they believe they are entitled.

**Mr. Hewitt:** What about a Labour Government selling 364 square miles in Central Queensland?

**Mr. BYRNE:** A Labour Government gave its reason for doing that, and it was not done for the propagation of timber. The land was needed for research. Here we had an opportunity for increased settlement, and I again point out that in the part of Queensland north of Townsville the Government has done nothing but discourage settlement and retard progress and development. I referred earlier to Carruchan, and it will be altogether wrong if the Government gives the company that is going to buy Brown & Broad Ltd. the right to the timber attaching to that sawmill license. It will be altogether wrong, too, if the Government gives King Ranch the right to further land and does not open it in a way that will enable local people to develop that part of North Queensland.

I had proposed dealing with the sugar industry, but time does not permit me to do so. I sincerely believe that the Australian Workers' Union has been perhaps the most influential body in gaining for the sugar industry the benefits and facilities that it has today. The Australian Workers' Union has protected not only its own members but also the farmers in the sugar industry. I shall reserve further comment till later in the session, when I hope to show that the development now taking place in the Queensland sugar industry will have to be handled very carefully if we are to safeguard against privileges similar to those that have been given to King Ranch being given to what we refer to as the capitalist classes.

**Mr. DIPLOCK** (Aubigny) (2.29 p.m.): I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and associate myself with them and other hon. members who have taken part in the debate in reaffirming loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen.

I should like, too, to compliment His Excellency the Administrator on the manner in which he is carrying out his duties. True, with Sir Alan's background and qualifications, we could expect that he would do a very efficient job. But he could do that job in two ways: he could be efficient yet officious, and lose the common touch. He visited Dalby during Centenary Week and proved conclusively that he was carrying on in the same manner as our Governor has done since he assumed office. I can assure hon. members that, although Sir Alan's stay in Dalby was very short, he endeared himself to all, and Dalby people as a whole would like him to return.

I take the opportunity, too, of congratulating Mr. Speaker on his re-election. It is true that Independent and other members are crowded into the one room in this building, but I do not criticise Mr. Speaker because of that. Obviously, if there is only one room available he has to accommodate us in that room and we have to make the best of it. Since he assumed office he has done everything possible to make our accommodation comfortable.

I should like to congratulate you, too, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on your election as Chairman of Committees.

During this debate there has been much criticism by members on both sides of the House of certain aspects of the election. During his speech the hon. member for Bundaberg quoted something that I said about an occurrence in Aubigny. I want to make it perfectly clear that, in my opinion, the returning officer, Mr. Don Fardon, did an exemplary job. No returning officer could have done a better job. I should say, too, that, at the 40-odd polling booths in the electorate, every presiding officer did a good job. I could not say that there was one trace of irregularity throughout the electorate.

I did tell the hon. member for Bundaberg that, when the votes were being counted, I noticed that a number had been disallowed because a presiding officer had not put his initials on the back of the ballot papers. Those were my votes but there were votes cast for the other candidates which were not initialled and which were similarly treated. I have no doubt that, if the result had been close, an appeal to the Elections Tribunal would have resulted in those votes being allowed.

I make the point, as I did after the previous election, that I do not consider it fair that because a presiding officer neglects to put his initials on a ballot paper the vote should be lost, no matter for whom it is cast. In my opinion, the present system is not as good as the one that operated when the present Government took office, where the number of the ballot paper was entered in the electoral roll, the corner of the ballot paper gummed down, and the vote cast. I suppose if somebody wished to find out very badly how a person voted he could do so with a good deal of trouble, but how easy it would be for a presiding officer to find out how a person voted under the present system. If a person applies for a vote and I, as presiding officer, want to find out for my party or for somebody else how he votes, I can simply refrain from initialling the ballot paper. Whether or not the vote is lost to the person for whom it is intended, I know just how that person voted.

**Mr. Aikens:** If you know a voter is going to vote against your own political party you don't initial the ballot paper, and so make his vote informal.

**Mr. DIPLOCK:** That could be so, too.

Absent voters were advised by one political party to vote from the bottom of the paper up. On the back of the absent voter's paper there were seven squares and the names of three candidates. The names of the three candidates were put in the top three squares. More than a dozen voters voted according to the instructions as they appeared in the paper, and in the bottom square they put "1", and so on through the seven squares. Quite a few votes were lost that way. If those votes had been submitted to the Elections Tribunal, as the intention of the voters was clear I think the votes would have been allowed. However, the returning officer was carrying out his duty according to the letter of the law. I have absolutely no criticism to offer about the way he carried out that duty.

**Mr. Thackeray:** What are you bringing it up for? What are you crying for?

**Mr. DIPLOCK:** I am not crying. I am offering the suggestion that perhaps the present practice can be changed. Of course, you have to be intelligent to understand.

**Mr. Thackeray:** I have more intelligence than to buy shares in that place out there.

**Mr. DIPLOCK:** You need the money, too.

**Mr. Thackeray:** And the graft, like you.

**Mr. DIPLOCK:** You need brains to engage in graft. I would keep quiet if I were the hon. member.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. DIPLOCK:** A.L.P. members have found excuses for the loss of the election. As I sit in Opposition, I am not concerned about what they offer in the way of excuses. What I am concerned about is the self-satisfaction and smugness of the Government. If we make an examination of the conditions surrounding the election I am sure that many Government members will realise that it is necessary for them to take stock. What has happened since the present Government assumed office? In its first term we had the redistribution. Without a shadow of a doubt that redistribution was made in the interests of the Government. Some seats the Government could not possibly lose, no matter who the candidate was. During the Government's second term of office we had the introduction of preferential voting. In spite of the introduction of these two gimmicks, if we take as a guide the advertisements appearing in newspapers circulating in the country, the Government did not rely on its programme of achievement to win the election. Instead, it cunningly whipped up the Communist issue both before and during the election campaign. If Government members were sincere in their protestations about the dangers of Communism, they should be commended. I want to know how they explain their actions in view of the advertisement that has been referred to so often in the Chamber during this debate. On one side of the advertisement the Trades Hall appeared and on the other side Parliament House appeared, and the Government said, in effect, "You could not possibly cast your vote in favour of Opposition members because of the Communist menace and because they are dictated to from outside." If the Government was sincere in its protestations how could it account for the fact that it advised that the second preferences in Aubigny and Carnarvon be given to men whom it alleged were being dictated to by the Communist element? I say that actions speak much louder than words and this action proved beyond any shadow of doubt that so far as the Government is concerned, the Communist danger is not real enough to supersede the election results. In other words, it was a weapon to be used as an expedient to win the election. That is what I believe the Government did; it used the Communist issue as an expedient.

In speaking briefly on the election campaign I wish to register my disgust at the tactics of the Aubigny executive of the Country Party. In the past we often heard what members now sitting in Opposition did, or were supposed to have done. I can remember members of the present Government holding up their hand when in Opposition and saying, "That is beyond the pale. We would not descend to that sort of thing." Although I have taken part in election campaigns over many years, the actions of the Aubigny Country Party executive on this occasion reached an all-time low. I make it very clear, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this criticism does not cover the Premier and other Government members who visited my area during the election campaign. They fought hard, but they fought cleanly and fairly.

**Mr. Aikens:** Does it cover the hon. member for Condamine?

**Mr. DIPLOCK:** No, it does not.

To my knowledge, the Leader of the Opposition was the only member of his party to visit Dalby. He fought the campaign as the Premier did: hard, but clean and fair. What was the result of the election? There was a clear indication to the candidate, and to the Aubigny executive of the Country Party, that they were not held in very high regard politically by the townsfolk and country folk alike and, in my opinion, it indicated to the Government that its administration was not held in high esteem by those associated with rural industry.

A survey of election results shows that in 1960 I received 1,104 votes out of 3,050 votes shared by the Country Party candidate and myself in country areas, or roughly 36 per cent. of the votes. In June 1963, I received 1,557 votes out of approximately the same number of votes, 3,102, shared by the Country Party candidate and myself at country centres, or approximately 50 per cent. of the vote. In the towns of Dalby and Oakey, in 1960 I received 2,448 votes out of 3,829 votes shared by the Country Party candidate and myself or approximately 64 per cent. of the vote. In 1963 I received 2,667 out of the 3,607 votes shared by the Country Party candidate and myself, or approximately 73 per cent. of the votes. In 1960 my majority over the Country Party candidate was well under 300; in 1963 it was well over 1,600.

Those figures should show very clearly that, in the eyes of the electors of Aubigny, the Government has not lived up to the expectations of the people. Surely the 1960 result in an electorate that was hand-tailored for a Country Party candidate by the Electoral Redistribution Commission should have indicated to the Government that it would have to do more to prove that it had the interests of small landholders and rural workers generally at heart if it wished to retrieve this Country Party seat!

The speech of the hon. member for South Coast last Thursday is one that I shall certainly file because it gave the answer to the result in Aubigny. I compliment him on being able to stand up in the Chamber and tell of all the wonderful amenities and improvements that have been given to his electorate, but I am going to use his speech to show the people of the country areas that the Government is concerned more with giving those amenities and improvements to the city and seaside areas than with giving them to country areas.

**Mr. Thackeray:** He is a rebel in the Country Party.

**Mr. DIPLOCK:** Although he may be classed as a rebel, I believe he got what he did because he fought hard for his electorate.

**Mr. Gaven:** I won't run away from anyone, no matter which side.

**Mr. DIPLOCK:** The picture he drew shows up in vivid relief against the public buildings, the railway stations, etc., that he would find in my area. The reason for the deterioration of Government stocks in Aubigny is not very difficult to find. Although decentralisation is supposed to be one of the Government's main aims, nothing very much has been done about it in my electorate. It seems to be a case of, "Go to the country, young man, and when you get there we will certainly forget you." Towns-people like to find gainful employment in the country. I know scores of people who would make their homes in the country because the jobs are there but they cannot do so because they cannot get a rental home. Workers who have been employed at the Oakey abattoir, where approximately 300 men are employed, have for a long time had to travel each day from Toowoomba to Oakey to work and then return home. I am going to be very fair to the Treasurer. I put this position to him and a week later he gave me proof that no applications for homes were held by the C.P.S. at Oakey. So the Treasurer cannot be blamed. But the reason why applications were not lodged was that people who had inquired if homes were available had been told that they were not and so they had not done any more about it. However, on Saturday morning, on my usual trip to Oakey, I visited a man who recently built four flats. He told me he had 40 applications for them. I have advised the proprietor of the abattoir to tell the men to lodge applications if they want rental homes. I am sure that the Treasurer will be inundated with applications for rental homes. It would be safe to say that at Dalby there are at least 80 on the waiting list for rental homes, and of that number 30 are very deserving and urgent cases.

**Mr. Thackeray:** With large families, too.

**Mr. DIPLOCK:** With large families, yes. They are men who, because they have large families, have not been able to save the

necessary deposit for a home. Industry in Dalby could employ at the moment at least another 40 or 50 men if the necessary housing were available.

As I said before, I have no quarrel with the Treasurer's proudly announcing the building of flats and homes to accommodate hundreds more people in the large towns. Those people are entitled to live in the towns and obtain rental homes if they so desire, but surely it is decentralisation in reverse if workers in large towns are provided with homes while those in the smaller towns removed from the coast are not.

I have tangible evidence that there is quite a large number of tradesmen who are very anxious to reside in Dalby if housing is made available. One institution at Dalby is paying tradesmen well over the award wage. I know that this firm spends in the vicinity of £150 a month on advertising for tradesmen. Replies are received from men anxious to take the positions, but as soon as they find that it is impossible to get rental homes they cease to be interested in the jobs. I have placed this position before the Treasurer and already he has done something about it. I appeal to him to do more, because there are now, as the Minister for Labour and Industry well knows, quite a few concerns employing tradesmen in Dalby. They are all wanting tradesmen and they would get them if housing were available. This is something that the Government should consider, and consider very quickly.

It has to be remembered, too, that if we cannot attract skilled workers to the country, we have no hope of employing any number of unskilled workers. For every skilled worker, we are able to employ a number of semi-skilled and unskilled workers. The skilled workers are the men that we are trying to attract to the country. We are doing so by offering better conditions and paying well over award rates. We would be helped considerably if some assistance could be given in the matter of housing.

I want to pay a compliment at this stage to the Minister for Labour and Industry, who paid a visit to Dalby. He was only there a matter of hours, but he made himself conversant with the activities carried on there and gave helpful advice. He promised publicly to help in any way that he could to foster these industries, and I feel sure that I can look to him for some support in this matter.

I can assure hon. members that secondary industries carried on in country areas are beset by enough difficulties, such as the distance from ports, extra cost of living, freight charges, etc., without having the almost insurmountable handicap of being unable to find accommodation for employees. I say, and say very vigorously, that if decentralisation of industry is really an aim of the present Government, something must be done, and done quickly.

I should say, too, that if the Government is sincere in its aim of decentralisation, it should, through the Minister for Transport, look into the tremendous handicap that high freight rates place on industries carried on in the country. Today manufacturers in Queensland have to compete with manufacturers in other States and overseas, and I can assure you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the competition is very keen. Freight is a very big item in the cost price of an article, and any concessions on existing freight rates would materially assist the progress of all country manufacturers.

The Minister for Labour and Industry has often urged people to buy Queensland-made goods, and I commend him for this. But we must give Queensland manufacturers the wherewithal and the assistance to make the goods. Without wishing to bore you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to quote some freight rates paid by manufacturers of farm machinery who operate at Dalby, and I think that they will astound hon. members on both sides of the Chamber. At the moment North Queensland is proving to be a very good market for this class of merchandise, and manufacturers in Dalby have to compete with manufacturers in other States, particularly in Western Australia and Victoria, for this market. I am not talking in the interests of some little manufacturer who employs one or two men. The value of farm machinery being turned out by one firm now approaches the £1,000,000 a year mark, and a volume such as that attracts a tremendous amount of freight. The rail freight from Dalby to Cairns on discs, implements, etc., is £30 5s. 4d. a ton in truck loads and £31 17s. 10d. in small lots. The shipping freight rate from Melbourne to Cairns is £13 18s. 6d. a ton.

**Mr. Aikens:** How can Queensland compete with that?

**Mr. DIPLOCK:** That is what we are trying to solve. As I said, the rail freight from Dalby to Cairns is £30 5s. 4d. a ton, and the manufacturers in Victoria can send a ton of the same class of goods to Cairns for £13 18s. 6d. The shipping freight rate from Melbourne to Mackay is £12 12s. a ton, but the rail freight from Dalby to Mackay is £22 10s. 9d. in truck loads and £24 3s. in small lots.

**Mr. Camm:** It would cost them more if they tried to ship it from Dalby.

**Mr. DIPLOCK:** Yes. When the hon. member becomes a Minister, he might put a river there, and we will try to ship it then. It would not cost us more if we could ship it from Dalby, either. I shall shortly quote some figures that will astound the hon. member.

The manufacture of discs is confined to two major firms in Australia, Ralph McKay Ltd. in Melbourne and Napier Bros. in Dalby, and consideration of the freight rates quoted readily shows that the Queensland firm is severely handicapped. Despite that,

it has now collared quite a large percentage of the Australian market. But you can see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there is a constant struggle to reach a break-even point, which the firm must reach to operate at a profit, if it has to suffer for very much longer the handicap of paying twice as much freight as the Melbourne firm.

Consideration of other freight rates will illustrate the handicap placed on Dalby firms who are obviously doing the major part of their business in Queensland and transporting their products mainly by rail. The rail freight from Dalby to Brisbane on steel in truck loads is £3 17s. 6d. a ton. The Government has made a concession, and I give it due credit for this, on the raw material from the port to the place of manufacture, but the freight on the manufactured product for the return journey to Brisbane is £5 10s. a ton on other materials, and on implements in truck loads, £3 17s. 6d. a ton. Yet we can send those implements to Sydney for £9 a ton.

**Mr. Aikens:** By road?

**Mr. DIPLOCK:** By road. The freight rate is £5 10s. to Brisbane, three hours away, and £9 a ton to Sydney, which as hon. members know, is a day and a half away.

**Mr. Aikens:** The road rate would be a cut rate for back loading, wouldn't it?

**Mr. DIPLOCK:** I do not know anything about back loading. From Melbourne the freight is only £16 a ton, from Adelaide only £18 a ton, and from Fremantle only £19 10s. a ton. The manufacturer who sends quite a deal of machinery from Western Australia to Queensland can send it to Mackay at about three-quarters the freight rate we have to pay from Dalby to Mackay. The rate from Dalby to the Philippines is only £19 14s. 4d. a ton, of which £3 17s. 6d. a ton is the rail portion. We do a considerable amount of business, amounting to £40,000 a month or so ago, with the Philippines. The freight from Dalby to South Africa is only £18 12s. 1d. a ton and out of that comes £3 17s. 6d. a ton for rail freight.

So it can be seen that manufacturers can send goods to South Africa, to the Philippines, to Melbourne, or to Western Australia—and vice versa, of course—at a much cheaper rate than we can send the same goods to towns in Queensland. So there is every reason for the Government's going into this matter.

The educational facilities provided by the Government seem to be biased very much in favour of children living in the cities. I give due credit—and lots of it—to the Government for its educational programme, although personally I disagree with much that is being done. Whether I am correct in

my ideas on the proposed extension of secondary education, or whether those responsible for the programme are, still remains to be proved; but I am convinced that the introduction of the new syllabus and the consequent necessity for a number of new schools and more teachers have not been in the interests of primary education, especially in country areas. We have to remember that the child is taught to think in the primary schools and no matter what percentage of its life is spent in secondary education we cannot afford to under-write the importance of the work of the teacher in the primary school. I feel that anything that tends to weaken the effectiveness of this foundation is certainly not in the best interests of the child.

Already—and I think all members and especially members representing country areas will agree—many of the more experienced and more highly-qualified teachers are being transferred from primary-school staffs, and I am afraid that at the beginning of next year many head teachers will find themselves with staffs of little experience and in the lower bracket of academic qualifications; but those head teachers will still be expected to achieve the same results as they achieved when they had balanced staffs.

My observations lead me to say quite definitely that the percentage of experienced teachers on the staffs of schools in the city is, and will be, much higher than that on staffs in country schools. Thinking of the country, I quite agree that it is not desirable to have high tops established at every small centre. No sane thinking man would advance that argument. It is in the best interests of the child that he should have the opportunity of attending a high school where he can proceed to the Senior level. I think everybody agrees that that is the wiser course.

It is obvious, however, that certain high tops will have to be established. I suggest very strongly to the Minister that the location of those schools should depend to a great degree on the distance to be travelled by the children to a high school, and the potential of the district to ensure that the high top will carry on for a number of years on an economic basis. Recently I introduced to the Minister for Education a deputation that was seeking the establishment of a high top in the Quinalow, Maclagan, Kulpi, Brymaroo and Mallang area.

The residents of the district had been offered transport services to Oakey. Some of the children would have had to travel 44 miles to school in the morning and return home the same distance in the evening. Their school day would have started before 7 a.m. because one cannot travel 44 miles in the country in less than an hour. They would have got home after dark.

Again I give credit where it is due. When these facts were placed before the Minister he agreed that next year, anyhow, those children should attend the local primary

school. But I am not concerned only about what is going to happen next year. I am concerned about what is going to happen the year after next and the year after that so that the children will not have to get up at 5 in the morning only to return home at 8 o'clock at night and then be expected to do homework until 10 or 11 p.m. During the interview I claimed that the district had the potential to ensure that the school would continue. The Minister replied that he was interested in opportunity rather than potential. I, too, am interested in opportunity, but I say very definitely that if potential is not regarded as important there will always be a scarcity of money for the establishment of high schools in country areas. I say that high tops should be established at centres that will cater for the most children, and at centres where they are most needed, irrespective of the political complexion of the representative of the area.

**Mr. Aikens:** What number do you say would be required to establish a high-school top?

**Mr. DIPLOCK:** I do not know what the Government requires but I can cite a case where a high-school top was established for 18 children. I can also point out that each child costs the Government £4 10s. a week.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. SULLIVAN (Condamine) (3.10 p.m.):** I am very pleased to rise on this occasion and associate myself with the motion before the House, which was so very ably moved by the hon. member for Carnarvon and seconded by the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha. At the outset I congratulate those two hon. members, firstly on being elected to this Assembly, and secondly on the very fine manner in which they moved and seconded the motion. I take this opportunity to associate the people of the Condamine electorate, and myself, with the motion of loyalty to Her Most Gracious Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II.

His Excellency the Administrator, Sir Alan Mansfield, has done excellent work in the absence of His Excellency the Governor, Sir Henry Abel Smith, and Lady May. I join with the hon. member for Aubigny in expressing the appreciation of the people of Dalby and district to His Excellency the Administrator on his visit to their town. They appreciate the keen interest he displayed in the district on his visit during Dalby's centenary celebrations. It was my privilege to be associated with him and his good lady on that occasion, and the people of Queensland are fortunate in having a man of the calibre of Sir Alan Mansfield to step into the shoes of the Governor during his absence.

I take this opportunity, too, to congratulate Mr. Speaker upon his re-election to office. His initial election closely coincided with the time of my election to this

Assembly. He has been very helpful to me and he has done an excellent job in administering the affairs of Parliament House. Only yesterday I was showing some visitors through Parliament House. They expressed the opinion that it was a remarkable building and was well maintained, and commended the improvements that are now being effected. Through you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I convey my congratulations to Mr. Speaker on this work. We know that, over the years of maladministration of the previous Government, parts of this building were allowed to fall into a state of disrepair. The people of Queensland know that only too well. One has only to walk around outside to see the improvements that have recently been effected. Both the present Speaker and the former Speaker, Mr. Fletcher, now the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation, are to be commended.

I also congratulate all new members on both sides of the House. On this side we have Mr. McKechnie, the hon. member for Carnarvon, and three new Liberal Party members. I think it was the previous speaker, the hon. member for Aubigny, who referred to the calibre of the people who can be elected. He said that if so-and-so was put up in any one of certain seats he would be elected. We in the Country Party, and the Liberal Party, are proud of the calibre of the men who win pre-selection before going to the people. We should be proud of them because members on the Government side have earned their pre-selection. In the very near future I hope to have the opportunity of welcoming Mr. Cory to this Chamber as the new member for Warwick.

I understand that in the last hour or so Dr. Delamothe has been given party selection for Cabinet rank, and I congratulate him. He came to this Chamber at the same time as I did. I have always thought that he has been an excellent member of Parliament. He has made some very fine contributions in this Chamber. Some hon. members opposite who came in at the same time, and others who have been here much longer, who would like to cast some reflection on him by interjection would do well to follow the example set by the hon. member for Bowen.

The hon. member for Bundaberg said there had been many bitter exchanges in the Chamber over what took place in the last election, but I am very pleased to report that I had a very happy campaign. Had my opponent and I got together to work out an itinerary, we could have campaigned in the same car. He was a very fine fellow and I was very pleased to have him as an opponent.

**Mr. Davies:** He seemed to be very vicious about your absence.

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** The hon. member for Maryborough makes so many inane interjections in the House, some of them almost inaudible. If he would take the plum out of his mouth we might be able to hear him.

Sometimes, perhaps, it is just as well that we cannot. However, I do not believe his statement because my opponent at the last election was above that kind of thing.

I note that my friend the hon. member for Salisbury has come into the Chamber. I hoped that he would because in the last session of Parliament he was always very keen to attack me. As a matter of fact, he tried to hang a name on me as the sacker of railway men, or something of that nature. However, my scouts in Chinchilla tell me that, when he went out there to assist the A.L.P. candidate, he did not refer to me in any way like that; he did not even mention my name. I was very pleased about that, but I am well advised that the supporters of the A.L.P. in Chinchilla told him that, if he wanted to use out there the tactics that he uses in the House, it would only cost them votes and they would prefer that he refrain from speaking. I am pleased to say he was wise enough not to adopt out in the Condamine electorate the methods he adopts here.

**Mr. Sherrington:** I noticed that you kept out of Chinchilla while I was there, anyhow.

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** As long as the hon. member thinks I did, that is all right. Nevertheless, I was well informed about what was going on. In my first election I won 68 per cent. of the votes and it was very gratifying, after three years, to have that figure increased by 5 per cent. at the last election. Previous speakers on the opposite side of the Chamber have told us how perturbed the farming communities are at the deal being meted out by this Government but, when we get increases in majorities in areas where we already had a big percentage of the vote, does that indicate dissatisfaction among the people who support us? For example, at one polling booth last election I won 100 votes out of 108 and this time I secured 99. Three weeks after the election an old man came to me and told me that he had had to vote in Bundaberg, so the effective result was exactly the same. Apparently at other booths I polled a sufficient number of votes to make up the 5 per cent. extra. There are reasons for those increases. It may be that I am doing my job—perhaps I am—but when we look around at what has taken place in an area such as Condamine, part of which was previously in Aubigny, and compare the deal it was given under the Labour Government with what is happening there now, we can understand why the people are giving us better support.

I am very pleased to see the Minister for Health and Home Affairs in the Chamber because I want to thank him very much for what he is doing for the people of Jandowae and Chinchilla. From where I stand I can see in the lobby a man who for years was a member of this House—Mr. Sparkes. I know the efforts he made to have a hospital built at Jandowae. The Labour Government was not sympathetic towards him but, when

the change in Government took place, he was successful, through the good graces of the Minister for Health and Home Affairs, in having the first wing of that hospital built. At present the second wing is nearing completion and it is going to be my pleasure to invite the Minister to open that hospital some time towards the end of this year.

I think it was only last week that the hon. member for Warrego spoke of the wonderful hospitals that were built over the years by Labour Governments. That may have been so in some cases, but I cannot say the same thing for the hospital that Labour built at Chinchilla. Prior to becoming a member of Parliament I never had occasion to visit it, but, having driven past it on many occasions, I thought, "It looks a lovely building and I should not have much worry there." The Minister was in Chinchilla and, as he will tell you, because of the architecture of the hospital it was necessary for this Government to spend £65,000 to bring it up to present-day standards. One of the things for which the people of the Condamine electorate, and many other country areas, are grateful to this Government is the provision of modern hospitals and amenities in rural areas.

I now refer to the great expansion that has taken place in secondary education in these areas. When the 1964 school year begins, in my area there will be only two small schools not within reach of secondary-school transport. This means that almost the entire area will be covered and children will have secondary education available to them. To my mind, the important aspect is that they will be home with their parents at night and travel each day to and from school.

**Mr. Thackeray:** That does not go for the whole of the State, you know.

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** It goes for my electorate, and many others. In the days of Labour administration it went for only few electorates. I say that advisedly because I have always been keenly interested in education, particularly the development of secondary education. If the hon. member for Rockhampton North wishes to develop an argument on that matter, that is all right with me, but I shall confine my remarks to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It annoys me to hear someone who spent 40 minutes on inane and silly statements sit there making these interjections and trying to condemn the job that the Government has done.

**Mr. Aikens:** He has never been farther west than Mt. Morgan.

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** That is true, and possibly the people west of Mt. Morgan hope that he never will go farther than that.

Anything that I have to say expressing my gratitude to various Ministers and their departments would be very incomplete without a reference to the job done by the Main Roads Department under the direction of the

Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity. The new road plan that has been evolved concerns my electorate greatly. The Warrego Highway, which runs as far west as Charleville, and beyond it, passes through my electorate. There is a section of 20 miles through a black-soil area which, over the years, has been served only by a gravel road. That was the policy of the day, and perhaps it was a good one. The Condamine Highway was built well away from the railway line, with which I have no argument, but since the war the development that has taken place in these intensively-farmed areas necessitates the bitumen sealing of this road. I refer to that section of the Warrego Highway that leaves the Condamine Highway 10 miles west of Dalby at Rangers Bridge, passes through Macalister and Warra, and joins the bitumen at the boundary of the Chinchilla Shire. That is a very intensively-farmed area. There is a great amount of through traffic coming from the North and going west to Wandoan and Taroom, and the only type of road suitable to carry that traffic is a bitumen-sealed road. The Department of Main Roads is now preparing plans, in conjunction with the Wambo Shire Council, for the bitumen sealing of six miles of it during this financial year, and I sincerely hope that there will be no delay. The Minister showed me the courtesy of coming up and spending three days there and having a look at the black-soil areas to see the problems associated with road-building, and I have pointed out to him on a number of occasions the need for a greater allocation of money for road-building in these areas.

Farming was not developed on this land till shortly after the second world war—prior to that it was used for grazing—and quite a bit of it is now a soldier-settlement area. With the finance available at the time, the Wambo Shire Council was able to provide only gravel roads to the properties. That policy was a good one because it enabled farmers to get their produce to the railhead or to the market, as the case may be, and there is now a very excellent network of gravel roads in the area. This applies also to the black-soil area of the Chinchilla shire, and I believe that it is necessary, in order that the money expended on the formation of those gravel roads will not be wasted, to expedite the bitumen sealing of them. I urge the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity to do everything possible to make available a greater allocation to the Chinchilla and Wambo shires for that purpose.

I wish to refer, also, to the Bunya Highway, which, under the new road plan, is a very important connecting road between the Darling Downs and the South Burnett. Previously there were two highways serving those areas, but under the new plan the Condamine-Burnett Highway has been reduced to the status of a main road. The Commissioner of Main Roads has said that he thinks that the Bunya Highway connects

the two areas better than did the Condamine-Burnett Highway. According to the plans of the Wambo Shire Council, in five years' time only six miles of that road will remain unsealed, because it proposes to seal 16 miles of it in the next five years. I have no complaint about the priorities allotted by the Wambo Shire Council for the money made available to it. I think they are very fair, and I believe that most people in the area agree that they are fair. However, the people believe that more money should be made available to enable the Wambo Shire Council to step up its programme on this connecting road, and they have asked me to appeal to the Minister to give consideration to making more money available. I hope that my representations will be successful.

I think it was a fortnight ago today that the hon. member for Barambah, Mr. Bjelke-Peterson, took part in the Address-in-Reply debate. Unfortunately, I was not in the Chamber at the time because I had to be in my electorate with the Regional Director of Education. However, the hon. member referred to the values placed on lands—most of them are in my electorate, but some of them go across into his area—for freeholding purposes. I do not wish to labour the point, but I support his arguments. With landholders, we have already discussed this matter with the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation, and we believe that in some instances the values placed on lands for freeholding are far in excess of what they ought to be. The hon. member for Barambah and I inspected this land, which lies between Jandowae and Kingaroy. It is grazing country, and one area in particular contains 4,500 acres in which it would be impossible to get one paddock of 10 acres of cultivation. It is all up and down, essentially breeding country. The unimproved value placed on that country for freeholding purposes is 5s. an acre in excess of that placed on another property only four or five miles away, which has a potential of 600 or 700 acres of softwood scrub that would make good cultivation. There appears to be some discrepancy there.

**Mr. Houston:** What is the actual value of these blocks?

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** The values on the two blocks to which I refer were 37s. an acre on one and 32s. an acre on the other. If 32s. is a fair valuation on the block that could be developed with 600 or 700 acres of cultivation, then I consider the valuation on the other property without any cultivation available should be down around 12s. or 14s. an acre.

**Mr. Aikens:** Who made the valuations?

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** The Valuer-General's Department and the Department of Public Lands. There is a difference of opinion between the Department of Public Lands values and those of the Valuer-General's Department. In this case the Valuer-General's

Department's values are lower and we consider they should be the values taken into consideration for freeholding purposes. I support the hon. member for Barambah in his representations in this matter.

Before going on to a couple of important matters to which I wish to refer at some length—they deal with primary industry—I wish to support the hon. member for Aubigny in what he said about freight rates as they apply to Napier Brothers in Dalby. The figures he gave are alarming and I support him in saying that if we want to decentralise our industries, somehow or other we must do something to assist industries such as the machinery works in Dalby that he mentioned, in its endeavour to compete with southern firms. I know that Napier Brothers is one of the only two firms in Australia—the other one to which the hon. member referred was Ralph McKay in Melbourne—manufacturing plough discs. If the Melbourne company has the advantage in marketing its discs in North Queensland of a freight rate something like half that which Napiers pay to get their discs from Dalby to North Queensland, then it is something we should examine. Consideration should be given to assisting local industries.

I wish now to speak of an industry that is new to Queensland. It is, however, an industry with which I have grown up. I refer to the fat-lamb industry. It has amazed me since I have been in this Chamber to learn just how few people are acquainted with the problems of the fat-lamb industry and I bring this matter before the Chamber in the hope that what I say may be of some assistance to people engaged in it.

I had the opportunity a week ago today, I think it was, of visiting the British Breeds Show at Dalby, staged by the fat-lamb growers of this State, and I am very grateful to the committee for extending an invitation to our new Minister for Agriculture and Stock, the Hon. John Row, to officially open the show. It was at my suggestion that they invited him, and I am very grateful to them for issuing the invitation. I am grateful to the Minister, too, for accepting the invitation so that he could see what we in Queensland have to offer. They tell me in the Parliamentary Refreshment Rooms that he has eaten nothing but lamb chops since he returned. The hon. member for Whitsunday was there also.

**Mr. Sherrington:** You cannot disguise mutton.

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** When you are eating fat lamb you know you are not eating mutton. Although I may bring down the wrath of the wool-grower upon myself I say that once a wether has grown wool for six or seven years it has done a pretty good job anyway. If it is to be used for human consumption I think it should be used for canning, or something of that nature. When the Premier opened the Pittsworth Show earlier

in the year he said that Queensland should be able to produce sufficient fat lambs to supply the State's demands. I think we can do that. It is incumbent upon farmers to take stock of themselves in this matter. I have always maintained that if you can combine the running of stock with farming pursuits you will be a very much better soil-husbandman.

**Mr. Aikens:** A lot of butchers are trying to pass off stringy old Merino wethers as fat lamb.

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** That is true.

We can help the industry by assisting its leaders to market their fat lambs at a price that is economic to them. There are many problems associated with the industry but I am afraid we cannot solve them all here. When I was in North Queensland I became aware of a situation similar to that which exists with the freight rates on discs manufactured in Victoria compared with those on discs manufactured in Dalby. The butchers in Cairns are able to land frozen lamb in that city much cheaper than they can land the live lamb or the chilled lamb from Brisbane. They tell me that they are happy to have a look at the economics of landing chilled lamb as far north as Cairns. I am sure all hon. members will agree that if meat is frozen and subsequently thawed out it has not the same flavour as chilled meat. The handling of lamb is a very costly business. If the raising of fat lambs is to be economic we must help.

As I said, I have grown up in the fat-lamb industry. I can go back to 1928. My dad came from Tasmania, where he had grown up in the fat-lamb industry. The then Minister in charge of the Department of Agriculture and Stock made available to him two South Downs rams in order to introduce fat lambs into the Jandowae district. He did that with quite a number of farmers on the Downs. I recall that in order to get our lambs to the Brisbane sales at Cannon Hill on Thursdays—they are held on Tuesdays now—it was necessary for us to walk them 10 miles to the trucking on Monday afternoons. Even as long ago as 1928 and 1929 I can recall my dad arranging with a transport operator in Jandowae, with only a 3-ton truck, to have a double-decker built for the transport of lambs to Cannon Hill. In those days they were loaded at 3 or 4 o'clock in the afternoon, and by driving all night, they arrived at about 10 o'clock the following morning for the mid-day sale. One can imagine they were in much better condition on arrival at Cannon Hill than if they had been driven to the trucking yards and taken by rail. On one occasion the truck broke down and the lambs did not arrive in Brisbane until too late for the sale, but they were sold about 4 o'clock in the afternoon when the agents got together four or five butchers so that they could auction them. They were keen to get the lambs brought to Brisbane by road transport because they knew they would be in good condition.

The road transport of lambs has proved that Dalby is one of the homes of the fat-lamb industry on the Darling Downs. The cost of bringing a lamb to Brisbane is 5s. 6d. When the price of lambs is £5 or £6 a head, as it has been in the last four or five weeks, that is not too bad, but it is high when the producer gets only £3 a head. The growers believe that if a killing works was established at Dalby the cost could be reduced from 5s. 6d. a head to about 1s. 2d. I know that they intend to see the Minister for Agriculture and Stock about this and talk it over with him and I hope that they get a satisfactory answer. If the lambs could be killed at Dalby, and chilled wagons made available for them, they could be transported to North Queensland. I believe that we could deliver carcasses in North Queensland at Townsville or Cairns, at the same cost as that for delivering live lambs in Brisbane.

**Mr. Coburn:** Borthwicks at Merinda get them from New South Wales.

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** That is true. That is one of the anomalies that arise under Section 92, with free interstate trade. The lamb growers in the New England district, and other districts, have an advantage over the Queensland growers because they can have their lambs killed at works south of the border and road freight the carcasses to North Queensland.

One of the leading meat experts told me at Cannon Hill the other day that the Brisbane market could absorb 10,000 lambs a week if the right type of lamb was put on the market. I fully believe that. Because of the economics, and the costs involved, many growers do not market their lambs as sucker lambs weighing 28 lb. to 34 lb. They keep them for another couple of months.

**Mr. Aikens:** Some of them run them until they are two-teeth.

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** They sell them prior to becoming two-teeth; once they become two-teeth they can no longer pass as lamb and can be sold only as hogget or mutton. Quite a few people in the industry allow them to grow bigger. They get the clip from them and then sell them. They do that because of the costs involved. If we want the really good type of sucker lamb we must do something to assist the growers.

In the few minutes left to me I think I should say something about the wheat industry because that industry and the fat-lamb industry are closely related. Hon. members may know—I think it is incumbent on me to tell them—that there are many problems facing farmers on the Darling Downs today because of foreign matter in the crops. The C.S.I.R.O. has done a magnificent job in developing weedicides, but it is very costly. Last year I had to have my crops sprayed to eradicate buck wheat, at anything up to 14s. an acre.

The incidence of black oats in crops is much more expensive to control. A weedicide has been developed but spraying it costs about £2 an acre. By using stock together with farming pursuits, black oats can be controlled without incurring the cost of aerial boom-spraying with weedicides. I am farming paddocks that were farmed 40 years ago. As a matter of fact, I have lived there 39 years and possibly they were farmed 10 years before that. I employ crop rotation along with stock-fattening. I use the paddocks one year for stock-fattening and then grow grain for three or four years. That effectively controls the black oats. It is very good feed and stock will fatten on it. I have very little black oats growing now; you could put the lot in your hat. It is important that farmers consider the use of stock with grain-farming. Of course, it must be economic.

Two or three years ago I made a statement in the House and gave some figures I had from an authority, a man who chaired a commission of inquiry into the dairying industry and who was Prices Commissioner for the Federal Government for something like 17 years. Figures taken out at that time proved that the cost of spare parts for a header were so high that if a header costing £4,500 were bought by the farmers as spare parts its cost would total roughly £42,000. I think the position is getting even worse. Manufacturers and distributors have a big responsibility to the farmers on this. The other day I bought a shaft for the water pump of an Oliver 99 tractor. It was a piece of bright steel about 9 inches long with a couple of collars and it cost me £9 2s. 6d. The tractor cost me £2,250 but I do not doubt that, judging from the price of that shaft, if I bought the tractor in spare parts it would cost me about £20,000. The manufacturers and distributors used to say they had to allow the country garage a good margin of profit to carry stocks, but I do not think that applies any longer. With the wonderful transport services we have today, distance does not mean so much and distant areas are no longer remote. From Jandowae I can phone the city at 3 o'clock in the afternoon and have a spare part at the local garage by 8 o'clock the next morning. From Taroom a farmer can ring at 3 p.m. and have a part out there at 12 o'clock or 1 p.m. the next day. So that argument can no longer be used. Distributors of machinery at Brisbane, Rockhampton or Townsville, perhaps even Toowoomba or Dalby, should keep adequate stocks of spare parts and they should be able to make them available to farmers much more cheaply. With the extension of bulk-handling this will become even more important.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. DAVIES** (Maryborough) (3.49 p.m.): I join with other hon. members in expressing my loyalty to the Throne and in congratulating the new hon. members on their speeches

in the House, particularly our new members, the hon. member for Tablelands and the hon. member for Port Curtis. I hope that the new members on the Government side will continue to display the same degree of courage as they have shown in their maiden speeches, and that it will grow and that they will become the critics of the present policy of the Government that we hope they will.

I disagree with the hon. member for Bundaberg and believe that we cannot renew our loyalty to the Throne and reaffirm it too often, because in doing so we associate the Queen and the Royal family with our democratic form of government. We realise that under the two-party system in this country we have a greater degree of stability than is evident in the government of many other countries. I might go further and say in all other countries.

The presence of splinter groups at various intervals in the history of our Parliament is always to be regretted, and we believe that the splinter groups at present evident will meet the fate that has always been met by such groups in Australian parliamentary history. That is all to the good. Although we may at intervals, such as at present, have Governments that hold up progress and drift along content to let things take care of themselves, we believe that our system is the best because, after three years, the people are able to change the Government. There was in France, with all its parties, a lack of stability till one person came forward and formed a Government of the type that we do not desire to see in Australia.

I believe that the two large parties in Australia are united on many fundamental principles. We are, or should be, united in our opposition to the forms of dictatorship that have arisen in various parts of the world. It is therefore to be regretted that we find members of the Government rising and swearing their loyalty to the Crown, and at the same time indulging in the malicious, character-assassination form of attack on members of the Opposition, and implying, and even directly stating in many cases, that they are under the control and domination of influences foreign to the system of government that we have in this country. The hon. members for Ashgrove, Nundah, and Merthyr possibly over-stepped the mark to the extent that it may have reacted to their disfavour when the new Minister was selected today. There appear to have been some more-balanced thinkers in the Liberal Party who agree with Mr. McEwen, who publicly rebuked the Prime Minister of Australia and Liberals generally when, speaking some 18 months ago in Orange, he dissociated himself from that form of attack.

I have heard on good authority that men who indulge in that form of attack never catch the Speaker's eye in the House of Commons, and charges such as those made against the Australian Labour

Party are not made against the Labour Party in Britain. This party is as firm as is the British Labour Party in its opposition to all forms of dictatorship and foreign ideologies whose protagonists may endeavour to extend their influence in our democratic system.

I remind these people that, in their efforts to divide the Australian people, they are not serving Australia very well. The Australian people are represented by two great political parties in this country. The issue is a great one, and one on which we should be united. No influence has been stronger and more effective in this country for decades in its opposition to Communism or Fascism or any other form of dictatorship than has been the Australian Labour Party. I ask hon. members opposite to search their consciences and ask themselves about their attitude to this question and whether or not they are doing a disservice to Australia. I remind them of the words of the Deputy Prime Minister, the Hon. John McEwen, who said that he did not believe in election-campaign tactics designed to create fear and hatred of the Australian Labour Party. It is a pity that he was not in Australia at the time of the last State election campaign and able to exercise the same influence over the Government as Sir Arthur Fadden exercised over it when the Country and Liberal Parties agreed to form a coalition with Mr. Gair and he stepped in and forced them to the polls as a Country-Liberal coalition. Mr. John McEwen said—

"Such tactics would tend to divide the Australian people instead of uniting them."

He avoided making any personal attack on the Leader of the Opposition, and said—

"We are not here to try to get your votes by running any other political parties.

"We want to make Australia stronger and greater and we do not want to divide Australians, one against the other.

"We are here to say that we believe that our party and our Government has the best policies for Australia.

"Our policies have given this country . . ."

and he went on to boost his party's policies, as he had every right to do, and as we expect each political party to do.

He continued—

"We want this country to be strong and we want it to be united.

"I am not here to ask you to hate and fear some other party in Australia, but to ask you to believe in the policies of our Government.

"The only group we hate and fear are the Communists. We hate and fear them at home and abroad because we want Australia to be safe and to remain free. That is the only group I denounce and which my party denounces, although I differ with Mr. Calwell on many things and make no bones about it."

What a great contrast we find in the State of Queensland, where, fearing political annihilation at the polls, even the Premier, the Country Party Leader, evidently succumbed to the Liberal Party tactics and, joined by other Country Party members, accepted advertisements of a scandalous nature aimed at character assassination, advertisements in the form of a hammer and sickle on Parliament House, and propaganda of that type—

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The hon. member knows full well that I have ruled any discussion on that matter out of order. It is totally out of order to discuss it, and I will not allow him to continue.

**Mr. DAVIES:** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to join issue with you, or attempt to join issue with you, on this question—

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I trust that the hon. member will not.

**Mr. DAVIES:** Whatever may have taken place, it was an advertisement in the newspapers.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! If the hon. member continues to discuss the subject, I shall have no alternative but to ask him to resume his seat. I ruled it out of order only a few days ago, when the hon. member for Aspley was speaking on the subject. It is ruled out of order under Rule of Practice No. 11—Quarrels not to be Prosecuted.

**Mr. DAVIES:** Very well, Mr. Speaker. I have too much to say to risk being punished at this stage. I will leave it at that.

The issue has been raised. It is the same old campaign that has been engaged in since before the Australian Labour Party was formed in this country. Such tactics should be foreign to the political life of Australia. We look back to the early days of the unions, and I say to hon. members opposite, who are so fearful of these individuals, that they do not understand the difference between political organisations and trade-union organisations. The Trades and Labour Council is a trade-union organisation, and the unions have the right to elect whatever representatives they wish to that organisation. It is outside the political organisation of the Australian Labour Party, and there is a great difference between their structures. Trade-union men have the right to express their trade-union views as forcefully as they so desire, and I might say to the Government, which fears them so much, that Gerry Dawson and the others about whom they complain so bitterly today would be quite tame in their speeches, remarks and general conduct compared with the union leaders of the 1890's who stood up against Gatling guns when the forefathers of the people governing the State today threatened to shoot them and sought to lay them low. Many of them were gaoled and at least one of them became a member of this House.

**Mr. Windsor interjected.**

**Mr. DAVIES:** The hon. member would not know anything about the philosophy or ideals of the Australian Labour Party, so I ask him to keep quiet.

As time went on, in an effort to defeat the Australian Labour Party, we were labelled "pro-Boer". Then we were called "pro-German" or "pro-Kaiser". The I.W.W. were active at the time and members of the Australian Labour Party were labelled "anarchists" in their efforts to cure wrongs that they felt existed.

The Australian Labour Party believes that these wrongs exist in many countries in the world today to a greater degree than ever; there are still evils and wrongs to be righted and we are determined to endeavour to right them by democratic and peaceful methods as fast as the majority of the people desire them to be rectified.

These attacks have gone on. Andrew Fisher was black-listed in the mines in Gympie when he protested against conditions. The things that are said by these men today are mild compared with what he said in those days, yet how often do we hear it said, "If only Labour men today were like the great old Andrew Fisher"? What did hon. members opposite say about him when he was establishing the Commonwealth Bank? They ridiculed him in every way. They said, "Andrew Fisher is going to destroy the sanctity of marriage and bring in free love." Such attacks reveal no respect for our democracy. The same thing happened with Ben Chifley; anti-Labour parties crucified him in every way they could, but after his death acclaimed him as a great and loyal Australian.

The type of men who spoke in that manner of the Labour Party in those days are today posing as great leaders of this country. They disrupted the country with their personal squabbles and the political feeling in their parties, and in Australia's greatest hour of need during the second world war they handed over to the Australian Labour Party. If they held us susceptible to the teachings of foreign ideologies this country would not have been entrusted to us in its hour of peril, yet the same people through the strength of their Press seem to be able to create fear in the hearts of a sufficient number of people to, so far, keep the Australian Labour Party out of office in the Commonwealth and this State.

I give credit, as I said before, to the Leader of the Country Party, who, to the embarrassment of the leaders of the Government in this State, has recently been outspoken on many matters. He has publicly rebuked people who adopt these tactics and methods. The Labour Party throughout the years has had to face up to this dastardly form of propaganda. In fact, Mr. McEwen said that an election should be fought upon a policy and these unsavoury methods should not be used.

I ask them to look within their hearts to see if they are doing the right thing for the country. We are now in greater peril, so far as our grandchildren are concerned in the decades that lie ahead, than we were in any time of war. These people, consequently, are not doing the right thing.

I should like now to comment on a recent attack by the hon. member for Merthyr upon returned soldiers generally and his implication that because he knew of one returned soldier—and he admitted that he actually fought in the war and went through all kinds of dangers—who came out of the war as a Communist. What a pity! What a great pity! The implication was that members were under no guarantee because they wore a returned soldier's badge. I give returned soldiers the benefit of the badge they wear and, despite the fact that one man here and there might defect, I hold that any reference in that manner to a returned soldier's badge is certainly out of place.

Much has been made of the unemployment figure. I am not going to dwell on it at any length now—I shall possibly deal with it in the Budget debate—but I remind the House of a statement by the Premier in which he said that seasonal employment was not the problem. He said it was more than a seasonal problem. In speeches in Canberra while he was appealing for more funds he strongly emphasised the point that unemployment was serious apart from the seasonal angle. We are told that the numbers have dropped. If they have dropped, as it is claimed—and we do not accept that low figure—it is still wrong. Nothing is being done by this Government or the Federal Government to overcome the problem. There should be some public committee sitting constantly to study the problems resulting from automation. They should be constantly looking for ways to provide opportunities for the unskilled to find employment. The best brains in Australia should be drawn upon. They should be sitting constantly in an endeavour to give advice to Governments as to the best means of overcoming the serious problem of unemployment.

As was suggested by the Federal member for Wentworth, the Commonwealth Government is moving sideways like a crab. We hear all this talk about education. I hope that during the Budget Debate I will have the opportunity to debunk all this glory Government members are painting for themselves about education. I hope to be able to point out the fallacy of many of their arguments. What has been done in the way of buildings has been absolutely essential, otherwise the children would have been out in the streets. The Labour Party has nothing to be ashamed of in its record of education following on the war when there was a shortage of men and materials. The Labour Party faced up to its problems, as I hope to be able to show in the Budget debate.

Much has been said about the discovery of oil and the expenditure of £4,500,000 in Gladstone. As Sir Maurice Mawby said, no plans have been prepared; the development depends on the availability of Markets. Knowing what was said by the Commonwealth Government about the Arnhem Land bauxite deposit, we hope the Gladstone story was not merely another stunt designed to win support at the last election.

At this stage I congratulate the hon. member for Mourilyan on his speech. Because of what the hon. member said the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation should be entering the debate. It calls for a personal statement about King Ranch from the Minister tomorrow morning. I listened to every word the hon. member said. There are the possibilities of a tremendous scandal here. Hundreds of land-hungry men cannot get land. The Treasurer smiled when that statement was made. Even if everything is above board let us have the whole story told here. I do not know if you were in the chair, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member made his speech, but I ask that it be read by all members of the Government and that we get further information on the matter. The hon. member for Clayfield said that this is some of the richest land in the Commonwealth, yet it is being thrown open at £2 6s. 8d. an acre. Hundreds of men are putting their names in for one block of land in a number of ballots in the North. Why cannot the people of the North take this land instead of the company? At one stage the hon. member for Mourilyan suggested that it looks as if there is something very unsavoury associated with this transaction.

The Premier proudly boasted of the smaller number of men in the various extension services of the State compared with when Labour was in office. This is to the shame of the Government. He was speaking about extension services for agricultural land. Quite recently Sir William Gunn made the statement that all primary industries should be provided with adequate and efficient extension services so as to be able to take advantage of the latest knowledge available from research. The figures show quite a sorry story in Queensland. I quote the words of Mr. Haigh within the last 12 months. He said—

"That we have inadequate force for both extension and research is indicated by the fact that Departments of Agriculture in New South Wales and Victoria with much smaller areas to cover, have 3.3 and 1.3 times the staff in Queensland.

"Only 6 per cent. of C.S.I.R.O. staff are located north of the latitude of our southern border."

Mr. Young, Director of Secondary Industries, said—

"The relative strength of the technical staff of C.S.I.R.O. available in Queensland compared with the potential for rural development appears to be hopelessly inadequate."

Yet we have spokesmen for the Government profoundly claiming what has been done by this Government for the man on the land. I say that the Labour Party has a magnificent record in the field of research stations and research officers. We laid the foundations in this State and the results have been tremendously beneficial to the various agricultural industries of the State.

Mr. Young continued—

"There are problems in development requiring experimental work and problems in carrying out the extension work required to put the experimental work into practice on actual farms.

Unfortunately, however, our available technical staff would appear to be too few in numbers to do all the work which would be desirable.

Queensland has 357,000 square miles with a 20-inch rainfall belt, Victoria has 54,000 square miles with a 20-inch rainfall belt, New South Wales has 121,000 square miles with a 20-inch rainfall belt, but State agricultural staff available in Queensland is stated to be smaller than in Victoria and to be approximately one-third of the New South Wales staff."

I will leave that statement with those few words.

I come now to a statement by Mr. Haigh on irrigation. When the Australian Labour Party was in office it built the Tinaroo Falls Dam. Thanks to the foresight of the Australian Labour Party there are now 1,300 producers at Mareeba where previously there were only 250. The Australian Labour Party also built the first stage of the Burdekin scheme. The hon. member for Burdekin never votes against the Government. He supports it in every way. In about 1957, I think it was the Premier said in effect that he would make no further approaches to the Federal Government on this matter because it had put up a brick wall. He gave no further support to that scheme. I cannot understand how the hon. member continues to support the Government. He had his opportunity to challenge the Government the other day but he did not dare.

When in office, the Labour Party built the first stage of the Burdekin Scheme by building the Gorge Dam. The hon. member for Merthyr has interjected. He should go up there and broaden his understanding of the problem. He should have a good look at that dam. We have been asked what the Labour Party has done. It constructed this dam. The hon. member for Mourilyan explained this morning what this Government has done in handing over vast areas to a rich company instead of to the people. The Labour Party opened up the land around Monto, Buderim, Eidsvold, Mundubbera, and Gayndah. The Labour Party cut it up into living areas and gave the people that magnificent country. The Treasurer smiled a while ago. He makes

many wise statements in this House but he went to that area and said the Mundubbera Weir built by a Labour Government was a white elephant. I doubt that he will ever go back there because of the resentment shown by the people of that area. As a result of the building of the weir, the orchards in the area have a better supply of water and the level of the wells has been raised. There should be more water conservation on the same lines. The Minister for Transport should know that this is a wonderfully rich area because of the increased tonnage railed from Gayndah, Mundubbera and Monto. It is magnificent country. This Government is doing nothing to plan for the future. It can only talk about the possibilities of the country. After six years, nothing has been done. I believe there is to be an enquiry into irrigation possibilities in the Burnett area. There are always inquiries, but no action.

My time is slipping by and I have one or two other matters to refer to. I want to refer particularly to a statement made by the Minister for Education and Migration, Mr. Pizzey. I am not taking it as his personal statement; it is the general opinion of the Government. I express strong resentment on behalf of the matron, the sisters and the nursing staff, and the wonderful Christian people who have given good service in the Wahroonga home at Maryborough. Although wonderful Christian people are giving such excellent service to the aged in the Wahroonga home in Maryborough, the Minister calls it a soulless institution. I say that is a wicked statement and on behalf of the people of Maryborough I express strong resentment. The home is a magnificent institution, built by a Labour Government at a cost of about £500,000. But the Minister for Health, the Minister for Education and the Government generally regard it as being too good for the aged people, and they cannot deny it. The Minister said the other day that he will not build any more homes for the aged like that one; he will leave it to the church organisations. The church organisations are doing a wonderful job—I have a tremendous respect for them—but they have neither the money nor the capital resources to build such homes for the aged. The Wahroonga home was the last built by the Australian Labour Party. The Minister for Health opened it. Then what did this Government do? The Labour Party had built a magnificent hospital in the same style for the care of the sick aged people so that those extremely ill, perhaps more senile than others, could be in a separate part of the hospital, away from the others. But no sooner was this Government returned to office than it took this hospital away from the aged people. The Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity ought to be ashamed at interjecting, and no doubt he is. He is regarded as one of the rebels in the Cabinet, but he may have lost his energy lately. His Government took this hospital away from the aged and made it

part of the General Hospital. Now the old people have to go across into two wards of the General Hospital and patients of all degrees of illness are in the one ward together. That is not right. It is not fair to the aged. It is not the fault of the matron and it is not the fault of the doctor. It has been done not only because this Government thinks the whole building is too good for the aged, as has so often been expressed by members of this Government, but also because they were going to get an allowance from the Commonwealth Government. So once more this Country-Liberal combination makes the old people suffer.

Hundreds of millions of pounds are being spent on defence. I am not disputing that. If money is available for the creation of an artificial lake in Canberra it should also be available for more useful purposes.

To call this a soulless institution! Ministers of religion go through the place regularly. Splendid Christian women, leaders in all kinds of social work in Maryborough, have an auxiliary, whose members wait on these old people a number of times every week. They have a special room there and anything the old people want to buy is made available. The institution includes a magnificent kitchen, a dining-room and a room for television and all sorts of amenities, and visiting organisations provide all kinds of entertainment, including pictures. The people of Maryborough in every way give the aged inmates Christian service. Yet this Government calls it a soulless institution. On behalf of the people of Maryborough I express very strong resentment at the attitude of the Government towards the home.

**Mr. Aikens:** Will this speech appear in the "Maryborough Chronicle"?

**Mr. DAVIES:** It is too serious a matter for inane interjections. I leave that subject now but I hope, when the Labour Government is returned, there will be further additions to the building because the dining-room, the kitchen and the general amenities room are large enough to cater for many more inmates. Any visitor going through the rooms of the aged will be impressed by the way they live, thanks to the permission given to them to install home comforts. For instance, one room has a piano in it and others have attractive curtains and other furnishings, gifts from friends. It will be my great pleasure on any occasion on which any hon. members visit Maryborough to take them to this home and show them through.

I wish to deal with shipbuilding problems and I shall have to be brief, because I also want to refer to the Treasurer's white elephant—the new fish depot at Maryborough. If I cannot get on to that, it will keep for the Budget debate, and I merely give the Treasurer fair warning now.

**Mr. Hiley:** Will it be an appreciation?

**Mr. DAVIES:** No, it will not be an appreciation; it will be thorough disgust. I shall deal briefly with one or two things concerning the fishing industry. I hate to keep the Treasurer in too much suspense, as he has enough worries.

Maryborough is one of the most important fishing centres in the State. The Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity could well have spent some of the money being used to construct an unnecessary by-pass road at Landsborough on the building of a bitumen road to Boonooroo, which is Maryborough's closest seaside resort and a beautiful spot. It is the best fishing centre in the bay. If the Treasurer did not catch fish the last time he was there, I shall show him where to try next time. This road is a disgrace. I know that the road has been bitumen-sealed to the forestry turn-off, but that is less than half the distance. We spent £14,000 on inverts to improve it.

**Mr. Hiley:** You just said that it was a white elephant. It would not be worthwhile building a road to a white elephant.

**Mr. DAVIES:** The Minister should wait till I tell him the whole story. This is the road to Maryborough's closest seaside resort, and it is a disgrace. I know that one year over 500,000 lb. of fish came from Boonooroo. The Government are building a by-pass on the old Gympie Road, near Petrie, which is not necessary at present except for speedsters or Cabinet Ministers rushing to their electorates. This work could well have been held up until the Toowoomba Road was sealed. There are many bitumen roads round Brisbane and in the Landsborough-Nambour areas that are less important. The work going on in some of these places at present is entirely unnecessary, but the Minister for Development is no more interested in the fishing industry than is the Treasurer.

I have here a statement describing the depot. It reads—

"It is visualised that the processing equipment and refrigeration will operate principally on Mullet fillets in both institutional and consumer packs and to an ancillary degree on Tailer, Whiting and School Mackerel.

"It is also proposed to smoke suitable varieties of fish.

"Depending on quality and size whole Mullet in prime condition may also be treated at Maryborough for export to American Markets.

"The plant is also capable of handling any overflow of prawns which cannot be treated locally at Bundaberg, Gladstone or Yeppoon.

"The number of personnel to be employed in the processing operation depends on the volume of seafoods received but it is estimated that the staff strength could total 15 persons."

To summarise it briefly, we find that the Treasurer has done nothing along those lines. Under a Labour Government, the old depot employed five people. I have not the exact figure as it is difficult to get, but I believe that, as a result of lack of interest by the Government in the new depot, the number is now two. I am wondering whether the Government is more interested in fostering the private-enterprise undertakings at Bundaberg and elsewhere at the expense of development of the Maryborough centre.

The statement was made by or on behalf of the Treasurer that the suppliers would not accept an offer by the board of 6d. a lb. It was stated in conference that Mr. Gallagher admitted that fish had been offered to the board at 6d. a lb. Mr. Gallagher said, "I had the first opportunity of buying mullet at 6d. per lb. net offered by E. Davies of Boonooroo."

These people have been sending their fish to Bundaberg at 6d. a pound net. I claim—I have to be brief now, but I have the full case here—that something is wrong somewhere. I do not know whether the Minister is getting the correct information, but I am informed by the fishermen—and I am ready to believe them—that on Tuesday, 7 May, they offered 3,500 lb. of fish to the board for processing and were told that it could not do anything with them. The fish was taken to Keppels, Bundaberg interstate operators, who gave them 6d. a pound net, whole fish weight. Rather than selling it for 8½d. or 9d. a lb. in Brisbane and losing one-third of that in various costs, which I have set out here, they are better off selling it in Maryborough. Very often the fish comes to Brisbane and is put in a refrigerator overnight and dumped the next morning, and the fishermen have to pay the cost of refrigeration.

The Treasurer said—

"The quicker we get the fish to process, the better. With a decentralising processing at Redcliffe, it will help local employment.

Fish and prawns will go direct to the processing plant there instead of having to come all the way to Brisbane."

What about Maryborough?

The Treasurer went on to say—

"You will have to catch less fish and put in some of your time cleaning some of them yourselves. It offends me every time I see fish arriving by train."

I believe it does, but he has done nothing about it.

He went on to say—

"You are paying for all the heads, backbones, etc., when it is not necessary. I would like to feel that, with a good run of mullet, the only part of that fish freighted to Brisbane would be the prepared fish ready for the housewife to cook immediately."

We can fillet fish in Maryborough if the Government will organise it. The board has the facilities for deep-freezing or snap-freezing fillets not only mullet and whiting but tailer and other fish. It is ridiculous to send them to Brisbane for filleting. It is an insult to the people of Maryborough to say that we cannot fillet them there. I doubt whether there are even three or four men in this Assembly who could be classed as good filleters. We should have a number of women in Maryborough trained to do filleting who could make this a part-time occupation, but the Treasurer has done nothing to implement this scheme. The Government says, "What is the good of sending fish there when there are no filleters?" I hope that the Minister will give serious consideration to what I have said. The fish being imported from overseas is only second-grade whiting or bream, not first-grade, and I am sure that people would much rather have comparatively fresh fillets of fish caught on the Queensland coast than fish from overseas.

I did intend to speak on the shipbuilding industry, but I shall reserve most of my remarks on that subject for the Budget debate. Walkers Ltd. now have enough work for about three years, but we know that Evans Deakin in Brisbane have only one ship on order. In spite of this, ships are being chartered by the Commonwealth Government for many purposes, and Danish ships and Danish seamen are being used to carry supplies to research stations in the Antarctic, and so on. The licensed fishing boat "Rana" was chartered by the Government to survey prawn resources in the Gulf of Carpentaria, and we have a Danish ship of the Clausen line engaged in the cattle trade in the Gulf. The Federal Minister for Customs and Excise, after backing and filling for many months and saying that it was a State matter, gave details of the ships that had been imported from overseas. They were the "Ilse Clausen", which was brought from Denmark, the "Clara Clausen", which was brought from Yugoslavia. Both of these boats were used on the cattle trade in North Queensland. The "Charles H. McKay", a barge was imported from the United Kingdom. We know that the Clausen vessels are supposed to leave Australia at the end of the season, but while these things are going on no provision is being made for the Australian shipbuilding industry. The two shipbuilding yards in Queensland played a splendid part during the last war, when both were proved necessary for the defence of Australia, but for many months the shipyard in Maryborough was idle because the Government could find no work for the men. We lost some of our best men, who had to go to jobs in other parts of Australia because no work was available for them in their home State.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. ARMSTRONG** (Mulgrave) (4.30 p.m.): I rise to support the motion moved by the hon. member for Carnarvon and seconded by the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha, and to join with them in pledging the loyalty of the people of Mulgrave and myself to our Most Gracious Majesty Queen Elizabeth.

I wish also to congratulate His Excellency on the Opening Speech with which he was pleased to open this Thirty-seventh Parliament. I should like also to join with other members in expressing appreciation of the work he is carrying out during the absence on leave of our Governor. I am sure that he has endeared himself not only to the members of this House but to the people of Queensland as a whole.

I express my appreciation to the electors of Mulgrave for sending me back to represent them for a further period in this Parliament. I pledge myself to serve them well and worthily, not only those who voted for me but each and every person in the electorate. I do not think I need stress here the importance of the industries in this electorate. There are quite a few of them and, like the industries in most electorates, they have their problems. We are overcoming them gradually but there are still many which we have to face up to in the future. I hope to touch on those later.

I should like at this stage to offer my congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, on being re-elected to the office of Speaker. I have no doubt you will carry out your duties with the dignity that is required of that high office, as you have done in the past, but as has not always been the pattern in this State.

I should also like to join with other members in offering my congratulations to those members who were returned to this Parliament for the first time. I have had the opportunity of listening to most of them—unfortunately not right through their speeches—and from the manner in which they handled themselves I have no doubt they will all work in the interests of their electorates and generally in the interests of Queensland.

Whilst I am in the mood for offering congratulations I should like to congratulate the Premier and his Deputy for again leading the Government to such a fine victory. I have listened to some of the criticisms made over the past few days by hon. members opposite and I still feel that they are speaking for a very small minority in this State.

**Mr. TUCKER:** 45 per cent.

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** That figure is an interesting one and is like many of the statements made by hon. members opposite from time to time. I do not think I will have time today to deal with this so-called percentage they claim, but I may find time to do so later in the session.

I wish also to congratulate my friend and colleague, Mr. Row, who has been appointed to the Cabinet. He is a very good North

Queenslander and I can assure hon. members that we in North Queensland appreciate the Premier's action on this occasion. We know that Mr. Row will be of great assistance not only to North Queensland but to the whole State.

**Mr. Thackeray:** Do you believe in the exhaustive ballot?

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** If it could exhaust the hon. member I would be a strong supporter of it.

As I was endeavouring to say before I was interrupted, my friend Mr. Row is a man of the earth. He has served one of the major primary industries in this State in many capacities for a number of years and has a very good understanding of that industry. It can be rightly claimed that it is one of the best organised primary industries, not only in Australia but throughout the world. I often think it is a great pity that some of our other primary industries do not follow more closely the example that has been set by the Queensland sugar industry.

**Opposition Members interjected.**

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** We have had very good men in the sugar industry, some of whom have come from the other side of the House. They have all laboured very well while members of that organisation. They have left their mark in the annals of its history. It is a pity that some of the other primary industries do not follow that example.

The recent victory of this Government has shown the great confidence that the people of Queensland have in it. For years and years by all sorts of guises and gimmicks, we were denied the opportunity of taking control of the House. I do not know where hon. members opposite will get another Moore from. Never was anybody more persecuted and prosecuted at election time, in season, and out of season.

**Opposition Members interjected.**

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** It did not hurt him too much but it served the cause of hon. members opposite. The strange thing is that a Government of the same calibre as hon. members opposite was dismissed from the Federal sphere on that occasion, but we have never heard anything about its misdoings and shortcomings. They effectively used the Moore theme for a very long time, but they will now have to think up something better than that to get back on the Treasury benches. Now that this Government has started on its third term, having served the people so well in its previous terms, they will have to think up something else to try to entice the people to vote for them.

Many of the services given by this Government are greatly appreciated, and it is only fair that that should be voiced. The people of North Queensland, particularly in the Mulgrave electorate, would expect me to

do so. I refer to this Government's practice of holding State-wide Cabinet meetings in the various towns and cities. These meetings give the people in those areas, some of them very remote, an opportunity to meet members of Cabinet and discuss their problems with them. It also enables Cabinet Ministers to see for themselves some of the difficulties that these people are faced with, and it gives them a greater understanding of them. I assure the Premier and his Cabinet colleagues that this service is greatly appreciated by the people of this State. We have enjoyed Cabinet meetings in North Queensland, and we look forward to more of them in the future. They have done a great deal of good. When Cabinet meets in the various centres dozens of deputations wait on the various Ministers, which has resulted in bringing great satisfaction to the people in those areas.

In the main cities along the coast we enjoy visits from members of Cabinet about once a fortnight. Again this is greatly appreciated in North Queensland. I have had the opportunity of being with Ministers who have visited on these occasions, and it was very pleasing to have them there. It will not make hon. members opposite very pleased to hear this, but the other day when the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity paid a visit to the North no fewer than three or four deputations waited on him just to thank him for the good job that he and his Government are doing. I think it was very heartening for the Premier and the Cabinet when Mr. Evans came back to inform them about that. That service is greatly appreciated and I know it will continue.

During this term of Parliament we have heard much about the development of Queensland and North Australia, and particularly about the development of Queensland and its northern section. While we are all in favour of developing that section of the State as rapidly as possible, I think it is essential for anyone who may come forward with such an ear-tickling phrase as "developing North Queensland", to bring forward something with meat in it. As most hon. members who have seen it would know, North Queensland is vast in area. Queensland at present is substantially a primary-producing State and the most effective way to develop that part of the country at this stage is in the field of grazing. A tremendous amount of work is necessary in that field before rapid development can take place. There are few facilities available in the area. There is great need for a good roads system, which the present Government has started to implement. Its efforts have brought heart to the many people living in isolated areas. No doubt, when the beef-roads system is well established it will greatly benefit that part of the State. However, for closer settlement and rapid development, when we look at the area involved, we realise the need of many concerns similar to Mt. Isa Mines Ltd.

to make a real impression. I sincerely hope the time will come when we discover oil and many other minerals in the north of the State. At present it is difficult even to get in to do the boring and the necessary exploratory work. The great hope for development there lies in the grazing industry.

A short while ago I was interested to hear my friend opposite talk about the various services that he claims are lacking under this Government, services that would assist this type of development. I assure him that if he studies the statistics and figures he will find that we are doing a damn sight more than the Labour Party ever did in office, and we will continue to do so. I do not think any member of this Government believes that we have enough technical men attached to the Department of Agriculture and Stock and to our experimental stations and other services necessary to improve the pastures and legumes and so on, and I do not think we have ever denied that we have insufficient. If he does not believe me I ask him to read the statistics. If things were as my friend contended, why is this State so far behind the more developed States? Why haven't we got all these things, if we had the men.

**Mr. Sherrington:** It is because of this Government and the Menzies Government in Canberra.

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** The Menzies Government and this Government have a very good record. If we had an opportunity to govern for some 40 years, as hon. members opposite had, the picture would be very different. There has been a marked change in this State in the past six years.

**Mr. Sherrington:** Strictly as far as the electoral boundaries are concerned.

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** Strictly as far as improved pastures are concerned. Hon. members opposite talk about what they have done, but they do not tell us what they did not do. We have pressed on as rapidly as possible. We will continue with our policy and it is accepted by the people.

The great area I am referring to needs development, and if hon. members opposite are as good as they would lead the people to believe, and had they provided the services they claim, the position would be entirely different.

Seeing you in the chair, Mr. Deputy Speaker, prompts me to offer my congratulations on your becoming Chairman of Committees. I feel sure that you, too, will do a very good job.

The services I have mentioned are very necessary but it takes time for their effect to be felt. I know a little about sugar and I cannot help harking back to the sugar industry.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! If hon. members on my left are not interested in the debate, I suggest they keep quiet and let those who are interested hear what the speaker is saying.

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** If the sugar industry had not availed itself of all the—

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I have just reminded hon. members on my left that it is quite difficult to hear. Will they please refrain from loud conversation in the Chamber!

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** If the sugar industry had not availed itself of every phase of scientific approach in the fields of agriculture, pest control, and many others, it would not be in the position it is in today.

**Mr. Evans:** And with their own money, too.

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** That is right. Of course, I do not have to remind anyone that, during most of the time the industry was developing, hon. members now opposite occupied the Treasury benches and it is interesting to note that often the sugar industry called on them for assistance but that assistance was not forthcoming.

**Mr. Hanson:** Absolute rubbish!

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** The hon. member would not know what he was talking about.

**Mr. Hanson:** You are talking rot!

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** I would suggest to new hon. members that they read the history of the sugar industry and find out just how much assistance it got from the Labour Government. As I was endeavouring to say, when assistance was not forthcoming from the Labour Government, the sugar industry fell back on its own resources and today it is spending many hundreds of thousands of pounds in every field of scientific research, which has repaid it over and over again. I know that similar research will do the same for other industries when they reach the stage that the men in them can see what technical officers are capable of producing.

It was interesting to hear the remarks on the Tinaroo Falls Dam and the great development that has taken place there. It was left to this Government to do much of that work. I think hon. members on my right will know that this Government, in conjunction with the Federal Government and the tobacco industry, has built a very up-to-date experimental station out towards Dimbulah, which is being used not merely to develop the tobacco industry but also for pasture improvement and legumes for the greater part of the area. I have no doubt that, as time goes on, and as we can train men and get them in this field, the industry will reap benefits similar to those of the sugar industry.

Closely associated with any talk of encouraging and developing new industries in Queensland is the need to do everything possible to assist and encourage the industries that are already established here. I refer to the dairying industry, the timber industry, the fruit-growing industry and many others that could be successful in that part of the State.

The timber industry has had a bad time for a number of years owing to all sorts of circumstances. Today many other materials are entering into competition with timber and it is necessary for the Government to assist this great industry, which employs many men and a good deal of capital. It is an industry that we should bend over backwards to try to help get on its feet.

The dairying industry has many problems, as hon. members will know, as have some of the other primary industries in my electorate and in adjacent electorates.

Again I must commend the Government for setting up recently an expert committee of highly-qualified scientific men to investigate the problems associated with soil fertility and the troubles that maize-growers are having on the Tableland. I hope that something worth while will flow from their efforts. This industry has helped a great deal in the development of that part of the State, and what is happening to it at present is a tragedy. I feel that the Government is doing the right thing in this matter and I hope that answers to their problems are found speedily so that these people can get back onto their feet again.

After listening to some of the speeches of hon. members opposite, one would think that nothing has happened since this Government came to power. On the contrary, one would think that there had been a mass exodus of people, and that industries had folded up. I should like to remind them of a few things that the Government has done. If they are not yet fully developed, the time is coming when they will be.

I refer firstly to the work of my friend and colleague, the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity, and what he has done for North Queensland and, indeed, all of Queensland.

**Mr. Sherrington** interjected.

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** There are no main roads in the hon. member's electorate.

**Mr. Sherrington:** The only ones that are in it are in a shocking condition.

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** The Minister has done much to assist in this matter. He has built from the border to Mossman a road on which for many miles one is now able to exceed the speed limit. A few years ago, prior to this Government's assuming office, one did not have to go very far beyond city boundaries to be driving on bush tracks, not roads.

Hon. members opposite say that the Government has done nothing. Let them consider the story of Mt. Isa and what that great industry is doing for North Queensland and Townsville, and what it will do in the future. That is something of great magnitude and it has all been done by this Government. Only a fortnight ago we witnessed the opening of another power station in the Barron Gorge. In case hon. members opposite have forgotten, the previous one, too, was constructed by our type of Government. Of course, it was left to us to develop this scheme to a further stage. Today it is producing electricity and putting it to use.

There has been a very rapid expansion in the provision of electric power, which cannot be denied by hon. members opposite. In my electorate I do not think I would be going beyond the truth in saying that at least 97 per cent. of people are supplied with electricity. Most of this has happened since this Government came to power. If the Labour Party had remained in office, we, in common with those in most other places, would have had blackouts, as most schemes instituted by it were either too small or otherwise inadequate. Hon. members opposite cannot get away from that.

**Mr. Evans:** We cut out the surcharge, too.

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** Of course. We realise that electricity is one of the most essential things for the development of not only North Queensland but all the State, and the Government is planning accordingly. We are not making plans and putting them in pigeon-holes, as I am led to believe was the practice when the Labour Party was in power. Plans are being drawn up speedily and put into effect.

I pass now to another great problem that came to my mind when listening this morning to some of the previous speakers. It is not much good opening and developing country and growing produce if it cannot be marketed. I suggest that there is a very great need today for a scientific approach to the marketing of the main products of Queensland along the lines developed by the sugar industry, which usually has some idea of the size of its markets and of the price that it will receive. Queensland is capable of producing many types of produce in large quantities. Most of the State has a reasonably satisfactory rainfall, but many primary-producing areas are a long way from markets. For instance, in North Queensland, apart from the local markets in Cairns, Townsville, some of the smaller provincial cities, and Mount Isa, producers have to send their products to either Brisbane or Sydney, which are a very long way away, thus incurring high freight charges. I suggest that we should have a really good look at the possibilities of getting markets in some of the islands to the north of Queensland, such as New Guinea, the Philippines, Hong Kong, Japan, and various others. I think we should have

representatives there constantly endeavouring to find markets for the things that we produce. In some instances they would be closer than the markets in which some industries are now trying to sell their products. I know that a great deal of organisational work is involved and that many problems have to be solved; but if we are to develop North Queensland, sooner or later we must do something about this problem. I was rather impressed by one of the ideas that the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity, Mr. Evans, brought back from the islands. He suggested that we should establish a Queensland House in certain centres and have trained men there endeavouring to find markets for the many products that are grown in North Queensland—sugar, beef, potatoes, onions, tropical fruit, timber, and many others.

**Mr. Aikens:** Did the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation explore all these possibilities during his recent visit to Fiji?

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** I have not had time to discuss it with him, but knowing him as I do, I have no doubt that he would have done his utmost, as did Mr. Evans and the other Ministers who have visited various parts of the world. As I said North Queensland is the closest part of Australia to these markets, and I believe that this proposal should be investigated carefully. In many instances when we try to sell in certain markets we are only invading the market of local people, and this, in turn, helps to reduce the price received by producers.

There is also a great need for shipping services in North Queensland. I should like time to discuss this fully because it is a sad story for North Queensland, and perhaps I could agree with some of the things said by hon. members opposite about shipping. It is very difficult to get a ship to come into Cairns to take our products away. It is all right for sugar and other commodities that the Government has made provision to handle in bulk, but some of the other products that are sent overseas have to be sent to either Townsville or Brisbane. Some firms with goods for export have had them on the wharves in Cairns for months and months because they could not get a ship to call there to take them away. I am sure that there are possibilities in starting a direct service to some of the places to which I have referred. In fact, only a few days ago I noticed a suggestion in one of the northern newspapers that a shipping line will be coming direct to Townsville.

**Mr. Aikens:** Why won't the ships go to Cairns?

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** I think the hon. member knows why they will not go to Cairns. The shipping story at Cairns is not a very good one, and it would take

a little time to tell it. However, it is a fact that it is difficult to get a ship to call at Cairns.

**An Opposition Member:** There is no water there.

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** There is any amount of water there for very large vessels. It is not a very attractive port for some vessels because they do not know when they will get out of it.

**An Opposition Member:** You get overseas shipping into Cairns.

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** We do occasionally, but not often. It is all right for sugar ships. We do not have any trouble getting them in and if we had listened to some hon. members opposite we would not have had even them. It was due to the foresight of this Government and the co-operation of the sugar industry that we have overcome the problem there. Next year, of course, sugar will be going out through the bulk terminal, and I feel that if we had a really good look at the possibility of linking the islands north of Australia with the North, and doing something about getting a shipping line, perhaps at a cheaper rate than we now pay, there is a very distinct possibility of getting rid of quite a few of the products that that country is capable of producing. I feel sure that that would enable us to open up more of these fertile lands.

Today we have to market some of our tropical fruits as far away as Melbourne. It is not only expensive but it takes a long time to get them there. If we can send fruit from North Queensland to Melbourne it should not be very difficult to send it as far, or perhaps a shorter distance, the other way.

I have referred to some of the products that this country is capable of producing in large quantities. If we can overcome the problem of marketing, or organise it on a sound basis with a direct shipping line, I am sure we will see very rapid development of that part of the State.

I was very interested in some of the remarks made recently by some hon. members opposite, particularly the hon. member for Cairns, who spoke of the position generally in Cairns and the deplorable situation that exists in North Queensland. So sad a story did he tell that I think I can brand him and his cobbers as prophets of gloom and despair.

**Mr. Wallace:** Do you object to the truth?

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** I have no objection, but the hon. member was nowhere near the truth. That is the very reason why I have to try to convince not only members of this House but the people of Queensland generally that such is not the position.

**Mr. Wallace:** It is the position.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I have called "Order" three or four times and if the hon. member for Cairns continues to interject I will deal with him in no uncertain manner.

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** It is interesting to hear the hon. member confirm his remarks by saying, "It is true." It is also interesting to see that his view is not shared by all members of his party. On Friday, the 13th of this month, one of the leading citizens of Cairns had something to say through "The Cairns Post". I do not intend to read the full statement—only sufficient to demonstrate that members of the Labour Party are at variance in their views on this matter. The article is headed, "New era of prosperity dawning for Cairns" and it reads—

"A new era of development and prosperity was dawning for Cairns and district said the Mayor (Ald. S. D. E. Chataway) last night."

**Mr. Evans:** Would he be Labour?

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** He would be Labour, yes. I had the opportunity of listening to him address a meeting prior to the date on which this article was published, and I found that he has every confidence in Cairns. He is not one of the band of gloom and despair to whom I referred.

**Mr. Wallace** interjected.

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** Never mind about our Government; this is the mayor of Cairns, who belongs to the same political party as the hon. member. Fortunately, he is a man of foresight and knowledge and he does not share the hon. member's views.

It is not true to say that the population of Cairns is not increasing. As a matter of fact, it is increasing fairly rapidly. If the hon. member had listened to the address given by the mayor of Cairns he would have known that he quoted the increase in population in Cairns over the last few years. I do not intend to do that today. Outside Townsville it is also increasing very rapidly.

**Mr. Wallace:** That is not so.

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** It is so. At this time of the year it is very difficult in Cairns even to get a bed to sleep in. That has been the position for months now.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! This is the last time I will warn hon. members on my left. The hon. members for South Brisbane and Cairns have kept up a barrage of interjections. I am warning them that if they continue, under Standing Order 123A. I will have no alternative but to ask them to retire from the Chamber.

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** All I object to is that my time is ticking by while you are trying to silence my friends.

The hon. member for Cairns is doing a tremendous amount of harm to that part of the State. I would not mind if he confined his remarks to some place where people could not hear them, but what he says here is published in the Press. It is stated in places

where it hits the headlines. As we all know, there are people going round the State at the present time looking for somewhere to invest their capital. But this sort of talk reminds one of a sinking ship. Anybody who is seeking an avenue to exploit his capital would very quickly fold up his bags and get out of a place where there is such talk. It is very difficult to rent a flat in Cairns, and almost impossible to get a house.

**Mr. Wallace** interjected.

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** I know what I am talking about. Time is beating me. The hon. member does not confine his remarks to Cairns; he speaks about the whole North Queensland area. The other day he was complaining about the 10-per cent. royalty on oil. He said that it was not in the Act introduced by Labour, the first petroleum Act that was brought into this House somewhere in the early 1920's. I suggest to the hon. member that it would be much better if he would read a little and make himself more conversant with the position before making such statements. If he cares to look at Section 23 of the amending Act of 1927 he will find that the 10 per cent. is there.

**Mr. Wallace:** I said no agreement was reached with any oil company.

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** It does not matter whether there was an agreement or not. I do not mind criticism, as long as it is confined to truth.

I commend the Government for what it has done, and for the great confidence it has instilled into investors in Queensland. Even in the place that my friend from Cairns tells us is deteriorating rapidly, some of the big firms are now coming up and establishing branches. Many have been established in the last few years. I know that pattern will continue. The people of Queensland have this great feeling of confidence in their State but hon. members opposite are doing their utmost to destroy that confidence. They are doing the State a disservice. I am not the only one who says that. Even the mayor of Cairns shares my view. I was in Cairns the other day, and I assure the hon. member for Cairns that some of the people up there are not too happy with him.

(Time expired.)

Motion—That the Address in Reply be adopted (Mr. McKechnie)—agreed to.

## SUPPLY

### CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEE

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

"That the House, will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty."

Motion agreed to.

## WAYS AND MEANS

## CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEE

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

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.”

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.11 p.m.

---