

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 8 OCTOBER 1963

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 8 OCTOBER, 1963

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

QUESTION

TRACTOR ACCIDENTS.—Mr. Bromley, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Labour and Industry,—

(1) What was the number of reported and collated accidents associated with tractors during the years 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962 and 1963?

(2) How many of these accidents proved fatal and what constituted the causes of the accidents?

Answers:—

(1) "Full details of all tractor accidents are not available to the Department of Machinery. The Act specifically exempts tractors used on any farm or grazing property from the operation of the Act. Reports, however, were received of 17 accidents in other spheres and investigated. These were—1959, 1; 1960, 3; 1961, 4; 1962, 6; 1963, 3, and involved 13 wheeled and 4 crawler tractors, including small tractor mounted cranes."

(2) "Nine of the above accidents were fatal, and were caused mainly from overturning or unsafe acts. The Chief Inspector of Machinery, with the co-operation of the Police Commissioner, maintains annually an analysis of all tractor fatalities in the State, including those in Question (1) above. In 1959, there were 12; in 1960, 19; in 1961, 10; in 1962, 13; in 1963, 12; making a total of 66. The causes of these are too numerous to detail here but, for the information of the Honourable Member, I am making available a summary of these fatalities recently prepared by the Chief Inspector. I would also inform him that the Division of Occupational Safety has, since its establishment by this Government in 1957, given prominence to the hazards of tractor operation. Safety films have been shown to tractor distributors, groups operating tractors, and to all branches of the Junior Farmer Organisations in Queensland. Talks have been given to many of these groups, and the co-operation of the Queensland Machinery and Tractor Association has been sought to have all their sales and service staff impress safety measures on their clients. Statistics and a summary of fatalities have been made available for this purpose. Short paragraphs based on recommended safe practice have been prepared and published in the Queensland *Country Life* newspaper, while an article was prepared for inclusion in a periodical published by the Colonial Sugar Refining Company.

Enquiries are at present in hand to obtain a small model tractor, which can be used to demonstrate unsafe practices. The activities of the Division have expanded enormously, particularly as a result of the Occupational Safety Convention held in Townsville in April, 1962. Requests for assistance are continually being received, typical of these being safety educational programmes for the Sugar Milling Industry and the North Queensland Local Government Association. Both management in industry and industrial unions have expressed their appreciation of the services rendered."

Paper—Whereupon, Mr. Dewar laid upon the Table of the House the summary referred to.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table, and ordered to be printed:—

Reports—

Agricultural Bank for the year 1962-1963.

Registrar of Co-operative Housing Societies for the year 1962-1963.

Department of Public Works for the year 1962-1963.

Balance Sheet, &c., of the Public Curator for the year 1962-1963.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

The Commissions of Inquiry Acts, 1950- to 1954.

The Racing and Betting Acts, 1954 to 1962.

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

The Medical Acts, 1939 to 1958.

The Irrigation Acts, 1922 to 1961.

The Irrigation Areas (Land Settlement) Act of 1962.

The River Improvement Trust Acts, 1940 to 1959.

The City of Brisbane Market Acts, 1960 to 1962.

Regulations under—

The Public Service Acts, 1922 to 1963.

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

Report and Accounts of The Totalisator Administration Board of Queensland for the year 1962-1963.

Report of the Brisbane Milk Board for the year 1962-1963.

Report of the Audit Inspector on the Books and Accounts of the Brisbane Milk Board for the year 1962-1963.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LONERGAN (Flinders) (11.13 a.m.), by leave: In speaking on the Address in Reply the hon. member for Burke said that I had followed an elector up the pathway to a polling-booth and furthermore that I had stated that I would fix him if he did not watch his step. I emphatically deny that I said that as I never use that expression. In this instance I should say that the hon. member for Burke is indulging in a half-truth. It is true that I had occasion to warn an elector, Robert Henry Davies, about following electors to the door of the polling-booth.

For the information of the House, this person who allegedly complained to the hon. member for Burke is the secretary of the A.L.P. branch at Charters Towers. He was also campaign director for the A.L.P. candidate at the last general election, who, I might say, suffered a crushing defeat.

SUPPLY

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT—
RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

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

Debate resumed from 26 September (see p. 540) on Mr. Hiley's motion—

"That there be granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1963-1964, a sum not exceeding £1,679 to defray the salary of Aide-de-Camp to His Excellency the Governor."

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (11.14 a.m.): The Financial Statement that was submitted by the Treasurer on 26 September sets out, in summarised form, the financial activities of the Government and registers, for the information of those who are interested in Queensland, the general financial progress that has been made in the State and the method by which the State proposes to use its funds for the development of Queensland.

There is a temptation, of course, to use the opportunities afforded in the Budget debate to deal with all sorts of subjects. The Treasurer himself has often exercised the privilege to deal with some aspect that he regards as sufficiently important to warrant his attention. This time he did not do so but confined his contribution mainly to an outline of the financial proposals and general intentions of the Government.

I have noticed in the replies the Treasurer has furnished from time to time a disposition on his part, when it suits him—that is, if the criticism levelled from this side of the Chamber is not particularly rugged or forthright—to commend hon. members for seizing the opportunity to focus public attention on

some matter of public interest and, as is well known, the Address-in-Reply debate and the Budget debate afford hon. members the only opportunities of speaking on a very wide range of subjects. On other occasions, when the criticism from this side has been forthright, the Treasurer has criticised us for not confining ourselves to a strict dissection of the Financial Statement. I do not think it is necessary to do that and on this occasion I intend to deal with two or three fairly important matters and to leave some of the dissection and matters affecting the transfers of funds, and questions to be directed to the Treasurer, to other hon. members on this side, notable the Deputy Leader.

I should like to take this opportunity of dealing with a general situation, which, I think, as far as this Parliament is concerned, is of some importance, and I refer to the development of the State. This Government came to power on the basis that Queensland had been unduly hampered in its development because of successive Labour administrations, that too many restrictive policies had been applied, that there was not the climate here for the investment of capital and that it required only the injection into the political thinking of the State of a Country-Liberal philosophy for this whole climate to be changed. Since that time—since the translation was effected—we have noticed a very consistent and premeditated policy on the part of the Government in utilising on quite a colossal scale the publicity mediums of the Government for the purpose of telling the world just what this Government is supposed to be doing. We have found an augmented staff in the Public Relations Bureau. We have seen for the first time a determined policy on the part of the Government to allocate £25,000 a year for the insertion of a series of advertisements in the Press for the purpose of publicising what is believed to be the industrial potential of this State. I do not particularly quarrel with that. As I have said previously, if the Government of the day feels there is need for the public to be informed of the employment and investment opportunities in the State, it is its bounden duty to give the widest possible publicity to that fact. But I do question the political ethics of this campaign's coinciding with an election campaign and I really feel that, if the people of this State are to receive the unanimous co-operation of all members of the Parliament in pushing forward the development of the State, that can be accomplished much more easily if we find that the Government is motivated by a desire to serve the State rather than a desire to serve its own political ends.

I make an appeal to the Treasurer, and through him to the Premier. Whilst I do not particularly criticise the expenditure of this quite considerable sum of money, I feel that it would remove a cause for justifiable criticism if the expenditure were distributed or channelled over the year and not made at

a time when an election is pending, because it can be construed in a certain way. Quite frankly, my own reaction to it was that a lot of this propaganda was very subtly prepared and it could be an augmentation of the funds that are employed by political parties in the prosecution of a political campaign. I think that that is entirely wrong and I hope that the cause of the complaint will be removed. I shall offer no objection to any action taken along those lines. The amount of £25,000, which is the figure mentioned, is a considerable sum, and almost all of it was spent during the election campaign. I think that it is more than a coincidence that this campaign was conducted at the same time as a general election was being held in this State.

I deny the general charge that the Labour Party is acting as a knocker in the development of Queensland, and I also deny strongly that in the past we have been responsible for restrictive policies. I want to deal briefly, but nevertheless in sufficiently detailed form for hon. members to follow my reasoning, with what has happened in the post-war period.

I have had the opportunity of reading in the last few days the Financial Statements of the Treasurers of Victoria, South Australia, New South Wales, Tasmania, and the Commonwealth. In almost every case claims are made similar to those made by the Queensland Treasurer. Whether the Governments are Labour or non-Labour, all claim unprecedented development and pick out some facets of it that they feel should be emphasised. It is, of course, only to be expected that a Treasurer will, in defending his Budget, point out what he believes to be improvements made under the administration of his Government. I take no exception to that except to say if one confined one's reading to the Queensland Press and the spate of propaganda issued by Government departments, one would think that this melodramatic development is something peculiar to Queensland. One could believe that this is the only State with a potential and the only one harnessing its resources for the purpose of development.

This is not the case, and there are grounds for grave misgivings in some directions unless there is some evidence of a predetermined plan outlining the objectives and the extent to which the finances of the State are being used to reach it. It appears to me, from a perusal of the financial tables, that much was made before the election of the channelling of funds into projects that would provide the most employment so that the percentage of unemployed would be reduced. That is borne out by the fact that special financial assistance over and above that given to other States was given to Queensland because of the high percentage of unemployed here. Consequently those funds were used for various purposes, and I am not particularly critical of the way in which

they were spent. Much has been made of the beef-roads scheme, the development of ports, and various things of that kind.

With the prospect of a Federal election receding and there being no State election pending, it is now rather interesting to observe that this financial year there is not the provision for financial assistance to Queensland that there was last year by way of special grant. There has been a considerable reduction in the amount of money coming to Queensland for special assistance.

I find it difficult also to ascertain exactly to what particular objectives the Government proposes to direct its energies. This brings me to an 80-odd page supplement to a recent edition of "Financial Review", which I am informed was the result of an invitation extended by the State Government to the proprietors of "Financial Review", namely, "The Sydney Morning Herald", to send a staff of reporters to Queensland to make an examination of our potential and what is happening here. Again, it is more than passing strange that, in the main, the supplement covers reports dealing with almost every ministerial department, and it is bolstered considerably by the insertion of Government advertisements. I have made inquiries, and I understand that the cost of advertising in "Financial Review" is about £175 a page. If that is so, the regional electricity boards, which are virtually semi-governmental authorities, were responsible for advertising worth approximately £150, the Tourist Bureau £175, the Department of Secondary Industry £350, and the Railway Department £80, to say nothing of the cost of blocks, art arrangements, and all the other work that goes into advertisements of this type. I should like to know from the Treasurer what financial costs were involved apart from those that I have mentioned—which I have perhaps understated rather than overstated—what facilities were provided for these people in the way of staff that may have been seconded to them, either temporarily or on a part-time basis, and what other costs might have been borne by the Queensland Government in providing transport, accommodation, and so on.

Mr. Hiley: The answers now are: nil; nil; nil.

Mr. DUGGAN: Very well. In that regard the invitation appears to have been a rather miserable one. After all, I suppose that, from the point of view of investment, there is no more authoritative or widely-read paper than "Financial Review". Although its primary purpose may be to report movements in share trading in Australia, which are of importance to people who are interested in share transactions, it also contains a great deal of information that is not available in other publications. I read "Financial Review" frequently because it has special correspondents and deals with a wide range of interesting public questions. It is

a very well-presented journal, and the fact that it has been able to push out of the field a rival publication by Consolidated Press shows that it is viewed throughout Australia as an authoritative publication. If the Government can afford to spend £25,000 a year on publicising Queensland, "Financial Review" would have been a very suitable medium for advertisements designed to channel investments here. The advertisements costing £25,000 that appeared in "The Courier-Mail", "Telegraph", and "Sunday Truth" were confined to Queensland readers and would not, in the main, reach the sources of capital investment sought by the Government of Queensland. That £25,000 was expended to win votes, not to win money for the State. Therefore, if we are to expend sums such as this, I think "Financial Review", which is read by Australians and by interested parties abroad, would be a suitable medium for this purpose.

I do not wish to be accused of parochialism, and I do not think that any fair-minded critic could say that I have ever used this Chamber to pursue purely parochial issues. I do not, of course, deny the right of hon. members to do that, but I have never elected to do it, either as a private member or in any other capacity. However, I read the 80-page supplement to which I have referred and was astonished to find not one reference to either the Darling Downs or Toowoomba, which is the second largest provincial city in the State. In Toowoomba we have the Southern Cross Foundry, which is one of the largest inland engineering works in Australia and which competes internationally in selling its products abroad. We also have Napier Bros. at Dalby, which is struggling for existence and is not receiving very much financial encouragement from the Government. When Labour Governments were in office, Napier Bros. received a good deal of financial support from the Government of the day by way of railway contracts and repair work, and this accelerated the development of Dalby to a very considerable extent.

A large percentage of Queensland's wealth is won on the Darling Downs. According to the Queensland Year Book for 1962, it constitutes 20.6 per cent. of the agriculture, 14.3 per cent. of the pastoral industries, 25.9 per cent. of the dairying and pig raising, and 15.7 per cent. of the poultry industry; mining, of course, is an almost negligible 1.3 per cent. Its total gross primary production under the headings I have mentioned, and others, is of the order of 15 per cent. of the State's total. Then, on a manufacturing basis it does not do too badly; there is something of the order of £9,000,000 worth of manufacturing activity on the Darling Downs.

I feel that, if the Government were hosts on this occasion, they might at least have done something to send these people to the

Downs. I have made inquiries of the Mayor of Toowoomba, who has expressed strong criticism of the failure of the Government and of "The Australian Financial Review" to send some of these inquirers to the Darling Downs. There is in Toowoomba an active secondary industries promotion league which knew nothing about these visits. They have established a Fair in Toowoomba each year which has made secondary industry on the Downs the best outside the metropolitan area and it is passing strange that no action was taken by the Secondary Industries Division to acquaint people of the importance and potential of the Darling Downs, particularly when the opportunity for development of primary industry is so great.

"The Australian Financial Review" says, amongst other things, that according to the Premier the developmental policy of the Government is to encourage export production; consequently, today one of the most important fields available for increased production relates to production of wheat, barley and other cereal crops. There has been a failure of world crops, mostly in European countries. In every country in Europe, because of bad seasons, there has been a decline in cereal production. Countries that usually export various types of grain have been compelled to import them this year. Russia, of course, is buying tremendous quantities of wheat, which brings me to the point that I deplore the tendency on the part of this Government, again during periods of election campaigns, to smear the Labour Party because of its so-called association with Communists or because of our alleged association with Left-wing thinking. The political philosophy of Communist countries is repugnant not only to the A.L.P., but also to the great mass of the Australian people. However, there is no disposition on the part of those who cast these smears to cease trading with Communist countries. This is a policy designed to win votes by introducing the Communist bogey and is followed by the Country-Liberal parties both in Canberra and here, but there is no reluctance on their part to explore every possible means of extending the sale of goods to these various Communist countries. Last year the anti-Communist countries of the world traded to the extent of 5,000 million dollars with the Communist countries and that was exclusive of the great American market which, with the exception of wheat to Yugoslavia and Poland, has religiously refrained from this trade. Indeed, sanctions and all sorts of other restrictive policies have been imposed on American business men who wish to export to those countries. However, despite the fanatical hatred of the Communist philosophy the Secretary for Agriculture in the United States Cabinet is now endeavouring to make a deal to sell wheat to these people.

I want to come back in a moment to the volume of trade that is being done with these countries because it is obvious that there has been a tremendous development of trade with all Communist countries, even Communist China. I myself was a victim of some advertisements in this regard in 1957, by the then Q.L.P., to the effect that we were supporting Asian policy. Even now the Q.L.P. policy is strictly against trading with Red China, but Mr. McEwen, the Leader of the Country Party in the Federal Parliament, has repudiated that as a spurious argument. He says definitely that we should extend our trade with these areas. Australia is becoming, with Britain, Japan, and the U.S.A., a large supplier to these countries. For example, in 1962-63 we sold to China goods to the value of £64,354,000, while in the same year China sold to us goods to the value of only £5,694,000. Our exports include wheat, wool, metals—especially zinc—steel plate and steel sheets, machinery, chemistry, leather, coal, and animal fats. Even before the war, when China was not subject to Communist domination, she took 10 per cent. of our record flour export. So it is with America, where all sorts of activities are going on at the present time so that this trade can be developed. Recently 200 important business men met in America for the purpose of trying to influence American policy in regard to entering into trade negotiations with Communist countries. Yet we find here this tendency to try to divide the people of this State with these constant smears.

The hon. member for Baroona raised in the House the other day—as I myself had done prior to that—the type of propaganda that was engaged in during the election campaign. It was entirely unworthy of the Government. Through Mr. Speaker the Government absolved itself of responsibility on the ground that at the time, even if there were justification for some intervention by Mr. Speaker, the office of Speaker was not actually in existence. For the record I wish to say that I propose to raise the matter at some future time with the Premier and the Standing Orders Committee in order to determine just what the position is so that if the Standing Orders are defective to that extent appropriate steps can be taken to ensure that we do have a Speaker in control of the Parliament who can exercise the full powers of Speaker during the period Parliament is prorogued, just as if Parliament were in session. In every other respect the office of Speaker is recognised by the provision of the full-time salary. He exercises the full privileges of Speaker during that period. For all practical purposes he is the Speaker in name. Indeed, on the very day in respect of which Mr. Speaker denied that he had any jurisdiction photographs were taken of him entertaining people in his capacity as Speaker. Those photographs were published in the Press. I merely mention these things in passing.

I come now for a moment to what we should do. Let me explain the reason why I am making this sort of approach. As I started to say earlier, Australia today is sharing in the accelerated development that is taking place in most countries of the world. I am not going to engage in a defence of the policies of previous administrations. Of course, during the war we were engaged in the prosecution of the war, but no State in the Commonwealth felt the impact of the war effort more severely than Queensland. We had the channelling of defence personnel to Queensland and the provision of defence facilities in this State at a time when such a demand was not made on the other States. At the cessation of hostilities munition annexes and things of that kind were available in South Australia and Victoria which could be readily used by manufacturers who wanted to take advantage of the cessation of hostilities to engage in the production of consumer goods. In that way those States were helped considerably.

I am not going to waste time by explaining all these things. It must be admitted that in every State, irrespective of what Government was in power during the immediate post-war period, there has been in recent times a tremendous surge of development. I am not going to exaggerate in what I say. Irrespective of what Government may have been in power in Queensland, the same type of inquiry would have been made here. With a Labour Government in New South Wales there has been no diminution of inquiries about new industries. There has been no lack of inquiries in Tasmania, where there is also a Labour Government. Those States can still show a great record of progress even though they have not our range of commodities. They have not the opportunities we have because of the size of our State and the diversity of products that can be produced here by reason of the fact that we extend through the tropical, semi-tropical and temperate zones. If the Treasurer cared to shed his political cloak of partiality, he would be the first to admit that much of the finance coming to Australia and Queensland is the result of political instability throughout the world. This has been caused by the rise of nationalism in Africa, South America, and Asia, where many of the assets of companies from the Western democracies have been seized. There has been a tendency for funds to flow from South Africa because of the South African Government's policy and people are coming here from South Africa because they believe there will be an explosion there before long. We have seen the seizure of £200,000,000 worth of British assets in Indonesia and even now, despite some evidence of a desire to repair the wrong that was done, there is still no indication of the return of the control of certain companies there which are owned by British interests.

There have also been tremendous developments in Cuba and South America, and for those reasons there is a desire for funds to be channelled into countries with prospects of political stability. As a result of these things there is an earnest desire on the part of these financial magnates to invest funds in Australia irrespective of whether a Labour Government or an anti-Labour Government is in power. Those are the reasons involved in the great influx of capital for development that has taken place in every State in the Commonwealth.

Later on I will deal with some of the dangers inherent in this tremendous injection of funds into the Australian economy. I have been asked, as the guest speaker, to prepare a speech for a conference on Thursday night of representatives from every State. I will deal specifically with this problem on that occasion, but I will touch lightly on it today. The feeling has been accentuated that great risks are involved in the retention of capital in some countries in the world and many companies desire to come to Australia. I am not against the injection of foreign currency, or technological know-how, into this country. I believe that, on the balance of the evidence, probably the financial conditions are favourable to the reception of foreign capital in this country, but I think we have reached the point where we will have to lay down very definitely where we are going. I think this has a direct bearing on Queensland and I intend to deal with some of the topics in due course. I think it is pertinent, in a Budget debate, that we should learn exactly what the Government's intentions are, because the Premier indicated that the highest possible priority is to be given to the development of primary industries to help our exports. In another part of "Financial Review" emphasis is placed by him on industrial development and that the highest possible priority is to be given to it. Whether it is to be given higher priority than the primary industries seems to be unresolved in "Financial Review".

No doubt the large-scale employment of capital for land development is due to the Country Party influence, and I want to say that I think that is the correct attitude to adopt. The Country Party is not in favour of large-scale employment of capital for development of land; it prefers the "owner driver", which is the term used in "Financial Review". It prefers the individual holder, rather than the large company, to develop the land.

We know that the Premier believes in the injection of overseas funds to develop areas that are considered too expensive for the State to develop. It has been suggested that an amount of £6,000,000 will be required to develop the brigalow area with roads and other facilities. It is not considered economic at present for the State to employ

funds to develop the marginal areas, where the productivity and rainfall are low. It is in these areas that the international people want to come into the picture, and I understand that the Government is toying with the idea of giving them some encouragement. Anyone who knows the ramifications of financial companies knows that, because of the risk factor involved, the rate of interest charged is very high. When we consider that one area of brigalow land requires the expenditure of about £40,000, and that these other areas are considered to be more expensive for development, if we add the cost of development to the cost of the properties it looks to me, on the figures available, that it will require something in the vicinity of £60,000 or £70,000 a block if there is to be ultimate individual ownership of the areas in which these financial companies are to operate. That will inflate our costs and make it more difficult for us to maintain price stability and compete in the markets of the world, which the Premier has indicated is his concern.

I see some other inconsistencies. The Premier, in his temperate speech at the opening of the Industries Fair, very properly focused attention on the fact that only two Queensland firms had been interested enough to establish themselves at the fair in Malaya. He said he felt that this called for rectification and that he was going to send a responsible Minister there to see what could be done to boost exports to Malaya. What did we find? The Minister for Transport, after making a couple of contradictory statements before he left, said he saw no reason why the products being exported from Queensland and Australia could not be made in Malaya with technological know-how from the Australian people. How it would help Queensland for Malaya to establish factories to produce goods that were previously drawn from Queensland and Australia I do not know. There seem to me to be very many such contradictions.

The A.L.P. wants to join with the Government in creating an atmosphere and a climate favourable to development in this State—we do not want to be regarded as a party seeking to impede the proper development of the State—but, as I pointed out, figures so far do not indicate that there has been the increase that has been claimed by the Government. In 1957 there were 5,465 factories in Queensland, and over the five-year period 1952-1957 there was an increase of 607, or an increase of 12.5 per cent. Between 1957 and 1962, according to Bulletin No. 2 of 1963, there was an increase of 359 factories, or a 6.6 per cent. increase.

The number of factory workers increased by 7,910 in the period 1952 to 1957, or an 8.4 per cent. increase in the number, which was then 101,000. In the five-year period ended 30 June, 1962, there was an actual decrease of 792 factory employees in this

State, or a decrease of .3 per cent. as against an increase in the five-year period under Labour of 8.4 per cent. For people who claim that we did not engage in this productivity increase I point out that in the five-year period 1952-1957, production increased by 49.5 per cent. whereas the percentage increase over the past five years, under this Government, has been only 31.4 per cent., despite the fact that there has been an increase in population of 146,493 during that time.

What I object to most about this Government is its lack of frankness. Previously the annual reports furnished by the Department of Labour and Industry contained some dissection showing which parts of the State were prospering and which were declining. Unfortunately the factory statistics that were included in the bulletin previously made available to the House have been withheld. Why have they been withheld? Only because they reflected a movement against those outside centres where there was a decline in the number of factories and also in the number of employees in factories.

I was in Warwick yesterday and before I went there I had a look at some of the statistics. I found that in 1957 there were 46 factories in Warwick. Today, after six years of this Government, there are still only 46 there—no increase at all. The figures available to us up to a couple of years ago (in the 1961-1962 report) show exactly where there has been a decline in these establishments. For instance, in the Moreton area there was a decrease, in 1961-1962 as against 1960-1961, of 38 factories, Maryborough 6, the Downs 21, Rockhampton 9, and Mackay 6, or a total decrease of 53 factories in the area outside the metropolitan area, and there was an increase of only five in the metropolitan area. The Treasurer might argue that the magnitude and volume of production of some of these newer establishments compensate for the decreased or unchanged number of factories operating. If that argument is used, all we can say is that there is a decrease in the number of employees. Whether his argument is that improved technology means increased production with less man-power, I do not know, but he cannot have it both ways. It is false economy to deny to Parliament the opportunity of seeing what is happening in these vital matters, particularly when the Government, for its own selfish political ends, is prepared to spend so much money in pushing political propaganda whilst at the same time denying information to elected members.

When the Premier put forward his proposal for an increase in the number of Ministers, the Opposition asked him to state why they were necessary. In his initial speech, read from a prepared document, he gave some general reasons and mentioned increases in revenue. When we directed some criticisms at him, he did not seem to be au fait with the situation and sheltered

behind the fact that he could not insult the Administrator by giving the information and revealing to Parliament something that had to receive its sanction. Yet on the very day on which the Ministers were sworn in, and prior to their actually taking their places on the front bench, we found in the financial tables a recognition of their offices, their names, designations, and so on.

How, in all fairness, can the Premier say that Parliament must be denied this information when, contemptuous of the approval of Parliament, all steps had been taken and the Government's intention was published in printed form in the tables? When I, as Leader of the Opposition, asked for reasons for the expenditure, I was told that they could not be given, but at 2.15 that same afternoon the tables were distributed and the Ministers took their places after having been sworn in during the luncheon recess. We find, on reading the relevant information, that provision had been made for the appointment of these Ministers, and it was known to the Government what the arrangements and costs were. I do not accept that position at all.

Great play has been made by the Treasurer on the fact that under his guidance the financial affairs of the State have progressed to a very marked degree. He pointed out that, despite the so-called unprecedented development, we have still, on a per capita basis, the second-lowest financial indebtedness of any State. That is true, but it is also true that that was the position in 1957. It has not been brought about by any magical formula that the Treasurer has been able to produce. In 1957 Queensland had an increase in five years of 39 per cent. in the per capita debt. New South Wales had 38 per cent., Victoria 56 per cent., South Australia 55 per cent., Western Australia 43 per cent., and Tasmania 83 per cent. Queensland was below the national average of 47 per cent.

In 1962 the increase in respect of Queensland was 34 per cent. The New South Wales figure was 31 per cent., so that there was a slight difference there. Victoria's figure reduced dramatically from 56 per cent. to 40 per cent. That of South Australia reduced from 55 per cent. to 36 per cent. The figure for Western Australia reduced from 43 per cent. to 35 per cent., and that of Tasmania from 83 per cent. to 44 per cent. If anything, our position has become slightly worse. The main point to be observed is that it is not so much a question of Queensland's position worsening but that in 1957 Queensland was the second-lowest rated State in the Commonwealth on a per capita basis, which is still the position.

What money is to be spent on the public debt is, of course, a moot point. Some people argue that we should spend as much as we can on these things to accelerate the development of the State. Everybody likes

to see development taking place, but there seems to be a disinclination to accept the obligation for servicing the debt. Take the case of municipalities. Toowoomba, I believe, is one of the most progressive cities in Queensland and the city council has undertaken all sorts of desirable projects. Each year we see some new project, such as new civic offices and additional amenities for the ratepayers. However, it is obvious that rates and taxes must increase to finance such projects, and today the burden on many people is becoming rather heavy. In my own case, I think the cost of services has risen from about £13 a year to about £60 a year—an increase of over 400 per cent. Facilities such as roads, water, electricity, and sewerage, were all available to me over 20 years ago, yet we are now paying four times as much as we were previously.

It is a moot point as to how much justification there is for a Government's complaining of having to spend more and more. The Treasurer pointed out the irony of the situation when he said that the State debt is increasing appreciably while the Commonwealth authorities, because of their method of financing, are able to reduce the Commonwealth debt progressively.

While I am on the subject of finance, it is true that the Treasurer was able to show surpluses of £109,719 in 1962 and £27,441 in 1963, and that a very small surplus is anticipated for this financial year. However, the net deficit during the six years that this Government has been in office is £3,351,922, and there is a need for a husbanding of funds because we have to pay interest on deficits and amortize them in due course. It does not matter how it is done; the loss has been incurred. There seems to be fallacious reasoning on the part of some people in the community that it does not matter if a Government has a deficit. If a private individual has a deficit, obviously he is in serious trouble; but it is apparently of no importance if a Government has a deficit. Perhaps the position is not quite analogous, but if the Government had not incurred a deficit of £3,351,000 the money could have been spent on roads or developmental projects or directed into other avenues of spending that might have appealed to the Government of the day.

Before dealing with the question of foreign investment in Australia, I wish to refer briefly to some rather disquieting information that appeared in the Press at the week-end about our universities. The Government made great play of the fact that it established a university college at Townsville, and I am in complete agreement with its decision to do so. I realise the difficulties that confront Governments in financing universities, and I am not so partisan as to believe that there are not problems associated with promoting the decentralisation of university colleges in the State. I said that we would accept the

obligation because it was the Federal A.L.P. policy that university education should be decentralised. In fact, the Federal parliamentary leader of the A.L.P., Mr. Calwell, in a speech referred specifically to the fact that places such as Ballarat, Bathurst, Toowoomba and Townsville should receive some assistance. But those who control our universities say that the establishment of new colleges in country areas only accentuates the difficulty that they are having in finding qualified personnel to staff the universities. I acknowledge that it is a problem, and the Federal Government must accept the obligation to find suitable staff. Anyone with any sense of responsibility knows that, in this technological age, scientific and technological skills are necessary and desirable and that we must do all we can to provide adequate staff for our universities. It places a heavy burden on the Government, and I think that a former Premier drew attention to the heavy burden imposed on the Budget by the demands of the university. Sometimes I think they might have been too extravagant. There has been criticism. I have probably been as critical as anyone of the former Premier, Mr. Gair, but in fairness I think it is true to say that very often there is a disinclination on the part of academic people to worry about finance. They are quite prepared to put forward propositions involving demands for money but they are not very co-operative as to how this money is to be made available. However, the fact remains that all the principal countries of the world—for instance, France, Germany, Italy, Canada and Britain—are spending more per head of population on education than we are in Australia.

We have to face up to this problem. This Government is constantly boasting about the amount spent on education in this State as compared with what was spent in 1957. I do not think that is fair. I have pointed out previously that whilst we were dragging behind in capital expenditure on education in Queensland as compared with other States in 1957, the difference has widened in the last six years. In his Budget speech the other day, the New South Wales Treasurer drew attention to the fact that 50 per cent. of the revenue of that State would be channelled towards education, and that is a much higher percentage of the total budget than is provided in Queensland. There is a responsibility in this regard and, irrespective of the amounts, one has to take into account the percentages.

Too many on the Government side are like the Minister for Mines and Main Roads who goes around the State, as he did at Warwick the other day, knocking everybody about the place. All he did was rubbish Mr. Simpson and the A.L.P. He rubbished the Independent candidate for Warwick, Mr. Simpson, but he does not mind the Independents doing his dirty work here. In the

last election the Liberal Party would not run a candidate against some of the Independents; they kept out of the field. In the case of Townsville South they did not hesitate to keep out of the field or to encourage the vociferous member for Townsville South in his boorish philosophy against us.

I am not betraying any confidence, because it was said publicly on the aerodrome; in my presence, Mr. Evans himself assured Mr. Adair, the hon. member for Cook, of an easy run in that area. When it suits his purpose he is all for the Independents, but when there is any danger, as there is in the Country Party seat of Warwick, all he does is rubbish the Independent Country Party candidate because he fears he might well take away enough votes to lose them the seat. That is all he does. He runs around the State the whole time rubbishing those he disapproves of and saying how much money has been spent on education by this Government as compared with what was spent in 1957. No matter what part of the Commonwealth you go to, you will hear the same story, whether it be a Labour-governed State or a Country-Liberal-governed State. You will find the same story of more money being spent on education, roads, and so on. Population is increasing, the value of money has declined, and there are certain other reasons, which need not be developed at this stage, that are responsible for this increase in expenditure.

When we come to the question of universities we get the same repetition by the Minister for Education of what has been spent this year as compared with 1957. I do not accept that as being a valid argument at all—namely, that Queensland spent so much on universities in 1957 and is spending so much more now.

Mr. Murray: In which direction do you suggest most emphasis should be laid?

Mr. DUGGAN: Obviously at the present time we cannot neglect our primary obligation because it is compulsory, but I say that, irrespective of the cost, we have to face up to our secondary and tertiary obligations. It is quite apparent that it will be painful but it must be met. It is being met in other countries and to a great degree in other States, and we seem to lag behind. If there is any validity in the criticism as to what Labour neglected to do in 1957 there is equal validity in criticism of what we are expending in Queensland now compared with the other States. We have gone back. I am prepared to admit that many good and desirable things have been done. I make this speech today on the basis that we want to see Queensland go ahead. I want to see something more constructive being done instead of this "rubbishing." Some of the Ministers are notorious for that. We want to play our part in the development that is needed in the State and all these things I am saying should be noted.

Between 1951 and 1957 Queensland's share of the Commonwealth grant for universities ranged between 11 per cent. and 13 per cent. of the Australian total. Those figures are revealed in the Australian Universities Commission report. The latest report discloses that in 1963-1964 Queensland will receive only 8·8 per cent. of the Australian total. I emphasise that between 1951 and 1957, under a Labour Government in Queensland, this State was receiving from the Commonwealth Government between 11 per cent. and 13 per cent. of the Australian total but now we are receiving only 8·8 per cent. under the present arrangement.

In 1957 the cost per student at the Queensland University was £393. In Sydney the cost was £352, in Melbourne £341, and in Adelaide £362. The estimated cost per student in Queensland in 1963 is £449, which is the lowest for any Australian university. In Sydney the figure is £480, Melbourne £543, and Adelaide £558. Whereas in 1957 those four States spent less per student than Queensland on university education we now find that we are in the worst position. I do not care what figures hon. gentlemen opposite like to bring forward about the gross amount being spent on education at university level; it is still not enough, and more will have to be spent in that direction. Whatever the demands are for university buildings and other facilities the Government must exercise appropriate prudence, but at the same time we must face up to the problem of making more money available if we are to progress.

I make an appeal to the Treasurer in regard to the Ogmores State coal mine. When I received a deputation the other day I promised I would ventilate this matter here in a general way. If he has an opportunity the hon. member for Ipswich East will deal with it in greater detail. We regard the hon. member for Ipswich East, the hon. member for Maryborough, and one or two others representing mining constituencies, as being in a better position to deal with this matter in greater detail than I have time to devote to it today.

The Ogmores mine is very important. I am greatly concerned about the drift of the population away from the country. Despite the fact that this is a Country Party Government pledged to decentralisation, the figures prove conclusively that there is a drift to the cities, and that under this Government it has been even greater. We must do all we possibly can to arrest this drift. The Treasurer may say that it is world-wide, that whether it is London, Paris or New York, there is the tendency for the population to gravitate to the cities. In general terms that is true. After all, we want to do all we possibly can to save an important asset. Tenders have been called for the purchase of this mine. So far neither the Government nor the miners' representatives have made any provocative statements. In his usual

manner the Minister for Mines and Main Roads might say, "I said to Bluey Millar, 'You can have it for nothing' and Bluey Millar said, 'I won't take it.'" But is that the way to deal with assets worth hundreds of thousands of pounds? If the Minister feels that way I ask him to put a proposal in writing to the Miners' Union setting out the terms and conditions under which the mine would be made available, and putting the legal responsibility on the union to give an official written reply so that the matter can be properly determined. In the first place, what right has a Minister of the Crown to say, "You can have the mine for nothing?" Did he discuss the matter with Cabinet? If he did why did he not put it in writing rather than merely talk about it off the cuff, as he so often does, saying "Bluey Millar is a Com. I played merry Hell with the Coms," when all he does is play merry Hell with propaganda in the Press? Let the Minister put it forward as a business proposition. As well as knowing what the conditions are, the miners would obviously want to know what privileges there are. I guarantee that if there was a private tenderer for the mine at Ogmores he would want to know the condition of acceptance and what quota would be allocated to Ogmores. No-one will buy a pig in a poke. It is all very well to say, "The present quota is 800 tons a week." When people put their money into this sort of thing they want to know what may happen. It could be changed to 200 tons a week. People want to know where they are. The miners would want to know, just as a successful business entrepreneur or a private individual would want to know.

The only valid argument against the mine is that there has been an unduly high percentage of absenteeism. I have the authority of the Miners' Union to say that the official policy of the union does not approve unreasonable absenteeism at the mine. The responsibility is on the management of the mine to see to it that disciplinary action is taken if there is an unwarranted degree of absenteeism at the mine, or any other mine—and there are no other State-owned mines because they have been sold.

The hon. member for Redcliffe laughs. It is a pity he does not take some disciplinary action against the recalcitrants in his own area. He makes a big noise; he is the one who makes the noise here, but he is the last one to take any action because he does not know where his political philosophy lies. He rubbished the Country Party and he rubbished the Liberal Party and came out as a forthright Independent and then, like a craven dog, crawled back to the Country Party for endorsement.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. DUGGAN: I do not mind the Treasurer putting up some proposition here for ratification after examination if he has

some reason for advancing it, but what happened at Ogmores? There was a loss of £14,000. Compared with the total funds available to the Government, that is a trifling amount. Of that £14,000, £6,000 is represented by capital expenditure in the period covered by the investigation. I realise that dieselisation of the railways and everything else comes into the picture. I realise, too, that the opportunity of expanding coal production for the generation of gas and electricity is relatively limited in the area. To make the mine an economic success I suppose it would need a weekly output of about 1,000 tons a week and that appears to be beyond the present allocation by the Coal Board.

The Wonthaggi mine in Victoria, a State-owned mine, lost £268,000 last year, and the accumulated losses are over £4,000,000. But, because of the loss of £268,000, we do not find the Liberal Party down there handing it over to private enterprise. The Government accepts it as part of the obligation of using a State instrumentality and it considers, I suppose, that that loss is just as difficult to carry as the £14,000 lost last year by the Ogmores mine.

My information shows that mining prospects in the last three months have been favourable, and that there will not be a loss. Because of the uncertainty in this area, and the fact that there is already a move away by the population, and because of the long distance from principal centres on the North Coast, I appeal very strongly to the Government on behalf of these people. Without any sense of provocation at all I ask the Treasurer, in consultation with his colleagues, to have some sort of committee inquire into this matter to see if the mine can be maintained on the present basis. If that cannot be done, naturally the next best thing is to have an orderly transmission, and the retention of as many people as possible by the new owners. I am not putting that forward as an attractive alternative, but it seems that the Government is wedded to its decision because it has called tenders. If the Government proceeds with this transaction I think it should do everything possible to safeguard employment in the area. I give the Government full credit for what it did at Mt. Mulligan, where it accepted the obligation of shifting the houses of miners to other areas.

At Collinsville the work force is down to about 30. Again, apart from the merits of what happened in the conduct of the mine, everyone will agree that it is regrettable to find these large labour forces being withdrawn from the decentralised areas in the State. It is a bad thing to have 70 or 80 miners with families thrown out of work. The deputation I received embraced not only miners' representatives but also citizen and business representatives, indicating a unanimous desire of those in the area to

retain the mine. It should not be beyond the ingenuity of those concerned, with tolerance and understanding on the part of the Government. I sincerely hope they will be able to meet the situation.

Mr. Hughes: You cannot condone continuing losses and still have more money for education and free hospitalisation.

Mr. DUGGAN: If the hon. member wants to argue from that point of view, all I can say is that on that argument this Government should have been kicked out four years ago when it could not balance its budget.

Mr. Houghton interjected.

Mr. DUGGAN: The hon. member for Redcliffe was not in it. If it is argued that the Government has to have an accountant's balance sheet and cut out losses, we should have a queer sort of State. But this Government has tremendous funds available. If it cut out some of the allocation for public relations in the Premier's Department, it would almost offset the complete loss. It is purely party-political propaganda. Then if it cut out some of the literature that is being sent around with art brochures, which is purely Liberal propaganda, it would offset the losses of this mine, keep 70 or 80 men gainfully employed and establish amenities and a community centre in an important part of the State.

As I say, the seams that are available for working in the area appear to be richer and more profitable than those currently being worked. I emphasise that the Government has not been provocative in this matter, nor have the miners or anyone else. I make a reasoned appeal that, before a final decision is made, consideration might be given to a full review of the administration of the mine generally, with proper and effective representation from the Government and from interested parties, to see what can be done to correct the position.

The information conveyed to me was to the effect that there is a considerable deterioration, of up to 1,000 thermal units, in coal lying at grass for some time and that some of the coal tested had been at grass for two or three months so that it might not have been a fair test. Representations were made for some further opportunity of having what would be regarded as a more reasonable test.

Before leaving the subject of the mine I want to point out that a royal commission was set up in New South Wales to inquire into mechanisation and technological changes in the coal-mining industry and the judge who conducted the inquiry made many recommendations. He rejected some of the requests by the Miners' Federation and others but he pointed out that employees having at least one year's service with the employer should be given at least three

months' notice that they might be rendered redundant as a result of the introduction of mechanisation or of other technological changes. He made many other recommendations, including some about training, and said that the responsibility lay jointly on the Government and the employers to introduce a training scheme so that all people who might be found to be redundant or surplus in some way because of technological changes could be re-trained not merely at the expense of the industry. That is a development that I know can be costly but forward planning can avoid many of the problems. That is the point I am making here. I do not think it is fair to the people concerned if there are quick changes. It should not be an impulsive decision but one that is carefully considered, and the Government should, as far as possible, give the fullest possible information and invite the utmost co-operation. That is one of the main recommendations in the report. If that is done, there will be less suspicion on the part of the people affected, more good will generated, and, generally speaking, it is a desirable policy.

I now want to draw attention very briefly to the tendency of foreign investment to come to Australia. I do not intend to spend a lot of time on it because additional information has become available in the last two or three days to which, because of pressure of other work, I have not been able to give sufficient attention.

In the last few years Australia has seen a tremendous change in the nature of foreign investments in this country. In the last few days I have received bulletins covering a later period, but the last figure I have, from about three or four months ago, is that in 1947 the total overseas investments in Australia amounted to £984 million, and, in 1962, £2,206 million. There has been a very considerable increase in the volume of this investment, which is the result of several important factors. In some cases, because of the ability of large international companies to expand foreign operations, there has been this penetration of Australia as well as other countries. We are living in an age of great amalgamations, and I doubt whether any single political party would be able to stop the trend. It seems to be world-wide, and for that reason we are prepared to offer our co-operation, free of party wrangling and disputation, in a fair approach to the matter.

We should like to join as far as we can in the promoting of an industrial relations programme, but there are several solid factors operating against the prospect of our benefiting greatly. Because of geographic and population considerations, it is more economic to manufacture in Victoria and New South Wales, quite apart from any question of politics. Whether the Labour Party or the Liberal Party is in office in Victoria, the fact remains that the greatest

concentration of population is in those areas, and their geographical position means that they are better situated to export to South Australia, Western Australia, and the north of New South Wales.

The tendency in industry is towards greater productive capacity. Even in this State there is today much unused productive capacity. I might mention the merger of Esso Standard Oil (Aust.) Ltd. and Goodyear Tyre & Rubber Co. (Aust.) Ltd. for the production of synthetic rubber in South Australia, where last year they incurred a loss of £640,000. Despite tariffs, overseas producers of synthetic rubber have been able to sell their product in Australia more competitively than that produced here, and the Australian manufacturers still incurred a loss last year of £640,000.

The Treasurer would know better than most people, and certainly more than most hon. members on the Government side, that what applies to synthetic rubber applies also to chemicals and other manufactured commodities. This means that the only consideration helping us to create a climate for capital investment, of which I am in favour, is that lower transport costs may compensate in some way for lower output. That appears to me to be the main factor here.

The basis of industrial development is the generation of electricity for undertakings such as smelting works, and so on. If we could get a subsidised form of assistance from the Commonwealth Government, perhaps we could produce power cheaply and prevent alumina going to New Zealand, for example, for processing. As the Treasurer knows, the generation of more electricity is one of our cardinal requirements. Despite the great development that has taken place in this field in Queensland—I believe that similar development has taken place in most Australian States—we still use a comparatively small quantity of electricity because we have not any really big industries here. I should like to see the Commonwealth Government accept financial responsibility for a generous subsidy scheme that would enable us to produce cheap power in Central Queensland. This would avoid the need to send alumina outside the State for processing and would bring in its train chemical and other industries that seem to be the basis of industrial power. Queensland has certain disadvantages that must be overcome and which we hope will be overcome.

To show the extent to which overseas capital has penetrated in Australia, in 1959-1960 26 per cent. of all company dividends paid in this country were remitted overseas, and further profits running into many millions of pounds were retained here. In 1954, one-quarter of all company assets in Australia were owned overseas, and it is believed that today the proportion is something of the order of 40 per cent. Those figures are very important.

I am introducing the subject of foreign investment into this debate particularly because we have seen an undesirable trend in investments in Australia in food processing plants and other plants that do not contribute very materially to increased production. I concede that it is a good thing for Australia if a company establishes a factory here to produce roller bearings, diesel locomotive engines or chemicals that formerly were imported because of the technology, industries and resources of countries overseas. It is particularly good if our manufacturing efficiency is increased, thus enabling us to increase our exports. The danger of this type of infiltration is reflected in Canada, where there is a very high percentage of American-owned and controlled industries. Whereas the unemployment figure in America was about 5 per cent., in Canada it was as high as 11 per cent. because many of the companies in Canada were controlled by affiliated companies in the United States of America that were exporting goods to Canada. We must not allow that position to develop here. It could well be that a foreign-controlled company operating in Australia could be told that its products were not to be sent to rich markets in the East, New Zealand, or somewhere else, and this would have a bad effect on our economy. Taking the case of foodstuffs, companies such as National Dairy Products, Kraft Foods, and Swifts, do not contribute at all. The recent offer of £2 cash for each share in Mayfair Distributors Pty. Ltd. could have a very bad effect. I am not saying that it will, but it could, and it is no use saying that things such as this do not affect the economy. At one time the Nestle Co. Aust. Ltd. had condensed milk factories at Wyreema and Toogoolawah, but it had no compunction in closing them down because it could produce condensed milk more economically in Victoria. Because control of this type could have a very adverse effect on Queensland, there is growing concern in the State, which has even been voiced at the Liberal Party convention at Rockhampton. I was not present, of course, but I understand that it was one of the items tabled for discussion. I am pleased to see that it has penetrated as far as that, because it has long been one of the main planks of Labour policy that we welcome foreign investment but believe there should also be some Australian capital investment.

I have a great deal of material here showing the extent of the penetration of foreign capital, but time prevents me from using it. Apart from the importance of such a policy to the economy, I find it quite a fascinating subject. The more one reads, the more one realises the ramifications of international capitalism. In the case of Mt. Isa, for instance, the American Smelting Company is a very successful firm at Mount Isa Mines, and some of the designs for their plant extensions are being done in the United States of America.

That is what I want to deal with next—the question of the penetration of American capital and how it can have an adverse effect on a State like Queensland, because policies are determined by people outside. My chief objection to this capital coming in is that, because of the status of the companies concerned, they are using Australian funds, through banks or in the form of debentures, and with the obligation to repay the debentures there is created a tendency to move these funds away and the assets created by the debentures or the bank overdraft become vested in the parent company. I have here indisputable evidence to show that the assets created by these companies are created with Australian capital. General Motors-Holden's Ltd. is a classic example. I suppose anyone could have bought General Motors 20 years ago. It was for sale and almost anyone had the opportunity, but no offers were made. Through an overdraft of £2,000,000 with an Australian bank, obtained because of the standing of the parent company, they have been able to build a capital strength of £80,000,000 to £90,000,000 and were able last year to remit £15,000,000 to the United States.

If we consider also such firms as Ford, Chrysler, the oil companies, the food companies and the drug companies in Australia, remitting dividends to their parent companies, it could constitute a balance of payments problem. We have had these problems previously, and what happens? Immediately we find there is need to deal with the balance of payments position and we start restricting imports, restrictions are imposed on our primary products by these countries. So I think it is time to direct attention to the undesirability of these things, which can adversely affect the economy of this country.

We have seen for some time the tendency for this penetration of capital with the movement of funds, and one of the most remarkable things that has happened is the extent to which British capital influence is being felt in the property market in this country. Since 1959 English property development companies have spent, or are currently spending £40,000,000 in Australia. If you go to Melbourne or Sydney you find going up in the heart of the business areas colossal status buildings costing millions of pounds. The extent to which this capital is coming here is due to international disturbance. Much of this English capital was used in the first place for development in Britain itself. Then it was gradually filtered out to South Africa and now, because of the political climate there it has moved again and now, apart from a number of local companies—the A.M.P., National Mutual, L. J. Hooker's and Lend Lease are the principal Australian people interested—this English capital is all that is available for property development, and, in actual fact, in very few instances is there a physical transfer of sterling funds to Australia for

this purpose. Because of the status of these companies, some of which I could name, they are able to raise the money locally. For instance, a consortium of English bankers is backing the £12,000,000 Australia Square project in Sydney, while Oddenino's Property Group of London is a partner in the £5,000,000 Princes Gate project in Melbourne. The property companies began to take an interest in Australia in about 1959 and the credit squeeze made their entry easier than would otherwise have been the case.

A number of these companies are operating in this country. I will name some of the principal ones. There are Hammersons Property and Investment Trust Ltd. and City of London Real Property Co. Ltd., with an issued capital of £21,000,000. It is only in recent years that that company has embarked on an expansionary programme. London County Freehold and Leasehold Properties Ltd. has a paid-up capital of £8,000,000. The Arndale Property Trust Limited concentrates on shop development. It has more than 300 freehold and leasehold properties throughout the north of England, the Midlands and Scotland. Then there is the Metropolitan Railway Surplus Land Company Ltd., the chairman of which is Sir Bernard Docker. Another is Slough Estates Ltd. Guiding the activities of these English companies has been Jones, Lang, Wootton and Sons, which has operated in England as a property consultant and real estate agent for more than 100 years.

They are the main people who are influencing this development at the present time. They are arranging with many of the Australian insurance companies to lend them money. This is where the danger of international control comes in. Because of their international affiliations they are able to arrange for finance with international companies, insurance groups, motor companies and various financial groups. With their overseas facilities they are able to arrange for space to be made available in these buildings. Because of the way they can channel the leasing arrangements into the parent companies they know before they start that they can arrange for the successful employment of the space in the buildings. What concerns me very much is that the great activity of these English companies in property development means that in the course of time, with their holding the freehold of these properties, once the loans are repaid to the insurance companies, there will be a further intensification of foreign-owned assets in this country.

They put in only a token amount of capital; the rest of it is mortgage capital. Consequently I see no reason why encouragement should not be given to firms of the type of Lend Lease Ltd., L. J. Hooker and the insurance companies. It is largely because of the fluidity that exists at the present time,

the status of these English companies and the guarantees they give, that the Australian insurance companies are prepared to make the money available for which they receive a return of 7 or 8 per cent. The actual physical transfer of capital is very small, yet very high returns are received. As many of these reports I have here indicate, shareholders of these development companies receive returns up to something of the order of 37 per cent. and 40 per cent. They are earning that amount of money during the period of the amortization of these projects, and at the end of that time the property becomes theirs entirely. Obviously there is a rich field here.

I believe that saturation point has been almost reached in the development of these properties in Sydney and Melbourne. It appears that the time is ripe for their intrusion into Brisbane. My information is that for the last 12 months representatives of these groups have been making a survey of Brisbane to see to what extent the policies pursued on such a grandiose scale in New South Wales and Victoria can be applied in Queensland.

Mr. Hughes: Are they concentrating on city office blocks?

Mr. DUGGAN: Yes. They have an advantage over the outsider because they have a ready sale to these people. The Treasurer will agree that even with accountants there is a tendency for many of the well-known firms to merge and amalgamate with overseas public accountants because of their international affiliations. They do the auditing of companies with international affiliations and consequently for their own protection many of these people are taking over.

I am concerned firstly because there has been a lot of bickering going on for too long between the Brisbane City Council and the Government about the town plan. Last week an architects' convention was held to deal with the threat posed by this property invasion. There is no question of my crying "Wolf" in this matter. The architects themselves held this convention. They had papers from representatives of some of these firms. They were quite frank and open about the matter. I am concerned about Brisbane's town plan if we are to have the invasion that Sydney and Melbourne have had. I spoke to a representative of one of the largest groups of architects in Australia which has carried out millions and millions of pounds' worth of work in Sydney and Melbourne on these projects. The only thing that gave him any satisfaction was the town planning scheme with the shops, the facilities, and everything else. If we are to gain any advantage from this, it seems that it will come from the supply of bricks, cement and so on to be used in construction, and from the employment of labour.

There should be very close consultation between the council and the Government to capitalise to the best advantage on these proposals if we are to have a new skyline in Brisbane in the next few years, and I think we will. The Government should interest itself in this matter.

Because of the volume of work these international companies specialise in architects doing this type of building, and the local architects fear, because of the international money available for this expansion programme and because of the present pattern of arrangements with these large firms of architects and specialists in Sydney and Melbourne, that the plans will be processed down there instead of in Brisbane. I mention this today because we will find that there will be much infiltration of capital and amalgamations of businesses. We are tying ourselves to overseas interests, and naturally we will be confronted with the situation that has arisen in Canada and many other parts of the world. If we are to avoid unpleasantness we must encourage these firms to use their resources and services with Australian participation, and then only good will come of it. I believe that adequate action by the Government will result in great benefit to Queensland.

I think I have said enough to show that very real problems are confronting Queensland because of the unprecedented boom in sugar, the fantastic development of mineral resources, the prospects of expanding markets in Japan, and many other things. I hope that they are all being watched by the Government. Provided we have some definite plans and objectives everything will be all right, but frankly I do not think the Government has them, and I do not think the Ministers of the Government have unanimity of purpose. The "Financial Review" shows contradictions between the Minister for Transport, the Minister for Education, and the Premier. There are contradictions in the Government about rural matters and about its objectives. I think that the Treasurer, with his knowledge of financial matters and his contact with the business community, is perhaps more suited than anyone else in the Government to guide these things. If I had had the disposition of these matters at my disposal, without hesitation I would have made him the Minister for Industrial Development. That would have been a more sensible arrangement because of his knowledge and contact with these matters.

I think the time is ripe for an objective study to be carried out and for the work to be done, as with a co-ordinating board, the Opposition joining with the Government in working out the problems to take advantage of the opportunities available because of what is happening in world affairs generally. The fiasco in Cuba, where the deprivation of sugar is preventing a flood on the world market, the loss of grain in Europe,

and the instability of many countries are providing Australia with an opportunity for great advancement. We will not be able to do this to the fullest extent with a division of the Australian people. If we go forward as a team I am confident that Queensland and the rest of Australia will march forward in the sixties. If the Government is prepared to be frank with us and to be above all this political propaganda and these trivial things I assure the Assembly that the Opposition will accord the Government the greatest possible measure of co-operation.

Mr. O'DONNELL (Barcoo) (12.44 p.m.): I have quite a number of interesting facts to lay before the Committee and later in the afternoon I shall be concentrating on the Central Highlands, particularly in regard to grain growing.

Last week I had the privilege of assisting in the campaign for the coming by-election in Warwick. Having the chance of once again visiting the Downs, I took the opportunity to see as much as I possibly could. However, when I read in "The Courier-Mail" on Saturday morning that the Minister for Mines and Main Roads also had visited Warwick and had made a statement to the Press, I was really astounded that he could have expected anybody in rural Queensland to believe what he said. I propose to quote his statement. The report reads—

"He said that under the present Government, the face of rural towns had been changed.

"New Government buildings replacing ramshackle ones had touched off a spate of private buildings and improvements.

"The Country-Liberal Party Government's policy had led to an upsurge of civic pride in hundreds of towns throughout Queensland."

I can assure you, Mr. Hooper, that if you had the opportunity of travelling through rural Queensland you would know that the Minister's statement was totally incorrect. I want to give credit where credit is due. It is the local authorities of Queensland who have been leading in the matter of civic pride. Wherever you go throughout the length and breadth of Queensland you will see that wonderful change that has come over the scene in every rural community where there has been a headquarters of local government. The people themselves have been so imbued with civic pride that they have given the lead in this matter. We know, too, that following their lead private people came next and last on the scene has been the Government.

I should like hon. members to know what was said to the Premier at Blackall when he visited there, when Councillor Hart pointed out very effectively that the Government buildings in the town of Blackall lagged far behind those of local government and private enterprise.

Mr. Richter: How long ago was that?

Mr. O'DONNELL: Within the last four years.

Mr. Richter: You are embarrassing your Leader.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I am not embarrassing my Leader. I am talking about the Government's claim to having taken the lead in this matter. As a result of representations so ably and persistently made by the council in Blackall there is now a clerk of petty sessions building there, but the police station is a disgrace. I am glad to see that at long last provision is being made in this year's Estimates for a new building. But the Minister claimed that the Government had taken the lead in the matter and I should like to see the correction recorded by the Press. Wherever you go in the country, you find that is the truth of the matter. So I raise my voice today to refute the Minister's statement. It is totally misleading and is only a form of propaganda.

In the last day or two we have read in the Press references to a Dr. Indorf of the United States of America, who has come to this country to study our education system and who has criticised it. In "The Courier-Mail" today appeared an answer by the Minister for Education, Mr. Pizzey. These discussions are highly valuable to the community. It is important when people from overseas come here—people who have a high ranking in education—to give us their impressions of what is wrong with our educational system and also, I hope, an appreciation of what is good about it. It is also highly valuable to have publicity in the Press on these matters and it is good indeed of the Minister to come out to defend where defence is called for, or perhaps to agree with a visiting specialist.

I am not going to deal in detail with what Dr. Indorf said, nor am I going to refer to the reply of the Minister for Education. I rather thought that he had a golden opportunity of which he did not take advantage. I do not know why. People come out here and look briefly at our education system. Much of their information is gained from talks with individuals, representatives of unions, and so on, and sometimes, under pressure, they are goaded into making some rash statements. Of course, after having given consideration to the matter, they often make valuable suggestions.

I think that the education system in Queensland today is of immense interest because of the change that will take place in 1964. My only criticism of the change is that I think it was conceived too quickly and is to be implemented without the necessary spade work being done. I have always felt that in the Department of Education we do not sponsor enough Queensland ideas.

We have relied too much on the sending overseas from time to time of high-ranked officers who have brought back some system, or part of a system, that has been tried elsewhere with success. That is then added to what we have, as either a reform or in combination with something already existing. I think that Queensland educationists, particularly the men at the head of the department and those in the field, whether head teachers or inspectors, have a great deal of ability, and I think that what is lacking today is our attitude to top administration. I think that we are overloading the top administration officers with unnecessary tasks. We all know that we can ring the Director-General of Education and ask him when the next school vacation begins. We can ring the Director of Secondary Education and inquire, and be told, what is the uniform of the Barcaldine High School.

I do not think that that is at all fair. Our top administration officers, who are men with university degrees and years of experience, should be doing not only administration work but contributing to our educational balance as well.

I drop further down the scale and speak about district inspectors of schools. I detest the title "inspector", because I think its connotation is very weak. One can imagine a fellow with that title looking into garbage bins. I think that what is sadly lacking in our education system today is an educational assessor. What I am suggesting could be done in Queensland only if there were an increase in the number of men responsible for districts. I do not suppose that anything I could say here would change the title from "inspector" so I must continue to refer to that name. I have always been impressed with the fact that under our system inspectors today have no time for education. I do not mean that they dislike education—let there be no play on the word—but they have no time to further it. Their time is taken up with inspecting schools and teachers, bus runs, and so on, and such things as seeing that there are the required toilet facilities. One could go on ad infinitum. That is not what is wanted from them. I consider that their numbers should be doubled and each should be given not a district as we know it today but part of a district. They could then do not only the work that is now classified as inspection but also, in travelling from school to school, instruct young teachers and be able to appreciate new methods that more experienced people were trying out and have time to collate their findings. At the end of the year, having seen what was going on in the schools, they could make a contribution to our educational programme. We could thus become less dependent on advice from overseas and would not have to suffer ridiculous criticism of many aspects of our programme such as we have had recently from the expert who has come amongst us. We could stand on

our own feet and say to this man, "This is what we have found. Here it is, set out before you. It has been tried and found successful. Have you anything to improve on this?" We do not want to see developing in the Press a competition between two people such as we have seen between the Minister and Professor Indorf. I should much prefer to see a statement in the Press that the two of them had got together to discuss the question.

I know that there are various conditions permeating our State educational scheme which will be difficult to eradicate. However, the teachers of Queensland are a fine body of men and women, and, with the co-operation of the inspectorate, could readily adopt the idea of being progressive. Instead of thinking of an inspector as a person going to a school to find out the value of a teacher from a departmental point of view and nothing else, I think we could improve the efficiency of our system by a more relaxed attitude towards education. I could not help thinking of one matter that was mentioned in the comments of Professor Indorf. He spoke of the lack of say that local parents and citizens' committees and school committees had in the organisation of schools. I believe that they do exert a great influence, and I think that to a certain extent lay people do not desire to intrude on a professional man's work. However, they do make valuable suggestions, and each year in Queensland we have a conference of these associations at which they put forward their ideas, and certain matters are then taken to the Department of Education for discussion. If their influence is not great, I should say that it is at least slow and methodical and will continue.

There has been a remarkable change in the attitude of school committees to teachers. Much of the old animosity has died, just as there has been—I say this quite freely—a great improvement in the relationship between inspectors and teachers. I am not ashamed to say that very few inspectors whom I have met are not of value to the department. They have their foibles, I know; some of them are quite amusing; but from the point of view of education generally, I should say that inspectors are victims of circumstances. Of course, most criticism of education comes from the teachers, who, unfortunately, one might say, are the victims of the victims of circumstances.

That is one matter which I am very pleased to bring before the Committee today, and I sincerely hope that, as we proceed, we shall realise that much of our educational progress must come from within ourselves. Whilst we go overseas to seek new methods and see the results achieved by world-famous educationists, what we need in this country is a blending of our own ideas with those from overseas.

I wish now to quote some approximate figures obtained through my knowledge of the Department of Education. They may not be completely up to date, but I understand that there are at least 250,000 pupils and students attending school today. Of those, 80 per cent. would be in the primary section and 20 per cent. in the secondary. Of course, 1964 will see an alteration in that ratio, but that is incidental. We have, I suppose, almost 8,500 teachers.

I quote those figures to stress the point that there are only 31 active inspectors full time in the field and, of course, some regional directors doing some inspectorial work. That small figure—in the low 30's—is an indication of the gigantic task ahead of this body of men, and from it one can understand the pressure under which they have to work, a pressure that is not good for them or for the teachers they have to assess; nor does it give them time to give to education as a subject the thought that it warrants or to outline the experience they have gained in the field, to summarise it and to assess the value of its application.

Apart from the regional directors scattered over the State, in the headquarters in Brisbane there are approximately 10 top administrators. I maintain that the regional directors and those top administrators in Brisbane should have the time at their disposal to give requisite thought to the progress of education.

I am not here putting forward a brief for inspectors as individuals, nor am I in any way condemning them, but if we are to have progress we must do something in this field so that those teachers who go out very young can have the benefit of the experience of these men and so that what these young people are thinking can be evaluated and discussed. In that, the importance of the time factor is paramount.

Under the old system—and I suppose it still prevails—an inspector was supposed to work four days a week and to write his reports on the fifth day. I do not think an inspector could be found who is not working five days a week and spending his nights and week-ends on reports. Then, when at the appropriate time he does take some period off, he equates the overtime he has worked.

I suggest that the number of inspectors be doubled. An increase of at least 50 per cent. is warranted now. The other day, when we were extending the Ministry, I could not help thinking, when we were prepared to spend a considerable sum of money on two additional Ministers, that perhaps if we considered the Education Department and the value of its work in its correct perspective we could spend that money to better advantage in that direction. As I say, from time to time visitors come from overseas and seem to pick out our faults.

I should like the Minister for Works to hear what I have to say now. When the walls of schoolrooms were first painted in pastel shades an instruction was issued by the Department of Works that teachers were to desist from putting charts on the walls. This was to prevent them becoming pock-marked with drawing pins. When the learned doctor said that he saw no reference to current events in the schools, that was probably the reason for it. When I was teaching we always had current events charts on the walls. Some of them were really classics, the way they were set up. The doctor must have been talking to one solitary teacher—a unique teacher—who said that parents objected to the fact that a newspaper was introduced into the school. That is going to a ridiculous extreme. I should like to have been able to hear all he said; we did not get a full report in the newspaper. I want to focus attention on the problems of education—and they are many. I want Queensland and Australia to make their contributions so that as time goes on overseas countries will welcome our experts and specialists who may then be able to criticise the systems of education in those countries.

I recall an incident which occurred when an inspector visited my school. I was about 22 years of age at the time. In a loud voice the inspector said to the cab-driver who had brought him to the school, "I think a teacher who does not take a drink is a failure because he lacks social instinct." I do not think that would be laid down today at the Teachers' Training College as one of the requirements of a teacher.

I do not envy the Government or the Minister for Education in their task of ensuring that in the change-over the needs of pupils and students are fully met with qualified teachers. In my opinion the Minister should look into the present method of recruitment and the training of teachers at the Teachers' Training College so that as the young teachers emerge they will have received the maximum opportunities. When they go into the field to teach they should be able to concentrate on their instructional duties rather than have to make up the leeway in university study. I think that the Queensland Teachers' Union was quite right when it urged for a three-year training course for teachers. Without that period of training I do not think they can do their job adequately, particularly at secondary level. If a teacher has to bear the tremendous burden of night study he certainly is not fit to perform properly his big task of instruction in day classes.

I shall conclude my remarks on education by repeating to hon. members what Mr. Pyle, District Inspector of Schools, said to me. He impressed me with his statement when he said to me years ago, "For a man to be a teacher he must be strong—physically, mentally and morally."

I have been most impressed with the recent report on agricultural development in Central Queensland, and I should like to place some figures on record. The expansion of agriculture in Central Queensland continues each year. That is an important point to be noted. The following crop-acreage figures will indicate the expansion that is taking place—

Year	Acres under Crop
1957-1958	89,000
1958-1959	127,000
1959-1960	147,000
1960-1961	156,000
1961-1962	212,000
1962-1963	236,000

Year after year there has been an upward trend in the Central Highlands. I am relating my remarks to the Central Highlands because it is one of the areas in Queensland that has shown sensational development. It is not so long ago that an agriculturist from the South said to me, "This is the cheapest farming land in Australia." Much of this land, of course, was under the control of the Queensland British Food Corporation. It is important to realise that the subdivision of the land has helped materially with the increased acreage under crop that I have referred to. No district has taken to farming as readily as the area I am discussing.

A wide variety of crops is involved in this increase, particularly linseed. I mention linseed because I think it affords an opportunity for establishing an industry in Central Queensland for converting the grain into oil. As a crop, linseed is tremendously important. When I visited the Hermitage Research Station near Warwick the other day I was particularly impressed to find that the farmers there were exploiting the safflower. The safflower is very much valued by the people growing it successfully because it can be grazed. The root structure of the tap root is very important as it allows it to stand up to the hard work encountered with stock grazing on it. I assure hon. members that if we can continue the development of the safflower in the same manner as in the areas I have visited—I suppose some places have had failures—we will really have something. Oil-producing seed could bring an industry to Rockhampton; that is important to Central Queensland. I have previously stressed that the electorate of Barcoo depends entirely on primary production. We have no secondary industries at all. We have no butter factory or flour mill or anything else associated with the processing of primary products. As a result, we are greatly interested in anything that will build up Rockhampton or the hinterland.

We have had many problems in Central Queensland in the past, but we are facing up to them and, as the figures I have quoted show, we are meeting with success. The processing of these oil-producing seeds would

greatly benefit Central Queensland, not necessarily my part of it, but perhaps at Rockhampton or Gladstone, and we are ambitious to see that take place. Of course, we know that only the surface has been scratched. Hon. members will remember that the last figure I quoted was 236,000 acres, and there will be an increase next year, and the year after. We can be sure of that, because there is tremendous scope. We know, too, that there is brigalow country in my area. As a matter of fact almost all my country is brigalow land though perhaps it is not as extensive as one travels towards the Drummond Range. As time goes on and the settlers who go on to the properties get to work, we will find that agriculture will extend, although it may be said that is not envisaged in the scheme. I cannot see it being halted. I believe that when these areas are cleared and perhaps almost fully developed we will have an infusion of share-farmers.

If I may digress for a moment I want to mention the share-farmer. In Central Queensland the share-farmer has been a terrific boost to population, particularly in the Central Highlands. To a certain extent he has counteracted the effect of the exodus that occurred when that country went out of sheep production. I do not suppose we have many more people today than when that country was fully under sheep and cattle. With the coming of the Queensland-British Food Corporation we had a population which did not really belong to the area but which was there only for a certain purpose. Then the population dropped after the breaking up of the country. Now we have the infusion of share-farmers. There is a problem with share-farmers and I think it should be noted very strongly. There is perhaps a disposition for people who come to the area to say, "The living area is too high. Look at the share-farmers." I should think that, if we are to consider living areas and share-farmers, we must consider the income-tax statement of the share-farmer as well. I should not like to suggest at any stage that the 5,000-acre living area, which is so common in the Central Highlands, is excessive simply because we have share-farmers there. It is a point I should like to be kept before those who are interested in rural development.

I am very sorry the Minister for Lands is not here today—I regret that he is ill—because I know he is very interested in land matters and he is very enthusiastic about learning as much as he can about new developments. He once spoke to me about share-farmers and I gathered that perhaps he was thinking along the lines that the presence of a share-farmer was an indication that the living area as allocated was excessive. I wish the Minister a speedy recovery. I sincerely hope he will be here when other hon. members on this side are discussing other land matters.

However, I mentioned the possibility of an infusion of share-farmers into developed brigalow lands. The share-farmer will come for sure because the Brigalow Lands Development Corporation is not permitted to finance agricultural plant. The share-farmer, having his own plant, will be in the nature of a contractor and after a while he will take advantage of the wonderful country that will be revealed when the brigalow is cleared. The country up there is phenomenal. It seems to be able to hold moisture. Again I refer to a conversation I had only two days ago, when a man said to me, "We have a reasonably good wheat crop and you must remember we have got it from planting rains." That is really a credit to the country although it is perhaps a slight exaggeration. It is important to know that the Central Highlands are pulling their weight agriculturally, and developing a wheat industry in Central Queensland. The last wheat crop in Central Queensland yielded 1,805,350 bushels. Of that quantity the Dawson and Callide Valleys combined produced 944,000 bushels, the balance of 861,000-odd bushels being produced on the Central Highlands. In 1950 not more than one farm could have been found producing wheat in my area. Today we are able to look at the wonderful production last year of well over 800,000 bushels. It is significant that much of last year's crop went to Red China. One of my friends on the other side of the Chamber attempted to disconcert me the first time I spoke here by interjecting, "Would you trade with Red China?" Here is the answer, and I do not happen to be on the Government side of this Parliament, nor have I any political affiliation with the Government side of the Commonwealth Parliament. I think he has his answer to that question.

It is estimated that this year Central Queensland will produce 1½ million bushels of wheat but included in that will be the Dawson and Callide figures, which are of no immediate interest to me. The State Wheat Board is taking an interest in Central Queensland. Previously, because of light production, it could not go ahead with great storage plans. It retained some of the fixtures of the Queensland British Food Corporation, and it has also set up a storage shed at Fernlees, which has been somewhat controversial over the last few days.

I hope the State Wheat Board continues with this interest and that we see at strategic points throughout the Central Highlands more storage sheds provided, because it is most important that farmers have adequate storage facilities. Of course, we also realise that these facilities are used at times for sorghum. The trouble at Fernlees was that the out-take of sorghum clashed with the intake of wheat. I sincerely hope that the Wheat Board will extend these storage facilities to Gindie and other areas. Admirable

structures are being erected nowadays and I know that the farmers take great pride in their facilities and are very quick to boast how much their district has benefited.

Before leaving agriculture, I should like to point out that last year the Australian wheat crop was 248,470,000 bushels. With the Central Queensland crop now estimated to reach 1½ million bushels, I suppose that within two or three seasons, provided they are favourable, it will be approaching 2 million, which shows that this part of Queensland is making its contribution to the total production of the State.

Of course, we know very well that our main trouble is overseas markets. At times I, in common with the primary producers themselves, have wondered what would happen to the sorghum and wheat produced so bountifully, but fortunately we have been able to dispose of it. Sometimes this has been because parts of Australia or overseas areas have been unfortunate enough to suffer droughts, and sometimes because our Asiatic neighbours have found it necessary to take substantial imports and have turned to us to make up the leeway in their own food stocks. It is to be hoped that this continues and that we see an expansion of the markets for our primary produce, particularly in Asia.

At times I feel greatly perturbed when I read "Country Life", the local Press, and the Brisbane Press when they speak of the cattle market in the United States. So many controversial pieces of news have appeared in the Press in the last two or three months that it can be easily understood that people interested in the beef industry are very concerned. First we heard about a glut of lot-fed beef. Then we heard about experts coming to Australia and telling us of the inadequacies of our beef production, particularly off grass, and stating that they would impose certain hygiene regulations that would interfere detrimentally with our markets in the United States of America. Their insistence on veterinary officers was very worrying to me because I knew there was a shortage of them. As a result, I asked a very extensive question in the House, a question which received a good deal of publicity in Western Queensland because of the rumours that have been circulating about the future of certain abattoirs, such as the one at Winton.

From this another problem has arisen. Whilst I was on the Darling Downs and visiting Hermitage Research Station, I spoke to some men who had diplomas from the Queensland Agricultural College at Lawes. They were concerned and said, "If there is to be a constant demand for people with degrees in agricultural science and veterinary science, what will become of people with diplomas? Are they going to fall by the wayside when applications are called for certain positions?" I think this question should be examined. After all, if young people proceed to Lawes and do an extra

year at the college and then lack opportunities for their services, it will be a sheer waste of time. I suggest that people who are intimately concerned with that aspect at Lawes and also the top administrators at the university and in the Department of Education could look at the situation and see whether this will continue to be a course of value.

I believe that the Australian Wheat Board should be commended for its sale of our wheat overseas. In this country with a very small population we produce a very big wheat crop, and the board has done an excellent job in getting out into Asiatic countries and disposing of it. Recent Press reports indicate that there is an intense interest in the United States of America and Canada in the Asiatic markets, and competition will be fierce. However, if we have the right people to put forward our case, I think we shall be able to get at least our fair share of the market. Bearing in mind the conditions under which people in Asia live, I believe that we are doing a fine job in disposing of our wheat and other grains, such as sorghum, in these countries. There is a constant clamour that our costs of production are too high, and they are, of course, for people in Asiatic countries who are poverty-stricken and live under appalling conditions. In this world of plenty, it is terrible to think of the conditions under which these people live, and if their earning capacity and standard of living could be raised it would be to their benefit and would also materially benefit us.

I should now like to deal for a few moments with the important point raised in this Chamber by interjection when the hon. member for Mourilyan, Mr. Byrne, was speaking about the leasing of land in the Tully area to King Ranch. Reference was made to the Government's granting a special lease to King Ranch—I am not going to debate that point—and an interjection came from the other side, "What about the Q.B.F.C.?" The Q.B.F.C. is rather important to me because many people have used the Queensland-British Food Corporation for political-propaganda purposes, and most of their allegations were completely untrue.

The Q.B.F.C. at no time resumed land. The land was on the market. Peak Downs and Retro were freehold properties already on the market and it is important to realise that, no matter what anybody tries to say, that is the truth. When one hears such an uninformed interjection—I should like to be ruder than that—trying to indicate that the Australian Labour Party, when it was in office, turned to an act of resumption from unwilling people, such a contribution to the debates in this House is erroneous and false. I should like to stress that because not only were those two properties taken over, but certain smaller properties belonging to individuals were also acquired.

One man came to me at the time and almost cried that the Government was taking his land. He put such a strong case to me that I was almost convinced. I went around to one or two of his neighbours, who had no political affiliations as I had, and they said, "That is totally untrue; this man had his property on the market." He had gone through all the details of selling it when all of a sudden it struck him that he had done the wrong thing, so he tried to back-pedal. When he found he could not get out of it, having signed up, he reached the stage of saying that his land was taken from him.

These rumours concerning the Q.B.F.C. have emanated from the other side ever since the scheme's inception. I suppose as long as we have a land question under discussion in this Chamber we shall hear a mumble or grumble about the Queensland-British Food Corporation. Such rumours, however, will not be true. There were extensive freehold areas in my electorate on the market. Their valuation at the time was, roughly, 18s. 9d. an acre. If you went back to that country today and saw those 5,000-acre blocks that were subdivided by the Australian Labour Party in its wisdom, you would find that the valuation is no longer 18s. 9d. an acre, but £8 to £10 an acre. According to experts, it is the cheapest farming land in Australia.

The whole of this area from Clermont right through to Springsure is going ahead in leaps and bounds and I think that the Government should keep a close watch and assist further development in every way possible.

There is very little mention in the Financial Statement of irrigation. It is not put forward as something the Government intends to press. I mentioned it in my Address-in-Reply speech but I want to mention it again in order to impress on hon. members that the Nogoia Gap Dam and a system of weirs on the Nogoia and Comet Rivers could convert the land in those areas and make it very suitable for closer settlement. We would have an opportunity to reconsider our living areas if we had irrigation in the Nogoia Gap and Comet River sections of the Central Highlands.

I was disappointed that the Government did not come in at one stage and state its attitude on the development of the cotton industry. If the Nogoia Gap Dam is constructed the cotton industry can be developed in that area. It can be developed if weirs are constructed along the rivers as a preliminary work to the major project of the Nogoia Gap Dam. I know that that would be costly—in the region of £15 000 000—but irrigation for cotton growing would not be the only benefit that would follow. Irrigated crops for beef cattle could be grown. It is an established fact that beef cattle do best on irrigated pastures. We have developed

various phases of the beef industry in our area. We have it on natural grasses; we have it on introduced pastures; we have lot feeding. We could go on to the next stage of having irrigated pastures at least in a certain section of the Central Highlands. I know that there are weighty problems associated with irrigation. I know that when you commence growing cotton under irrigation you strike a number of agricultural problems, many of which have not been solved. But we must proceed by trial and error. We should extend our experimental work. We know what is being done on the Darling Downs, but that is lacking in Central Queensland. Let us extend such work to the Emerald district. It is important that we go ahead with that type of work. Even though it may be costly now, it would not be as costly as it will be in the future. We now regret that we have not done things which we considered too costly 20 years ago.

The establishment of universities has received publicity. In Queensland there is the general set-up of divisions—the northern division, the central division and the southern division. If we challenge the Minister about favouring one division or another he quickly comes back to deny it. So let us have a university in the central division. The university in Brisbane is becoming overcrowded. The success of the university college at Townsville should indicate the need for something similar in Central Queensland. In its initial stage it need not be as extensive as the Townsville University College, but at least let us make a start. Let us cater for students from Central Queensland. Let us have an agricultural college established. But let us get it all on paper. Let us make the decision that we are going to do it. Set the date when we are to make a start. Let us hear something about it. We are becoming very disappointed about it. From there on we can develop the central division. We want everything in the central division that it is possible to get.

Earlier in my speech I spoke about what was lacking in Central Queensland. I suppose if I were really parochial I should want a university somewhere in my electorate, but I shall not press that point. We could have extensive experimental work in agriculture and animal husbandry at some place not so far from the university at Rockhampton when it is established and have those activities carried on in conjunction with the work at the university.

If a university is established at Rockhampton it is my sincere hope that a teachers' college will also be built. In that way the whole thing would grow. It is not just one thought about a university, but what can be done with development in agriculture and animal husbandry on the one side, and, on the other, the training of teachers for the central division. It is important to understand that people become reluctant to live in

an area where development is not taking place. Whilst we do not begrudge others anything they get, we really think the time is opportune for us to receive some of the plums. There will be competition for a university, because the Toowoomba people want one and the people of Mackay have one in view. It has to stop somewhere. There must be some sense in the matter. We cannot have a university just wherever anyone thinks it is necessary, and the logical place is Rockhampton.

Mr. Hiley: You think you would settle for three.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I will settle for three for quite a while. What I have said today covers quite a deal of ground. Sometimes I may not have pleased Government members with what I have said, but I have presented a case to hon. members to try to illustrate some thoughts on education that I have had for a long time although I do not set myself up as an expert in this field. I have also tried to place before hon. members the production potential of Central Queensland and its importance to Queensland and to Australia. I have also brought to the notice of hon. members certain aspects about an interjection made in this Chamber and I have tried to put the interjector right on the facts. Finally, I have mentioned the establishment of a university at Rockhampton—not in my electorate—which would greatly benefit the people in my electorate.

All these matters are important to the people of Central Queensland. We have wonderful people there. Irrespective of the brand of government I do not think any Government can take credit for the work done by the people of Central Queensland, because, after all, it comes from within themselves. They do not do it because they belong to a certain political party; they will not do more work as teachers, railway engine-drivers, farmers or graziers because they belong to a certain political party. It is because it is within them, and they have a feeling of loyalty to themselves, to their families, to the district, to their State, and to Australia.

Mr. ADAIR (Cook) (2.59 p.m.): I welcome this opportunity of speaking in this debate because it gives the representatives of large electorates the time and opportunity to put before hon. members and Ministers problems affecting their areas—and the larger electorates have many problems.

Before coming to the Budget, I will deal for a time with a statement that was made by the Leader of the Opposition this morning. He said he heard the Minister for Mines say that he was going to give me, the member for Cook, an easy run in the recent election. If the Leader of the Opposition heard that statement by the Minister, I did

not, and I was not concerned about an easy run from the Country Party or the Liberal Party because I fought the election on my own, without help. I did not require the services of any speakers in any part of my electorate, and I spoke in every area.

Mr. Aikens: And the A.L.P. came at everything, including raw prawns!

Mr. ADAIR: Oh, everything! In my speech in the Address-in-Reply debate I mentioned what went on at the polling booths but I omitted one incident, which I should now like to give. At about 11 o'clock in the morning I was at a polling booth when a person came up to me and asked, "Do you know that gentleman standing there?"—indicating a man who was handing out "How to Vote" cards. I said, "I don't." "Well," he said, "he is a member of the Communist Party."

Mr. Aikens: Oh, that's usual.

Mr. ADAIR: Wait a bit.

Mr. Aikens: Nothing unusual in that!

Mr. ADAIR: I said, "Righto." I went over to him afterwards and spoke to him for a while. Later in the afternoon, about 2 o'clock, he came over to my daughter, who was handing out cards for me at the court house, and he said, "This is too tough for me. I'm going home." I do not know the political feelings of that person but was told by a prominent man in Mareeba that he is a member of the Communist Party. Whether he is or not I do not know and am not concerned.

Mr. Wallace: What was his name?

Mr. ADAIR: I know his name well but I will not give it.

Mr. Wallace: Why not tell us his name?

Mr. ADAIR: No, I will not put the man in. He is working in a Government department and there is no way in the world I would put him in.

Mr. Wallace interjected.

Mr. ADAIR: You told lies here in the House. You told deliberate lies.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hodges): Order!

Mr. WALLACE: I rise to a point of order. I assure the hon. member for Cook, and any other hon. member, that when I make a statement in this Chamber it is always basically correct.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hodges): The hon. member for Cook.

Mr. ADAIR: The hon. member for Cairns said he was told by somebody in Mareeba that what I said was wrong. But I am not concerned about the hon. member for Cairns or anybody else. Whatever I say in this Chamber is absolutely true.

Mr. Wallace interjected.

Mr. ADAIR: If you want to see me, see me outside the House. You see me outside the House any time you like.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hodges): Order!

Mr. Wallace interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hodges): Order! I ask the hon. member for Cairns to give the hon. member for Cook an opportunity to make his speech. I ask him to refrain from inane interjection to enable the hon. member to continue.

Mr. ADAIR: As I said, I did not hear that statement by the Minister for Mines. If the Minister did make it, I cannot help it. I fought the election strictly on my own. I had no assistance from the Country-Liberal Party. And if the A.L.P. had had any brains at all they would not have put up an opponent against me because it cost them nearly £2,000 to run their campaign. The hon. member for Cairns went to Thursday Island and paid taxi drivers to cart electors 100 yards to the polling booth. It do not know how much money it cost them but it must have been at least £2 a vote.

Mr. Aikens: And when they got there they voted for you.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hodges): Order!

Mr. WALLACE: I rise to a point of order. Did I understand the hon. member for Cook to say that I paid them?

Mr. ADAIR: No, your party did.

Mr. Bromley: Why don't you shut up, you scab?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hodges): Order! The hon. member for Norman is using unparliamentary language and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr. Bromley: I was provoked into saying that. I am trying to listen to—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hodges): Order! The hon. member will withdraw without any explanation.

Mr. Bromley: I withdraw.

Mr. ADAIR: Of the 22 major points in the Financial Statement, not one is of any advantage to the electorate of Cook. The only thing that I can see of advantage to the whole of Queensland is the abolition of the tax on the carriage of passengers and goods by air transport. That concession is now operating and we now travel tax-free from Cairns to Thursday Island, Cooktown, Laura, or Coen, but immediately the tax was lifted the company, Ansett-A.N.A., increased the air fares. For the trip from

Cairns to Thursday Island there is now the highest air fare charged in Australia. For a journey of 450 miles passengers have to pay £22 and a few shillings, whereas for the 850 miles from Cairns to Brisbane the tourist-class fare is £19 6s. I hope the Government looks into this matter and sees that the airlines do not increase their fares as the one from Cairns to Thursday Island has been increased. It is the highest fare in the whole of Australia for 450 miles.

Mr. Aikens: Does T.A.A. run a service there?

Mr. ADAIR: No. It is an independent service.

Mr. Aikens: Then it is about time T.A.A. did.

Mr. ADAIR: I should like to point out to the Committee and the Minister that Ansett-A.N.A. is the only company that has assisted me when I have made approaches for air-travel concessions for people requiring hospital treatment in Brisbane who could not afford air fares. Mr. Roy Clarke, the manager of Ansett-A.N.A. at Cairns, has repeatedly given me concessions to assist in bringing these people down. If one is unable to get from the superintendent at Cairns a free pass to bring a patient to Brisbane, the fare is for five seats in an aircraft at £25 a seat. That is a heavy expense for any patient, but an impossibility for one who cannot afford it. I have gone to Mr. Roy Clarke and put propositions to him, and he has on several occasions reduced the charges for me. On two occasions he allowed me to travel down on my Government pass and charged the patient £25 for his transport to Brisbane. Mr. Clarke has done everything possible to assist me in having hospital patients brought to Brisbane. When the tax was abolished the companies raised the air fares from Cairns to Cooktown and Thursday Island, and, as I say, we are now paying the highest passenger air fares in Australia. The fare from Cairns to Thursday Island, a distance of 450 miles, is £22, compared with a tourist air fare of £19 6s. from Cairns to Brisbane, almost twice the distance. I ask the Minister to take note of what I have said and investigate the matter.

The construction of the beef-cattle road from Normanton to Julia Creek will be of benefit to Julia Creek and to the meatworks in Townsville, and the Georgetown-Mount Surprise road will be of benefit to the people in far North Queensland. However, the most important road from our point of view is the Mulligan Highway, and I believe that the Government should have given its construction top priority. Thousands of head of cattle are now being driven from the top of Cape York Peninsula to the saleyards at Mareeba, and this will continue till an all-weather road is constructed. It is impossible for motor transport, or even cattle, to travel on the road for four or five months of the

year, because in the wet season rivers such as the Palmer, the Annan and the Endeavour are flooded. We have sea transport available this year, but we do not know whether the Clausen Line will continue to carry cattle next year. I asked a question in the House recently but the Minister did not tell me whether the Clausen Line would continue its operations. The people of Cape York Peninsula have put up with these conditions for a long time, and I think the Government should have spent the money made available to it by the Federal Government on the construction of an all-weather road into that area.

Mr. Wallace: They will have to seal all these roads.

Mr. ADAIR: Yes. Dirt roads are no good to anybody in that area. After each wet season £40,000 or £50,000 has to be spent in repairing washouts and other damage to the roads. It is up to the Government to see that the roads are sealed. The Mulligan Highway is very important to Cairns because cattle from Cape York Peninsula are keeping the Queerah meatworks going. Some cattle are coming direct to the meatworks by ship; others are being driven down to the saleyards at Mareeba. The good seasons that we have had recently make it even more important that the Mulligan Highway be bitumen-sealed as early as possible. As I have pointed out, for four or five months of the year there is no chance of a truck getting through from Laura to Coen or to the top of Cape York Peninsula, and sometimes cattle take 12 or 14 weeks to reach the Mareeba saleyards. Many of these cattle are crippled when they arrive at the saleyards at Mareeba and many of them have to be shot on the Byerstown Range on the way down. This will continue until the road is made an all-weather road by bitumen sealing.

Graziers at Coen are today paying £27 a ton for the transport of their goods and stores from Marina Plains or Port Stewart to the town of Coen; that is £27 a ton in addition to what they pay for the goods in Cairns. If that happened to people in Brisbane one would hear the squeal all over the State. If the price of bread rises 1d. a loaf one hears the squeal all over the place. If fares on buses or trams go up the squeal is heard all over the country, but these people, who are the pioneers of the State, are paying £27 a ton cartage on their goods from where they are landed by boat. They pay that to have them carted by lorry from Port Stewart or Marina Plains. It is time these people were given a "go". The Government should see that they have a decent road which will, at least, give them something. They are people who have battled for years.

So far as the development of Cooktown is concerned, not so long ago the Government closed down the line from Cooktown to Laura with the result that from 24 to

30 people left the area. Today there is no industry in Cooktown. Even the saw-mill has closed down. That mill gave work to at least 16 to 20 men in the area. I have asked in the House on several occasions that the Forestry Department do something to assist Rankin Brothers to continue operations in the area, but I have always found in the 11 years I have been in this House that the Forestry Department will do nothing to give assistance in these areas. It is going to spend £126,000 on roads to timber stands in the Tully and other areas but it will not spend one penny to assist Rankin Brothers to carry on an industry that will keep the area going. Cooktown is a dying town and, without assistance, it will not survive. It is up to the Government to give whatever assistance it can to Rankin Brothers either by way of road construction or in royalties on timber, to help them to mill this timber and to carry on the industry in the area.

I know that Rankin Brothers will commence operations immediately if they get some encouragement from the Government to carry on, but unless the Government gives them some encouragement I cannot see them carrying on. There are large stands of millable timber in the Mt. Poverty, Romeo and Bloomfield areas and it is up to the Forestry Department to help get it out. I have battled for years for some assistance from the Forestry Department but it seems to be a government in itself and will not assist people in these areas.

Mr. Aikens: If Cooktown dies the Government won't even read the burial service.

Mr. ADAIR: It certainly won't. The Government has a wonderful opportunity at the present time. The sugar industry has never been more prosperous. The outlook for that industry never looked brighter than it is now. The price being paid for sugar now puts the sugar farmer right on top of the world.

Recently an inquiry was conducted into the possible expansion of the sugar industry. It is up to the Government and those in charge of the sugar industry to extend and expand the industry into the Cooktown area. The committee of inquiry appointed Mr. Whitaker, the manager of the Mulgrave sugar mill, and chairman of the Cairns Harbour Board—a man with an outstanding knowledge of the sugar industry—to investigate the possibilities of the extension of the sugar industry into the Cooktown area. I perused Mr. Whitaker's report recently. In that report he said that there are 20,000 acres of sugar land in the Cooktown area adjacent to the branches of the Endeavour River. It is mostly red-soil river flats, and it would be easy to irrigate this land. He reported that there were two sites suitable for the building of a mill, and that the harbour could be improved so that it would be suitable to bring in big ships to take the sugar from the mill.

Mr. Aikens: How far would the mill be from the port of Cooktown?

Mr. ADAIR: At least 17 miles from the port of Cooktown, but that is nothing. Mossman is 50 miles from the port of Cairns. At the present time raw sugar is being transported from Mossman to the wharves in Cairns. The 1950 Royal Commission pointed out several problems associated with the establishment of a mill in the Cooktown area. One of them was that from July to December there was only 10 or 11 inches of rainfall in that area. Where I live at Freshwater I do not think we get more than 10 or 11 inches of rain from July to December but they are irrigating cane now in the Barron and Freshwater Valleys. I do not think that would be a problem at all.

In his report Mr. Whitaker suggested that trial blocks should be taken up and that experiments in cane-growing be carried out. He knows as well as I do that there is no need for trial blocks in the Cooktown area. He knows that sugar-cane will grow anywhere on the coastal belt of the Far North. He knows that if a mill is established at Cooktown the surrounding country will grow the cane. It is up to the Government and the sugar industry to see that the Cooktown area is granted a mill and that the industry is extended into this far northern part of Queensland. I have talked to many cane-farmers on the coast and they all agree that it is up to the sugar industry to open up the Cooktown area by extending the industry to that remote part of Far Northern Queensland.

Mr. Wallace: Would the present sugar set-up need to be altered?

Mr. ADAIR: No. Now that the inquiry has been held it would seem that bigger assignments will be granted. Anybody who lives in the North knows that over the years the populations of Babinda, Gordonvale, Innisfail and Edmonton have not increased. If we go back 40 years we find that the populations of Gordonvale, Edmonton and Babinda have not increased. The big cane-farmer is buying out the small cane-farmer and putting a manager on the farm. That is what is happening in the sugar industry. No additional population is coming to the areas. When this inquiry is carried out and the results made known, extra assignments will be made available, as in 1950 when the Royal Commission was conducted. Extra assignments will be given to the bigger sugar-growers and correspondingly smaller assignments to the smaller growers. I think it is only right that every farmer should be given a living area, or a living tonnage, and I claim that a living tonnage should be not less than 1,200 tons. But that will not happen. The big cane-farmer will get the big handout.

I come now to the construction of the road that I have been battling for since I entered Parliament. I suggest to the Government that this is one way of getting rid of

me. If the Government constructs a road from the Daintree River to Cooktown—it is a “must”, and it will come no matter what Government is in power—I will get out of Parliament tomorrow. I have battled for 11 years for this road, it must go through. In addition to the sugar industry, this road is a “must” for the survival of Cooktown. At present there are five months of the year when one cannot travel over the existing road. It is essential to have an all-weather road. It is 220 miles from Cooktown to Cairns, and the coastal road would cut 80 miles off that distance. Only the other day £10,000 was granted for the construction of the road—a sort of a second-grade road—from the Daintree River to Tribulation and there are only 14 miles of road to construct from Tribulation to the other side of the Bloomfield River, and we have a road from Bloomfield right through.

Mr. Hiley: You have given away the idea of going up through China Camp?

Mr. ADAIR: I have no option. It is the desire of the Douglas Shire Council that the road be constructed this way. Although the council is totally against me on this I claim that the other road is the best one because it would not have to cross the Bloomfield River, and would need only a low-level bridge over the Daintree River. However, that is the way the Douglas Shire Council wants it to go and I must agree with what it wants. But I still say that the inland road would be the better road.

Right along this road, from the Daintree River to Bailey's Creek and Tribulation, there is the best cattle-fattening country in Queensland. It does not matter what the King Ranch people do in the Tully area, this country is as good as any land in the Tully area, or any other area in Queensland. It is all scrub country and to develop it all that is necessary is to push down the scrub, as Mr. Brennan has done. In the last six months, with his T.D. 25 he has pushed down the scrub—walked over it—burnt it and put in Guinea grass and I guarantee that at present he can fatten two to three beasts an acre on that land. I believe, too, that if the sugar industry does the right thing it will expand into the Bailey's Creek and the Daintree areas. Those areas are suitable, even ideal, for sugar-growing. I still press for the construction of the road because I think it is a “must” for Cooktown, not merely for opening up the country along the highway. The Mulligan Highway has not opened up one acre of land. There is not one acre of land on that 220 miles of road that anybody can take up for settlement because it is all taken over by graziers. On the coastal road all the land can be opened up for cattle-fattening or for cane-growing. It is rich agricultural land. There are large stands of timber and, in the Roaring Meg area, there are the Roaring Meg Falls, which can be developed for hydro-electricity generation. In addition to that, there is tin-mining.

Mr. Thackeray: How is Ken Morris's property going?

Mr. ADAIR: Ken Morris is doing very well up there. He has a good property and I believe he is helping in developing the Cooktown area. I wish more members of this Parliament would go up there and develop the area. Then they could see for themselves what is needed.

At the present time the road is being constructed from Cooktown to Laura. It is what they call the back road through. Thousand of pounds have been spent by the administrator of the Cook Shire, Mr. Gallop, on the construction of this road through to Laura. I do not say it is not necessary, but it is right against the wishes of the ratepayers of the Cook Shire. They would like to see the money spent on the construction of the road from the Daintree River through to Cooktown first and then later, if necessary, the road from Cooktown to Laura. Why all this Federal aid money is being spent on the construction of the road from Cooktown to Laura, I do not know, because it could easily be spent on the construction of the other road to give access for motor traffic for tourists and to open up all this country from the Daintree River through to Cooktown.

Cooktown has a serious problem in that there is no water scheme in the area. For years the people have suffered inconvenience. From this time of the year until December they have to cart water from permanent council wells near Cooktown. They cart the water in 44-gallon drums and tanks to their homes, to the hotels and to the business places, yet the administrator of the shire has been deaf to advocacy for a water scheme. It would be an improvement if they had only a central place from which to get their water in drums or tanks. The council wells are out of town and the people have to drive their utilities or trucks to them for water. I think Cooktown deserves a water scheme and I request the Minister for Local Government and Conservation to see that something is done about it.

I should like to dwell a while on the Licensing Commission. No wonder at present there are fewer hotel licences than there were 30 or 40 years ago. I am speaking especially of the far northern areas, in particular Cairns and the district round it. I should like the licensing inspectors in Cairns and Townsville to come to Brisbane and see some of the metropolitan hotels. Recently I was invited by a licensee to look at the condition of a hotel that he had just taken over. It is outside Brisbane but still in the metropolitan part of the city. The hinges were off the doors of the cabinets in the bar. The cabinet timber was rotten, but in those cabinets were kept soft drinks and bottles of beer. How the Licensing Commission allowed those conditions to exist, I do not know. They certainly would not be permitted in the Cairns area, or even in hotels outside it.

Mr. Hiley: Would you say that it was a worse standard than the Laura Hotel?

Mr. ADAIR: The Laura Hotel is good compared with this. In Laura there is a cold-room.

Mr. Hiley: There is only one good room in the place, and that is the bar.

Mr. ADAIR: Even at Mount Carbine, where bush timber was used in the construction of the building, conditions are better than in some hotels here. In Brisbane one can go into hotels and ask for rum, brandy, or whisky, and the bottles are taken straight off the shelves. In Cairns all hotels have cold-rooms in or adjoining the bars, and spirits, wines, and beers are served direct from these rooms. Even the glasses used are taken from the cold-rooms. We in the North get better hotel service than is obtainable here.

In spite of this, licensing inspectors in these areas are more severe on the little publican than they are on the publican down here. I could go to several Brisbane hotels and point out what is allowed to go on in Brisbane but would not be tolerated in Cairns. That is wrong, and it is no wonder that so many hotels are being burnt down and so many licensees are surrendering their licences. No wonder there are fewer licences today than there were 30 years ago. The licensing inspectors sent to these areas are making it too tough for the owners.

When I return to the Lodge at Parliament House, sometimes at 11 o'clock at night, I can still hear singing in the hotels. That is not tolerated in Cairns. The police close the hotels down strictly at 10.30, and it is almost impossible to get a permit to carry on after 11 o'clock. Here in Brisbane we hear people screaming and going on after 11 o'clock right in the heart of the city. Recently the licensee of the little hotel at Mt. Molloy, who has a lease from a firm in Cairns, rang and told me that a quarter past ten at night a policeman was outside her door with a torch. He had walked over her cabbage patch and sneaked in the back way to try to catch her. There is no comparison between the two places.

Mr. Wallace: What do you think the reason is?

Mr. ADAIR: I do not know. Twelve months ago I went to a race meeting at Laura, and right on 10 o'clock the policeman closed the hotel. That is the only time of the year when the graziers of the Peninsula get together and have a bit of a celebration. A platform had been erected on which open-air dancing was taking place, and when the policeman closed the hotel I went to him and said, "Give them a go." He was very gracious and allowed the celebrations to go on till 11 o'clock.

Mr. Aikens: They are doing everything they possibly can to drive the people out of country areas.

Mr. ADAIR: Yes. As I said, the graziers there usually see one another only once every 12 months.

I should like now to deal with the mining industry. Although I am going into the electorate of another hon. member, I assure him that I am doing so only because I have a mine in the area and I am raising this matter on behalf of the miners. Mines in the Irvinebank and Herberton areas and adjacent areas are producing a large tonnage of tin at present. I admit that the dredges are producing the major part of it, but the miners who are working tin mines are doing an excellent job. The Irvinebank smelter is in full production and the Herberton mill is also functioning almost all the time. As I have previously said on several occasions, it seems to me that the Mines portfolio is considered a minor one in this Parliament. Less money is allocated to it than to any other, and I do not think that is right. If the mining industry in the Far North is to be developed, the Government should allocate more money to the department. Diamond drills are badly needed in the area to which I am referring. I know only too well that mines such as the Elaine Mary and Bradlaugh are old mines that were good producers at one time. However, they were abandoned when the price of tin dropped. Now that the price of tin has risen the mines have been developed again and are good producers. One of them, the Elaine Mary, is worked by the owners for only six weeks in the year. The partners get £3,000 each. They do not work any longer because if they produced any more tin, the Government would take the proceeds in taxes. That is their bank; it is there as long as they want it, and they just take out the tin they want. The owners of the Irvinebank mine do the same thing. There is also the Dorner Castle, which is a good producer.

All those mines which are producing today had to be re-worked, which is a costly procedure. They are from 300 to 400 feet deep, and in many cases the timber has rotted out, or bush-fires have been through and burned the timber out. In most cases the remains of the timber is at the bottom of the shaft and has to be pulled up; the water then has to be drained out and new timber put in.

As I say, it is a costly procedure, and the only way to put many of the mines into production again is to put in diamond drills, which must strike the old lodes because they are still there. The mines were abandoned not because the lodes petered out but because the price of tin fell. Two per cent. ore will now pay and all these mines will be brought into production again if the Government will assist the miners to prospect them.

The Government gives aid to coal-miners. It does not seem to matter what expense is incurred in finding and developing coal mines, but no money is made available to assist tin and other metalliferous mining. Two-thirds of the tin production of Australia is obtained from that area and it is up to the Government to do something to see that these mines are prospected and re-developed.

Before finishing, I should like to mention Thursday Island. I recently asked a question in the House relating to Torres Strait Islanders. There are 700 returned servicemen in the Torres Strait islands, 700 men who took an active part in the last war, and as the Act at present stands, not one of those islanders can be freed from it. They have not the same rights as an aboriginal.

I will not say that the Torres Strait Islander is a better-class citizen than the aboriginal, but he is a good class of person and I believe he should be given at least the same rights as are enjoyed by aboriginals. It is possible for an aboriginal to be freed from the Act if he is of good character, has not been a nuisance, has a home to go to, and if it is considered that he will look after his family, but I am unable to get a Torres Strait Islander freed from the Act. The problem is that on Badu Island, Saibai Island, Murray Island, Darnley Island and other islands in the Torres Strait, if the islanders were given their freedom they would still have to be looked after by the Department of Native Affairs. Their goods and stores would still have to be transported by boat out to the islands. They are not self-supporting. There is no way in the world that those islands can become self-supporting. My electorate borders right on to Soekarno's area and it is now up to the Government to revise the Torres Strait Islanders' Act to give these islanders their freedom.

Mr. WHARTON (Burnett) (3.50 p.m.): First, I compliment the Treasurer on the presentation of his Budget and the clear and concise way he has set out the finances of the State. I do not think anybody on either side of the Chamber could set out the State's finances better than the present Treasurer.

Mr. Davies: Give us a chance.

Mr. WHARTON: If that happened I should be really worried, as would the people of the State. Hon. members opposite had a chance of governing the State a while back, but where did they go?

Mr. Donald: You gerrymandered the seats.

Mr. WHARTON: They could not get enough votes because they have not got a policy.

The Treasurer painted a very glowing picture of the State's activities. He spoke of the wonderful seasons. In many parts of the State they have been good but in my neck of the woods it is still very dry. We

look forward to a break in the seasons so that we, too, can make a worth-while contribution towards the State's production. At the present time in the central Burnett we are entirely dependent upon irrigation.

The Treasurer summed up the position when he said—

"The past year has seen an exciting improvement in production, development and employment. The Budget has been framed to encourage and assist the rising tide of activity."

I am sure we all accept that. The Budget provides for no increases in taxation. This is very important because it gives incentive for production.

Mr. Windsor: New South Wales budgeted for £5,000,000 in new taxes.

Mr. WHARTON: That is true. Down there under a Labour Government they like to have a welfare State. Here we like the people to have the money in their hands. We govern the State as it should be governed by giving encouragement to private enterprise. The absence of new taxes and the provision of additional tax concessions will encourage private enterprise. We are receiving increased revenue from the railways. The effects of increased exports and greater employment are being reflected throughout the State. It is an important part of our Budget that we encourage production rather than hinder it by taxation. It is pleasing to see the abolition of tax on the carriage of passengers and goods by air. This is a very wise move because Queensland is a rapidly-developing State. We need to transport our goods quickly; people wish to move about quickly. We are in a new progressive era. We need to encourage air travel and the air-freighting of goods. In every way we want the job done quickly. We want to see results in our own lifetime. In the next few years we will witness great development. As part of this development air travel is most important. Not only do we want to see our cities develop; but we also want to see the overall development of the State. The air concessions will encourage much wider travelling and more air-freighting in the State, which is most important. They will make a great contribution to the air traffic.

I believe that the land tax concessions are extremely important because they will encourage people to work their land better. As a result of increased development, there will be increased valuations, and it is only right that these concessions should be passed on to the men who have borne the brunt of the work of producing on the land, because we want to encourage the people on the land to produce even more than they have in the past.

Another concession that will be of great benefit is the concession for probate and succession duties. Whilst I admit that this concession is somewhat small, it is a step

forward and it is something that has not been previously attempted. It is pleasing to note that the Government is giving some recognition to the need for concessions in succession duties. It is probably more important than some of us may realise because we are all living today and happily going ahead building up our estates.

Mr. Davies: Not everybody is building up an estate. What about the people who are unemployed?

Mr. WHARTON: In spite of the hon. member for Maryborough, we are progressing. He does not appreciate the great advantage conferred by this concession.

Mr. Davies: What has the Government done for irrigation on the Burdekin?

Mr. WHARTON: The hon. member will hear about that; he cannot wait. It does not matter so much about irrigation on the Burdekin at present.

In the country, family units work together to build up a worth-while estate. There are possibly four or five sons in a family who work hard to build up the estate only to find that as successors to the father they have to pay tax on the whole estate.

Mr. Ewan: The hon. member for Maryborough will have to pay only £30,000.

Mr. Davies: It looks as though the hon. member who interjected will die without making the Cabinet.

Mr. WHARTON: That could not apply to the hon. member for Maryborough, because he will certainly finish up in a cabinet.

We could extend this concession to cover cases where the family as a group contribute to the building up of an estate. For example, a family consisting of five sons may work together to build up an estate and, over the years, they may not have received their full due in wages. They may have worked long hours and put their money back into the property. I submit that if the estate is divided between the five of them the succession duty should be paid by the individual on the amount he receives, rather than on the collective amount that is paid at present on the father's estate. That would be a big concession and it would be just. Why should the five sons pay probate on the whole of the father's estate when, after all, each one gets only a proportionate share? I suggest that to the Treasurer as a means of encouraging production.

Mr. Bromley: How do you get on with the old chestnut, "Brothers and sisters have I none, but that man's father is my father's son."?

Mr. WHARTON: I will not waste time with inane interjections like that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. WHARTON: I think that is one of the things the Treasurer should look into because it is important.

Mr. Ewan: What about the husband and wife paying only on the one?

Mr. WHARTON: Yes, I agree.

If the individual members paid they could pay in accordance with the amount received. That would encourage people to develop their areas and, after all is said and done, the development of the State came about through the family unit. Look back over the years and you will find, particularly in rural areas, that the lands and properties have been developed by families. The father did the initial spade work, reared a family and in turn that family helped build the estate. We should give some recognition to the family development of an estate and I feel sure that such recognition will play a big role in the development of the State.

Mr. Davies interjected.

Mr. WHARTON: The hon. member for Maryborough will have ample opportunity to speak. He has been grizzling about hon. members not talking. I think the debate might lapse. He has plenty of time to come in and I ask him to reserve his comment till then.

Mr. Davies: Not a bad subject to talk on—the shortage of speakers.

Mr. WHARTON: He will come in, too, but he does not say much that is worth while.

In line with my argument, by imposing no new taxes and by reducing taxation we are keeping the money in the hands of the people, and that is important. It is much better than the growing tendency to ask the Government to do this, that and the other. Some would have us as a welfare State where the Government buys for everybody. But over the past few years the development of this State, and of the Commonwealth for that matter, has hinged on the work and enterprise of the private individual. We should keep the money in the hands of the people rather than in the hands of the Government. Of course, we must have some Government funds for public works. But it will be appreciated that the great development of the State will come from private enterprise, financed by itself, building up its own assets, each unit in its own way. It can do it more competently and much more effectively than the Government and it will lead to not merely a great State but a great free State.

I turn now to some of the needs of the Department of Agriculture, which, with the growing trend in primary industry, has become the Primary Industries Department. In the development of the brigalow lands and in the planting of better pastures generally, we are hindered more than a little in the seed department. I am not critical of the department or of its personnel, but

we need to take a look at it to help make it more efficient and to enable it to render a more efficient service to those depending on it. It is obviously impracticable, indeed futile, to sow seed for pastures without germination tests and certification. That is where the shortage of germinators in the department is most felt. Before you can secure the sale of seed it is necessary to have the seeds tested for purity and for freedom from noxious weeds. There is a great shortage of seed-testing equipment and we need a seed germinator there so that seeds can be tested much more quickly and much more effectively. People who have seeds for testing do not get them tested when they should. They wait till a contract is called and then they rush in and want their seed tested. Everyone is in the same boat and so the shortage of a germinator in the department is felt all round.

There are quite a few things to be said about seed-testing, and I should like to make a few comments on it which may assist in making that portion of the department a little more effective than it has been.

The seed-testing laboratory is under considerable pressure, and this pressure is conducive to delays in seed analyses. The building up of these pressures has been brought about by a marked change in seed-testing in the pastoral industry, consistent with the development of the wet tropics, Cape York Peninsula, and the Brigalow Development Scheme. All of these projects require the testing of considerable quantities of pasture grass and legume seeds and grain seeds.

It is fundamental that such developmental schemes require the propagating of new and improved species of plants. The research work associated with the development of new species, with the harvesting, cleaning, and storage of seed has meant that to keep pace with these demands requires such work to be probably given priority over other seed-testing. Whilst agreeing wholeheartedly with any research planning—

Mr. Bromley: Who wrote that for you?

Mr. WHARTON: In reply to that interjection by the hon. member for Norman, this was prepared by the Seed Merchants' Association. Hon. members opposite read lengthy extracts from files and books, and if I take a leaf from their book I am sure that they will appreciate it. My information continues—

"It is appreciated that the delays in obtaining results of analyses of samples are associated with these three factors. After all, the time taken in postage of samples and reports of analyses is not significant in these times of speedy postal facilities."

An Opposition Member: Who said that?

Mr. WHARTON: I do not think that I need answer that interjection for the simple reason that I have already answered one. If hon. members opposite run out of questions, I ask them not to keep repeating them.

"It is understood that there has been a slight improvement in the staff situation in the seed-testing laboratory in the last six months, although understandably new staff requires considerable training in the exacting science of seed-testing.

"It would seem, however, that staff cannot operate efficiently unless provided with adequate apparatus and equipment, and unless accommodation is adequate to provide staff with space to operate in comfort. A visit to the seed-testing laboratory will very quickly indicate the difficult conditions under which the personnel are operating.

"At the present time there appears to be a delay of approximately six weeks in the receipt of results of analyses of seed samples, and this is having a serious effect not only on local trade but on interstate trade, and, more important, on international trade by way of exports."

Seed testing is quite a business, a bigger business than is appreciated by many people. People specialise in the growing of certified seeds. Under normal conditions, these are used in the local trade and export markets, and at present the problems of these people are accentuated by the development of the brigalow lands and other lands. In this State there is not only the development of the Government-sponsored scheme in the brigalow land. In addition, practically every land owner is interested in better pastures and feed for cattle and stock. Each is interested in his own way in the improvement of seeds and the types of crops grown on his property. We have here the culmination of events, which means that those doing seed testing are particularly hard pressed.

My information goes on—

"It is our considered opinion that Queensland is on the verge of tremendous developments in export trade of many types of seeds, and unless the seed-testing laboratory of the Standards Branch is adequately provided for, opportunities will be lost in this export trade.

"Members of the seed and produce trades are aware that action is contemplated to station inspectors of the Standards Branch in certain country areas, Toowoomba being the first place chosen. It is suggested that these officers may be the most suitable of departmental officers to advise farmers, particularly regarding the incidence on their properties of weed plants responsible for weed seed contamination in crop seeds."

That is very important. It is not much use having pure seeds if there are a lot of weeds with them. My information continues—

“At present, the Standards Branch—under the control of Standards Officer Mr. C. Peel—is responsible to the Director of Marketing. In our opinion, there is not sufficient importance appreciated of the work which the Standards Branch are called upon to do—both in relation to produce, stock feeds and seeds, and further, that the branch is not only associated with carrying out the regulations under the various Acts under which it functions, but is also playing a vital role in the fields of research.

“In view of the above, it is hoped that the appointment of the new Administrative Officer, Mr. Stan Ivers, will help to publicise the work and activities of the Branch within the department itself, and also in the commercial field of the Seed industry.

“One way in which seed merchants can assist the Branch is in the matter of submitting samples for testing, as information made available to us would indicate that in the past few months, as many as six samples of some parcels of Rhodes Grass, Buffel Grass and Green Panic, have been submitted for Seed Analysis Reports. It is our considered opinion that the Standards Branch should not accept samples of grass and legume seeds from growers other than for the testing of such samples which may require to be replanted by growers, and that all samples where seed is offered for sale should be submitted by the country storekeepers or produce merchants or members of our Association. It would then be up to the party requiring to purchase the seed to deal with the grower concerned on the basis of the Seed Analysis Report, in formulating their price to be paid in any given variety of seed.

“It is not intended to offer any criticism of the work or personnel of the Standards Branch; rather do we record our sincere appreciation of a job well done under extreme difficulties.

“It is respectfully requested, therefore, that the Honourable the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry investigate the situation which is hindering the more efficient operation of the Standards Branch, which might even involve the question as to whether the Branch might more effectively operate by being made directly responsible to the Director-General, since its ramifications cover more than the limited scope of marketing activities, and indeed have a relationship with almost all aspects of agricultural and stock industries.”

Referring to the Budget, I would mention that, as indicated by the Treasurer and as promised by the Premier in his policy speech, the Government has great plans for the

progress and development of the State industrially. In a speech earlier this session I mentioned the important benefits that would come from industrial development, such as increased home markets for our products, additional employment, and so on. I raised, too, the matter of matching the development of our primary industries with that of our secondary industries. I shall not reiterate that now other than to say that we do need progress in primary industries to cater for not only the home market but also export markets in the Near East, the East, and indeed throughout the world.

I mentioned, too, the part that irrigation would play in the development of primary industries farther away from the cities. Queensland is basically a dry State and irrigation will play a much greater part in its development than we believed possible hitherto. I am not suggesting that every landholder should irrigate the whole of his property; but many landholders should provide some irrigation to bring security to themselves and the industries with which they are associated. I am a little disappointed to see that the Treasurer has not allocated—I do not say that it is all his doing—any increased funds for irrigation.

Mr. Davies: It was the same last year.

Mr. WHARTON: I am not criticising the Treasurer, but I am disappointed that we cannot allocate more funds to irrigation. We are spending £2,000,000 a year on dams; we are spending an extra £2,000,000 a year on education and other things. The problem at the moment is to reduce the level of unemployment, and I suggest that irrigation would help us to do this. There is a great need to educate our children, and I agree entirely with everything that is being done in that direction. However, it is not much good educating children if there is no work for them. Primary industries do provide a future for many of our boys and girls, and if they wish to stay on the land we want them to be secure in their employment. If they are to have security, something must be done to provide additional irrigation.

Mr. Davies: Why don't you make a thorough protest?

Mr. WHARTON: One cannot make a point in this Chamber but the hon. member for Maryborough interjects and warps the matter a bit. We have spent a great deal of money, £22,000, on an investigation in the Burnett area. It is a considerable sum of money and I appreciate the fact that it has been spent, but I do not want to see it wasted. In particular, I wish to refer to the need for a weir at Gayndah. I have got down to the parochial level now because this is something that has been needed for a long time. It is a great shame that we did not have a Country Party Government in office previously. Had we done so we probably would have had

one there now. The citrus industry was pioneered in the Gayndah-Mundubbera area. There are 1,300 acres under citrus now and it is expanding considerably but there is a shortage of water every year, even though there is a weir at Mundubbera. I appreciate the value of that weir to our growers—

Mr. Davies: Built by a Labour Government.

Mr. WHARTON: Yes, but built in the wrong place. The Mundubbera growers say they want another weir because the first one is in the wrong place.

We want a weir at Gayndah because it is needed not only for the citrus industry but also for the town water supply. Anyone who knows the area would know that the Burnett is a very sandy river. There are miles and miles of sand, and last year during the dry time in September many of the growers dug 4 feet under the sand to get water. Over quite a considerable strip of the river—some 7 or 8 miles—they put down bores and wells to the bottom rock 12 or 13 feet under the 4-foot depth of top sand, so hon. members can appreciate the great difficulty under which these growers are operating.

The Mundubbera weir has certainly served its purpose and has helped a great deal but if the whole of the water in that weir had been used for these growers last year it would not have made much contribution towards alleviating their needs.

It may be argued that there is over-production of citrus, but I give the lie to that. Great quantities of citrus are being exported at the moment to Singapore and Hong Kong and we are catering as well for the local markets. This is an industry about which something will have to be done.

The site for the Gayndah weir lends itself to a reasonably constant water supply. It will cost £330,000 to build. It has been established that it is a good site, and £28 per acre-foot is an economic price. I do not think there is a more economic site in the State and, on that basis and keeping the needs of the people of the area paramount, a weir is justified not only so that they can hold what they have but add to it as well. If growers in the citrus areas do not get enough water in one month the whole of the output is lost.

The town is in need of further water supplies, and this particular site, having been proved economic, ought to be considered. I am not submitting that we should take away from anybody else; all I am saying is that here we have found a good economic site that will cater for the needs of the people who will be served. They have indicated their willingness to pay the levy for the water. It is not a £2,000,000 scheme, but a £330,000 scheme.

I should like to turn my attention to the 2,000 acres of irrigable land in the Reid's Creek area. Over the past 20 years growers

have put themselves on restrictions. They have used the water as and when they could. Applications have been made for further licences but at the present time it is impossible to increase these licences. Some of these men have been working their orchards there for 20 years but then someone comes in and wants to grow cotton on 150 acres. He wants to do it with irrigation in three lots. It can be imagined what happens. Everyone is calling for water. The citrus-growers want it; the cotton-growers want it.

Mr. Davies: Have you brought this up in Caucus at all?

Mr. WHARTON: The hon. member need not worry. He will never be in a Government Caucus. He should not waste the time of the Committee.

Mr. Davies: This is good country. I know it.

Mr. WHARTON: If the hon. member spoke of what he knows something about rather than what he knows nothing about, he would be better off.

A survey has been made in this particular area. I understand that there is a suitable dam site in the upper reaches and that it would not cost a great deal of money. The construction of a lot of little weirs and small dams would help the people much more quickly than a large scheme. I made that point about the Gayndah land. It is better to provide the water now by these small schemes rather than perish first and get the water later on. That is the correct attitude to adopt in the provision of water. I hope that we will be able to find some solution to the problem of these people in the Reid's Creek area. You cannot deny people water if they want it to produce.

They feel the pinch when someone new comes in. I have already mentioned the great potential for cotton-growing. One man is growing 150 acres. The construction of a dam in that area would certainly assist.

Mr. Davies: The Government does not seem to be interested in the cotton industry in Queensland.

Mr. WHARTON: The hon. member is so wrong so many times. I ask him not to take up my time because he is so wrong so often.

I realise that there are needs in other parts of the Burnett. We look forward to something being done later. I am pleased to see that consideration has been given to other areas. I have stressed this before. They have waited a long time for it. I have made the point previously that the need is for further weirs. After the building of dams the water ultimately flows down to the lower reaches so that all share in it. A suggestion for a weir at Gayndah was made ten years ago, but we are still starved

for water simply because when the water facilities are made available people become more water conscious and use more water. In the Burnett area from Monto down, there are acres and acres of agricultural land and as the water is provided along the stream it is used. In this cause, let the ones that have it use it. Let us build small weirs at various places and the whole State will benefit more quickly. Gayndah cannot survive much longer without a weir.

I congratulate the Treasurer on his Budget. It gives the answer to any criticism that may be levelled. In fact, very little criticism of a worth-while nature can be directed to it, because the State is progressing and the Government is developing it. No Government has carried out more development than the present Government. I again congratulate the Treasurer and I believe that the people of the State should be thankful for having such a progressive Government.

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) (4.26 p.m.): I think that today, in this debate, we have had an example of just how lazy and complacent this Government has become. This morning the Leader of the Opposition opened the debate and he was followed by the hon. member for Barcoo. It was only after a great deal of pressure had been applied that we found that the hon. member for Burnett was thrown into the debate. I am led to believe, too, that the debate is finishing at 6 o'clock and we have many speakers on this side of the Committee—Mr. Melloy, Mr. Hanson, and Mr. Houston, just to mention a few—who wish to participate in this debate. This is a very important debate, yet we have the spectacle of its closing at 6 o'clock due mainly to the complacency of the Government.

Mr. Hiley: It does not close at 6 o'clock; it adjourns at 6 o'clock.

Mr. TUCKER: If the Treasurer feels happier by putting it in that fashion, it adjourns at 6 o'clock.

I have studied the Budget but I can find nothing in it to bring a frenzy of applause from the people of Queensland and more particularly from the people of North Queensland. The Treasurer has made great play about the fact that no new taxes have been imposed and that certain concessions have been granted to the general public. When one analyses the proposed concessions it is obvious that they are only an attempt to correct an inflationary trend that has appeared consistently under the present Government. To give an example, I refer to the land tax concessions. Since this Government has been in office land values have consistently risen. Is it any wonder that the Government has had to raise the exemption from £1,500 to £2,000?

Mr. Ewan: That is the barometer of prosperity.

Mr. TUCKER: It is put forward as a concession by the Government, but it appears to me it can be described as pure fairy floss. The Budget really contains nothing, but there has been a great deal of window-dressing in its presentation by the Treasurer. He can do that sort of thing. He can stand up and deliver a story that sounds pretty good until one analyses it and brings it out into the light to look at it, when one finds that the fabrication he is putting up contains nothing at all. He is a past master at that, and I pay him a tribute because he has the ability to tell a good story.

In his Financial Statement the Treasurer referred to the Mt. Isa Rail Project, and I want to refer to it again today. I do not think it hurts to continue to refer to it, to continue to bring the spotlight onto it and to continue to show the people of Queensland just how we were sold down the river on it. The Minister has stated that the net expenditure on the Mt. Isa Railway Project to 30 June, 1963, was £17,320,855. He further stated that the anticipated expenditure during the current year is £7,432,000 and that the line should be completed by December, 1964. This Government persistently claims the rehabilitation of the Mt. Isa line as one of the big achievements of the Country-Liberal coalition. Whenever we take it to task over the lack of northern development and whenever my colleagues and I say that we are not getting in the North the kind of development we believe we should have, the first thing brought up by the Country-Liberal coalition is the scream, "What about the Mt. Isa line rehabilitation?" Well, what about the rehabilitation of the Mt. Isa line?

I have no argument with the rehabilitation of the line because I can remember that it was my party, the Australian Labour Party, which initiated the idea. In fact it would have gone through except that in 1957 we lost the Treasury benches. What riles me is to listen to the claims of the Treasurer and others that Queensland did very well in the matter. I am going to show, as it has been shown before, just how badly we did. What riles me, too, is to hear the Treasurer speaking of the Commonwealth Government now, though he did not before, as though in its paternal goodness it was prepared to hand us a sort of bonanza on the rehabilitation of the Mt. Isa railway line.

In fact, each time the Treasurer mentions the project he and his colleagues should hang their heads in shame. They fell for the three-card trick by the Menzies Government and they sold Queensland down the river when they accepted the Commonwealth's terms. It is all right to say that we had to have the money and that we had to get on and do the job. It is true enough that we had to do the job but it is not true that we had to accept the money from the Commonwealth on the terms imposed. After all,

if you are the head of a family you do not run the family into debt by entering into fantastic and stupid arrangements with anybody who comes along and offers them to you. As head you have a responsibility to your family, and so the Government of Queensland has a responsibility not only to get on with the project—and certainly we must get it done—but also to get the best terms from the Commonwealth on behalf of the people of Queensland, and I suggest that it did not do that. It is all very well to say that we must have the money at any cost. We have heard people say, "Peace at any price!" Some would try to justify that statement but you and I know that in the long run those things can be very dear indeed. I say the Government has adopted that attitude on the Mt. Isa line project.

In the Financial Statement the Treasurer says the Commonwealth has made provision for advances of £6·7 million this year. Of course it has. We understand that. The terms were—and I will repeat them—initially, £20,000,000 advanced by the Commonwealth, repayable in 20 years at 5½ per cent. Those were the terms accepted by the Government of Queensland from the Menzies Commonwealth Government. If we could see the budgets for the next 20 years, we would find that over that period the interest payable to the Commonwealth would be in the vicinity of £1,250,000. I think that that should be noted and remembered. For the sake of having the money to rebuild this line, we are going to pay to the Commonwealth not only the repayable amount of £20,000,000 but also £1,250,000 in interest. Let that be noted carefully because I am going to make certain statements in a few minutes on the question of whether the claim that we have done very well in this project is correct. I know that that is not so.

I believe that all will agree with me when I say how badly off we are in comparison with other States that have received Commonwealth aid. Nevertheless, we find on every occasion the Government claiming that in this project it has done the best for Queensland. I think that the best way to look at it is to consider the assistance given by the Menzies Government for rail development in other States. It will be remembered that the Treasurer and the Premier canvassed the world trying to get money for this work, and finally they said that they would go it alone. Eventually they received the money from the Commonwealth, but on the Commonwealth's terms.

For the rail works for the B.H.P. steel-works in Western Australia, the Commonwealth found £41·2 million. Of that sum £14·4 million was an outright gift to Western Australia, and we are assured that much of the remainder will be made a special Commonwealth grant to that State. Admittedly there will be a small remainder,

but again it must be noted that that small amount repayable by Western Australia to the Commonwealth is to be paid over 50 years. Our repayment is over 20 years. Western Australia received £14·4 million as an outright gift, and quite a number of other Commonwealth grants designed to reduce still further the remainder payable over 50 years.

In New South Wales and Victoria the Commonwealth lent the whole of the cost of the recent railway project in those States. Again it should be noted that only 30 per cent. of the loan is repayable, and again over 50 years compared with our 20. The rate of interest on the repayable money is 5 per cent. to 5¾ per cent., compared with our flat rate of 5½ per cent. In spite of that, this Country-Liberal Government has the gall to claim that in this project it made a master stroke for Queensland. When we look at the grants made to the other States, we find that Queensland certainly did not get any great concession from the Commonwealth. In fact, we suffered.

By means of skilful propaganda, the coalition Government has endeavoured to hoodwink the people of Queensland into believing that we have done very well in this project. I stand here to expose it and remind the people of Queensland that we have not. On the contrary, I believe that we have done very poorly indeed.

Let us take the example of South Australia, where Premier Playford heads a minority Government. All the money for South Australia's recent railway works was provided by the Commonwealth Government. Again only 30 per cent. of the loan is repayable.

Mr. Murray: For standardisation?

Mr. TUCKER: That is correct; and repayable over 50 years.

Mr. Murray: But standardisation is a totally different proposition from moneys loaned—a different formula altogether.

Mr. TUCKER: It is certainly wrong. It puts us in a very poor light indeed.

Mr. Walsh: You do not want to be led astray by the hon. member for Clayfield.

Mr. TUCKER: I am aware of that. There may have been some standardisation involved in the work in South Australia, but it certainly was not the whole of it. Only 30 per cent. of the loan was repayable, and, as I said, over 50 years. The interest rate was 3¾ to 5 per cent., compared with 5½ per cent. on our loan from the Commonwealth, and I emphasise that the Commonwealth found only two-thirds of the cost of the rehabilitation of the Mt. Isa railway line. I see that the Treasurer's latest estimate is that the line will cost £26,500,000, not £30,000,000; but when the loan was made the Commonwealth found only two-thirds of the proposed £30,000,000.

Mr. Walsh: Not as a grant.

Mr. TUCKER: Not as a grant. It has to be repaid over 20 years at 5½ per cent., as I said when mentioning the terms given to other States, so we will pay £1,250,000 in interest on the money loaned. I believe that this story must be told time and time again.

I have heard it said, "We had to have this money. We had to take it because we could not do anything else about it." There may be some merit in that argument, but I believe that the Government of Queensland should have demanded terms similar to those given on loans to other States. The geniuses of the Country-Liberal Coalition Government have lost millions of pounds for Queensland by not obtaining terms similar to those given to Western Australia, South Australia, and other States.

Admittedly we have received some additional help from the Commonwealth Government over the last couple of years. But I think it should be stated very clearly that that was not because of the representations of the Premier and his Cabinet colleagues. It was because of the representations of the people at the ballot box that we received something from the Commonwealth Government for the brigalow scheme and beef roads. However, that is not what I am speaking about today. I am speaking about the Mt. Isa rail rehabilitation project, and I want to make it clear to everyone how we were sold down the river.

The Estimates make provision for new departments following the appointment of two new Ministers, and the Government has really spread itself in regard to development. We find that a certain amount has been set aside for the Premier and Minister for State Development and for the Deputy Premier and Minister for Industrial Development, while the hon. member for Wavell, Mr. Dewar, retains the shell of Minister for Labour and Industry. If ever I saw window-dressing in regard to State development, this is it. With all these various terms, we in the North have, in fact, received nothing. We understand how the Government is prepared to bring up this word "development". We understand how it is prepared to hand it from one Minister to another, how it is prepared to put out a tremendous spate of words on what is going on in the State. The other day, when the Premier came north he said, "You have never had it so good with the tremendous splurge of development," and everyone looked around to see just where it was. Apart from the Mt. Isa rail project it is surprising just how little we have received and what we have lost because of it.

This development has now gone to the Premier, the Deputy Premier, and to a certain extent to the Treasurer, because I see he has certain allocations set aside for the promotion of Queensland industry, as he calls it. So he must have a finger in the

pie somewhere; and the Minister for Labour and Industry, as I say, has the final empty shell left to him. I know that because I will bring up in a little while certain things I wanted with regard to an industry in Townsville, and how already confusion has occurred by its being handed from one Minister to another.

In North Queensland not one major project has been started by this Government, although we are looking for it on every occasion. In fact, we need it. I half expected again the cry, "What about the beef roads?" That again is Commonwealth expenditure and anyway, roads, although they are good and necessary, do not necessarily spell development in the real sense of the word because, even if you have roads, unless you have people and industries flourishing alongside them you have not real development. Although you can sit beside a road, you cannot eat it or do much else with it.

Although these beef roads have been put in and may some day become useful, we need a great number of primary and secondary industries in the North and people to go with them if we are to have real development. I do not want to knock roads, because I know that, in the far-flung areas, they are very necessary. However, I do not want to miss analysing these roads and what they will do in the next few years.

Mr. Windsor interjected.

Mr. TUCKER: I notice that the interjector always makes his best speeches sitting down. He would have been well advised to get to his feet today and enter this debate to show that he is not lazy or complacent, although I think he is both anyway.

We do not have the wherewithal in the North to establish further secondary or primary industries at the moment and, as I said, just to have these roads running through the country and to sit beside them certainly does not do anything for the real development of the North.

What about this beef industry? Everyone is aware that on occasions when the American market is depressed or when the other world markets are depressed, the beef industry is in a pretty precarious position. There is no doubt about that. So it is one of the duties of this Government to get moving and put this industry on a sound basis.

We hear a lot of lip service in this matter of development and much talk about the beef industry. I am going to ask this afternoon exactly what the Government has done to try to get markets for the beef industry. I am going to ask if the Premier has done anything about going to Eastern countries? Some of them, we know, have plenty of money and are ready to buy. Has he done anything about trying to establish a Queensland House in a strategic area in the East so that this State can have a shop window there? If he has not done that, why not?

I know there are other markets than in the East but those who have been there say that it offers a very ready market and I do not feel enough has been done about it. The Menzies Government has been very lazy. That Government should have established an Australia House somewhere in the East so that buyers could see what we have to offer. The Prime Minister is well known for his spate of words but not for his actions. If he is not going to do something in this direction the Government of Queensland should take steps to do everything possible to acquire markets there. If the Federal Government is not prepared to find some place to establish an Australia House, let us go it alone. Let us establish a Queensland House as a shop window for our primary products. From what I have been told, I firmly believe that there is a ready market for our beef industry in the East. But nothing has been done about it. The Government has been complacent about it; the Premier has been complacent about it. Had he got cracking before this, we might have had those markets now. In this manner we could put the beef industry on a sound footing. It is not in that position today. We could probably find a ready and profitable market by giving buyers in the East an idea of what we have to offer. That is just one idea that comes readily to my mind. We need a shop window in the East which would tell those people, "Here is what we have in Queensland. We can offer you this at such-and-such a price. It is a good product." In that way we may be able to do something for Queensland. If that were done I would listen to the Premier. I would say, "That is real development. That is getting off your seat and getting out to try to do something for the State." I am very sincere in these representations.

Mr. Walsh: Gladstone monopolies like Vestey's are over there.

Mr. TUCKER: That is what we are always up against.

If the Government was prepared to put our primary and secondary industries on a sound basis it would be doing something for the development of the State. It would have something to talk about.

Mr. Murray: Would you suggest subsidising the beef industry?

Mr. TUCKER: We heard the hon. member "beefing" for three years but he eventually fell out and we did not hear any more from him. Now he is here representing the blue-ribbon seat of Clayfield.

What I have suggested would mean real development for the North. If the development of the North has been taking place, as the Premier and Government members claim, why do we find bodies such as the People the North Committee being set up? If this development is taking place, why is there a

need for the people of the North to band together in such committees? The members of the People the North Committee apparently feel that the Queensland Government is not doing its job, because they banded together. Most of us have read the publicity put out by one Alderman Harry Hopkins of Townsville, and his offisider, Larry Foley. They are seeing the Prime Minister next week. I will read from "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" of Saturday, 5 October, under an article headed "People the North Committee Work Appreciated". Halfway through, it says—

"The chief sources of the income in the budget which Alderman Hopkins presented were—expected revenue shown first with actual receipts in 1962-1963 shown in brackets—Local Authorities £5,500 (£5,487), Regional Board £1,175 (£1,125), Harbour Boards £700 (£700), Mining £200 (£200), Commerce £500 (£641), Other Sources £280 (£220), Bank Interest £85 (£102), the totals being expected this year £12,777."

This has been supplied by the local authorities, the harbour board and many other people and organisations in the North to set up this People the North Committee. I ask the committee who is the Premier of Queensland, when we find Alderman Hopkins and the People the North Committee going to Canberra to press for northern development?

In the same paper, on the second page we see, "Deputation to Prime Minister" by the People the North Committee. I do not say this in any derogatory fashion because many good people are concerned with this committee. But who is the Premier of Queensland, Alderman H. H. Hopkins from Townsville or the hon. G. F. R. Nicklin? Who decides what we are to do for Queensland, the elected representatives of the people here, such as the Premier of Queensland, or a committee called the People the North Committee? I believe that if there are to be submissions to the Prime Minister they should be made by the Premier of Queensland. By no stretch of the imagination could Alderman Hopkins be called a Labour supporter so I do not suppose he would have any axe to grind at a coming election or anything like that, yet he is prepared to bypass the Government and go to Canberra to put his case. It is a clear indictment of the Government that these people are prepared to bypass the Government. They must believe that there is no real development in the North if they are going to the Prime Minister, to use the journalist's words on the second page, to beard the Prime Minister in his den with reference to northern development. If the Government claims that there is development in the North, and if many of its supporters in the North claim there is not, and are prepared to spend £12,000 in setting up this committee to run it for one year, I

should say there is no doubt about it. Hon. members may dispute my statement, but those are the thoughts of the people up there about northern development and how little of it there is. They are prepared to bypass the Government and make their submissions directly to the Prime Minister, which proves that development is not taking place. I repeat that if the Premier and the Government were doing their duty this expenditure of time and money by these good people would not be necessary. If the development is taking place as claimed it would not be necessary for these people to go to Canberra. In fact, I do not think it is necessary for the Government of Queensland to be bypassed. The elected representatives of the people should not have to be bypassed by these people in submitting something direct to the Prime Minister of Australia.

A perfect example of this inability to assist is to be found in a story about a small business man in Townsville. Through hard work and real tenacity of purpose he established a small business there. Such people are the salt of the earth. They get stuck into it, and through hard work establish a small business and employ labour.

Mr. Sullivan: That is typical of the Country Party.

Mr. TUCKER: I do not know whom he supported and I will not be drawn into that.

Mr. Sullivan: That remark is typical of the Country Party.

Mr. TUCKER: I pay tribute to the people who do work.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. TUCKER: This young man established his business in Townsville. He manufactured such things as gates and fencing and did all that sort of work in Townsville. Because he has such a small business it is not economically possible for him to order raw materials in large quantities. He has only started and has not the money and possibly not the sales. So he finds that he has to buy his raw materials virtually on the retail market. Big Business says to him, "If you don't order in 50-ton lots we won't sell to you at all". So he cannot get on the wholesalers' list in Townsville. Imagine how that young man has to cut and prune and work his fingers to the bone to try to compete even in tendering for contracts in Townsville against big firms like Cyclone, who have the advantage of being able to buy in 50-ton lots or more at wholesale prices! His plight was brought to the notice of the Minister for Labour and Industry by the hon. member for Townsville South and me; both of us made representations on his behalf. Anywhere in Townsville, wherever we think we can help, we are right

in there to do the best we can. It is very necessary to help all, big and small, and I am particularly prepared to help the small.

Although the Minister for Labour and Industry, Mr. Dewar, was very helpful and courteous, he said to me, "We have reached an impasse on this thing. I am not able to do any more about it". Why is he not able to do any more? The Government says it is going to help industry in the North but when it runs up against Big Business the Minister says, "I can't do anything about it. I have reached an impasse". I believe that is one problem the Government should get its teeth into, to find out how it can assist small industry. It would mean real assistance to the people in the North. That is a small example of practical aid that could be given.

It is not only fencing. For some unknown reason, small firms and bigger firms in Townsville at times cannot get mild steel. Most of us understand that something down south clamps down on the firms and suddenly mild steel becomes unavailable in the North for prefabrication and that sort of thing and firms in Townsville more or less have to close down. You can imagine how the spiral of costs starts the moment they cannot get their hands on raw material. They are up against it all the time. We have brought that to the notice of the Government, too, but B.H.P. is too big for it. These things should be discussed because their solution is very necessary to the firms and the people in Townsville. That is one real way the Government could help develop the North. Men wishing to set up in business there should be assured of adequate supplies of raw materials and of protection from those anxious to preserve the interests of Big Business. Small firms are very important to the North, just as important as some of the bigger ones, and just as important as the big oil companies or anyone else. Although they may employ only a dozen or half a dozen men, if they work together they become the real structure on which we can build development in the North. There are other small firms but those are examples of the fact that when we give the Government a knotty problem to unravel, and ask, "What can you do about this?", with due respect to the Minister for Labour and Industry, he says, "We have reached an impasse. We cannot do anything about it". I think that the Government could do something. If they cannot do it themselves, they should seek the aid of the Commonwealth Government. That would be a real contribution and would show that they were prepared to do something to develop Northern Queensland.

They give lip service to northern development, but on every occasion their actions speak otherwise. We have the example provided by the Cairns railway workshops. They said, "We are going to develop the North," but after a while they let it be known that

the workshops at Cairns would ultimately be closed. The men that they did not frighten out of the service on that occasion were transferred elsewhere. We find again, as the hon. member for Cairns has said on a number of occasions, that our northern people are gradually being decimated by the actions of a Government claiming to be concerned with the North.

Perhaps the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha was expounding the policy of the Government when he said in his speech in the Address-in-Reply debate—

“ . . . it would most likely help, not hinder, an invader to have food, housing and water in settled areas.”

He was speaking of the North on that occasion. So far as I am concerned, that sort of talk smacks of the Brisbane Line attitude. He may argue that that is not what he meant, but the way in which he said it sounded as though he meant that we should leave open the whole of the North, as, if an invader came and found housing, food, and clothing, he would probably be assisted. That suggests a Brisbane Line attitude, and the people of North Queensland and I reject it. We believe that we want people and industries in the North. If it is to be helped, we have to be there physically. We want help for our industries and assured markets for our primary products. We want assistance for the provision of water.

In the North, water is gold, and we cannot have too much of it. It is all very well to speak of small weirs and say that large projects are no good. On the other hand, I have heard Government members and Cabinet Ministers speak of Mareeba and the way it is developing at present. Everyone knows that the development of Mareeba came from the Tinaroo Falls Dam and the long-sightedness of a Labour Government that was prepared to undertake a project that was knocked by a great number of people, many of them on the Government side. When the scheme flowered and showed something for the foresight of an Australian Labour Party Government, these people were ready to applaud it.

Now they say, “These projects are too big. We are going to build small weirs and that sort of thing.” I have no argument with that where it can be done, but I do not think that we should lose sight of the fact that in North Queensland we need to think big. We want more people. There are 310,000 Europeans living north of the Tropic of Capricorn. That is a very small population for the vast area we hold. We have resources capable of adding immeasurably to the national income and the Australian standard of living. I do not think that anyone could argue with that. Our exports are worth approximately £220 a head of population in the North, compared with the Australian average of £90.

Admittedly we have a limited range of activity. We have cattle, sugar, tobacco, mining, some dairying, maize, and, of course, secondary industries which depend on mining and that sort of thing. Those are the major industries in the North; from them come its productive wealth. I believe that the statistics to which I have referred are startling.

The hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha, when speaking in the Address-in-Reply debate, said that it might be to our advantage to leave the North empty. I reject that suggestion, as does every other North Queensland. We believe that we need more people and more closer-settlement schemes in the North, and at this stage I wish to give hon. members some further statistics. Victoria has over 1,000,000 acres of irrigated land, but we in Queensland, a State many times the size of Victoria, have 160,000 acres of irrigated land. The Burdekin River has a catchment area of 50,000 square miles. We could build a dam there—I have advocated this in the Chamber on many occasions—to hold 16 times the volume of water in Sydney Harbour. I listened in amazement when the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha said that the Burdekin lands were so impregnated with salt that they were virtually useless for irrigation. It is very obvious that the hon. member did not go there and see the land. I would not advise him to go to Ayr or to Home Hill, because the moment he said, “My name is Lickiss,” he would be gone. We know enough about the agricultural possibilities to begin detailed planning for the Burdekin dam, and I believe that this should be done.

Mr. Murray: Say that again. He is here now.

Mr. TUCKER: The hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha is well able to read it in “Hansard.” For some unknown reason, each time we put forward the suggestion that the Burdekin Dam be constructed it is knocked on the head. Possibly this is because it was Labour thinking and nobody on the Government benches would like to see our thoughts and ideas and ideals eventually come to fruition, so they say, “Put it aside. It is not a project that we can go on with.” However, every authority who has made an inspection has claimed that the project is worth while. The Tinaroo Falls Dam was one of Labour’s ideas that was eventually proved to be well worth while and led to tremendous development in the Mareeba area. I suggest that if the Government was prepared to build the Burdekin Dam we should see one oasis in a very barren area. It would be part and parcel of northern development, something which would give a tenfold return to Queensland.

I say quite categorically that the Government cannot be proud of northern development. It has done nothing for the physical

development of the land or to find markets for our products, and I believe the two things go hand in hand. We must go out and find markets so that the people who go on to the land will know that they have somewhere to sell their products. That is another argument that the Government has used on every occasion to knock us. It says, "All right. Build the dam. Where are we going to sell the things that are produced?" If we adopted that attitude on every occasion, we should never get anywhere. I often ask myself how much longer we can hold these vast empty spaces. I look out of the window of the aircraft—usually somebody is looking over my shoulder, too—and for half an hour at a time I do not see anybody. This land is our heritage. We must hold on to it. If we do not do something about it quickly, we shall have it taken from us.

The hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha is now in the Chamber. He said that we could hold these areas with a trained army, navy and air force. I should say that nothing is further from the truth. If it were true, Mr. Hooper, I should like to know what you and I were doing in the islands when we had one of the mightiest navies and air forces in the world backing us. What were you and I, amongst others, doing in the islands, Mr. Hooper, if we could physically hold these places with a trained army, air force and navy? You and I know that we had to get onto those islands, and wasn't it hard, once the invader got in, to throw him back? I say our first duty is to get in there. A famous general was once asked how he won his battles and he said, "I got there firstest with the mostest." As far as North Queensland is concerned, we have to get there "firstest with the mostest." That would allow us to hold this State, and to do so we have to develop it. There is not one man in this Chamber today who does not personally feel that we should hold what has been handed down to us.

Mr. DONALD (Ipswich East) (5.16 p.m.): I must express surprise and utter a protest against the undemocratic action of the Government in depriving Crown employees of the right to serve on local-government bodies. This action stamps the Government for what it is, namely, a very undemocratic administration. In spite of the protestations of its members that they believe in democracy and that they are scrupulously fair, is it the first step towards eliminating the adult franchise in local-authority elections and towards re-introducing the property franchise that prevailed before the Labour Party became the Government in this State?

Local Government is a very important phase of government—it was the earliest government we had in the State of Queensland—and any interference with this function is to be regretted and opposed. Representatives on city, town and shire councils

should not be restricted to non-Government employees, and any Government that thinks they should is losing touch with the people and is certainly taking a very retrogressive and undemocratic step. Many Crown employees have been successful local-government representatives over the years. As I said, it is a retrograde step and, while it may be desirable in a few individual cases, the decision that the Government has made cannot be justified in any democratic community.

I support very strongly what my Leader said about the sale of the Ogmore coal mine. The mine has lost £341,000 since 1936, and last year's loss was £13,000, but it has given valuable service to the State and the quality of the coal there is above the average in this State. Great emphasis has been placed on absenteeism by certain people connected with the operation of the Styx mine at Ogmore, and when my Leader said that the union would deal with those people who were chronic absentees it brought a laugh from the other side. They laughed because they were ignorant of the working-class movement and the anxiety of unions to see that justice is done to all who work in industry. Workers know that if certain people are going to absent themselves from work repeatedly it must have an adverse effect on those who are left, and it would not be the first time that the Miners' Union took action against its members for being neglectful in this respect.

Whose responsibility is it to see that the men attend their work regularly? Is it the responsibility of the respective unions? Is it not a responsibility of the management? If the management could not get these men to work regularly, then the Government, which has the administration of the mine, should have taken the necessary steps to see that they were there. They did not do so, but they used it as an excuse to sell the mine to some private firm.

The production per man-shift overall or under-ground at Ogmore State mine compares very favourable with that for other non-mechanised mines in Queensland, which in itself is an indication that the men working there are pulling their weight and not loafing on the State. The mine has for many years supplied electric power, light and water to the community at Ogmore. That cost has had to be borne by the mine itself. No-one can say that the people of Ogmore are not excellent citizens or that they are not good workers. They have demonstrated that they are again and again. Hon. members opposite cannot raise the boggy at Ogmore that they did at Scottville, because there are not any Communists in the community at Ogmore. The Government cannot use the boggy of Communism to justify its action in selling the coal mine at Ogmore.

Let us make a comparison with what is happening in Victoria, where a non-labour Government has had control of the Treasury

benches for many years, although there has been a Labour Government now and again. In that State the Wonthaggi coal mine has been working for a long number of years. It was opened up by a non-labour Government. I can recall when the Victorian Minister who was in charge of the Wonthaggi mine was no less a person than Sir Robert Menzies, now Prime Minister. We had to wage a strike for 18 months before we could get economic and social justice for the miners employed there, but we won. That mine has an accumulated deficit of £4,593,928. Last year it lost £268,048. In 1961-1962 it lost £303,796 and in 1960-1961 it lost £278,552. But that non-Labour Government is not selling out. It has not considered that it should get rid of this mine because it is not paying. It realises that the Wonthaggi coal mine over the years has been a valuable asset to the State of Victoria. Because of that the Government is keeping it going in spite of its tremendous losses. There is very little black coal in Victoria and again and again the Wonthaggi mine has come to the rescue of people who had to have black coal to carry on their businesses.

While speaking of State enterprises I might also mention that the Victorian Government had to take over the brown coal mine at Yallourn from private enterprise because private enterprise could not make a go of it. Over the years the Victorian Government has demonstrated the advantage of State control and State ownership. From the brown coal at Yallourn is generated the cheapest electricity in Australia. That is possible because the mining operations are carried out in such a very efficient manner, and that mine has been successful year after year.

Let me come now to New South Wales, where there are eight State coal mines. To put it more correctly, perhaps I should say that eight mines are controlled either by the New South Wales Government or by the Electricity Commission of New South Wales. It is public enterprise whether the mine is State-owned or owned by the Electricity Commission. Those eight mines compare in size and production with any other group of mines in New South Wales. In fact they are second only to that powerful group owned by B.H.P. and Australian Iron and Steel. They are among the most progressive, economic and productive mines in New South Wales. They are successful in every way, whether they be regarded from the point of view of value to the State or economic profit.

The non-Labour Government in Victoria makes a great success of Yallourn. What is wrong with the present Queensland Government in its desire to sell the Ogmores State coal mine? It must be remembered that our Leader pointed out this morning that Ogmores is the only village of any consequence on a long stretch of our northern coastline. It must also be realised that if

the mine is closed the people who have given service to the State for a very long time, under adverse conditions, will be sacrificed because there is no other employment there for them. In addition, those people who have put their money into businesses will lose everything. The miners will have to move to some other locality. It is not as easy to bring the mine-workers from Ogmores and place them in a job on another coalfield as it was when the Government—and every credit must be given to the Minister for Mines and Main Roads for this—transported the miners from Mt. Mulligan to Collinsville some years ago. That cannot happen today because the call for labour on the coalfields is not as great as it used to be due to the introduction of mechanisation in many of our leading fields. I should say that the Department of Mines should give deep thought to the plight of the people at Ogmores. It may be said "Well, we are not closing the mine or making the mistake we did at Collinsville and putting these people on the grass without any work until we get a suitable buyer for the mine. We have called tenders and the work will continue until the successful tenderer takes over the mine." This should be considered: the people who buy the Ogmores mine may get the quota gained by buying it to supplement their present quota and then close the mine. That would mean, of course, that there would be another ghost town in Queensland, with no-one to take the place of the very estimable people who reside there today.

Although the Treasurer introduced his Budget in a very cheerful and optimistic manner it would be futile for anyone to attempt to deny that there is among our people a general dissatisfaction with our present social and economic system. This dissatisfaction is expressed in many ways and is clearly apparent to all. The most obvious objections come from its economic defects, such as the unequal distribution of wealth and income, the recurring depressions accompanied by mass unemployment with its resulting poverty and all the privations and misery that go with it. The exploitation of both the producers and the consumers by monopolistic interests plus the sinful waste are all universal features of the capitalist system.

The political power arising from ownership of wealth stultifies political democracy. Even with a Labour Government in office—and I use the word "office" deliberately and advisedly, instead of the word "power", because there is a great difference—there is a tendency to subordinate public policy to the interest of private gain. The present system of society degrades human desire with its treatment of the worker as a mere instrument of production, with its glorification of pursuit of wealth and its reverence for money as a standard of success. Capitalism inevitably tends to encourage and strengthen

selfishness at the expense of public spiritedness, and individualism at the expense of co-operation.

Some defects of the capitalist society can be reduced, or even eliminated, but attempts to cope with them upset the balance of the system and tend to raise new, and often more serious, obstacles to the improvement of human welfare. Depressions can be largely prevented at the price of retarding economic progress. Monopoly can be checked by putting back the clock of industrial development. All remedial measures require a positive Government policy which interferes with the working of a private-enterprise system. However, repeated intervention must lead to a planned society, but planning is a technique which may have widely different destinations—democratic socialism which is very desirable, or the extremes of Fascism or Communism. Therefore, it cannot be undertaken without clear knowledge of the difficulties in the way. Socialism is not a dogmatic creed or a panacea. It aims at the replacement of profit seeking by conscious planning and co-ordination of society within a democratic political system. This means, in the economic sphere, the transfer to the community of resources and industries essential to the general welfare, a distribution of income which relates to services rendered to the community, the recognition of the worker as a human being and the enlargement of his status in industry, and the adoption of such planned and orderly controls over other parts of the economy as may be required.

It implies, in the political sphere, that the transformation must be accomplished by true democratic methods and that the socialist system must be constructed to fit into a democratic framework. This condition, I feel, is necessary if the gains in the social and economic spheres are not to be outweighed by the loss of those personal and political freedoms which are just as much a condition of full life as are high living standards and social security.

Socialism entails neither the elimination of private property nor complete equality of incomes nor a police State. Planning under Socialism would aim at stability of employment while preserving economic progress, at reducing inequality and poverty while maintaining individual incentive, and at orderly development while upholding individual liberties.

The essence of Socialism is the belief that social planning for the general welfare can, by increasing opportunity, enlarge individual freedom, by reducing waste, exploitation and inefficiency increase economic progress, and by offering incentives encourage initiative. In expressing this belief I am mindful of the difficulties in the way and the problems to be overcome, honestly believing we have much to gain by the implementation of a Socialist policy.

The most glaring evil of the capitalist system has been its inability to prevent depressions and mass unemployment every few years. That this characteristic of the system is expected to recur in the future is obvious from public discussion, comments in the Press and frequently expressed business fears. People are undoubtedly right in their assumption that another depression is bound to occur. Nevertheless, it is now recognised that, even under capitalism, much may be done by means of public works and other policies to ease the worst effects of depression. However, the policy of the present Federal Government is such that the people of Australia cannot, with any confidence, expect much, if any, assistance to be rendered to the community generally from that source. While admitting that programmes of public works by the Federal and State Governments would represent an honest attempt to deal with the problem of depression and represent a big improvement on the policies applied in previous slumps, they are at the best palliatives and have many unsatisfactory features.

Socialists maintain that the best solution lies in the gradual transformation of the capitalist society into the Socialist society. Under Socialism depressions can be prevented. It is not necessary to wait until they arrive before dealing with them. Socialists insist that employment can be maintained by democratic methods, which at the same time advance economic progress and reduce social hardships to a minimum.

Depressions in Australia have in the past arisen from both external and internal causes. The immediate causes have usually been external. The capitalist cycle of boom and depression in Australia has in the past coincided with similar movements in other capitalist economies. Usually the boom has collapsed in other countries first and then the depression has spread to Australia from overseas. The next depression will probably be no exception. What happens is that crises overseas lead to curtailed demands, reduced prices for our exports, lower incomes for our farmers, reducing their demand for the commodities produced by Australian industry, and thus depression spreads throughout the economy. Australian Governments, whether Federal or State, cannot prevent these overseas happenings. All they can do is alleviate their effects on the Australian economy by the intelligent planning of Australian agriculture in boom, in conjunction with inter-governmental long-term contracts for the sale of our major export products, price stabilisation schemes, price guarantees, or other policies to maintain the income of primary producers, and by any measures which will enable Australia to maintain her capacity to obtain necessary imports from abroad despite a temporary drop in export income.

Whilst it is important to recognise the importance of overseas causes of depression in Australia and to take adequate measures

to deal with them, it is equally important to take account of the causes within Australia herself, for, however adequately overseas influences are dealt with, the internal causes will continue to produce depression if nothing is done about them.

Depression would occur in Australia even if overseas influences were entirely eliminated. The more Australia develops industrially, the more important the internal factors will become. Ultimately depression in Australia, like slumps in all capitalistic countries, arises from the unco-ordinated activities of profit-seeking firms.

During a boom period the rapid exploitation of the more obvious industrial possibilities occurs without regard for the less profitable forms of development which must also take place if the boom is to be maintained. The result is that the boom does not last and depression ensues.

An analysis of the internal causes of depression suggests the remedy. The solution is the continuous establishment of new industries as labour is released from the older over-expanded industries. This would not only maintain employment and prevent depression, but would also raise living standards by the production of new goods. Depression would not then merely be dealt with after it occurs; it would be prevented from occurring. Economic progress, instead of being halted every few years by serious depressions, would be continuous.

If the solution to depressions is so simple and offers such great advantages, why has it not been tried? The answer is that the establishment of new industries has been left to private enterprise, though it is generally believed that this is just what private enterprise is good at—enterprise, the testing of new ideas, the establishment of new industries. Let us ask ourselves if this is really so.

Certainly at the beginning of a boom new ideas are tried out in large numbers, new products are produced, and enterprises established. The boom is largely fed by the demand created for these new products, but as the boom proceeds industry finds itself with less time and inclination to develop production of further new products. This means that when demand for the main products of industry is satisfied, there is not enough production of new goods to maintain employment and satisfy consumers. Lack of enterprise is the most significant business characteristic in the later stages of a boom and when depression comes, of course, business enterprise is almost non-existent.

This implies that if the required new industries are to be established, the Government must take a hand. Three possibilities are open to a Government. It may offer special inducement to private enterprise; it may apply compulsion to private enterprise; or it may establish new industries itself. Let us assess the merits of these three approaches.

It will not be enough for the Government to wait till a depression occurs and then set about the establishment of new industries. Depression spreads so rapidly once it starts that this would be totally inadequate. The Government needs to look ahead and plan for the establishment of new industries exactly when they are required.

Suppose it decided to induce private enterprise, by subsidy or guarantee against loss, to establish the required industries, the Government must determine what kinds of industry are likely to prove most successful. It must then induce private firms to establish these possibly unfamiliar industries, with agreement upon the amount of subsidy or guarantee.

As the Government alone has a sufficiently comprehensive knowledge of economic conditions, it must be complete master of the situation and itself determine the time and rate at which the new industries are established. The private firms must be ready to co-operate completely with the Government, even if at the time this is against their own private interests.

The requirements of such a policy need merely be stated for the difficulties to be apparent. It is easy to imagine how difficult and ineffective such a dual control could become, with the Government finding the money and determining the policy but private industry carrying it out. Maintenance of employment under such conditions would, though theoretically possible, rest on very shaky foundations.

Some difficulties might be overcome if the Government were to apply compulsion. This would be necessary for the success of the policy if negotiations with private enterprise broke down. But the large-scale compulsory direction of resources as a normal peace-time policy would almost certainly be resisted by private industry. It would have to be enforced. Such a system would not be democratic; in fact, it could even be described as Fascism.

In view of the serious difficulties of the inducement and compulsory policies, there is, at the very least, a strong case for the third method—for the Government itself to establish the required industries. Put at its lowest, one might ask why the Government should pay large subsidies to private industries at the expense of the community, to induce industries to do things the Government could well do itself.

Moreover, the fact that the Government would combine the responsibility for determining general economic policy and for the execution of particular measures would reduce greatly the difficulties of timing and co-ordination which would be inevitable under divided control.

Most significant of all, however, unemployment itself would cease to be a serious danger if the level of production of the

economy were continuously adjusted to changing needs within the framework of an overall plan. There might be errors of judgment in directing resources to different uses, but the problem of depression and unemployment would simply cease to exist. Its solution would come automatically as a by-product of socialised planning for higher standards of living.

Measures to maintain full employment under capitalism either fail to provide an acceptable solution to the problem of unemployment, or they introduce into the capitalist system elements of planning and control which disrupt its proper working. In the last resource, these policies, to be effective, would lead to such a degree of planning that the capitalist system would disappear. Capitalism, therefore, cannot provide any adequate remedy for the problem of depression unemployment. Even if it could, capitalism would still stand condemned because of its inability to achieve maximum production.

In a capitalist society, the aim of each firm is to make the highest possible profit. Profits are the main motivating force behind the system. It is urged that, in the search for profits, capitalists continually direct the productive resources of the community into those industries where they will be of most use in fulfilling people's wants. If there is a big demand for an article, prices and profits in the industry concerned will be high and this will encourage firms to produce it. If demand is slack, profits will be low and production of that article will be discouraged. It is claimed that, as long as nothing is done by company taxation, price control or other methods to interfere with the capitalists' search for profit, the system will automatically achieve maximum production of the things people want.

However, this comfortable theory does not work out in practice. Maximum profits do not necessarily mean either maximum production or production of the things people most want. It is characteristic of capitalism that production of luxuries occurs, while basic needs are left unsatisfied.

In many other ways the interests of private profit clash with public interest under capitalism: advertising and high pressure salesmanship, which waste resources in persuading people to buy what they do not really want; the neglect of unprofitable social needs of culture, education, and art; the destruction of beauty and the creation of ugliness, which have characterised private enterprise in the building of our towns and cities; the cost to the community imposed by reckless farming through soil erosion; the failure of private industry to assume the unprofitable responsibility for the training of skilled workers; product adulteration—all these are examples of the inevitable conflict between private and community interests. A

system based on private profit is fundamentally incompatible with the production of the right things in the right quantities.

Even in what it does produce, the profit system is restrictive and inefficient. A firm usually has a choice between selling a relatively small output at a high price and selling more at a lower price. Given the conditions of modern industry, it will usually pay a firm to sell little at a high price and restrict production accordingly. We have seen that again and again, not only in our manufacturing industries but also in our primary industries.

The relatively small population of Australia means that production of important commodities must be in the hands of one firm, or a few firms, if modern large-scale methods are to be used. Low density of population means that local markets all over Australia are easily dominated by one or two local firms. Under these conditions a large degree of monopoly is inevitable.

One common fallacy in discussion on monopoly is its identification with large-scale production. In fact, through the growth of the trade association, monopoly has spread right throughout Australia and embraces both large and small firms. All these tendencies are accentuated by the well-known phenomenon of interlocking of directorates and ownership of firms.

In a socialist economy it would be possible to enjoy the benefits of economic progress without the disadvantages of private monopoly. It is often argued, as if something profound and decisive were being said, that Socialism would merely mean the substitution of government for private monopoly. This is merely a play upon the word "monopoly". There is all the difference in the world between a monopoly run privately for the purpose of maximum private profit and a monopoly operated by the community in the interests of the community.

Even on the absurd assumption that a socialised industry would restrict output and charge monopoly prices just like a private industry, at least the monopoly profit would accrue to the community in the form of reduced prices for something else, or reduced taxation, instead of to the advantage of some private individual or group.

In fact, however, prices in a Socialist society would be determined on whatever principle is believed to be most in the community interest. For example, price might be equal to production, approximately defined. Provided the efficiency of public enterprise is no less than that of private enterprise, it is certain that under public enterprise prices would be lower and output higher than under private monopoly.

This proviso, of course, is of vital importance. It would be possible for a defender of capitalism to admit all that has been said and yet prefer private ownership of industry. He might feel that the

socialised industries would be less efficiently run than private industries and that this loss of efficiency might be so great as to outweigh the gains from the elimination of private monopoly. This view is often advanced simply because the seriousness of monopoly is not appreciated. In many cases it rests on irrational prejudice against public ownership and enterprise. Casting prejudice aside, it will be admitted that not all private enterprises are efficient and not all government enterprises inefficient.

The true situation is that some public concerns, such as the State Government Insurance Office, the Public Curator's Office, the Commonwealth Bank, T.A.A., the National Shipping Line and many others are very highly efficient, while others are less so. Again, while some Australian industries are highly efficient, some are notoriously inefficient. There are all degrees of efficiency in both public and private enterprise and there is no decisive balance in favour of private ownership.

However, Socialism implies much more than the nationalisation of particular industries for particular reasons. Socialists aim at a change in the character of the economy from one in which industry is mainly privately owned to one in which industry is mainly owned by the community. Full employment cannot be maintained, nor can monopolistic restrictions on production be eliminated, without public ownership of very much more than a few key industries and public utilities.

Socialism embraces no less than the planning of industry as a whole to achieve community objectives relating to employment, production and distribution. A comparison of the relative efficiency of individual industries under private and public control does not do justice to the case for Socialism.

The enormous advantage which the Socialist society possesses of being able to prevent depression and organise industry for the community advantage relegates this question to a secondary order of importance. The ability to continually transfer resources to new forms of production, which a Socialist society possesses, would enable it to maintain permanent full employment. Permanent full employment, and the means used under Socialism to achieve it, would result, in turn, in an expansion of production uninterrupted by periodic depressions, a steady increase in the production of old, and a steady flow of new types of products.

A Socialist society would encourage increased production in a way impossible under capitalism, by an organisation of community-owned industries undreamt of by those who merely want to nationalise a few industries and leave the greater part of private enterprise untouched.

The growth of automation is naturally giving a great deal of concern to various working-class organisations and, indeed, to

a number of employer organisations. I was very pleased indeed to see Mr. Wilson, the Labour leader in Great Britain, give this question very great prominence and deal with it in the manner he did. Personally, I firmly believe that some knowledge of industrial history is very helpful in providing the answer as to how automation is going to affect our social and economic life. Industrial history is the story of man's labour with tools and mechanical power appliances for the satisfaction of his wants. When we speak of the industrial revolution we mean that great transformation which has been brought about during the past 200 years by discoveries and inventions which have altered fundamentally all the methods of production and distribution of the means of life, and consequently revolutionised all the economic functions of society.

Man, who through the long centuries had toiled with his hands aided by crude implements to wrest a pitiful subsistence from nature, suddenly discovered that the blind forces against which he had been struggling could be harnessed to do his work. Through the countless ages humanity had been the helpless prey of the vulture element, consumed by fire, drowned by flood, struck down by lightning, frozen in winter storms and eliminated by pestilence and famine. So man's first action was defensive. He sharpened a piece of wood, polished a flint, kindled a flame; thus industrial history was begun.

Yet the thousands of years that elapsed from primeval days until the 18th century did not produce as many mechanical, technical and scientific triumphs as have been brought forth in the last two centuries. Not since the Industrial Revolution of the 18th century has industry witnessed such far-reaching changes in the method of production as those following the development of automatic control devices, which have made automation possible. There can be no doubt that robots and automation are threatening to revolutionise the gadget age as did the spinning wheel the industrial age, when hand weavers feared for their jobs and their futures.

It is the opinion of many that automation will displace many workers from industry, thereby causing widespread unemployment. If that is so it will be necessary for Governments to cushion the effect of automation when it is introduced into industry. It is true that automation in a mild way has been creeping into our daily lives ever since push-buttons and gadgets took the place of physical exertion. As we watch a bulldozer, a grader, or an excavator at work on an irrigation, main road, railway or building construction job, it is not difficult to visualise the number of semi-skilled and unskilled workers whose services are no longer required on that type of project. The same position is found in the printing industry, where linotype machines have displaced hundreds of hand-setters. And

so it goes on throughout industry generally. The answer, of course, is firstly that no-one would want to return to the pick and shovel or to hand-setting, and, secondly, for every navy, hand-setter, or unskilled or semi-skilled worker put out of employment, many more technicians have been employed manufacturing earth-moving, printing, and other machinery, the use of which has been encouraged by the cheaper cost of production. Thus it is that progress is encouraged, and workmen graduate from the drudgery of antiquity to the status of technical and engineering experts at a higher rate of remuneration and under improved working conditions that formerly were not economically possible.

Naturally the worker fears what will happen during the transition period, covering the stage during which the unskilled worker is trained and acquires the necessary skill and knowledge to become an expert technician. It is the responsibility and the first duty of all Governments to insist that the welfare of any displaced worker should be safeguarded, even if it means a charge on the wealthy companies that are experimenting with automation devices and discoveries.

Another vital social problem arising from automation is the utilisation of the extra leisure time made available by the reduction of working hours so that society can obtain the greatest benefit. Workers must not be left in a position where they will have plenty of time on their hands with nowhere to go and nothing to do. That would not benefit the individual, the race or the nation. It will be the duty of Governments, therefore, to provide opportunities for the technical and cultural advancement of the people by making available technical educational facilities to enable ambitious young men and women to qualify for positions superior to those filled by the unskilled. For those who desire cultural subjects a conservatorium of music, among other things, should be established.

A still shorter working week, which would be made possible by the extension of automation to more and more industries, will call for greater facilities, both cultural and technical, to enable all who so desire to qualify for the highest posts their country can offer.

Even from the sordid, selfish standpoint, the dividend-chasing investor will need to provide his employees with higher salaries, not for their benefit, but to ensure a healthy consumer fund for the effective purchase of more goods and commodities produced by the newest devices. Accordingly, it will be in the interests of the investor's own profits and dividends that any unemployment pools traceable to automation be ended as early as possible. The application of automatic productive techniques in industry and their possible consequences for the working people should have the closest attention of all, particularly members of the Labour Party and the trade-union movement.

Automation has been described as a curse, but is such a pessimistic view justified? If automation is properly handled need such an attitude be adopted towards what, after all, is only a logical adaptation of power, other than human labour, to industry, which presents no problem of itself entirely new? Automation promises a very real possibility of removing much that is monotonous and back-breaking from factory work and I believe that, on this ground alone, it should win the support of the trade-union movement. If by some process the energy stored in coal could be obtained without asking men to go underground and engage in what must be regarded as a dangerous and very strenuous occupation, it would be much better for all those employed underground and for many engaged on the surface in the coal-mining industry. Indeed, it would be to the benefit of mankind generally because it would eliminate for all time the dreadful disasters that occur all too frequently.

Fears are frequently expressed that automation will give rise to widespread unemployment and economic depression, but the people who express such fears have seldom stopped to consider the full impact of greater industrial efficiency on the economy as a whole, nor have they assessed or visualised clearly all the implications and possibilities for the working people in a more advanced economy.

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 5.59 p.m.