

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 15 SEPTEMBER 1964

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

Answer:—

"The Medical Superintendent of the Brisbane General Hospital has advised that the accommodation of male and female patients in wards, suitably divided for the purpose, is not due to overcrowding but for the better medical and nursing care of the patients concerned, and to provide improved working conditions for medical and nursing staff. The partitions dividing these wards are approximately 7 feet in height, and over the years that these arrangements have been in existence, there have not been any complaints from patients or their relatives. The visiting specialist medical staff find these arrangements satisfactory. The general position in regard to the main Brisbane hospitals is that there are sections where there is some overcrowding and other sections where there are vacant beds. The overall situation is receiving close attention and it may be necessary to divert patients from a hospital where sectional overcrowding exists to a hospital where there are vacant beds in a corresponding section. The whole matter is at present being carefully considered with a view to relieving any overcrowding."

COST OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES TO COMALCO AT GLADSTONE AND WEIPA.—Mr. Lloyd, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

What is the estimate of the cost of the provision by the Government of services to (a) the Comalco Alumina Refinery at Gladstone and the Port of Gladstone to service the plant and (b) the town and harbour at Comalco's works at Weipa?

Answer:—

"It is difficult to answer a general question of this nature. Indeed, I am not sure if I clearly understand the information which the Honourable Member seeks. There will be a deal of expenditure by Local Government and Harbour authorities. The Government will have to find loan allocation for the purpose, some of which could be from State Loan Fund. The expenditure by these authorities for services will be fully recoverable by way of charges. The Government will have certain responsibilities for subsidy under the approved loan/subsidy scheme, e.g., in respect of the augmented water supply scheme for Gladstone. Again, we will have certain responsibilities in each centre in respect of housing, but full economic rentals will be charged and will require to be guaranteed by the Company. We will have responsibilities for navigational aids and harbour equipment in both ports, but these costs will be recoverable by pilotage charges and conservancy dues. As is the case everywhere, some of our expenditure will not be recoverable, e.g., subsidies to Local Government, cost of

TUESDAY, 15 SEPTEMBER, 1964

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

QUESTIONS

ADDITIONAL WARDS, BRISBANE GENERAL HOSPITAL.—Mr. Dean, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health,—

In view of the overcrowded conditions existing at the North Brisbane General Hospital, where both women and men patients are accommodated in the same ward with a temporary low partition separating the respective patients, has he made plans for additional wards to be built at that hospital? If not, will he give immediate consideration to having the hospital enlarged, so that the sexes may have their own wards?

hospital and police services at Weipa and the like. The Honourable Member will appreciate that some of the expenditure has been the subject of a preliminary estimate only. However, if he will be more specific in his Question, I will be happy to give him the best of information presently available."

IMPROPER PUBLICATION OF PRELIMINARY COURT PROCEEDINGS.—Mr. Davies for Mr. Bennett, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Justice,—

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the fact that the Association of the Bar of the City of New York intends to spend \$25,000 on the delicate ethical problem between the public's right to learn the news and a defendant's right to full protection under the law in relation to the role of the press, radio and television, following the assassination of President Kennedy and the murder of Lee Harvey Oswald?

(2) If so, does he intend to take any action to ensure that the various news disseminating media in Queensland so conduct themselves as not to improperly publish preliminary court proceedings or any other material which would prejudice a fair trial or influence a prospective jury?

Answers:—

(1) "I am not aware of the position."

(2) "If any of the various news disseminating media in Queensland so conduct themselves as to publish improperly preliminary Court proceedings or any other material which would prejudice a fair trial or influence a prospective jury, any person responsible therefor would render himself liable to the pains and penalties of contempt of Court. I have no knowledge that the Press conducts itself so improperly."

GOLF ASSOCIATION APPLICATION FOR LAND IN TOWN COMMON AREA, TOWNSVILLE.—Mr. Aikens, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Lands,—

With regard to the proposed leasing of 143 acres of the Town Common, Townsville, to the North Queensland Golf Association,—

(1) Is there any connection between the North Queensland Golf Association and the Townsville Golf Club, which holds and uses for golfing purposes a large area of land in Rosslea Estate, Townsville?

(2) What rental will be charged to the North Queensland Golf Association for the lease of the 143 acres for thirty years?

(3) Why was not the application of the North Queensland Golf Association for the lease made public knowledge before the decision to grant it?

(4) Will the Townsville Golf Club continue to function as such after the North Queensland Golf Association begins to function?

Answers:—

(1) "The North Queensland Golf Association administers golf interests in the area between Sarina and Ingham on the east and Winton and Mt. Isa on the west. I am informed that the Townsville Golf Club is affiliated with the Association."

(2) "My Department is considering the application submitted by the North Queensland Golf Association and if a decision is made to lease the area concerned, it is probable that the terms of the lease would be an annual rental of £20 during the first rental period of 10 years. The rent for the second and third rental periods will be determined by the Land Court. In determining a reasonable rental for the first period, regard has to be had to the fact that the land will be used for a recreational purpose and consideration has to be given to the heavy expenditure which will be involved in converting the area into a Golf Course and the provision of necessary club facilities. The fact that in terms of any lease the area must be used for golfing only has a reducing influence on rental value as have the rights of resumption with respect to Special Leases of this kind, which are exercisable on 6 months' notice if this were deemed necessary or advisable in the wider public interest of the people of Townsville."

(3) "My Department receives many applications for land during the ordinary course of business and never has it been practice to formally advertise these as suggested by the Honourable Member. However, the process of inquiry into such applications particularly through Local Authorities, usually leads to publicity and public awareness of such propositions. In this case, the decision of the Townsville City Council to withhold a declaration of its views upon the application until after proper investigation, was published in the local Townsville paper on June 19, 1964. On the following day the local Townsville Radio Station, during its news bulletin, referred to the application and the Council's decision thereon. The application was again considered by the Council during late July and a report of the Council's deliberations appeared in the local newspaper on the 29th of that month. Again on August 15 last, the Golf Course proposal was mentioned in an article in the local Townsville newspaper. Correspondence in my Department indicates that both the Townsville and District Tourist Development Association and the Townsville and District History Society were aware of the proposal. This does not support the inference that the proposed leasing of the Golf Course Area was the subject of confidential consideration."

(4) "Yes. Townsville's golfing community is growing as rapidly as Townsville itself. Membership of the existing club has reached saturation point; a 'waiting list' stage has been reached. I understand that the Townsville Golf Club fully supports the establishment of a second course in Townsville."

RESIGNATIONS FROM TEACHING SERVICE.—Mr. Sherrington, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) What is the number of teachers who have resigned from the Education Department during the past three years?

(2) Is he able to indicate reasons for these resignations?

Answers:—

(1) "1961, 729; 1962, 824; 1963, 1,128."

(2) "The following are among the reasons given for resignations during the current year:—Marriage, 362; Leaving the State, generally for overseas travel, 118; Family, personal and health reasons, 265. Other reasons include entering religious orders (23), full-time study at the University, change of occupation. On the other hand already 630 teachers have been re-admitted to the Teaching Service this year. Many women teachers who resign to marry are re-admitted almost immediately to the service of the Department. With the increasing number of young married women in the service, a progressively greater number will be resigning each year because of approaching motherhood."

PROPOSED DIRECT RAILWAY LINE FROM MOURA TO GLADSTONE.—Mr. Hanson, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

(1) Has he received a request from the Biloea Chamber of Commerce seeking to present a case to him for a direct rail-link from Moura to Gladstone?

(2) As the Biloea Chamber of Commerce has indicated that the Ministers for Mines and Transport have received similar requests, will he accede to the request of the Chamber and with the two aforementioned Ministers meet a deputation accordingly?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "My Government has not made any decision to vary the existing Agreement which provides for a private line for the carriage of coal only between the Moura coalfield and Gladstone, and were it to do so, I reiterate my recent statement that any such variation would be brought before this House for validation. For this reason, I see no necessity for me or any of my Ministers to receive a deputation in this matter from the Biloea Chamber of Commerce or any other organisation."

CAMP SITE AT KURANDA FOR NATIONAL FITNESS COUNCIL.—Mr. Wallis-Smith, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

In view of the urgent need by the National Fitness Council for an area and buildings for camps and training, will he give sympathetic consideration to their request for portion of the area and buildings previously used by the Co-ordinator-General's Department at Kuranda?

Answer:—

"As I recently advised the Honourable Member for Mulgrave, who had previously made representations to me in this matter on behalf of the National Fitness Council, the situation regarding these buildings at Kuranda is that some are being removed for use in connection with the Collinsville Power Station Water Supply. It will not be until later in the year that a final assessment of building requirements can be made and the site vacated. The interests of the National Fitness Council will, however, be kept in mind."

SCHOOL BUS SERVICES, TOLGA-MILLAA MILLAA.—Mr. Wallis-Smith, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) How many school bus services operated to serve schools along the Tolga-Millaa Millaa railway prior to August, 1963?

(2) What was the cost of these services?

(3) How many new services have been instituted since that date?

(4) What is the cost of all services on this line?

Answers:—

(1) "Thirteen (13)."

(2) "£13,935 per annum."

(3) "One (1). This was the duplication of an existing service."

(4) "£14,703 per annum. It might be noted that transport services to cater for primary and secondary education in this area were instituted prior to 1963. It is unlikely that further services will be established."

PARKING OF MOTOR VEHICLES, BUNDA-
BERG.—Mr. Walsh, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Mines,—

Is there anything contained in any Act or any regulation or any direction by a statutory authority that would prevent the Bundaberg City Council from imposing within any particular part of the area under its jurisdiction a time limit on the parking of motor vehicles other than by the installation of parking meters?

Answer:—
"Yes."

CAPITAL COST OF PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS, BRISBANE.—Mr. Bromley, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) What is the capital cost of (a) primary school buildings and (b) secondary school buildings in the Metropolitan area?

(2) What would be the average cost to replace (a) a primary school and (b) a secondary school?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "As Primary Schools and Secondary Schools are of various sizes and of different types of construction, it is not practicable to advise as to the average cost of replacement of either a primary or secondary school. However, as an indication of costs in the Metropolitan area, the following particulars are furnished: The Mount Gravatt South State Primary School comprising eight (8) general purpose classrooms, administration accommodation, toilets, &c., cost £55,000 approximately, exclusive of land and ground improvements. The Balmoral State High School buildings were erected at a cost of £165,548."

PAPERS

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

Reports—

Public Service Commissioner for the year 1963-64.

Golden Casket Art Union for the year 1963-64.

Operations provided for by Part III.—Aid to Development, of "The Financial Arrangements and Development Aid Acts, 1942 to 1947."

Agricultural Bank for the year 1963-64.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

The Fisheries Acts, 1957 to 1962.

The Harbours Acts, 1955 to 1964.

The City of Brisbane Market Acts, 1960 to 1962.

Order in Council appointing Committee of Inquiry to inquire into Representation on Canegrowers' Organisations.

Regulations under—

The Abattoirs Acts, 1930 to 1958.

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

AMPOL REFINERIES LIMITED AGREEMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong)—Minister for Industrial Development): I move—

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill with respect to an agreement between the State of Queensland and Ampol Refineries Limited and for purposes incidental thereto."

Motion agreed to.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—SEVENTH ALLOTTED DAY

Debate resumed from 10 September (see p. 342) on Mr. Lee's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Mulgrave) (11.20 a.m.): I rise to support the motion before the House so ably moved by the hon. member for Yeronga and seconded by the hon. member for Warwick. I feel sure that the approach of each impressed every hon. member. The background of the hon. member for Warwick and his experience before entering the House will stand him in good stead. I have no doubt that the same can be said for the hon. member for Yeronga, and that, with their experience, both members will represent their electorates with dignity, decorum, and satisfaction. I have no doubt that as time goes on they will, like their predecessors, leave their marks in the political history of the State. I wish them both long and successful parliamentary careers, and offer them my congratulations.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber. It must be most difficult for "Hansard" to hear the hon. member for Mulgrave.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: In common with other members, I regret the untimely passing of the predecessors of these hon. members, each of whom made a worthy contribution as a Parliamentarian and a Minister of the Crown, as well as in the work he was doing before he entered Parliament. I had a lifetime association with the late hon. member for Warwick, Mr. Madsen. We were neighbours in my boyhood days, and I know the part that he played in the industry with which he was closely associated before entering Parliament. I know, too, what the people engaged in that industry thought of him. He became a leader in the dairying industry and had to relinquish the top position in it when he became a Minister. This experience provided him with an excellent background to discharge ably the duties of the important portfolio that was ultimately allotted to him when

this Government came to office in 1957. When any representatives of our great primary industries had occasion to approach him as a Minister, they were always sympathetically heard, and, if he could accede to their wishes, he would do so. The State is indeed the loser by his passing.

Much the same can be said of the late Dr. Noble. His experience before entering Parliament stood him in good stead in discharging his duties as a Minister of the Crown. He did much for the health services of the State, and I know that those who have been unfortunate enough to have to use them are very appreciative of his efforts. He left many things that will serve as monuments to him in the days to come. It is a great pity that he was not spared sufficiently long to see more of his plans come to fruition.

I, in common with other members, would like to express my deep sympathy to the relatives of both the late hon. members.

I, too, feel that I must express the loyalty of the people of Mulgrave to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen and the Throne, and the hope that she is long spared to reign over us in the manner in which she has done since assuming her very responsible position. I express also my appreciation, and that of the people whom I have the honour to represent, of the efforts of the Governor, Sir Henry Abel Smith, and his capable lady, Lady May. They have travelled extensively in the State and have become conversant with its industries and its potential.

As hon. members know, Sir Henry recently paid a visit to the Gulf of Carpentaria and to Aurukun Mission, which is a very fine mission station in the area. He has given encouragement and hope to people in distant parts of the State, and I know that we all appreciate the work that he has done and is doing. When the time comes for him to relinquish his office, I am sure that he will, with his extensive knowledge of Queensland, become one of our best ambassadors. I wish him good fortune and good health for the remaining portion of his term.

I think I should express my appreciation to you, Mr. Speaker, for the work that you have done since you became Speaker of this Assembly.

Mr. Newton: You are "lollyng" them up this morning.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I think the hon. member will agree with me that Mr. Speaker has spared no effort in trying to improve the comfort of hon. members, not only in the Chamber but in other parts of the building. It ill-becomes hon. members opposite to interject, because I have been told—I believe it, too—that some hon. members who came into this House while Labour Governments were in office were unable to find chairs to sit on and had to go to the markets and get fruit

cases for this purpose. There has been a marked improvement over the past seven years. It is necessary only to look at this Chamber and see the comfortable seats that have been provided for hon. members to know what I am talking about, and I express my appreciation to you, Mr. Speaker, for what you have done.

Mr. Hanson: Get on with your speech.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I shall deal with things in my own way.

Although you have done these things, Mr. Speaker, I know that you have experienced some criticism and had to overcome difficulties. I remind hon. members that anyone who strives to do something lays himself open to criticism. Only those who swim with the tide and do nothing can hope to escape it. Here we have a man who is interested in the members of this Chamber and their welfare in every way. I have approached him more than once with small problems and he has always done what he can to assist me with them. Hon. members opposite appreciate his attitude, too, because he has done a great deal to help them. They have much better facilities today than they have ever had before, and I do not think that they should be criticising him.

There are many problems still to be overcome, and Mr. Speaker knows that. The offices in which we work are overcrowded, and it is often difficult to find a place in which one can confer privately with constituents; but I am sure that he will do all he can to improve still further the facilities available to hon. members, who, after all, have the responsibility of representing the people of Queensland.

When I first became a member of this Assembly, I was rather surprised by the difficulties under which hon. members laboured. Before my election I had had some experience of facilities provided by private enterprise, and I expected something much better than I found here. I point out that our employees in this building are now working under improved conditions, too.

Mr. Hughes: The House was falling down.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: That is so.

Some time ago when the Chamber was being painted, I asked how long it was since it had been painted previously. The person to whom I was speaking scratched his head and said, "I have been here 35 years and I cannot remember seeing it painted in that time." Mr. Speaker has had the Chamber re-painted in attractive colours, and he is giving hon. members every facility that he can. The least we can do is to show our gratitude, and I want to put it on record that members on this side of the House, at least, appreciate what you are doing, Mr. Speaker, and the improvements that you have made for our comfort.

I wish now to devote some of the time available to me to dealing with the industries of Queensland, particularly those in the North, and put before the House some thoughts on what we might do to develop the northern part of the State. The word "development" has become of very great importance, particularly during the last few years. I think it is good that its use has become so widespread. In almost every newspaper one picks up, somebody is writing about developing the northern part of this continent. Ultimately, much good must come of this. It is only in recent times that these writings have come from people in the southern part of the continent who have an opportunity to visit the North and, for this, I give this Government much credit. This Government's Ministers are great ambassadors for development. They have done everything possible with the resources available to them. I know there are not sufficient but it is at least heartening to know that there are people in Australia today who are interested in developing the northern part of the State.

In addition, from time to time committees are set up in an effort to do something in this regard, but whilst it is very desirable to encourage new industries—nobody would like to see them more than I—we should do everything possible to encourage the expansion of the industries we already have in this part of the State because they are the industries that have done for North Queensland all that has been done so far. If we can expand them year by year they will play an even greater part in the future than they have in the past.

Mr. Aikens: Then you have to convince your Government to buy the products of those industries.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: We do not have to convince the Government. Unfortunately, we have to convince many people outside. As I walk through shops I look at what they display and I have seen bacon from the other end of the continent being sold here.

I think we could do much to develop North Queensland with the industries that are presently there. Of course, if we can encourage more to come, that is all to the good. The industries that play the most important part in my electorate, and in other northern areas, are sugar, dairying, timber, maize, potatoes, cattle-fattening, and various other industries such as the fruit and vegetable industries, particularly tropical fruits.

As I said earlier, those industries have done for Queensland what has already been done. They have been responsible for encouraging local settlement and for the existing amenities, and I think we should do everything possible to encourage their expansion. I know it is a very difficult problem because in many parts of Australia

at the present time there is over-production in some primary industries. Particularly is this so in the dairying industry and the potato-growing industry and, to some extent in the maize industry.

There is a particular problem in the maize-growing industry in the North at the present time but I sincerely hope that it will not remain unsolved for long. At this stage I should like to commend the present Minister for Primary Industries, as well as his predecessor in office, for their efforts to overcome this problem. I recently visited the experimental station and saw what the Tableland maize-breeder is doing to overcome the problem of rust. If the Government could do more and if the industry could do something to help the breeder, probably he would overcome this problem more rapidly. I am glad the Minister is in the Chamber as he knows that the breeder must have a glasshouse—

Mr. Row: He is getting it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I am very pleased to hear that and I congratulate the Minister for his very sympathetic approach. I was with him when the breeder asked him for a glasshouse and he said, "I should like to give it to you but I have no money. I will do what I can in the future." The Minister could perhaps meet the maize-growers at a later stage and suggest that they might follow the example of the sugar industry and make a small grant so that the breeder can get on with the job. The sum involved would not be great. I have no doubt that the problem of rust will be overcome and then maize will be in a similar position to our other primary products.

I think I heard the hon. member for Bundaberg talking about the sugar industry, in which at the present time far-reaching expansion is taking place. It will do a lot for North Queensland, although the expansion is taking place throughout the sugar-growing areas and there will be approximately 1,000 new farmers. In turn these farmers will need to make more demands on the various services and they will help to expand the other industries, although it will be only in a small way. We must try to do better than that. There is little use or sense in encouraging these people to market their products on southern markets. Apart from the problem of transporting their produce long distances, in many instances they have to compete with people who are in the same position as they are with over-production. Of necessity we must turn our eyes to the north of this continent where living conditions of a substantial population are gradually improving. From experience I know that some of these countries are very anxious to do business with us. They are very anxious to know what we have to sell. Here I must congratulate the dairying industry for what it has done. It got out and started looking

for markets. I am glad to see that it is finding them. To some extent the sugar industry has done the same thing. It brings home forcefully the need to do something in this field. I have had long discussions with the Minister on this matter. I know that recently he had occasion to visit one of the islands. He was not asleep when he went there, but unfortunately he did not have sufficient time to explore the market position fully. We must do everything possible to encourage trade with these countries.

Industries such as dairying and maize have done much to open up and develop the Atherton Tableland. To further expand these industries new markets with reasonable prices must be found. The obtaining and expanding of new markets can be achieved only by careful planning in conjunction with the industries, some of which have lapsed more or less into stagnation from a lack of markets. When you talk to these people about expanding they think that there is something wrong with you. We have to encourage these people. They are capable of doing a job if they are shown the way and if they know they can get markets at reasonable prices.

It is interesting to note what has occurred in the sugar industry in recent times. It has become Queensland's most valuable primary product.

Mr. Walsh: A great example of sound Labour thinking.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I would not say it was sound Labour thinking. I have had something to do with the sugar industry. I would say it was sound industry leadership. When Labour was in office, on some occasions, the industry had to wait weeks to get an interview, and then we did not always get what we wanted. Nevertheless, I give credit where it is due to the late Hon. H. H. Collins, who, as Minister for Agriculture and Stock, did what he could for the industry. Perhaps he may have done more only for lack of support from his Labour colleagues. Since the Labour Government left office an approach to the powers-that-be has been very easy.

The sugar industry has reached the stage where it is displacing wool and wheat in importance. In 1962-63 its gross value exceeded £60,000,000 representing more than 50 per cent. of the State's primary production. Of course, when this expansion takes place, as long as we can get reasonable markets and prices overseas that picture will change even more. It is true that we have commanded an extraordinarily high price on the free-world sugar market in the last 12 months or so. However, it is not so heartening to learn that at the end of last week the price was very low in comparison with that of 12 months ago. At the end of last week the free-world market price of sugar in London was approximately £33 10s.

a ton. I sincerely hope the low prices do not continue, otherwise the expansion in the industry may not be successful. However, I have much confidence in the men who have planned the expansion; so far as is possible at this stage, I am sure they are aware of the vagaries that lie ahead.

There is room for expansion in the dairying industry on the Atherton Tableland if we explore to the full the markets that are now available. This industry supplies a substantial area of the northern part of the State and has one of the longest milk runs in the world, extending to centres as far away as Mt. Isa and Home Hill. There are two dairy factories in my electorate which are branching out; one is manufacturing powdered milk and the other is going into cheese production. If we encourage the sale of these products in the islands to the north I am sure there will be much room for expansion which, in turn, will do a great deal for the northern part of the State.

Mr. Walsh: What about the pineapple-growers?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The pineapple-growers have possibilities, too. There are no better pineapples, bananas, papaws, or other tropical fruits, than those grown in the North, and I am sure the hon. member knows that. It is a pity that markets cannot be further exploited for those fruits.

I am deeply concerned about the timber industry, which has done much to aid North Queensland. This industry, which extends all over North Queensland, has had its ups and downs—I think more downs than ups—since its establishment. It is time to give national consideration to timber production so that we may get stability for this very important industry. Looking back over the past, we cannot be very proud of our record in Queensland. Queensland was one State in the Commonwealth that was bountifully endowed with timber. Perhaps we were not as fortunate as some other places in the world, but compared with the rest of Australia we were pretty well off with softwoods, hardwoods and all types of cabinet timbers. Unfortunately, we cut it, burnt it, and did many other things to destroy it and today, instead of the industry expanding with an expanding population and development in other spheres, it is retracting.

Mr. Bromley: Because you have not had any long-range projects.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The hon. member is dead right. When his party was in power it had no great interest in long-range planning. We took what nature gave us and expected nature to go ahead with the job. Many people must bear the blame. Nevertheless, it is useless crying about what has happened in the past. It is our duty to try to do something to right the wrong while we still have an opportunity. There is a tremendous potential in Queensland for

timber production. Queensland has virtually everything that is required. There were some very good stands of hoop pine, bunya pine, cypress pine and hardwood which some of the other States would have been very pleased to have. In the northern part of the State we had Kauri pine and bull blue pine, and many varieties of the best cabinet and furniture woods in the world, but these timbers, too, were cut without thought for the future.

Mr. Walsh: Years ago they used to make fruit cases from silky oak.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: And houses, too. However, it is not much good harking back to the past; it is better to plan for the future. The Government must take a positive stand and provide much more money so that we may get on with reforestation schemes before it is too late. I know that the department is doing everything possible with the resources available. It is treating scrub in North Queensland, leaving it to nature to rejuvenate, and the department has plantations in the southern part, and farther up as well. By these means the department is trying to replenish softwood supplies, which have deteriorated remarkably in the last few years. However, what is being done is not keeping pace with the times. It breaks my heart—and I know all hon. members have these problems—to have someone writing in wanting to start a sawmill, saying that he has outlets for his products, and to have to refuse his request because not enough timber is available. That is what is happening today.

The trend over the last few years shows what has happened to the number of mills in Queensland. I should like to correct a thought I have heard expressed that timber is a done product, and that the decline in the number of mills does not matter because not much timber is used today, as houses are now being built of brick, aluminium and other materials. I am reliably informed that today two-thirds of the average house consists of wood products in one form or another. People could be forgiven for gaining the wrong impression, because not many weatherboard houses are built today.

Mr. Duggan: We are importing £90,000,000 worth of timber a year.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: And we will be importing a lot more unless something is done. I am glad the Leader of the Opposition shares my views.

If two-thirds of the home consists of timber products, we must realise the importance of the industry and should do something to provide sufficient raw materials to keep it going. In this morning's newspaper the Premier issued a warning on costs. With the provision of more materials, and encouragement to bring plants up to date, the Premier will achieve his objective of lowering costs.

To give an idea of the trend that has taken place, I shall quote some statistics. In 1941-42 there were 367 sawmills and plymills in the State, with a work force of just over 6,000, producing 198,000,000 super feet of timber, 80,000,000 square feet of plywood, and 28,000,000 square feet of veneer. Most of the veneer would be manufactured in the North where there are such beautiful cabinet timbers.

The latest figures available, taken from the 1964 Year Book, show that there are 584 sawmills and plymills, employing just over 7,000 people, and producing 206,000,000 super feet of sawn timber, 85,000,000 square feet of plywood, and 169,000,000 square feet of veneer.

In the period from 1941 to 1962 the greatest number of sawmills and plymills we had was 671; that was in 1951-52. The work force was almost 9,000. The production was 263,000,000 super feet of timber, 110,000,000 square feet of plywood, and 47,000,000 square feet of veneer.

Since then there has been a decline in the number of sawmills and the amount of production, which is regrettable. The prime reason, as the department knows full well, is that if the private sources of timber are cut out in this State, the department will be hard put to supply the people who are dependent on it for raw material.

Mr. Walsh: It is mostly hardwood.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: No. The whole picture is very bad. There is hardly any kauri pine. The latest bulletin from the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics shows that we are not producing much kauri pine. It is slipping back. That is something we should endeavour to overcome. We are not short of land, and we are not short of men with the know-how. It breaks my heart when I go to other parts of Australia, such as South Australia, where there was not much timber in the early stages, and find that they are on the up-and-up and are now exporting timber to Queensland. When you go to the top, you will find that nine out of ten of the men directing affairs are Queenslanders. It is a tragedy that has been allowed to happen.

Mr. Muller: The reason is that the royalties on log timber are too low. No-one would protect it. The only fellow who gets nothing is the one who looks after the trees.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: That could be so. We have done all sorts of things. In many instances we tried to burn some varieties of timber because there was no market for them at that time.

Mr. Walsh: Bush fires in the ranges.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: They took their toll, too. A halt has to be called, because this industry is so important not only to Queensland but to Australia. As the Leader of the Opposition said a while ago, we are

importing timber, and we will be importing much more if we do not endeavour to do something about it.

Mr. Walsh: Strangely enough, they are importing tobacco.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Yes, but that is a problem that I am not dealing with now.

In the last ten years there has been a decrease of 87 in the number of mills. The figures that I have used indicate what is happening. In even the last 12 months there has been a further decrease of nine mill licences in the Cairns area. On the one hand, there are people complaining that they cannot get sawn timber of various sizes, and, on the other, sawmills are closing.

One wonders what brings this position about. I am convinced that the problem is in the source of supply. The private timber owners are making a very fair contribution to overall production, but it is still waning. The department is aware of what can be done, and there are here men capable of doing it. What we do not have is the necessary finance.

Mr. Hanson: Whose fault is that?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: It is the fault of all of us. The Government of hon. members opposite had a very poor record. At least we are doing something, little as it may be. Approximately 4,000 acres a year have been planted in the last few years. It is true that the cut-off is improving, but it is not nearly enough. Some of the products being turned out are very interesting. Some firms in Brisbane are producing articles of which we can be proud, but the supply of materials is not sufficient.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: Do you think we should be planting scrub areas when we take timber out of them?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Not exactly, because some lands may be fit for other uses. This is an industry that I know, because I served an apprenticeship of some 20 years in it. Round Kuranda there is a lot of country that is at present regarded as useless but will nevertheless grow good timber. Those areas should be planted. They grow very good softwoods and some of the best hardwood produced in the State. This is one of the few areas in which hickory grows well. Some of the best stands of kauri pine that I have ever seen have been in the area and round Black Mountain and at the back of Kuranda. Available land is not the trouble; it is money. We have men capable of doing the job, and they are doing it now. What is needed is more finance.

I was interested to see the Commonwealth Government coming to the fore. A National Forestry Council has been set up. I read in "The Australian" the other day of what is happening in New South Wales. This is

good from the Australian point of view, but it does not please me very much. It concerns timber plans for Eden, on the Victorian border. This is what the article says—

"N.S.W.'s far south coast will get a much needed shot in the arm when plans are finalised for a crash reafforestation programme by the National Forestry Council."

I ask hon. members to note that it is referred to as a "crash" programme. That is good. I am not against New South Wales doing what it is doing—Australia will need all the timber it can get in the near future—but I want to see development in Queensland because this State has a greater timber potential than has New South Wales. As I said earlier, we can grow all types of timber here, and we must now convince the Minister for National Development of this. I think that he already understands the problems facing the timber industry, and we should give him all the information we can. He is very concerned about the problems, as anybody who studies them would be.

The Leader of the Opposition mentioned Queensland's timber imports. We have been importing timber for many years, and Australia's import bill at present is something of the order of £90,000,000. If this trend continues, even with our meagre plantations the gap between our needs and our production by the turn of the century will be about 50 per cent. If we are to close this gap, we must step up the annual plantings in Australia to about 40,000 or 50,000 acres. Queensland should play its part in this respect, because for various reasons it is probably more favourably situated than most other States. Nature was very good to us in the early stages in the supplies of natural timber with which we were blessed, but we did not have the intelligence to help nature by classifying lands and preserving forests.

I do not want to be critical of Labour Governments, but this is something on which they let the State down badly. The Country-Liberal Government has certainly improved the position, but it has not gone far enough yet. Labour Governments were very reluctant to declare State forests or to give the Department of Forestry land in its own right, and we have seen our timber reserves dwindling and dwindling. Naturally, the department was loth to spend money on land over which it had no secure tenure. As I said, I do not want to be critical of former Governments, but this is now a matter of history, whether it was done because of a lack of understanding or for some other reason.

I am counselling a positive approach to the problem now. The industry is capable of employing many people, and the demand is there for timber. We have the land; we have the men; we have the know-how. The only thing we lack is sufficient money, and I am sure that if we make a proper approach

while we have a man of the calibre of the present Minister for National Development, Mr. David Fairbairn, in charge of this important portfolio, we will make some progress. He has already demonstrated his interest in the problems.

Mr. Murray: He is a practical man.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: That is correct. There is no doubt that he is interested; he has already demonstrated that.

Mr. Davies: In what way?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: If the hon. member gets "The Australian" of 11 September, 1964 and turns to page 14, he will see an interesting article that I recommend he should read. All I am asking is that the Minister and the Government make a positive approach to take advantage of the expansion that undoubtedly is coming in the timber industry and its by-products in the next few years.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I forgot to give the hon. member the five-minute bell. He has only two minutes left.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: In that two minutes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak about the potato industry. It is expanding too, and it is interesting to note that, even with the depressed price over the past 12 months, the industry is worth over £200,000 a year to the Tablelands. We have a potential there that not too many people have with this industry. We can produce potatoes almost the whole year round, but here again the future of the industry depends upon obtaining markets. I know that this Government will not be found wanting in that direction. All I want it to do is to join with the industry and get on with the job, first of all, of exploring markets and, secondly, of arranging transport. If that is done, I know the industry is quite capable of playing its part.

I am sorry I have not more time at my disposal to speak of some of the other potentials of the North. I should like to say something about the meat industry and just what is going on in that sphere.

Mr. Newton: Talk about the price of meat.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I am afraid I have not time on this occasion.

(Time expired.)

Mr. BROMLEY (Norman) (12.1 p.m.): I thought it rather funny, Mr. Speaker, that you forgot to give the bell to the previous speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will continue with his speech. I do not want any comment on that incident.

Mr. BROMLEY: I simply wanted to say that I thought you were waiting for the hon. member to burst into the old song, "They cut down the old pine tree and carried

it away to the mill." He was completely wrapped up in the timber industry but I thought he was barking too much and, in fact, up the wrong tree. As a matter of fact, it might be interesting to remind hon. members that only a few years ago there was on the Business Paper a motion by the hon. member for Maryborough designed to deal with the timber industry. We of the Australian Labour Party realise that over the last seven years this industry has deteriorated considerably, but I am not going to make a song and dance about it. If the Government had considered it so important, as the hon. member has said, why did it not do something about it and bring up the motion of the hon. member for Maryborough for general discussion?

It is usual in speaking to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to pay tribute to the Governor and to his wife, Lady May. Of course, one must also mention allegiance to the Crown. In doing so, I should like to include the allegiance of all A.L.P. members in Queensland particularly those in my electorate of Norman, together with the electors.

In this debate, which is shortly to conclude, Government members have risen one after the other and praised Government policy and the various Ministers. I do not know what policy they can praise but I have never in all my life heard so much rot and crawling. They speak of private enterprise. So far as I am concerned, their attitude has been typical of the crawling of underlings to the bosses in private enterprise. It is sickening.

The hon. member for Clayfield, a Johnny-come-lately in the party, came in here like a knight in shining armour.

Mr. Hanlon: Like a white tornado.

Mr. BROMLEY: Yes, he entered, with a few other members clustered around him, as the hon. member says, like a white tornado. He built up a small band of followers and began to state, "I am the leader of a brand new cause." I can imagine the call of bugles as he leaves home every morning saying, "Murray is here. Look out, Standing Orders and the Constitution, here I come." That is all he spoke of in this debate.

It is a pity Mr. Speaker is not in the chair at the moment. If he were, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would advise him to beware of this self-styled knight in shining armour because I think he will huff and puff and endeavour to blow this House down. He could not blow a pack of cards down. He is certainly never going to blow Mr. Speaker down. There is no way in the world he is going to try it.

Let me debunk some of the praise heaped on the various Ministers. At times when hon. members opposite were praising the Ministers I interjected that we should send for a shovel

or bulldozer. However, that was not necessary because we have an efficient staff in Parliament House, and they did a very good job. I want to remove some of the halos that Government backbenchers think the Ministers are wearing. The other day we listened to the hon. member for Albert. He is not here this morning. He is probably in his electorate worrying about the formation of Liberal Party branches. The other day he said he would tell the Minister for Transport what he should do with his railway line. I do not think he was "fair dinkum" about doing something for the people in his electorate and south of his electorate when he was making suggestions about what should be done before the railway line is pulled up.

As much as I dislike quoting while making a speech, I believe that an article I have here dealing with the Minister for Transport should be included in "Hansard". It is taken from an editorial in the "Isis Recorder" of Thursday, 14 May, 1964, so it is of recent origin.

Mr. Davies: It is a Childers newspaper?

Mr. BROMLEY: Yes, it is published in the area "presided over" by Mr. Pizzey. I think those are the right words to use, seeing that he was a school teacher and is the Minister for Education.

The article states—

"Mr. Chalk—And Others
We'll Never Forget You

"June 30, 1964, is a day the Isis people will never forget the State Transport Minister (Mr. Gordon Chalk), and the Liberal-Country Party State Government will also live in our memories as the team of persons who were instrumental in regrading our town to a place without the amenities of a railway line—a shocking retrogressive step and certainly not one of which those responsible can be proud."

Mr. Davies: That was supported by the Country Party, too.

Mr. BROMLEY: Certainly it was.

The article continues—

"The Isis is a valuable area in the State's economy but—according to our Minister—the area does not warrant a railway.

"He prefers to give trade away which should be carried on our State-owned railways, over to private hauliers. Of course that means nothing to Mr. Chalk. If the railways never pay, they'll never be broke.

"In between the date of our deputation to Mr. Chalk in Bundaberg and the (and this is funny) promised date when the line would come up for reconsideration by State Cabinet we were shown scale freight rates acceptable to the Department and our Shire Council was advised to apply for money to improve the Isis Junction road.

"Certainly Mr. Chalk's promise was merely to keep us 'off his back' and allow him to continue with his almost arrogant attitude towards the wishes of the people of the Isis, unhindered.

"And Mr. Pizzey, what did you do? Precious little to prevent Mr. Chalk's centralization (and isolation) policy. The dye has been applied and the stain will remain as a reminder to us of personalities who are entrusted with such responsible and important portfolios.

"And, of course, if we paid Ford, Bacon and Davis £100,000 to isolate Childers, we'll also remember the Yanks. We may as well put a few Yanks up for the next election.

"If—and we doubt it—our railways had to go, it has happened at least ten years before it should. Our roads are definitely not suitable for any more heavy transport vehicles."

That, of course, is a matter for the Minister for Main Roads.

The article continues—

"The Road Safety Council certainly has the job in front of it now.

"We remember when the T.A.B. furniture and fixtures, &c., arrived in Childers by Carters Transport"—

While I am speaking of the T.A.B., I should like to relate a very funny incident which occurred on Saturday afternoon. During the debate the other day the hon. member for Aubigny referred to the T.A.B. being here, there and everywhere. On Saturday afternoon, during the council by-election for the South Brisbane ward, a person walked into the T.A.B. with a how-to-vote card and so on to lodge an informal vote with the T.A.B. It was a humorous incident; I should imagine that he was a member of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Walsh: He was probably on a dead horse.

Mr. BROMLEY: He voted for the wrong one because I saw the how-to-vote card.

The article continues—

"We remember when the T.A.B. furniture and fixtures, etc., arrived in Childers by Carters Transport—one State Department not patronising its own Railways but Mr. Chalk blames us entirely. How much of our new State School's equipment came by road transport? Another Government Department which didn't help us any. Close the line, leave it for 12 months, then re-open it—and then if we don't use it—you will be justified in taking up the line, but first give us a chance."

The article then says that Mr. Pizzey, the member for Isis, now resides in Brisbane, and could not care less. We should keep this article in mind because it gives us some idea of the thoughts of many people towards the Minister for Transport and the Government.

Certain members of the Government delight in interfering in A.L.P. affairs, and in being filthy in their allegations. Although they do not know what they are talking about they like to do that because they know their speeches will be mentioned in the Press as the A.L.P. is so important to the people of Australia. Some hon. members opposite have referred to arguments within our party. If we do have arguments they are for the benefit of the people of Australia and are not of a serious nature affecting the internal working of the party. However, the coalition Government, which is often described as "a marriage of convenience," is not a marriage but a state of illegitimacy. The arguments that the coalition parties are involved in at present are vital to each party's existence and also to the welfare of Queensland. One can only describe it as a fight to the death; it is a test of strength and endurance for each party. With the introduction of preferential voting, of course, the Country Party members were sold down the line. They were "conned" into it by the Premier. They thought, "If we give our proxy vote to somebody there is a possibility that we may become Ministers," but of course that did not happen.

Mr. Sherrington: Do you think the Liberals will fight to the last Country Party man?

Mr. BROMLEY: I think they will fight to the death of one another.

Mr. Ramsden: You are a bit short of information.

Mr. BROMLEY: In reply to the "tunnel maker" from Merthyr, I have plenty of information. There are quite bitter fights going on in the House, its lobbies, and outside. It happens even up on Wickham Terrace. I was up there the other day and could hear the arguments floating out onto the roadway.

Mr. Ramsden: Were you a peeping Tom?

Mr. BROMLEY: No. I was in a traffic jam outside, and could hear what was going on. Not only up there, but also in the House, and in the street, the Liberals are saying that their colleagues of the Country Party are insignificant puppets, and that when the new system of the Tory Party comes into being and they establish Liberal Party branches in the various Country Party areas, they will "do" those Country Party puppets like a dinner. That is the type of expression we hear. I see the Minister for Primary Industries laughing to himself, but he is only laughing to bolster his own confidence.

Mr. Row: That is only wishful thinking.

Mr. BROMLEY: The Minister says it is wishful thinking on the part of Liberal members. I think he is right.

While the Minister for Main Roads might be giving the game away shortly, he is not a bad punter and he is prepared to bet

that the Liberal Party branches will not hit the deck, and that although they might open in some areas they will not be in the race in defeating Country Party members. Personally, I think they will get a big hiding; they will be of immense assistance to the Australian Labour Party. We are staging many rural conferences, which will build up the Australian Labour Party further in the eyes of the people.

Referring briefly to the fight between the Liberal Party and the Country Party on Senate selections, the whole set-up reminds me of a story which I have often told about a fairly important person who was sent to a country town. He met the local good-time girl, and the way he finished up is nobody's business. He was told he was going where no man had been before, and that was not on the top of the Senate ballot paper. This person and the girl concerned had differing political persuasions.

I express my sorrow at the death of Dr. Noble. Of course, that does not prevent me from attacking the Department of Health, either now or in the future. I am going to have a fight with the policy and administration of the present Minister for Health, Mr. Tooth. I have been asked many times, "Does wisdom still exist in our hospital system?" It is well known that we have had many reports of complaints and dissatisfaction. Many people have come to me personally, and I intend to deal with this question while I have this opportunity. It seems there is a five-part policy, as follows—

1. To endeavour to discourage the admission of patients.
2. To discharge patients as soon as possible, whether or not they are in a fit and proper state of health to be so discharged.
3. To gradually eliminate the free-hospital system.
4. To dictate to the hospitals boards, and freeze the money available for necessary medicines and equipment.
5. To overwork the staff.

Mr. Windsor: You should read the Minister's report. There is an answer for each of those points.

Mr. BROMLEY: I do not need to read the report. I have reports direct from the people in the hospitals concerned. They are either working there or are patients there. I feel that if one gets the story from where the trouble starts, it will be the true story.

I have never castigated the staff of any public hospital; rather have I taken the reverse attitude, as "Hansard" will show. I have always praised nurses. As a matter of fact, I often wonder why so many enter and remain in this calling. Nursing is a wonderful profession, although it amazes me that after working in hospitals for three, four, five, or six months, girls decide to

remain there. Young women of this calibre should have nothing but praise heaped upon their heads. I believe that they are magnificent. Many of the jobs that they have to do are very hard, and I think that nurses can be described only as angels of mercy. I have nothing but praise for them.

I am going to substantiate my statements numbered 1 to 5 with one or two brief examples of what I consider to be gross neglect not only by the department but perhaps on the part of the administration. I do not believe that the staff is directly responsible for this sort of thing because, like all employees, they are told what to do and they have to do it or lose their jobs.

I quote, first of all, the case of my mother. She was sent to the General Hospital with a letter of admission from her doctor, who had been treating her for many years. When she got to the casualty department, after a wait of an hour and 20 minutes she was examined and told, "You are all right. You are not sick at all. You can go home." She was then sent home. I was not there at the time, but my sister was with her.

At a later date a second letter was given by her doctor, who is Dr. Macfie of Nundah and is very well known, for her admission to hospital when she took a bad turn. Again the same thing happened. I was in Brisbane on this occasion. My sister rang me and told me what had happened. I said, "I will see what I can do." I rang the Acting Superintendent of the hospital at the time and explained that this doctor had been treating her for some time and I thought that she should be admitted to hospital. The Acting Superintendent said, "I think you are acting with the natural concern of a son for his ill mother." I said, "That is quite true, but at the same time I feel that she should be admitted." He said, "We decide that here." I then said, "I am acting also as a member of Parliament." I do not believe in using that sort of remark, which is why I had not mentioned it previously. He said, "In that case, perhaps you had better contact her home and get them to bring your mother straight in for admission." She is 82 years of age, and this sort of treatment is rather shocking.

I am now going to refer briefly to a second case. Time does not permit of my dealing fully with each one. This concerns a person who was admitted as a patient to an S ward. I have here the names of the people concerned, and I know them particularly well. This lady was a former patient of a private hospital, where she had been for four to five years. She became, I believe, a little hard to handle, and it was suggested that she be admitted to the Princess Alexandra Hospital, which she was. She was in there for only a short time and it was suggested that she be discharged. She was then 91 years of age. Her daughter got

in touch with me and I said, "I don't know what we can do. I have hundreds of these cases. We will go and have a yarn with the doctor." He was a very decent fellow and he said, "I will tell you what: we will discharge her back to the private convalescent hospital. If she gets worse again, I will arrange with the matron to have her sent back here direct." After two days in the private hospital she was sent back to the Princess Alexandra hospital, where she subsequently died.

I turn now to what I believe is the most damning of the three cases that I am bringing before the House. It relates to a person who was in Ward C1 at the Princess Alexandra Hospital. As I said, I do not intend to mention names, but I have them all here. This lady was 45 years of age, and she had very bad kidney trouble. On Saturday, 29 August, which is not long ago, a woman doctor at the hospital decided that this patient should be discharged. The patient's mother was there and she said, "I don't think she should be discharged; she is too sick." The woman was discharged against her mother's wishes and was taken downstairs, where she collapsed unconscious. I think the circumstances of this case—I will prove my point as I go on—are tantamount to a charge of manslaughter against the policy of the Minister and the administration. The mother pleaded for her daughter to be readmitted, and she subsequently was readmitted; but the doctor said, "What is the good of readmitting her? She has only a week to live, anyway." By that time the patient had become partly conscious, and she overheard this remark. She was readmitted, as I said, and her mother said to the woman doctor, whose name I have here, "I will have to place my daughter in God's care." The woman doctor said, "If you are going to place her in God's care, why don't you take her out of here and place her in God's care?" This was said in front of witnesses and I have the names of those witnesses.

Mr. Graham: Shocking!

Mr. BROMLEY: Absolutely shocking, and disgraceful. The patient died on Tuesday, 1 September, three days later.

This sort of thing will have to be stopped, and if the Minister does not inquire into matters of this sort and insist on their being stopped, I shall demand not only his resignation but the Government's, also. There are too many of these cases. If I had more time—unfortunately, I have not—I could refer to more of them.

I turn now to another equally serious matter affecting the people of Queensland, and I am glad to see that the Minister for Education is now in the Chamber.

Mr. Graham: The first time.

Mr. BROMLEY: Yes, the first time that he has been here today during this debate.

I wish to deal with education and the teaching profession in a very broad way because of its importance to the welfare of the children of Queensland. Let me give the Minister some advice. I know that he is amenable to advice, because I was away with him recently and he took quite a lot of notice of what I had to say. The suggestions that I have to make are directed to a long-term improvement in this important field.

We were assured by the Minister for Education that schools would be adequately staffed by 1964, but he knows that they are not. I could quote many instances to prove my point.

Mr. Pizzey: They are better staffed than they ever were under your Government.

Mr. BROMLEY: Living in the past again! Why does the Minister not listen to what I have to say? I have some fairly brilliant suggestions here for the improvement of his department.

I will admit that we can always expect a certain amount of groaning and creaking when we go into a new system, but we have this new system at least 12 months before the department or the schools are prepared to go into it. In my opinion, the present system under which the Minister for Education is working, is proving inadequate because the task of servicing the needs of an expanding and developing modern education system requires much more than it has today. It is obvious that important changes now in process can never be fully successful with the present depressed, diluted and demoralised teaching service.

Mr. Sherrington: One thousand resigned last year.

Mr. BROMLEY: The figures the Minister gave this morning are indicative of our demoralised teaching service.

Mr. Pizzey: Aren't you in favour of Queensland teachers getting married?

Mr. BROMLEY: I think marriage is a wonderful institution and I do favour it. If I had time I would compare what is happening in New South Wales in relation to married teachers—such things as equal pay and the accouchement leave they are entitled to—with what is happening here. Their entitlements there are far in excess of what they are in Queensland. However, I have not the time to go into that.

I desire to make some suggestions relating to the teaching service lest we in Queensland drift on from year to year without any proper arrangements, with no policy and no plans, frantically shuffling personnel to bolster up weaknesses where there are vacancies at certain schools, where the weaknesses are greatest and where the pressures are brought to bear, but without further teachers being brought in.

Other countries have faced up to this problem, and if they can do it, we can. I have here the Robbins Report, of which the Minister no doubt has a copy. It was published in Great Britain and it recommends that teacher training be centred on the university and proposes a large expansion of tertiary education, including teacher training, to meet the needs of the 1970's. That is what we have to do here. We have to plan ahead. We are not planning ahead for extra staff. The Minister himself mentioned this morning that we are not planning ahead.

I have no doubt that the Minister has a copy of the Ramsay Report on the development of tertiary education in Victoria to cover the period from 1963 to 1972. He will know that that report made other proposals for the linking of teachers' colleges with universities to provide adequately trained teachers to meet the needs of education in the future. Again that is what we are not doing here.

A further report is the Wheatley Report. There is no doubt the Minister has it also. Dealing with the teaching profession in Scotland, it recommends, among other things, the transfer of the control of teacher training from the Department of Education to a general teaching council along the lines required for medicine and law.

Mr. Pizzey: What lines are these?

Mr. BROMLEY: A proper teaching method. It is a haphazard method today, as you know.

Mr. Pizzey interjected.

Mr. BROMLEY: We need complete university teaching, not spare-time studying where men and women have to attend in their own time and at their own expense without any reimbursement.

Mr. Pizzey: People do not get any reimbursement when they are training for medicine or law.

Mr. BROMLEY: I am talking about teachers who attend the university to help themselves and, at the same time, to help the children. I think you must agree that there are very significant trends in present-day world thinking about the training of teachers. I do not think the Prime Minister knows very much about it, but at least he appointed a committee on tertiary education which made the observation that the training of teachers must remain a State responsibility. I suppose we must agree with that statement. Sooner or later we will have to come to grips with the recruitment and training of extra teachers for the future.

Mr. Pizzey: Do you know that we gave a scholarship to every applicant who qualified last year?

Mr. BROMLEY: Of course you did. I am not trying to take anything away from you. I listened to you make one intelligent interjection. You listen to me give some good advice.

Mr. Pizzey: Where are they available from—the other people?

Mr. BROMLEY: I am talking about a long-term plan. You have people available. Why don't you do something about making them available?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. member to address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. BROMLEY: Through you, Mr. Deputy Speaker—why does not the Minister do something about it? A committee of investigation should review present practices and produce a plan appropriate to Queensland to ensure an adequate supply of fully-trained teachers to meet the needs of education at all levels during the momentous years that lie ahead of this State.

Mr. Rae: Who wrote your script?

Mr. BROMLEY: No-one prepares my script. Although you spend a great deal of time in another part of the House I believe in spending my time in here and in the Parliamentary Library. To quote one of your colloquialisms, "You wouldn't know".

Mr. Sherrington: He does not know what a colloquialism is.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BROMLEY: He probably cannot even spell it.

We receive all sorts of queries. Day after day we see letters in the paper about the need for urgent attention to the teaching profession. Day after day we read complaints about it; day after day I receive telephone calls from teachers. I am not going to give the Ministers their names, either.

Mr. Pizzey: You will hear plenty more with speech nights coming up.

Mr. BROMLEY: I hope you come along to some of ours.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BROMLEY: The Minister should realise the position by now. I have drummed it into him often enough. I have a lot of material on education but unfortunately nobody will grant me an extension of time. The education system can never be successful unless there are sufficient adequately trained teachers capable of teaching properly.

(Time expired.)

Mr. RAMSDEN (Merthyr) (12.40 p.m.): I rise to associate myself and my people of Merthyr with the Address in Reply, and to assure Her Majesty, through His Excellency,

Sir Henry Abel Smith, of the loyalty of the electorate to the person and throne of Her Majesty.

This loyalty may well be tested in the year ahead of us, for with Indonesia's 100 million people chanting confrontation against Malaysia in our Near North and being supported by the Soviet as a buffer State against the growing menace to Russia's supremacy in the Eastern Bloc by Red China, we may well be called upon to aver our loyalty to the throne and the free world, in this next year, not by uttering our words of loyalty, but by breaking our bodies and shedding our blood.

In 1914 the first great World War started—a war to end war—and when it concluded, on 11 November, 1918, the world expected that never again would it face the agony of international destruction and war. But just 21 years later, in 1939, the world was once again faced with destruction of all that free men held dear and decent. That war went through a phony period because everyone believed that disaster could be so total that it would be over in a few months. But again we were wrong. It dragged on this time, not for four years as in the first war, but for six years. And when Nagasaki and Hiroshima were annihilated,—the innocent and the guilty alike—by the most terrible weapon ever devised in the history of man, the world breathed a sigh of relief and said, "Now that destruction has become so absolute, never again will we see the peace of the world endangered." Since that day in 1945, when the free world accepted the final surrender on V.P. Day, we have seen the peace of the world threatened by Korea, Vietnam, Malaya and Suez. In each case these incidents, costly as they have been in men, materials and time, have all been contained within themselves and prevented from bursting into world conflagration.

I must confess that 19 years after V.P. Day I am fearful for the continued peace of the world because of the action of Indonesia in dropping invaders in Malaysia. At times the chairman of the Rural Fires Board issues a warning that conditions are such that the slightest spark could set alight the greatest conflagration of all time. We are living, not in a State but in a world so arid with racial hatred, prejudice and jealousy that the smallest spark could set the world afire. If that fire were to ignite the nuclear armaments of the world we could well find that, after the third world war, the story of creation could begin all over again. So, as we face a year fraught with the danger of self-destruction, our pledge of words of loyalty may well become a pledge of action and sacrifice to ensure that this nation and our children may survive.

Last year at this time we were looking forward to His Excellency's return from furlough to begin his second term as Governor of this State. We have been encouraged since his return by his continued

enthusiasm and devotion to duty, as well as the support given him in his work by his lady, Lady May.

Other hon. members have mentioned the premature death of the late Minister for Health, Dr. Winston Noble. I speak not so much as a parliamentary colleague who had a great appreciation of Dr. Noble professionally, politically and personally, but rather would I as chairman of the Multiple Handicapped Association of Queensland, on behalf of that association, pay a public and sincere tribute to him, who was our first patron and who by his encouragement and subsidy did so much to ensure that we survived the very difficult days from our initial formation until our establishment as an accepted charitable and educational organisation. To his widow and family we of the association offer our deepest sympathy. We are reminded that contrary to the words of the bard, the good that great men do does survive them, and Winston Noble's influence in the field of public health and his reforms in the field of geriatrics and mental hygiene will long remain a living monument to his humanity and ability. I extend to his successor, the hon. member for Ashgrove, my sincerest congratulations on his elevation to Cabinet rank. I assure him of my personal co-operation and support in the task he is called upon to do.

Following Mr. Tooth's elevation to the Ministry, there existed a vacancy in the panel of temporary Chairmen. I congratulate the hon. member for Aspley upon his selection for this position. I know that he will occupy the chair with justice and impartiality.

Finally, I congratulate the hon. member for Yeronga, Mr. Lee, on his recent election to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Dr. Noble. I am delighted to support Mr. Lee in his motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, which he moved so effectively. At the same time I offer my congratulations to the hon. member for Warwick, Mr. Cory, for the contribution he made in seconding the motion. Both members will bring the Chamber much constructive thought in the days which lie ahead.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much audible conversation among hon. members, both on my right and on my left. I ask them to give the hon. member for Merthyr the courtesy to which he is entitled.

Mr. RAMSDEN: Surely that must be the mark of every responsible member of Parliament. I know that there are times when because of emotional issues, we exhibit acrimony and ill-temper. There are times when we speak on party-political issues. But I believe those occasions should be the exception rather than the rule. The State and the electorate expect us, as the representatives of the people, to apply ourselves diligently to constructive thought, and to

bring to the notice of Parliament suggestions and policies which, if carried out, will ensure the fullest development of the State and the welfare of our people. Within the limits of our ability, most of us in the House try to do that.

It is in this spirit of constructive thought that I speak today. During the course of this debate the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha made passing reference to the need for the better development of the port of Brisbane. I support what he said in this regard and want to develop the theme more fully. We all recall the recent credit squeeze which the Federal Government decided had to be imposed in order to contain inflation. Whatever our personal opinions may be about that squeeze, we all accept the fact that Queensland made a very slow recovery from this economic crisis, while other States such as Victoria, New South Wales, and South Australia recovered from the blow with greater rapidity. I do not think that any economist would disagree with me when I say that our slow recovery in this State was due largely to our lack of basic heavy industries, and, as an added disadvantage, the fact remains that the bulk of our development capital was not acquired here. The main effect this has is that until there is a spill-over of capital from Sydney and Melbourne, economic activity in Brisbane does not reach any sort of peak. It is with a view to offering some sort of correction to this state of affairs that I make my observations.

The Greater Brisbane area is governed by a city council which, by its very nature and constitution, can be only an administrative authority, ill-equipped, both financially and technically, to be a developmental authority for a great industrial area in which we can perhaps set up one or two basic heavy industries which will give impetus to industrial development in this State and city. We in Brisbane, despite the disadvantage I have mentioned, have one great advantage not enjoyed by any other capital city in Australia, namely, a large area of open land around our port, capable of being set aside and developed for maritime industry, that is, industry which has a high import or export content. There is around the mouth of the Brisbane River approximately 12,000 acres of this open land which should be set aside for such future industrial development. It is for this reason that I give unqualified support to the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha when he asserts that these 12,000 acres, stretching roughly from Brett's Wharf, Hamilton, to the Serpentine and mouth of the river on the north side, and from about Cannon Hill, including Wynnum and Manly, on the south side, should be excised from the Greater Brisbane area and given to the specialised and developmental authority of a specialist Port Development Authority. Unless this is done, three things will happen, none of benefit to either Brisbane or the State. In the first place, the

port will fail to be developed to its full potential because the Brisbane City Council will not have the funds to develop it properly.

Mr. Melloy: Not from this Government.

Mr. RAMSDEN: The hon. member for Nudgee has interjected time and time again. Although it is the inherent right of every man to make a fool of himself, I wish the hon. member would not abuse the privilege.

Because there are so few votes in the 12,000 acres mentioned, in all fairness no city council, regardless of its political colour, would be justified in spending the sort of money necessary to be spent in the port area, having regard to the higher priorities in other more densely populated areas of the Greater Brisbane area. What council could justify high cost of reclamation, extra access roads in the port area, industrial subdivision, water, sewerage and electricity extensions—all to an area where the return from rates and building permits, etc., would not be had for many years, whilst places like Upper Mt. Gravatt, Aspley, Ashgrove, and a host of other places scream out for sewerage, kerbing and channeling, and the host of amenities the third capital city of Australia merits? These are indisputable facts and I offer my proposal not in condemnation of the local authority, the Brisbane City Council, but in order to relieve that administration of the onerous burden of having to set aside funds it cannot afford to develop the port of Brisbane.

The second thing that will happen if this excision is not done is that, in the hope of providing workers' dwellings for the ever-increasing industrial area in the vicinity of the port, the city council will permit satellite towns along the Serpentine to emerge, and neither the site nor the position is satisfactory for the establishment of a residential area. And the third thing will be the continuation of the haphazard policy of allowing to go to the port area industry which is not essential to the port, and to which the port is not essential. In other words, a topsy-turvy industrial area will grow and the best economic use of the port area will not be made.

The last Liberal Party convention carried a motion unanimously calling upon the Government to set up a select committee to inquire into the merits of setting up a separate port authority for Brisbane on the lines I am suggesting today. Fortified by that decision, I now call upon the Government to appoint an all-party select committee of Parliament to make a full inquiry as to whether it should use its constitutional and legislative powers to excise the area I have mentioned from the Greater Brisbane area and set up a self-governing industrial and port-development authority to promote the balanced development of the port area and thus actively go out and seek the industry which needs port location. We have the ball at our feet—we

are the only capital city in Australia which has land in quantity still around its waterfront.

The setting up of a port authority similar to the Port of London Authority would be able to encourage capital investment from the southern States, where industry requiring access to the ports and seaways of the nation can no longer buy or lease land within any reasonable distance of the waterfront. This is all the more urgent now, because the axis of world trade has changed as far as Australia is concerned. Up to the second World War, and indeed for a short time after it, Melbourne and Sydney were the main ports of entry to Australia.

If we go to Western Australia and talk to the citizens of Perth, we find that in all their conversation and trade publications they look on the Indian Ocean as the centre of their trade activities. And as for us in Queensland there is now an unprecedented opportunity for future development. Europe, with Melbourne and Sydney as the ports of entry, will of course go on; but with the awakening of Asia, Brisbane is no longer the back door to Australia—it is the front door, through which will pour the imports and exports, if we plan for it now as I suggest, of 100,000,000 Indonesians and the teeming millions of Malaysia, the Philippines, and Japan! With a good, well-planned, well-developed, properly-administered port area, we can attract overseas investment, which will at least set up assembly plants in the area, to use the port of Brisbane as the catapulting pad from which their finished products can be scattered to their Asian and Australian markets.

I can think quickly of two assembly plants which I am assured could with the sort of encouragement I have mentioned, possibly be set up here. One is a Dutch company which has a large export small-car industry to Indonesia, and the other is a Japanese company which is exporting cars in increasing numbers to the southern States and North Queensland. Assembly plants for both could be brought here with the right encouragement, which could come if there was a port authority that could make land available, grant site approval, and supply the essential services. And I repeat: the Brisbane City Council, whatever its political persuasion, is not equipped to supply these facilities. With the construction of a cross-river tunnel in the lower reaches of the river—and I am convinced that the tunnel will be in operation by 1970 or 1971—there will be such an upsurge of industrial development, spurred on by the two oil refineries, that orderly planning and development becomes an essential if the economics of the port are to be fully developed and Brisbane is to become the nation's front door.

I might well be asked, "And what should be the constitution of such a port authority?" I believe it should be based constitutionally

on the Port of London Authority (with such modifications as are necessary to cope with local conditions). In the Port of London Authority we find representatives of the shipping interests, Government and council interests, stevedoring interests, and industrialists. I would suggest a port authority consisting of seven members—one a representative of the Government, who would be chairman, one a representative of the Brisbane City Council or perhaps, better still, elected by the Local Authorities Association, one elected by shipping companies operating in the port of Brisbane, one elected by the stevedoring industry, one from the Chamber of Manufactures, one from the Chamber of Commerce, and one from the Institute of Planning. Such an authority would be well equipped to plan and develop the 12,000-odd acres which surround the port of Brisbane. A decade from now the mouth of the river could be developed, if we plan properly for it, to be to Brisbane what Fremantle is to Perth.

A short time ago I said that I believed the cross-river tunnel would be operating within six or seven years. I say that because, since the Treasurer's announcement in the Chamber a week ago that the Government would give sympathetic consideration to any approach by a competent Australian or overseas firm which would be prepared to finance and construct the project on a franchise basis, I have been able to forward to the Premier the first concrete proposal on the matter, submitted to me by the Queensland Employers' Federation acting as agents on behalf of the Victorian Employers' Federation Foundation. In addition, a representative of an English civil engineering company called on me as recently as last Friday and discussed the question of the feasibility test which must be undertaken. Within a matter of days I shall be receiving a submission from that firm to forward to the Premier. I have already made a Press statement that an American company is presently considering doing a preliminary survey with a view to seeing whether it would be justified in financing the full feasibility study from its own resources preparatory to tendering for the construction of the facility.

It is in the light of these facts that I am prepared to be rash enough to prophesy the 1970-1971 date. Time alone will tell whether I have been too optimistic. May I qualify my statement by saying I believe the accomplishment of the project is dependent upon two facts—(1) that peace will continue, and (2) that this Government is still in office. In all seriousness, therefore, I urge the Premier, as Minister for State Development, Mr. Munro, as Minister for Industrial Development, Mr. Dewar, as Minister for Labour and Industry, and Mr. Hiley, as Minister in charge of Harbours and Marine, to give very serious consideration to my request for a select parliamentary

committee to investigate the potential and necessity for the establishment of the Port of Brisbane Authority.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.]

Mr. RAMSDEN: Professor Greenwood, Professor of Economic Geography, in a recent paper on the subject of port development in Brisbane, said—

"The negotiation of improved facilities for the extension of heavy industry in the Brisbane Metropolitan area, rests on three straight forward assumptions:—that Brisbane has the opportunity to participate more fully than in the past, in the structure of heavy industry in Australia, that there is also an opportunity for a substantial increase in Brisbane's overseas trading activities, particularly in relation to manufactured exports, and all of these are most likely to be achieved by the expansion of industry in the port area immediately behind the wharves of the lower estuary. I feel that these fundamentals are hard to challenge, whether they are investigated from the point of view of a Government, a Local Authority, a business organisation, or an academic theoretician such as myself."

He went on to say that there are no insurmountable obstacles in such engineering wonders as tunnels, expressways, land reclamation and other engineering and industrial techniques. The only limitation to our flights of fancy and imagination must be the sober facts of costs, markets and competition of other people who are in the same game in other places. In the short time that I have left I want to develop some of these facts. We have now in Brisbane some 670,000 people, occupied in a varying array of manufacturing industries, growing retail sales, and servicing activities which have already formed an almost continuous built-up area merging into Ipswich and Redcliffe, and fast merging into the city of the Gold Coast.

Mr. Duggan: In view of that fact, don't you think it was rather disappointing that the C.M.O. was not represented at the conference that you convened?

Mr. RAMSDEN: I know the Leader of the Opposition is often quoting statistics to show we are still in the doldrums, and, whilst not wishing to engage in political propaganda—at least on this occasion—I must point out that Professor Greenwood went on record in this same paper as saying—

"The placid easygoing days when growth rates were slow and the city served primarily as an executive commercial centre and port for an essentially primary producing State, have been replaced by an environment of accelerated and diversified development of a highly competitive kind, some indication of which can be gained from statistical data. Even if we confine ourselves to the post-war period, we find that between the two census counts of

1947 and 1961, the population of the metropolitan area increased by 50 per cent. (413,337 to 621,550); the industrial output of the metropolitan area increased 4 fold in value (£56m to £221m) representing an approximate doubling in volume of production, and the volume of cargo shipped to overseas destinations from Brisbane wharves, increased a little more than 4 fold (469 to 1935 thousand tons). Over this post-war period of 14 years, therefore, there has been quite a substantial rate of growth in the urban area and the industries and commerce within its borders. Indeed we have experienced a period of development and prosperity that is without precedent in our history."

These are stirring words from an objective thinker independent of political interests. Nevertheless, in spite of this, we are conscious that we have not matched the rates of industrial growth or achieved such a high ratio of industrial output to population as have some other Australian centres. It is to try to overcome this disadvantage that I ask the Government in all sincerity to set up a parliamentary select committee to study this port-development problem.

Queensland, because of its size and position, has rather special advantages for expansion in rural industries, and overseas post-war conditions have created enlarged overseas markets for our beef, sugar and wool, and therefore we would have been foolish not to invest in rural expansion. But these particular exports require only a very limited industrial processing before export—and, of course, to this we must add the fact that in addition these exports, because of decentralisation, which I support wholeheartedly, have been shipped from Cairns, Townsville, Rockhampton and Gladstone, as well as from Brisbane, and thus there has been even less opportunity of developing the industrial processing plant to any magnitude. Then again, as we have 1,500,000 people scattered over an area more than six times the area of the United Kingdom, there has been little chance to produce the right climate for heavy industry because of distance and transport costs. In a country with our great size and our small population, the major concentration of manufacturing activity, of necessity, is to be found in the vicinity of the largest market concentrations.

Some years ago when I was in Perth I met a manufacturer who had come from America to set up somewhere in Australia a factory to produce Stanley tools under licence. He told me that he had been to Sydney and Melbourne and had subsequently made his decision where he would build. I said, "Did you go to Queensland?" He said, "No, of course I didn't. Let us be realistic. What on earth is the use of my going to Brisbane to open a factory when the whole of the consumer market for our

product is in Sydney or Melbourne? We must go where the population is." So it becomes a vicious circle.

Thus it is that, with a few exceptions, we tend to miss the basic capital intensive heavy metallurgical, chemical, oil refining and textile industries; we have been left to specialise in the smaller subsidiary types of industry. One basic heavy industry—the steel industry—could change our whole pattern, but let us be realistic about this. A steel industry results from much forward planning, and the combined problem of dispersed raw materials and a limited local market have so far deterred steel interests from contemplating a major plant here in the foreseeable future.

Professor Greenwood, in his paper on Port Development, was highly critical of the growing tendency to continue to export raw materials overseas for manufacture, and he urged a continued and growing effort to process our raw materials here in Queensland, and then to export the manufactured article. The vital argument in favour of the professor's appeal is that payment for manufacturing generally exceeds many times over the value of the raw material. We can review our attitude, I am sure, for the markets for Australia have changed, as I said earlier. Imports from the United Kingdom are now below 40 per cent. of the total, and exports to the United Kingdom recently dropped to 20 per cent. of the Australian total. The United States of America, Japan and other Asian countries are assuming a growing importance, and, as I said earlier, Brisbane has the opportunity to become the front door to Australia's eastern trade.

I plead with the Government to set up this select committee on the Port of Brisbane Authority, because we must hasten to take advantage of the new situation, and more actively encourage the many shipping companies which have been providing direct and fast services from Brisbane to Asia and North America. For these reasons it is essential that we push on with the full and comprehensive development of the port of Brisbane, and I believe we can never achieve a first-class port such as I have envisaged whilst the 12,000 acres behind the lower estuary of the river are left to decay as an unwanted and undeveloped wasteland in a remote part of Greater Brisbane.

I agree wholeheartedly with Professor Greenwood when he said,

"If we aspire to attract heavy industries to Brisbane, or if we feel that the techniques of container transport, and the wharf handling of containers on and off coastal ships are now serving to give a relative advantage to interstate transport, or if we wish to promote our export trade, then the delta land is almost priceless."

He went on to point out that large-scale cement, pottery, engineering and fertiliser production are some of many industries that make heavy demands on sea transport and, if

we wish to stimulate developments such as these, we simply cannot afford to see the delta flats abandoned to residential uses or lying idle as waste lands.

Mr. Bromley: Don't bother reading all that. "Hansard" has a copy of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. members for Salisbury and Townsville North are continually heckling, laughing and giggling like school children. I ask them to discontinue those practices, otherwise I will have to deal with both of them under Standing Order 123A.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I remind the House that we in this city have been blind to the wealth of port land lying awaiting development. Visitors from other States envy our fortune in this regard. And, as I said earlier, this is the only capital city which still has ample land to create a planned port, and in this we are the envy of industrialists in every other capital. I do urge the Government to take seriously this proposal for the excision of the area under discussion from the city of Brisbane, and/or any other local-authority area into which it may fall, and set up a separate and independent Brisbane Port Authority. After all, Brisbane is the only port in Queensland with no harbour board. Surely the first stage is to accept, in principle, the value of related port and industrial development, the next stage being to plan how it can best and most quickly be carried out. It is to aid in these two steps that I seriously and sincerely urge the Government, in the interests of industrial development in this State and particularly in this capital city, to commission a select committee of Parliament to make a full and complete inquiry into:—

(a) The amount and location of land which should be set aside for the development of the industrial port of Brisbane;

(b) Whether such area should be excised from all existing local authorities and handed over to the administrative control of an independent Brisbane Port Authority;

(c) What powers—

(i) to levy income and port dues and taxes;

(ii) to plan and develop the area as a port;

(iii) to grant site approvals to industry within the area;

(iv) if any, in addition to (i)-(iii), such an authority should have conferred upon it.

(d) The composition of such Brisbane Port Authority;

(e) Any other matters which the committee may consider to be relevant to the efficient functioning of a Brisbane Port Authority.

If the Government will accept my suggestion and act upon it by appointing such a select committee quickly, then it will earn the approbation of the whole of the commercial

and industrial life of a city wanting to leap forward as soon as this green light to progress is given.

An Opposition Member: A very well read speech.

Mr. RAMSDEN: At least it is prepared, which is more than I can say about many A.L.P. speeches.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The question is that the Address in Reply be agreed to.

Mr. BYRNE (Mourilyan) (2.29 p.m.): I associate—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member should call the Chair when he rises to his feet.

Mr. BYRNE: I associate myself and the district I represent with the expressions of loyalty to the Crown. I also compliment His Excellency the Governor on the excellent job he is doing. He is an untiring worker; he is eager to get out in the country to see things for himself and is always very pleased to see development taking place in the State.

I wish to deal with a matter that the hon. member for Gregory referred to in Parliament not long ago. I was quite astounded when I heard him develop an argument in favour of certain of his constituents who, according to him, owed this Government a considerable amount of money for road haulage fees, and for fines imposed upon them for breaches of the State Transport Act. In reply to an interjection the Minister for Transport said that these people in the West, constituents of the hon. member for Gregory, owed his department £250,000. The hon. member suggested that the fees and fines should be halved. Although that is a very good policy for the hon. member for Gregory to advocate in the interests of the road hauliers in his district, it is not sufficient unless he advocates it in the interests of road hauliers throughout Queensland. It would not be right if, as a result of his representations, certain people got remissions of fees and fines, while people in other parts of Queensland were sent to gaol for similar breaches.

The hon. member for Gregory said that what the Government was doing was annihilating men who had given excellent service over a great many years. That is true, and while I am sympathetic with the hon. member and the people of the West, we cannot have an Act and regulations which provide for fees and penalties unless they apply to the whole of Queensland. To that extent, I think that representation to this Parliament is wrong. It is not a sectional matter at all.

The publicity given to this case gave to the Minister for Transport an opportunity to state openly to this Parliament what amounts of money are owing by these people in the West in road taxes and fines

so that we, as members of Parliament, will have an idea of exactly how the Act and regulations are operating, and whether preference is being given to some people while the Act is being applied strictly in the case of others.

It was also said that some people owed as much as £15,000 to £20,000. If members on this side of the House owed anything like £15,000 to £20,000, the Minister would do something about it. He has had an opportunity to tell the House the exact position as to the assessment of road taxes, the penalties that have been imposed, the extent to which they have been paid, and the amounts outstanding. We cannot have one law for the rich and another for the poor.

My area relies almost entirely on the sugar industry. I take this opportunity of speaking about that industry, which is perhaps the most important in Queensland. I want to give hon. members an idea of what has taken place. Others have spoken on this subject, and I trust my words will not be out of place.

There has been a considerable increase in the areas assigned to each mill in Queensland. This will mean increased production of sugar over the years. Some of these increases will take place immediately, and some in succeeding years. It is understandable that new growers will not be able to reach maximum production for a number of years. Mill expansions and the cultivation of new areas are providing a great amount of work. The position in the North would have been rather bad if this amount of work was not being done by the mills and the growers.

In the granting of new assignments the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board is assisted by local committees, who made detailed examinations of the applicants, their suitability, their ability to obtain finance, the location of their properties, and their experience. The Board could not possibly have carried out these examinations in the limited time available. If it were possible, however, I would much prefer the Board to do all of these things. When they are done by local committees there is always a great amount of dissatisfaction, which does no good to the area. Local feeling always runs high. Of the applications made for new cane assignments, one-third were granted and two-thirds refused. Those who made two-thirds of the applications are obviously dissatisfied and discontented.

The urgency and magnitude of the task of assigning the new cane lands were such that errors could creep in. Where there is this possibility, care must be taken to see that the blame is placed on the right people. Members of the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board are not on the spot, and they have to be guided by the opinions of the local committees in the assigning of new land. If errors do occur, the Board has ample power

to correct them. If, on the other hand, assignments were obtained by misrepresentation, the Board has power also to correct that situation. If a man obtained a cane assignment on grounds that amounted to fraud or misrepresentation, obviously he should be dispossessed of it.

Members of the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board have a big job in keeping the industry moving and adjudicating between miller and grower. They have to see that the sugar is produced and eventually got away. The industry is worth millions of pounds to Queensland, and we want to see it working smoothly. The Board does a major job in bringing this about. The chairman, members, and secretary of the Board, on whose shoulders rests this responsibility, are, in my opinion, inadequately compensated, when the great value of this industry is considered. I compliment them on the job that they do. I do not always agree with their views, and if it can be shown that it was incorrect to grant certain assignments, I think that they are big enough to see that the matter is put right.

I am concerned with the new grower; the old grower can look after himself. In many instances the new grower would be inexperienced in financial matters and on the technical side of the industry. After he has invested his savings, it will probably be necessary for him to borrow money, and all the sharks in the country will be trying to sell him equipment, some of it completely unsuitable. They will offer him worn-out, second-hand equipment, and if he is not experienced he will probably fall for it. The going is good only while the money lasts. He has first to purchase his land at about £50 to £100 an acre, sometimes more. In my area, £100 an acre is quite common, whereas previously the land in question was probably worth about £5 an acre as a maximum.

If the new grower buys on terms, he has to pay a large sum in interest, and the cultivation of his land imposes a very heavy burden on him when he is buying equipment, erecting buildings, and so on. When he finds it difficult to raise money, he is in trouble. He has to mortgage the property, and eventually he will come under pressure from the mortgagee for the payment of the money and find that he is unable to meet his repayments. Things will not be so rosy then and he will want to get out. He will be obliged to approach the mortgagee and try to make the best deal that he can. He will have to seek the permission of the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board to sell his farm and have his assignment transferred, although he has not completed the necessary years of residence, made effective the assignment that he has obtained, or fulfilled the other conditions to which he agreed.

If he is permitted to sell, the sharks and the money-lenders will come in again and ask that the particular assignment concerned

be transferred to them. This is the only way in which they could get an assignment—by cashing in on the new grower's misfortune. I have seen it happen before; it will happen again. In my opinion, it is likely to happen in every area, whether the mill is co-operative or privately owned, and I should not like to see a new grower, because of inexperience in financial matters, and so on, lose his assignment to a mortgagee who presses him when he is unable to meet his obligations and then see the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board grant the assignment to the mortgagee.

Under common law, the mortgagee is entitled to some special consideration or protection for the money that he invests by way of advances to new growers. Probably it will be said, "How are we going to protect the new growers? Can we do anything?" As I said, I should not like to see a new grower lose his assignment to a person who, because he has money to lend, is able to cash in on the grower's inability to keep up his payments as they fall due. I ask the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board to take a particular interest in the matter and prevent the unfair practices that I am sure take place.

The remarks that I have just made are substantiated by the fact that, in my opinion, the sugar boom is over. Even the experts do not seem to be very optimistic about future prices; in fact, they are rather cautious in their pronouncements. Forecasts for 12 months hence are of prices of about £30 a ton, which is much the same as the present price. When one considers that not so many months ago the overseas price of sugar on the open market was around £100 a ton, one wonders if we are ever again likely to get £100 a ton for our sugar overseas. I am afraid that very few of those well versed in the industry will say that we are likely to see that figure again in the near future. Other countries are building up their industries and becoming exporters of sugar. Production is being pushed ahead in the countries that are producing beet and trying to make themselves free of any defalcations. More of our sugar will have to be sold on the free market at what I have said previously are very low prices.

The effect of the overseas world price may not be too bad this season because of the possibility of a contract having been made at a higher price. I am not in a position to know exactly what the position is, but I hope contracts have been made at a higher figure than the present overseas price of sugar, namely, somewhere about £30 a ton.

Everybody seems to be very cautious about it. Can we say what our quota will be under the International Sugar Agreement when it again becomes effective? Can we expect an increase in the quantity of sugar we are exporting? We can only hope that our home consumption will

increase and that we will be able to find other markets, and generally continue the prosperity in this great industry.

Mr. Camm: Will you admit there is not much prosperity in the sugar industry today?

Mr. BYRNE: No. The prosperity of the sugar industry today is very pronounced. As a big sugar-cane grower the hon. member knows of the prosperity of the industry from the taxation assessments he and other big growers receive.

Mr. Camm: You said a minute ago that there is no prosperity.

Mr. BYRNE: The industry is at present very prosperous. But can the hon. member, or anyone else, say that that will continue in the years to come? That is the point I am making. All the authorities I have read are particularly cautious—and all the information I have also indicates it—in saying that things cannot continue to be as good as we have had them in the past.

I do not desire to dwell to any extent on the alienation of our lands to foreign concerns. I dealt with this matter very fully during the last session of Parliament and I thought that I had made out a good case to support my argument that in future, when any of our lands are to be alienated, our own people are at least given an opportunity to acquire them rather than that they should go to foreign concerns. We were able to find a tremendous area of land in the Tully district at ridiculously low prices and to give the purchaser the right to freehold it at a mere fraction of its true value.

I am drawing attention to this matter because the opportunity for settlement has been missed. It is not much use throwing open lands unless people are given an opportunity to reside on them, to make the best use of them and to develop the country as we are entitled to expect. There has not been any Crown land available for growers in the sugar industry. When I say that, I mean that virtually no Crown land has been made available to people who wanted to get onto it and who were forced to go to private landholders and pay as much as £100 an acre for it. I should like to be certain that that state of affairs will not continue. Landholders were able to get £100 an acre for their land because this Government neglected to open up Crown lands which could have been leased at a fraction of the price that was actually paid. The new growers then would not have had to outlay a huge capital investment of, say, £8,000 for 80 acres at £100 an acre.

The initial capital cost will eventually prove a burden around the neck of the new grower. If the Government refrained from opening Crown land so that the new grower would have to pay private landholders such tremendous amounts, one must come to the conclusion that there has been some collusion

between the private landholders and the Government. Last November I appealed to the Government to open up Crown land for the specific purpose of sugar-cane growing. How much new land has been opened up for that purpose? Much of the land sold at £100 an acre was lying useless for years but now new companies, admittedly with an Australian flavour on this occasion, are coming into the field, and they are looking for this land. When is the next big "chop-up" of Crown land coming? I feel that it is coming, but I do not know when. Many companies are looking for our land, and pressure will be put upon the Government to make an additional 50,000 acres of land available to them. I hope they do not come into the rain-forest country in the Tully district. The local people should be entitled to get onto that land. They have lived there all their lives; they know the area well and they are capable of using the land to its best advantage. The best form of settlement is by putting our own people on the land.

With the vast area of land available in North Queensland we do not seem to be making much progress. When the Crown puts up an allotment for sale one has to pay £400 or £500 for it. A young man who is striving to get on cannot pay those prices. It would be better for the Government to give him the land, as long as he erects a home on it and lives there with his family. In my opinion to have to pay £400 or £500 for a piece of land is quite wrong. A young man today has no possible chance of making a "do" of it unless we are prepared to help him to the greatest possible extent. Although farmers are paying £100 an acre for land adjoining the King Ranch property, for rating purposes the Government is valuing it at only 10s. and £1 an acre. I cannot reconcile the fact that farmers in the immediate vicinity are being charged £100 an acre with the fact that for local-authority purposes the land is valued at £1 an acre. However, I must concede that people have bought, and are prepared to buy, at £100 an acre, before they even get an assignment. I do not want to see any more of our land going to these big companies. Let us give it to our young people so that they can develop it themselves.

I desire to draw the attention of the House to the matter of stock routes in my area. The idea was to provide stock routes about three chains wide but, for some reason or other, in the Cardwell shire the Government has reduced the width of stock routes from three chains to one and a-half chains. It suggested to the Cardwell Shire Council that when it desires to increase the width of the stock route to three chains it might approach the King Ranch people and ask them to give the land, sell it, or permit the use of it so that the stock route may be widened to three chains.

Mr. Murray: In the main, the cane-farmers have removed their fences along these roads. There is a growing tendency to do so.

Mr. BYRNE: That has been done because King Ranch is in the district. The stock route is only 1½ chains wide instead of three. Why should the Cardwell Shire Council have to approach the King Ranch people? Cattle are using the stock route and 1½ chains is altogether unreasonable.

Mr. Murray: Generally speaking, no-one drives a number of cattle along an unfenced area amongst cane. The cane-farmers are eliminating their fences.

Mr. BYRNE: The point is that this concerns the King Ranch. This is not in the cane-farming area at all. The King Ranch came into being and the stock route was confined to 1½ chains. It is altogether wrong that the Government should put this suggestion to the Cardwell Shire Council. I make a plea to the Government to further investigate stock routes in the Cardwell shire and to ensure that they are three chains wide. The Herberton shire is affected, as well as the Cardwell shire.

This morning the hon. member for Mulgrave tried to take to task former Labour Governments and their administration of our timber reserves. Unfortunately the timber in our area, and throughout Queensland, is subject to a good deal of mishandling. We have had large timber forests in our area. They were not opened because Labour Governments would not permit it; the land was retained for the natural propagation of trees. By opening up these lands the present Government has destroyed millions of feet of timber. The Premier admitted that when the King Ranch matter was under discussion, because he said that a lot of timber would have to be destroyed. I opposed it then and I still oppose it. There was no need for it to be destroyed. The clearing done by the King Ranch people has destroyed a considerable area of forest timber which would have been most useful.

The Labour Government commenced plots for the propagation and planting of trees, but these areas were neglected by the present Government and the plots are now degenerating into useless tracts of land. This Government believes, and the hon. member for Fassifern always held the view, that natural regeneration was just as good as, if not better than, artificial propagation. A considerable quantity of timber is imported. I have said time and time again in my speeches that we should undertake the propagation of trees so that we may grow more timber. Money should have been spent, and it has not been. Much of the good work that was commenced by the Labour Government has not been continued. In the rain-belt areas, such as Tully, those stocks will be irreplaceable in the years to come. One cannot blame preceding Governments for a desire to retain those areas for the propagation of timber. Once they become open the timber will be taken off them, and unless timber is propagated there must be difficulties in regard to future production.

I have already spoken about Carruchan, where licences were granted for approximately 3,000,000 superficial feet a year. For three years no timber at all was cut there. This Government permitted the company involved to sell the licence for 3,000,000 superficial feet of timber, and so permitted the destruction of that little town overnight. The men who had worked there were obliged to get out and look elsewhere for work.

I place on record my wish to see price control reintroduced in Queensland. At the moment the prices of commodities manufactured by proprietary organisations are not controlled, and those organisations can charge whatever price they like for their products. That kind of thing is now being extended to the little towns where interested people are meeting with a view to controlling prices. Today there is no such thing as competition.

The Minister for Industrial Development is a great believer in freedom of trade. He does not believe in price control. But married people with a large family are not happy at the way things are going at the moment. There is absolutely no control over the prices charged by these big combines. They are controlling the prices charged for various manufactured products, and the same principle is developing in country towns in Queensland.

I sincerely hope that the sugar industry will continue to prosper and that the new growers coming into it will find it profitable. I hope also that as far as possible the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board will eliminate the unfair practices that exist from time to time and do so much harm to this great industry.

Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (3.4 p.m.): It was quite timely on your part, Mr. Speaker, to draw attention earlier to the necessity for members, when rising, to call the Chair. I have felt for some time that there has been a tendency on the part of some members to simply rise and, because they are on a list which has been presented to the presiding officer, consider that they have an unchallenged right to the floor. I hope that whoever rises and first catches the eye of the Speaker or the Chairman will be the one who receives the call.

I should like to identify myself with the words of approval uttered by previous speakers concerning the speeches made by the hon. member for Yeronga and the hon. member for Warwick in moving and seconding this motion. It is not because I was so much impressed by the content of the speech of the hon. member for Yeronga that I signify my approval; rather was it the emphatic way in which he presented it. If I were to judge him on its content, I would assess him as belonging to the very old school of hard conservatism. There was so much in his speech that

indicated that somewhere during his life he has been a student of the outlook of the diehard Conservatives of the past century.

I think the hon. member for Warwick impressed everybody because of his nature and the calm, placid way in which he went along. He spoke on matters that he knew something about. That is one of the great things for a new member to remember, not only in his first speech but in all subsequent ones. However, I wish both hon. members luck in their future political careers. The hon. member for Yeronga may be on more shifting ground than is the hon. member for Warwick, but of course one never knows. Some of us have experienced setbacks in political life, and I think there are some who will continue to experience them.

With other hon. members, I identify myself with the remarks made concerning His Excellency the Governor, Sir Henry Abel Smith, and his good lady. As the years have gone by, His Excellency has impressed the people of Queensland more and more with his outstanding interest in community life throughout the State, its industries, its problems, and its people. As a matter of fact, just prior to lunch, I gathered, in discussing with the hon. member for Cook His Excellency's most recent trip to the North, that His Excellency had gone into country not too frequently visited by any important personage of this or any other State. The hon. member for Cook told me that His Excellency and his good lady travelled into this area where the amenities of life are not as they are in the civilised areas, or in the cities and on the coast generally. They travelled in a jeep and had virtually to make their road as they went along.

Mr. Murray: It is not a bad life.

Mr. WALSH: It may not be a bad life, but so many people in comfortable positions are not prepared to go there. Frankly, I have to admit, not having been a Governor myself, that I have never had time to go there. I hope that His Excellency will continue to enjoy his stay in Queensland, because I believe that the people of this State approve of his holding his office. We should like to see him and his lady here for many years to come.

There are a few things that I wish to place on record. Following the speech of the hon. member for Nundah, a question has been raised concerning matters that might be regarded as sub judice. It is not really a question of what my opinion on the matter may be or what the opinion of any other hon. member on the matter may be. I think it is far more appropriate to look at the opinions of authorities who are well qualified to express them and give rulings on matters such as this. Many rulings are contained in the various publications that are available to hon. members, but I have before me the second edition of "Australian Senate Practice," a book compiled by J. R. Odgers, Clerk Assistant in the Senate, which contains references to very many interesting rulings.

Strangely enough, in one instance someone even went as far as to question the Queen's right to open the Federal Parliament during her visit to Australia, simply because the Constitution says, in effect, that the Parliament shall be opened by the Governor-General or a person acting in his stead. However, hon. members can look that up for themselves, and I merely quote this passage from page 96—

“Matters still under adjudication in a court of law cannot be brought forward in debate.”

It then goes on to say—

“That is to say, the Senate will not permit a debate which, in the normal way, would be regarded, if it occurred outside Parliament, as a contempt of those court proceedings. But the rule is not always confined to those limits. Speaking in the House of Representatives which, generally speaking, takes the same line as the Senate on sub judice matters, Dr. H. V. Evatt (then Attorney-General) made the following statement on the 17th April, 1947—

“What is said in Parliament is absolutely privileged by the law. What is said in the courts of justice is absolutely privileged by the law. We have those two great instruments of government, the legislative power exerted by one, and the judicial power exerted by another. As the years have gone by, the Parliament, having an absolute privilege and not being bound to apply the rules of contempt of court, or even the laws of defamation, both of which are applicable to comment outside the Parliament, has taken the view which I believe has been carried out in cases like the Jerger case. That is to say the Parliament does not ask ‘Is there a proceeding pending at this moment?’, but rather, ‘In all the circumstances, should a debate on a particular matter be permitted at this particular moment?’ ”

I emphasise particularly the last sentence, and I do not know of many authorities who would be better qualified than Dr. Evatt to give such an opinion.

To go a little further—

“Thus, it can be said that there is no rigid rule, but rather that common sense indicates how the line should be drawn. A pertinent point to bear in mind in issues of this nature was made by Dr. Evatt in the above-mentioned debate when he quoted—

“It is possible to poison the wells of justice before they begin to flow.”

How appropriate that is, and I think I can say that, generally speaking, there has not been any considerable abuse of those principles in this Parliament in the 25 or more years that I have been a member of this Assembly.

Odgers goes on then to deal with another approach to the matter and says—

“Todd, in his ‘Parliamentary Government in England’, page 573, vol. 1, declares that it is highly irregular to bring into discussion, in either House of Parliament, any matters whether they relate to criminal or civil cases, which are undergoing judicial investigation, or are about to be submitted to courts of law, as it leads to the impuration of a desire to interfere with the ordinary course of justice.

“As to the application of the rule to Bills, the position at Westminster is that there is no restriction on the introduction or discussion of Bills, in either House, relating to matters which are sub judice.”

I think that could be, in some way, a guide to members of this Chamber if at any time they feel like raising these questions, but I should hate to think that the mere fact that somebody issued a writ and presented it in court would, for months or even years, prevent this Parliament from proceeding to discuss matters that are of public interest. However, I put it on record, as I think I should also put on record another one I have here. It is on page 264 of the same publication and says—

“Statutory recognition of the privilege of freedom of speech in Parliament had its genesis in the famous Bill of Rights (the document setting forth the conditions upon which the British throne was offered to William and Mary in 1688), the ninth article of which declares—That the freedom of speech and debates or proceedings in Parliament, ought not be impeached or questioned in any court or place out of Parliament.”

There are so many people outside, including the Press, who in their own way want to claim privilege for what is said in their papers but at times proceed to publish matter that would indicate that they were not so happy in conceding to members of this House the long-established principle of freedom of speech and protection from the laws of libel and defamation.

I have more matters to discuss than time will allow me, but I want to deal with some phases of the royal commission that was appointed to inquire into matters connected with a certain hotel and the police administration of the liquor laws.

Firstly, my own impressions were that the proceedings were somewhat drawn out and that the further they went the more farcical they became. It is true, perhaps, that that was not the fault of the presiding officer—the judge who controlled the activities of the commission. After all, he was asked to allow as wide a scope as judicial procedure would allow to the parties before the commission and those affected by it. One interesting feature was the quotation from the Scriptures having regard to personalities. It appeared a little out of place, at least as I read it.

Then there was the charge that certain members of the A.L.P. spivved on their mates. This, of course, was not accepted kindly by members of the Australian Labour Party, and I should not think it would be.

If I may say so at this stage, I do not think many people would be impressed by the police tactics in the initial stages of the commission. If we are to reach a stage where the police organisation is to be used to screen the background of every witness who is to appear before such a body, then there is not much hope for the administration of justice in this State. I think it was a shocking thing for the Press to be able to come out and say that members of the Police Force, virtually on an Australia-wide basis, were investigating the background of a certain witness. Probably they could have got all the information they wanted here—sufficient to damn him—but the proper place to use that is in the witness box, and to allow it to be dealt with accordingly. I hope that some of the persons who were parties to that action will not themselves experience similar treatment. With the array of counsel that appeared, it was difficult for me to work out for whom Mr. Arnold Bennett was really appearing. I thought he may have been appointed by the Government to watch the public interest. He was supposed to be representing the Crown. He seemed to take up as much time “rubbishing” certain witnesses before the commission as did some of the counsel appearing for the affected parties.

Mr. Aikens interjected.

Mr. WALSH: If the hon. member wants to box on, let him say so.

Mr. Aikens interjected.

Mr. WALSH: I am not interested in what happened between the hon. member and Mr. Justice Mack. Probably Mr. Justice Mack was right, anyway.

At one stage I formed the impression that Mr. Arnold Bennett was appearing for the girls. The suggestion was even made in this House that perjury was committed before the commission. It was intriguing to see a man who was representing the Crown not being interested in this particular type of witness. I am interested only in the public phase of this matter, not the individual phases.

Seeing that the Minister for Education, who at one time administered the Police Force, is sitting on the front bench, let me say that it was rather intriguing that this Government did not see fit to print the report of this royal commission. To my knowledge, reports of every royal commission appointed by Labour Governments were printed and tabled. Those documents were available for examination and consideration of hon members, and they could obtain copies of them. It is not much use tabling something in the House as a record of administration which, as time goes on, merely becomes part of the cluttered-up junk of Parliament and is finally

removed to the stables at the rear of the building. If somebody wants to have a look at it, where does he go? In the first place I was surprised that the Leader of the Opposition did not move that the report of the royal commission be printed.

Probably it would have given us the opportunity to debate the matter, anyhow. Although I appreciate that the Government might be saving money for something else, I suggest in all seriousness that some copies might have been made available to the Parliamentary Library where they would have been available for hon. members.

Mr. Aikens: I am interested to find out who paid Young's legal costs. The A.L.P., I think.

Mr. WALSH: Let the hon. member ask Mr. Young.

Going back to the origin of this inquiry, I would say that probably the words used by the hon. member for South Brisbane were somewhat loose. I suppose I still have the privilege to say these things, but any person who charges another with condoning and encouraging misdemeanour or irregularity is certainly set the problem of proving it. It is nearly as bad as a charge of conspiracy before a court. Many of us know how difficult it is to get a jury to convict in charges of that nature. I am not saying that any of the matters that have arisen as a result of these findings and the comment that has been made is the fault of the judge, because I think everybody agrees that he is certainly a man of very high integrity, and there is no question as to his suitability to conduct the commission. If the right witnesses did not come forward—and people made statements to several hon. members of this House—after public appeals had been made (even by the chairman of the commission himself) it is no fault of the presiding judge.

As we go along we find the machinery in action: the disappearing witness who was so important, and particularly a member of the Police Force who suddenly resigned and left the State. Even he did not respond to the appeal to come back and give evidence. If he thought he could completely exonerate any member of the Police Force in respect of allegations made against him—rightfully or wrongfully as the case may be—why did he not offer some evidence of what he knew about it? But no, like one or two others, he disappeared. Let me repeat that I was amazed at the facility with which some of the witnesses could conveniently remember, or forget, or be unsure of the circumstances, depending of course on how the answer to the question would affect their own credibility. I am not saying this without having read the transcript. I am not depending on Press reports. To the extent that that applies to certain police witnesses—if that is the standard of their sworn testimony in

criminal cases in the past—I wonder how many innocent people have been put in gaol, even for major offences.

Mr. Aikens: Why didn't you go into the box yourself?

Mr. WALSH: I cannot afford to waste time on the hon. member for Townsville South. If he wants to be the gas-pipe of certain sections of the Press here and abuse the privileges of this House, I do not intend to follow suit with him.

I put this proposition: it may be that the rules of evidence as applying to royal commissions are such that they would not be acceptable in the hearing of a criminal case before a judge and jury. Never have I seen or read so much shifty and uncertain evidence given by police witnesses. My own feelings are that probably the judge's strict adherence to judicial procedure in these proceedings operated to save many people from a most embarrassing situation. Even if one followed the published reports one could not help thinking that there were so many "dead" or "dumb" witnesses appearing before the commission. In all my experience I cannot recall so many witnesses running "dead", as I put it. If the same form was shown by horses on a racecourse the stewards would be called in, for sure. The manner in which certain police handle their diaries must throw doubt on a great deal of the police evidence. This was mentioned by the Commissioner in his findings.

While a great deal of money and a lot of police machinery were used for the purpose of drawing red herrings across the track, I do not think the Government came out of it as well as it might have. I am not absolving the Government in any way for its handling of the matter, irrespective of the loose language that the hon. member for South Brisbane may have used in laying his charges. It would be idle to suggest that hon. members had not heard many statements about these matters.

I make this observation: if the published reports in "The Courier-Mail", the "Telegraph", and "Sunday Truth" are to be accepted as a guide, the policing of the Liquor Act is just as loose as it was previously. These articles are all recent. The heading in the "Sunday Truth" of 26 July reads, "Law Liquor Breach At Ball." In the "Telegraph" of 5 August there are photographs of bottles and glasses. There is a report in "The Courier-Mail" by a staff reporter. It says that the Minister in charge of police, Mr. Dewar, intends to make a thorough investigation into this matter. There is a heading in "The Courier-Mail" of Tuesday, 28 July 1964, which reads, "Nightclub drinkers avoid police clamp-down." That place was prominently identified with the royal commission hearing.

Even though this staff reporter from "The Courier-Mail" sat in, according to his report, and witnessed these things going on in the early hours of the morning, and reported it to his editor, if he appeared before the royal commission it would be treated as uncorroborated evidence. That would be most important if the plainclothes police and uniformed police who made the investigations were not able to identify the parties. If that is the extent of the efficiency of the Police Force in this State, the sooner something is done to change the administration, the better.

I know that the Minister in charge of police has made reference to a new plan for the next 20 years. I wonder whether we have been told all the story in this respect. Irrespective of the opinions of hon. members on the findings of the commission, I think that if the great majority of them gave an honest opinion on this matter it would be that public opinion is that the findings were an extensive whitewashing of certain people.

Mr. Aikens: Isn't that a reflection on the judge?

Mr. WALSH: After all the years he has been here, the hon. member for Townsville South should know that it is competent for any member to criticise any decision of any court.

Mr. Aikens: Hear, hear! I will support you on that.

Mr. WALSH: The Licensing Commission added to the farce with its merciful decision, following the hearing before it. What a contrast that was with the speed with which the police acted in the Ulster Hotel case, which I doubt if one member of this House had ever heard spoken of.

I do not know what is behind all these moves. I have a right to ask these questions, and I will continue to exercise it irrespective of any threat that may come from any source or any people, no matter what may be their status in life, particularly in the administration of the Police Force. They will never bluff me out of expressing my opinions in this House.

Here again the Licensing Commission followed with a decision entirely different from the one that applied in the other case. Members of the public have their feelings in these matters, and long before the inquiry finished their opinion was widely expressed in terms such as, "The police will get out of it. It's a cover-up."

Another similar case was the inquiry undertaken by Mr. Arnold Bennett, Q.C., concerning missing papers connected with the Plomp case. Following remarks made by, I think, Mr. Justice Philp, the Government appointed Mr. Arnold Bennett to inquire into this matter. What did the inquiry show to those who followed it through? It revealed inefficiency within the Criminal Investigation Branch at that time, and, in particular, on

the part of the person in charge. They proceeded then to involve a man who had been associated with the arrest of Plomp, and left in his lap a very substantial bill of costs that the Government has refused to pay.

This was followed by the Government's appointment of Mr. M. B. Hoare, Q.C., to inquire in effect into whether statements made by three members of the Full Court were right or wrong in respect of a certain police officer. In view of all these circumstances, how could the public not get feelings that all is not right in these matters?

I have only five minutes left, and I want to deal with a matter mentioned in "The Courier-Mail" of this morning. It concerns an application by a certain woman to the Minister for Justice for the payment of legal costs incurred in defending a charge made against her son. It interested me to read in the Press at the week-end portion of the contents of the letter from the Minister for Justice in which he said that the claim for costs had been rejected. Then he made this fantastic suggestion: that the mere fact that the defending counsel, who, by the way, was one Daniel Casey, had not made an application to have the case taken from the jury indicated that there was a case to go to the jury. One does not have to be a barrister to know that a judge would find it almost impossible to justify a decision to take away from a jury a case in which it was alleged by the police that a boy had made a confession. How in the name of goodness could a judge accede to such a proposition? Let me put it the other way. Would it not have been fairer for the Crown Law Office, which had before it all the evidence, evidence that would not be available to the defendant's counsel when the decision was made to proceed with the case, to have entered a *nolle prosequi*? Of course it would have been. Instead, a witness was brought all the way from New Guinea, at a cost of £150 to £200 to the Government, only to give evidence, as he did in the lower court, that he had not even made a complaint. In the face of this, the Minister for Justice says that the fact that counsel for the defence did not apply to have the case taken from the jury showed that there was some evidence to go to the jury. How stupid can one get!

There were many other matters to which I wished to refer, but time will not permit me to deal with them now. Some of them relate to matters that I have raised in the House previously and I shall have more to say about them later, when an opportunity offers. However, I should like to draw the attention of the Minister for Transport to the rule preventing taxi-cabs from turning right off Victoria Bridge at William Street after half-past four in the afternoon. Passengers who take a taxi at the Treasury rank or the Albert Street rank and who want to come down here have to travel a very circuitous route. In effect, the area in Queen Street from William Street down to Creek Street is a no-man's land for taxis. In my opinion, taxis are

just as important in the public transport system of the city as are trams and buses. In fact, they are probably more important, because there are no trams and buses running after a certain hour at night and one expects taxis to be available then. So if a bus has the right to turn right at William Street after 4.30 p.m., let us make sure that taxis, which provide a similar service, have a similar right. I do not think it is fair to the travelling public to deny them this right. In peak-hour traffic it would take about 25 minutes or more to complete the circuit and get down to this end of George Street. I have had personal experience of the difficulty that taxis from the City Hall rank, say, have in getting through the peak-hour traffic, and taxis coming from South Brisbane, as I said, are not allowed to turn right off Victoria Bridge into William Street. It is not a big thing, but if the Minister intends to investigate the problems confronting taxi-drivers, he might well consider the points that I have mentioned.

(Time expired.)

Mr. HOOPER (Greenslopes) (3.44 p.m.): I join with other hon. members in affirming my own loyalty and the loyalty of the people of Greenslopes to Her Majesty the Queen, and I endorse the remarks that have been made during the debate about our hard-working Governor, Sir Henry Abel Smith, and his wife, Lady May. I congratulate them on the wonderful work they are doing in Queensland.

Before moving on to refer to some of the less fortunate people about whom I intend to speak today I cannot help but remark on something that was said in this Chamber this morning by my colleague and very good friend the hon. member for Merthyr, Mr. Ramsden, who spoke of the very grave situation with which we are faced at the present time. It was not my intention to say anything in this Chamber, but I feel very deeply for the people in Malaysia, and Singapore in particular, to whom I owe my life. I refer to the Malaysian-Chinese. The position in which they are placed at present is a very dangerous one and I pray to God that the situation will ease, particularly for those very true friends of mine and of many others who were unfortunate enough to be in the Eighth Division in World War II.

I should also like to express my sincere congratulations to the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. The hon. member for Yeronga, Mr. Lee, is of course an electoral neighbour of mine and, judging from what I have already seen of him since his endorsement as the Liberal Party candidate, I believe he will be a worthy successor to the late Dr. Noble.

Mr. Duggan: Would you be a good judge?

Mr. HOOPER: I should say that I would be an extremely good judge of a man like Mr. Lee, and I should also say that the Liberal Party, in selecting a candidate for

Yeronga, selected him in a most democratic way. May I say here and now that the hon. member was elected as the Liberal candidate democratically and fairly; he was the choice of the majority of people who attended the meeting.

Mr. Duggan: Mr. Aboud would have attended?

Mr. HOOPER: Mr. Aboud had the same opportunity as Mr. Lee had. He did not get the endorsement, and all I can say—and I say it sincerely—is that Mr. Lee won his endorsement honestly and fairly. I know it was a sincere and honest vote because I was there representing the parliamentary members of my party.

Mr. Duggan interjected.

Mr. HOOPER: The Leader of the Opposition may chide the hon. member for Yeronga but I say that he will show hon. members opposite in no uncertain manner that he is a worthy member of this Chamber and one who will live up to the ideals in which we on this side believe.

Getting back to Mr. Lee, I believe that he will bring to this House not only his own personal experience in business but his experience as a working man who did not get things as easy as did some members opposite who chide him. It may do them some good to remember that Mr. Lee started off in business with one vehicle and a pick and shovel. He worked hard and got to the top, and I congratulate him for it.

I should also like to congratulate my colleague the hon. member for Warwick, who seconded the motion. Of course, this was not Mr. Cory's maiden speech but he contributed a tremendous amount to the debate and I believe he is to be congratulated on it. The two hon. members who had the honour of moving and seconding the motion came into this Chamber after most unfortunate happenings, namely, two deaths. We all know only too well the tragic circumstances surrounding the unfortunate passing of the late Mr. Otto Madsen. It was not my privilege to have known him for very long. It was only from 1957 until his passing that I had that privilege, but in that time I found him to be an industrious, courteous and honest member of the Government.

The hon. member for Yeronga succeeds the late Hon. H. W. Noble. My knowledge of Dr. Noble goes back many years—back to the 1930's when he came to Queensland and commenced practice as a young doctor at Cleveland. At that time my sister had a private hospital in Cleveland, and Dr. Noble was the doctor there. I believe that all in the Chamber would agree that the late Dr. Noble was a gentleman, a fine doctor and a humanitarian. On my own behalf let me say that I feel the richer for having passed his way. I wish to convey to Mrs. Noble and the members of the family my sincere condolences in their very great loss.

I wish to say something about a section of the community not as fortunate as we are. I indicated this earlier in my speech. I refer to those people who receive respect and admiration for what they are doing, for their courage and their fortitude—the blind people. I speak from my heart. Only a couple of years ago I became associated with an organisation under the auspices of the Queensland Braille Writing Association when I was elected to the committee of the Queensland Training and Placement Centre for the Blind. I wish to say something of the great work this centre is doing, and has been doing, for a number of years.

The work carried out by that organisation under the auspices of the Queensland Braille Writing Association has to be seen and studied to be believed. Later I will table a recent brochure produced on behalf of the Association. It has been given the fitting caption, "When the hands can see, the world becomes alive again, and hope returns." The Association functions as a free lending library. I am talking now about the mother association, the Queensland Braille Writing Association. In this free lending library for the blind at the present time some 6,000 volumes are provided. A free teaching service for the adult blind has been provided since 1897—67 years. Braille books are produced by voluntary transcribers, and these are circulated in Queensland, New Guinea and other parts of our territory in the islands. A free monthly magazine in braille is produced, edited and embossed and sent to readers in Australia, New Zealand, New Guinea, the United Kingdom, India, South Africa, Ceylon, Fiji, Brazil, Jerusalem and the United States of America. The transcribing of magazines into braille by voluntary workers is magnificent work. An average of 100 books, as well as magazines and papers, are transcribed each year for the primary, secondary and tertiary students covering English, French, German, geography, history, mathematics, chemistry, physics, science, psychology, economics, philosophy and social studies. Other subjects, such as Latin and art of speech are also transcribed for our examinations. In 20 years, one voluntary lady transcriber has transcribed 36,000 pages of braille. She also donates to the association the fees paid to her by the Department of Education and the university for braille work for the Junior, Senior and University examination papers.

The funds are derived from voluntary subscriptions and donations are also important in fund raising. We receive no Government subsidy whatever.

Mr. Tucker interjected.

Mr. HOOPER: I remind the interjector that this has been going on for 67 years. We do not employ any collectors for the Queensland Braille Writing Association. The entire work of the association is done by 60 workers at Braille House, all giving their

services entirely free. The Commonwealth Government allows braille books and equipment to travel post-free and gives concession rates for telephone calls. The State Government binds 50 volumes of transcribed braille free of charge every year and in 1954 made £3,000 available for the blind towards the purchase of Braille House. In 1959-1960 a further £5,000 was provided by the State Government for extensions to Braille House. The appointment of Miss M. D. Biggs as a teacher of braille helps the association greatly. She assists at the centre and visits blind people at their homes and in hospital throughout the State.

The school for the blind and the Q.M.L. Society for the Blind through its scholarship fund for high-school students—which has now lapsed—have provided some materials for the production of textbooks. On an income of £1,000 to £1,500 a year the association manages to maintain Braille House and to purchase braille paper and equipment both locally and from overseas. Binding materials, etc. are also purchased locally and overseas. It conducts social functions and provides other services for the blind, all services being entirely free.

I think it is well to note that, in 1951, the Queensland Braille Writing Association Committee, realising the importance of placing young blind people in unsheltered occupations—and I emphasise “unsheltered occupations”—approached the P.M.G. Department about the training of switchboard attendants. This scheme was set up at the Queensland Industrial Institution for the Blind and Miss Muriel Best was allocated for the training of blind people as switchboard attendants. This was a happy day for the blind people and for us.

Mr. Alan Hinton, the first trainee, was ready for appointment to a position as a switchboard attendant. Mrs. McMurdo, who was honorary treasurer of the association, and later the officer in charge of the Training and Placement Committee, and Miss Bird, the honorary secretary of the Braille Writing Association, visited 30 firms in Brisbane to see if they could place some of these people. Indeed there were teething troubles. Following on those visits there was not one single success.

They then approached the Department of the Premier and received from the officers there the greatest assistance. It is recorded in Braille House that the assistance given by Mr. Colin Curtis was magnificent. The feeling in the association is that without his help many placements would not have been made. This did not happen easily. Discussions took place for months in an effort to enlighten people as to what properly-trained blind people could do.

In 1954 the Training and Placement Committee became a separate section of the Braille Writing Association of Queensland, and much more recently, from 1961, was known as the Training and Placement Centre

for the Blind. Firstly, I feel I should take hon. members back to 1956, when a very small committee was formed under the auspices of the Queensland Braille Writing Association. Its primary object was to secure employment in open industry for blind school-leavers—that was the object at the time—and further, for those older blind persons desirous of improving their opportunities, to remove them from the sheltered workshops where only the time-worn trades of basket-making, etc., were available. That was the real idea behind the Training and Placement Centre.

Prior to 1956 some few placements had in fact been made through the untiring efforts of the two devoted ladies I mentioned previously, who worked very hard for them. The formation of this committee was suggested by a member of the National Council of Women, following a talk delivered to the league by Miss Mercy Griffin, who is now Mrs. Harold Dickinson. She is blind, and is a Bachelor of Arts. She taught at the blind school for a number of years before her recent marriage. She is a Rockhampton girl, and still goes back to Rockhampton to visit her people. I should like to pay tribute to Mrs. Dickinson for a life of devotion to the people who have suffered, as she has, from blindness.

The talk that I have just referred to was delivered by Miss Griffin after her return from Great Britain and America in 1955, and it aroused a great deal of enthusiasm in the people who heard it. The first chairman of the Training and Placement Centre was Dr. H. W. Thiel, now a student councillor at the Queensland University. One of the most active and zealous committee members was Mr. Malcolm Bryce, a blind ex-service man who was trained in physiotherapy at St. Dunstons. Those who know anything about blind ex-service men know the wonderful job done at St. Dunstons for many of our men. Mr. Bryce is at present practising at the Government Rehabilitation Centre as a physiotherapist. He is also the present chairman of the Training and Placement Centre for the Blind.

Several successful placements were made shortly after this. Some were switchboard operators and some were placed in positions in light assembly work. I believe that it was indeed a wonderful effort to get these people into this type of work. Not all are totally blind, but most are. My colleague the hon. member for Kurilpa knows all about this because he, too, was a member of the committee. He knows the work that has been done, particularly by voluntary workers, in training these people.

Committee members were finding it exceedingly difficult to take time from their work and professions to investigate possible placements and interview prospective employers. In June, 1962, Mr. and Mrs. Harold Dickinson left Brisbane on what was to have been at that stage a honeymoon trip. They are both blind. They were to make a tour of Great

Britain, visit Hanover for the international conference of educators of blind youth, spend a further period in England and Scotland, and return home via America. Whilst in England they took the opportunity of visiting many rehabilitation centres for blind persons and kindred organisations, and investigating possibilities and gleaned ideas for implementation on their return home.

Facilities for the use of this experience were to come in greater measure than they had expected, and much quicker. During their absence it was decided to inaugurate a full-time training programme for the rehabilitation and placement of all blind people. To this end Mr. Dickinson was offered the position of director of the Training and Placement Centre for the Blind, perhaps largely in view of his long and varied experience with industry generally and his useful contacts resulting from his interest in industry. The centre began a full-time training course on 16 April, 1963. Once again the parent organisation, the Braille Writing Association, assisted with the provision of premises and facilities.

Here let it be understood that the centre receives absolutely no Government assistance, as I said before, and relies solely on private donations and profits made at various public functions. From this it will be appreciated that its financial resources are severely limited, which seriously restricts the full scope of its activity. Nevertheless, for the 12 months ended April this year 45 students have been enrolled in age groups ranging from 16 to 75 years.

To the initial purpose of training for placement it was found necessary to add a more comprehensive scheme of rehabilitation for older blind persons, particularly those suffering from loss of sight through accident or illness. Indeed, this facet of the centre's work, though less spectacular, seems to be more important than its primary aim. During the last 12 months successful placements were made in professions, industry and commerce. A general routine has been laid down, consisting mainly of practical English—for example, spelling, letter writing, typing, braille shorthand, where required—and all kinds of cooking, sewing, home management, pre-vocational training, and some of the odd jobs around the home for which training is necessary. For all blind people, mobility and independence are prime factors and a necessary addition to any course that may be taken at the centre.

The primary aims of the centre were modelled on what was seen overseas by Mr. and Mrs. Dickinson, and the correctness of this has been borne out as the centre has grown. From the first week of the centre's operation—I am speaking about the present full-time centre—Mrs. Dickinson has worked for three days each week in a voluntary capacity, in addition to working with evening classes. I should like to pay tribute, too, to Mr. Dickinson, who, with his wife, is training people at his own home. The

Dickinsons have a very comprehensive range of machines belonging solely to them at their Taringa home, and they do this work outside the hours that Mr. Dickinson is required to be at the centre. Mrs. Dickinson's enthusiasm has infected all those who know her personally, and her experience has been of great value to the centre. Indeed, without her generous assistance much of the success of the first year's operations would not have been possible.

Many other voluntary workers and assistant teachers have also contributed in no small measure to the progress and welfare of the students. As the centre is the only one of its kind in a State with an area of about 1,000,000 square miles, it is obvious that the students have widely differing backgrounds and that their educational, social and economic standards vary tremendously. Because of lack of finance, our work with students from distant localities is restricted by the availability of accommodation and the students' ability to live away from home. One of our greatest needs is finance to enable us to provide suitable accommodation, plus a training allowance. We sincerely believe that this and other problems will be solved by the committee as the work becomes more widely recognised, and some degree of public awareness of its importance to the community is already manifest. Pioneering in any field is an exciting challenge. Efforts are frequently thwarted by scepticism and lack of finance, but the rewarding moments are those when blind people are placed in useful work. This is the ultimate achievement.

The Training and Placement Centre has produced a brochure that outlines pictorially some very important facets of the work that it is carrying out, and I table two copies of the brochure for the information of hon. members. Here I should like to pay a special tribute to my colleague the Minister for Education, who in recent weeks sought and received Cabinet approval for the use of the former Junction Park vocational training school at Annerley as a training and placement centre for the blind, who are at present training under difficult conditions. On behalf of the committee I express my sincere thanks to Mr. Pizzey and other members of the Cabinet who have taken this humane step to assist us in the work we are doing. I am quite sure that this training and placement centre will not disappoint them.

I should like now to make one or two remarks about optometry. I appeal to the Minister for Health and the Minister for Education to examine the present Optometry Act. I shall make some suggestions as to what I believe is necessary in order to raise the standard of education. The educational standard for entrance to the optometry profession should be raised to matriculation standard in any faculty provided it includes physics, which is important. This can be done by altering the Act to give the Board by-law making power in respect to the prescribed entrance standard. This would then enable the Board to arrange a full-time

course which it has not at present the power to do. This also could be done by negotiation between the Board and the Department of Education.

A university optometry course would be preferable and would be welcomed by the university. Whilst Queensland was the first State to introduce the registration of optometrists it is the last to raise the educational standards to present-day requirements. Whilst the present standards exist in Queensland, optometrists are debarred from reciprocity with the other States, and this is important.

The Board of Optical Registration at present consists of three Government representatives, three Association representatives and one Government-appointed chairman. While the Optical Association feels that this is theoretically a good arrangement it is irksome that a member of the opposition—I am not referring to my colleagues opposite—is on the Board representing optometrists. This member is a Government representative. In other words, optometrists do not have representation on the Medical Board.

I might mention that these views are identical with those of the Australian Optometrical Association, Queensland Division, and could be instituted with very little expense. It could be done quickly and without any worry and I implore both the Minister for Education and the Minister for Health to have it instituted.

I should like now to refer to a Press article that appeared in "The Courier-Mail" of yesterday's date. I think all hon. members would have seen it. I do not in any way wish to make this political or to snipe at the Australian Labour Party, but the heading of the article is "Hospitals Lip Service" and it reads, "Lowood delegate, Mr. Walters, told the conference that the present Government was only paying lip-service to the free hospitals scheme in Queensland", and so on. Mr. Walters went on to say that this Government was doing nothing about free hospitals in the area he represented. I want to throw that charge back in Mr. Walters' teeth because yesterday I had a phone call from a lady who was the matron of a private hospital in Lowood in 1955 and 1956. It is anybody's guess who was the owner of the premises! It was none other than Mr. Walters himself. An approach was made to the then Labour Government to have this private hospital revert to a cottage hospital. The request was turned down. I will mention the matron's name because she has given me permission to do so. She is well known to me and was well known to the late Dr. Noble after he went to Cleveland in the 1930's—Matron Deighton. She leased these premises from Mr. Walters. Mr. Walters said that he did not want them to continue as a hospital. He said he would rather turn the premises into flats than have them as a hospital, either private or public.

I say this only for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition. I am sure he would not want these false claims put before him by a member who attended his conference. This is factual. I challenge any hon. member to ask the Minister for Health a question as to whether representations from Lowood were made in the time of the Hon. W. M. Moore, and whether they were turned down because they did not want a small hospital there. This is the same gentleman who has condemned this Government because we have not instituted a cottage hospital. While she was in Lowood, Matron Deighton averaged two patients a month. She lost £1,500 on her business efforts there.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HOOPER: She is telling the truth. I challenge hon. members who are so loud in their interjections to do something about it. Then we will see what Matron Deighton will do about it. She will stand up to it. If Mr. Walters has been pulling the wool over the eyes of the A.L.P. he is certainly not pulling it over the eyes of the people in Lowood. They are absolutely ashamed of what he has done by trying to make political capital out of what he himself was opposed to. He stated quite clearly at that time that he would rather see those premises converted into flats than used as a hospital. The reason the A.L.P. did not institute a cottage hospital system was that they never believed in it. It was against their policy. Mr. Walters, who was a delegate at one of their recent conferences, has really tried to pull the wool over their eyes. Matron Deighton asked that these facts be aired in the House. I congratulate her for doing so and for her stand in this matter. In this way a few home truths can be put before the members of the Opposition who were so one-eyed as to accept this gentleman when he was opposed to—

Mr. Houston: What evidence have you got to prove it?

Mr. HOOPER: I challenge the hon. member to ask the Minister for Health whether a proposal was made for a cottage hospital at these premises.

(Time expired.)

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH (Tablelands) (4.25 p.m.): It is the wish of the electors of the Tablelands electorate that I convey to His Excellency the Governor, Sir Henry Abel Smith, their expressions of loyalty to our Sovereign, Queen Elizabeth II. In doing so I must pay tribute to His Excellency for the speech he read because it is also the wish of the people I represent that I have something to say about the first paragraph in which he mentioned an industry in Queensland. I refer to the paragraph in which he said, concerning the tobacco industry—

"I trust that, by constant improvement in quality of the tobacco leaf, a larger percentage of Queensland-grown tobacco will be used by the manufacturers."

More tobacco is grown in my electorate than in any other electorate in Australia. For that reason I think it is only right that I should put before the House certain aspects of the industry. To give full coverage I think I should go back to 1930, when tobacco was first grown in the North. At that time expansion in the industry was spasmodic mainly because of lack of irrigation and the inroads of a number of pests. As time went by the pest menace was overcome, and later on the Labour Government planned and built the Tinaroo Falls Dam, which overcame the water shortage. The spasmodic expansion in the first place can be put down to three reasons—

1. No water and no control of pests;
2. Low prices; and
3. No competition.

In 1932 tradesmen from the Ipswich Railway Workshops were given free passes to Mareeba to build tobacco barns. Those hon. members who recall the 1932 period will remember that those were very difficult years. It was not until 1948 that the auction system was introduced. At that time the industry was only on a small scale, and in 1951, 1,300,000 lb. of tobacco was grown in the Mareeba-Dimbulah area. In 1961 the crop increased to 9,100,000 lb. and in 1964 to 14,800,000 lb. However, a fresh problem has crept in, because only 13,500,000 lb. was sold. The irrigation problem and the pests have been overcome but we now have the problem of getting rid of the leaf. This is not due to the poor quality but to lack of stability in the industry and the fact that growers are at the mercy of the buyers on the floor. I will later prove that this happens in all States in Australia where tobacco is grown, not only in Queensland.

Mr. Bromley: Would you say that a price ring is operating?

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH: I would say that a price ring is operating when the price is kept below the production cost. That is to the advantage of the people who are buying. I emphasise that there is no problem in production but there is a big problem in marketing. If the industry fails in the district there is no alternative crop. In other areas, if for some reason or another a crop fails in one year, the farmers can plant an alternative crop and the money put into the land can be recouped to a certain extent. They do not lose everything, including their homes.

It cannot be denied that the situation is unsatisfactory when 8·8 per cent. of the crop is unsold. When I say that 1,300,000 lb. is not sold, I ask hon. members to bear in mind that the price of 1 lb. of leaf could be averaged at 10s. One does not need to be a Rhodes Scholar to realise that that amounts to over £500,000. There was also an average price decline last year from 144d. to 129·6d. a lb. It is not difficult to imagine the result. Although Mareeba gives the appearance of being

a prosperous town, the shopkeepers will tell you that industry is not buoyant; their business is not buoyant. The farmers are very much into the banks, and they are wondering what to do for the coming season.

The need for stabilisation is recognised by all growers, but they cannot agree on who is to make the sacrifice. Many facts have to be considered in achieving stabilisation, owing to the particular system necessary for the growing and marketing of tobacco. The essential element is marketing, which is in the hands of the Commonwealth Government, mainly through the percentage system which still operates.

The percentage system has been passed over by numbers of people. I think it is just as well to refer to what it means to the buyer. The present percentage is 41·5, and that is all the Australian leaf that a manufacturer need buy in order to qualify for an extensive rebate on leaf imported from overseas where production conditions and figures are lower than in Australia. The saving is of no small size. It amounts to enough money to pay all the advertising costs of the various companies, and anyone looking at television, the films, or the newspapers, realises that it runs into thousands and thousands of pounds. If the manufacturers buy that percentage of leaf, the Government in effect pays for their advertising. It is most important that the Commonwealth Government should shoulder its responsibility.

I refer to a circular issued by the Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board on 15 May, 1964. That board asked the Commonwealth Government to shoulder its responsibility, and this was the text of the reply—

“The Federal Government advised growers not to sacrifice their leaf but at the same time to use tolerance and a sense of responsibility in their dealings with manufacturers, in consideration for which the Federal Government promised to do all it could to ensure a satisfactory price and clearance of the current tobacco crop.”

The reduction in percentage dates back to 11 September, 1962, when the Acting Minister for Trade, Senator Henty, reduced it from 43 to 40. The then hon. member for Tablelands, Mr. Gilmore, told the people in that area, “Growers are reassured from the Minister’s statement that as soon as the 1963 crop estimates are available that year’s percentage will be determined according to normal principles.” We went back from 43 to 40 per cent. in 1962. It is now 1964; the fields have been planted for 1965, and we have advanced 1½ per cent. It must be realised that each one-half per cent. means thousands of pounds for the growers brought about by increased sales.

The reason given for the reduction in the first percentage from 43 to 40 was that sufficient leaf could not be produced. That was in 1962. The surplus leaf at this present

moment in Australia amounts to 13,000,000 lb., which represents more than half a complete season's crop.

Mr. Bromley: It is no wonder that they are walking off their farms.

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH: As the hon. member for Norman says, it is no wonder that they are walking off their properties. A very large headline to that effect appeared recently in the Press. It referred to growers in the south-west of the State, but the same thing is also happening in the Mareeba area.

It appears that the rate of increase of the percentage cannot cope with the supply. In other words, whilst the percentage remains at 41.5 it cannot cope with the supply of leaf at the present time. This is where the State Government has to come into the picture and assume responsibility for controlling production. We have the Commonwealth Government controlling percentage. The State Government's job now is to control production. The industry is looking to the Governments in those States in which tobacco is grown for some positive action to enable the industry to be taken under control for the benefit of all. The growers are looking to the State Government to indicate its willingness to take whatever steps are necessary to enable the industry to be controlled.

Mr. Bjelke-Petersen: What are the tobacco-growers themselves doing to organise and control their own industry?

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH: They are coming down to see members of the Government. They have had various deputations.

Mr. Bjelke-Petersen: Peanut-growers organise and control themselves in matters such as planting and so on.

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH: When it is realised that tobacco is grown in two or three States, it will be seen that no State alone can take any particular action, nor can any particular group of growers. They can, however, suggest action. Only recently a Tobacco Marketing Board was set up in New South Wales. There has been no unanimity among the States in the control or sale of tobacco, which is why growers look to the State Governments to express a willingness to get together on the matter. All hon. members know that if one gets together a number of trades people or people interested in one thing, all have different ideas. The Government should be able to come to some arrangement for the control of the production of tobacco leaf.

This action has been left a little too late because next year's crop has already been planted. I was in my electorate a couple of weeks ago and plants are now six to eight inches high. Production will once more be too great.

Mr. Campbell: Don't you think they could do something to look after themselves?

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH: Added to the 13,000,000 lb. that I mentioned before will be still more unsold leaf unless there is some improvement in the percentage and a curtailment of production for the next three or four years.

Mr. Bromley: Yet the hon. member for Aspley says they should look after themselves.

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH: That is typical of the hon. member for Aspley, and indeed all on the other side of the House. I remember a Liberal member's saying to people in Burketown, "We have our problems, but we didn't ask you fellows to come up here." That is the Government's decentralisation policy—"Look after yourselves; we are not interested." I am interested in these people, and as long as I am in the House I shall try to protect their interests.

Similarly, it would be a retrograde step if the vast water resources of the Tinaroo Falls Dam were not used to the fullest possible extent because of lack of development. I have heard some rather innocuous remarks from Government members about water conservation, but I assure them that without water conservation the tobacco industry would be in the same boat as it was in the 1930's.

There must be a place in any stabilisation scheme for future expansion, and the State Government should insist that any increased level of production to which it agrees shall provide for such expansion. I should point out here that on many farms the soil has been tested and found to be unsuitable for tobacco-growing. What will happen to those farmers? As I said earlier, there are no alternative crops. I have been told by departmental officers and by Ministers that they could probably grow vegetables. Alf Jonsson tried to grow vegetables and he finished up in gaol. As the hon. member for Mulgrave mentioned this morning, we have not got the markets. Unless one has a market, one cannot sell one's crop. In this instance there is a market but it is being exploited, and that is where the Government should step in. Whatever form of stabilisation is introduced growers must experience some hardship, and I think we should consider the great majority of growers instead of trying to find a scheme that will satisfy everyone. It is the Government's clear duty to play a leading part in putting the industry on a firm footing. The bankruptcy and distress that follows in the wake of unsuccessful tobacco sales is very disturbing, and the State Government should make strong representations to the Commonwealth Government to ensure that a market is found for this valuable Australian commodity.

I have here the July issue of "The Australian Tobacco Journal", and, so that it will be recorded in "Hansard", I read the following passage from the editorial—

"The Commonwealth Government therefore cannot be excluded from any arrangements for the operation of this industry. Because of its vital role, the greater the degree of Commonwealth participation and the greater the exercise of Commonwealth responsibility, then the greater the security the tobacco grower is likely to achieve."

That is why I said that the State Government should approach the Federal Government and make every effort to see that the industry is stabilised. If it is, we shall no longer see headlines such as "Uproar at Tobacco Leaf Auction", "Tobacco Growers Banned from Selling Floor", "Stabilisation Scheme for Tobacco Industry May Be Submitted Next Week by Growers", "Final Details of Tobacco Scheme Still Under Way", and, as I mentioned earlier, in the South-west "Penniless Tobacco Men Walking off Farms". Those things will continue unless this Government, the Commonwealth Government, and the Governments of other States in which tobacco is grown, take immediate and energetic steps to prevent over-supply. It costs approximately 9s. to produce 1 lb. of tobacco leaf, so people should not think that the growers are making millions when they receive 10s. or 11s. a lb. Much of that goes in the production of the leaf.

Mr. Armstrong: The industry is looking at that problem, is it not?

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH: The industry is looking at the problem, but the bank manager is looking at the overdraft. There has been too much looking and not enough action.

I should now like to discuss various aspects of transport. The Gulf shipping service, which was mentioned a few days ago, is still being mentioned and the people of the Gulf of Carpentaria are still being ignored. I say that without fear of contradiction. I have here a newspaper clipping of 10 June giving the Premiers' assurances to these people. We are now past 10 September. The assurance the Premier gave was as follows—

"The people of Normanton need have no fears that their interests would be overlooked by the State Government, the Premier (Mr. Nicklin) said yesterday.

"He said that the Transport Minister (Mr. Chalk) in association with the Treasurer (Mr. Hiley), was now arranging transport services to Normanton.

"He said: 'This service will be, at least, equal to—and possibly much better than—the service they receive at present'."

Having mentioned what happened earlier in the piece, I will now show hon. members that, months later, this state of affairs is still continuing. I have here another clipping of 10 September reading: "North Queensland

ship link will be boosted, says Mr. Nicklin." I say it will be busted and I think the Premier will need a lot more to tell the people of Burketown when he goes there on 4 October than merely to assure them that this or that will not happen. In the article of 10 September he says—

"The new service also would provide a new and regular service to points such as Cooktown, Portland Roads, Marina Plains, and Red Island Point, which the old service rarely touched."

He also said that—

"Arrangements had been made for regular road services from Cairns to Croydon, Normanton and Burketown.

"Present indications were that, in no case, would the service be more costly, and that for many months of the year it would be available at least twice a week compared with once a quarter."

That is the understatement of the year. Mr. McGrath, manager of John Burke Ltd., has an "Error" claim" on the same page in which he states that each port received 11 calls a year. I went to Mr. McGrath and checked on this point because I thought he could have been in error but he assured me that he was correct. He also assured me—which I did not know previously—that when the Premier said that a new service would be provided for Cooktown, Portland Roads, Marina Plains, and Red Island Point, he overlooked the fact that John Burke's had given service regularly to Cooktown, Portland Roads and Marina Plains.

I think that shows that the Premier does not know what is happening. He is giving assurances to these people but what are his assurances worth? This newspaper cutting indicates what the people think of them. It is headed, "Panic buying as change in supply looms." These people in far distant areas are being told that smaller ships will be used for the delivery of their supplies. It stands to reason that foodstuffs will be treated as essential goods, but who is going to decide the priority of other goods to be carried? One person might be waiting for oil; another for fencing, which is of the utmost importance. However, the people loading the goods do not know how important it is. It will be like a ticket in the Casket—you may get it and you may not.

The hon. member for Carnarvon gave an assurance to the shire clerk at Normanton that both the Treasurer and the Minister for Education had assured him that everything would be all right, that there was no need to worry. We have almost the whole Cabinet coming in to add weight to the assurances, but what are they worth? They are worthless when we find that the people who will suffer are those away out on the Gulf of Carpentaria. The Treasurer said, "That is not in the contract." We know it is not in the contract. Why shouldn't it be in the contract? The Premier has given an assurance that these people will

get a service but he cannot tell us how. Keith Hollands cannot tell us how. Who can? We are told that an arrangement has been made for regular services by road from Cairns to Croydon, Normanton, and Burketown. That is so fantastic that I do not think anyone who has lived in the North would take it seriously. One has to travel on only one of those roads to remember for many years what they are like.

Mr. McGrath also claimed that he had over 40 tons of freight waiting to go to Mornington Island. This transport will be by launch after 1 November. The trip from the mouth of the Norman River to Mornington Island is 115 miles. It is 100 miles from Burketown to Mornington Island. Imagine a small launch carrying a full cargo over that open sea! Probably it would not be able to make two or three consecutive trips because it would have other jobs to do. This service is to serve the mission station, where hundreds of aboriginals and white people are dependent on it.

I am pleased that the Minister for Education is in the Chamber because I have another urgent matter to raise. It concerns the two mission stations that are to be rebuilt. The cyclone that caused the damage occurred early this year. Most people in Queensland are confident that already something permanent has been done to alleviate the housing problem in this area. But since that time not one piece of timber or iron has been put permanently in place to provide shelter.

Mr. Pizzey: That is not true, and you know it.

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH: It is true, and I know it.

Mr. Pizzey: You are exaggerating.

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH: I am not, and the Minister knows I am not. When one of the contractors asked a shipping firm could he get 150 tons of cement and 300 tons of timber to the Edward River he was told that the firm was not interested. Another firm told him they could get it only within three miles of the beach. Here we are in September; the storms start in October; the wet season starts in November. I have a letter from one of the missions saying that it would be a good idea to get the people to rebuild palm huts for shelter. It is a shocking state of affairs, particularly when the people of Queensland think that this Government rushed immediately to the aid of these people and gave them shelter. I have here photographs showing the 10 ft. by 8 ft. tents. They have no flies. Anyone who has tried to live in a tent in a temperature of 95 degrees would know what it is like. The tents are housing up to five, six and seven people. Neither I nor anyone else in this House would tolerate it.

A question was asked in the House about the £20,000 guarantee entered into by the Hollands shipping line, concerning the conditions of contract. We were told that it covered all the freight they took.

This brings me to the railway service, another form of transport. A guarantee was given by this Government that the closure of the Mt. Garnet line would not increase prices, but since the closure prices have risen considerably. When the local people learnt of the £20,000 guarantee given by Hollands they could well have suggested that the Minister for Transport gave a guarantee of £20,000 or £200,000 that this would not happen. If he had he would have forfeited it by now and at least the people would be a little better off than they are.

The closure of the Millaa Millaa-Tolga line has already brought to my notice the ways and means by which the alleged loss on the line has been transferred to other departments. I refer firstly to the extra bus service that has had to be provided for school children who were previously carried by rail. Secondly, we now have the spectacle of a winding road between Innisfail and Millaa Millaa on which large trucks can ply at will without paying the 3d. per ton-mile because permit fees are not payable. That is an absolute dead loss to the Government and proves that for too long the people have laboured under the misapprehension that if the railways did not pay they had to be closed down. I ask hon. members whether the roads are paying. Does anyone say what they cost? The only information we get about roads is the large amount that the Government has spent compared with what the A.L.P. spent. I do not think the people can be satisfied with closing down railway lines and building roads and transferring the alleged loss on the railways to other departments such as the Department of Education and the Main Roads Department.

When the Government closes down a line it has to get rid of the houses and other buildings. This brings me to another point—the method of getting rid of them, or letting them to the public. I have already made representations on this subject. The letting conditions are such that no private landlord would ever think of imposing, although some of the conditions may be all right under the Railways Acts for railway employees. When a railway line is closed the houses are left, sometimes even without access to a road. The rental is not low. In a little country place it is £3 10s. a week for an unfurnished house, with no access, plus rates and taxes if leviable, with one month's notice to vacate, and the tenant must insure the house for £1,750. If anyone went to a private landlord who imposed those conditions he definitely would not take the house. However, the Railway Department imposes those conditions on people wanting houses. If they do not take them the department pulls them down and takes

them elsewhere, thus reducing the population in the country areas and showing once again that the Government's policy of decentralisation is just a lot of hot air.

When we see in the headlines, "Our troops will fight" and "Stand by in the North," I ask hon. members to recollect what the trains and the Railway Department did on the Atherton Tablelands during the last war. Prior to entering the House I was responsible for sending a telegram from the R.S.S.&A.I.L.A. to the Prime Minister asking him to intercede on behalf of the people of North Queensland, on the ground of defence, and restrain the Premier from pulling up the Mt. Garnet line. His reply was that it was of no defence value. The position can change overnight, and it could be a sorry day if we find we have no means of transportation where we had one previously.

The Atherton Tableland is the richest part of my electorate. It is in the throes of rehabilitating itself, but not because of the findings of the investigation committee which the Premier set up and which brought in its report on 13 February this year. The report was waited for anxiously by all interested parties, but the farmers were disappointed with its contents. They were disappointed also with the terms of reference, which did not include one to inquire into the growing of sugar on the Atherton Tableland.

The Minister for Primary Industries, Mr. Row, was good enough to accompany me, and the hon. member for Mulgrave was there for good measure, on an inspection of a plot of 1½ acres of sugar-cane grown by Mr. Costa. Mr. Costa said he was ashamed because he had not given it as much treatment as he should, yet Mr. Row was impressed by the cane he selected to look at. It was wrong to allow this committee of investigation to go through the area without looking at those plots and without asking the farmers if they could grow cane.

If a mill was established in that area the Tolga-Millaa Millaa line could remain and be the main artery of supply. It would be a secondary industry on the Tableland, where we now have none. When the hon. member for Mulgrave said that it was better to expand the existing industry, it showed how one-eyed he is in his outlook. We should establish a mill on the Tableland, where cane can be grown.

I have been asked why maize was grown on the Tableland. It was grown there in the first place as an experiment. It was the nearest place of supply for the horse teams that were necessary in the sugar industry in the early days, when there was no rail connection. It was not because it was the only crop that could be grown, and not because it was economical; it was because it could help the sugar industry. I say that the Atherton Tableland has got what it takes to establish a sugar industry of its own.

The Minister for Primary Industries will no doubt agree that the more he examined the cane that he saw the more he was impressed. It was tested at one c.c.s. higher than the mill c.c.s. at that time. We have the quantity and quality of land. It would be easy to change to cane from dairying, maize, or peanuts, and if a minimum assignment was granted the area could continue to grow those other products.

Mr. Armstrong: The only thing you do not understand is costs.

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH: If the hon. member for Mulgrave devoted as much time to the potato industry as he does to the sugar industry, I am sure that before long the potato industry would be blooming.

(Time expired.)

Mr. SMITH (Windsor) (5.4 p.m.): On my own behalf and on behalf of my electors I wish to reaffirm our loyalty to the Throne and our admiration of Her Majesty's representative, His Excellency Sir Henry Abel Smith. To him and his lady we extend our very best wishes.

On my own behalf I wish to thank the House for the consideration extended to me earlier in this session by consenting to a measure which was one of personal interest to me in enabling me to accept the post of Acting Judge-Advocate-General for the R.A.A.F.

Mr. Bennett: You would not have had it without my support.

Mr. SMITH: I feel constrained to say very little about that measure. I am, however, bound to point out, particularly following the interjection of the hon. member for South Brisbane, that the subject on which he spoke was not the subject of the Bill. He spoke of the Judge-Advocate; the measure concerned the Judge-Advocate-General.

Had those speakers who spoke on the introduction of the Bill wished to inform themselves on what was being debated, they could have gone to an encyclopaedia, of which there are many in the Library, or to some of Her Majesty's Stationery Office publications and they would have learnt all about it. It is quite noteworthy that in one of these publications, namely, the Lewis Army and Air Force Courts-Martial Committee Report of 1946, mention is made of a matter that tickled the fancy of the hon. member for Townsville South. That was the title of the position. In this publication, which is Command No. 7608, paragraph 114 at page 25 reads—

"Finally, under this head we commend that the title of 'Judge Advocate General' be changed. As we have pointed out in paragraph 30 above, this title is misleading as tending to suggest that the holder of the office is both an advocate and a judge. If our proposals are accepted the functions

of the Judge Advocate General and his staff will be exclusively judicial and advisory, and we think in future he should be known as the 'Chief Judge Martial', a title which will indicate the judicial character of the office as well as its association with the Services."

It is much more descriptive of the position.

I come now to what is, I submit, a very important matter, namely, the port of Brisbane. Earlier in the debate colleagues of mine referred to it, and the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha suggested the setting up of an advisory body that would concern itself with the development of the port.

Mr. Bromley: Did you write Sam Ramsden's speech?

Mr. SMITH: No, I did not; I can assure the hon. member for Norman of that.

What I suggest is that at this stage of the State's history and development it is important that consideration be given to proposals that have been made for cross-river traffic. My colleague the hon. member for Merthyr advocates a tunnel; he suggests that that is the only solution. I submit that we have to look at the cost structure of a tunnel and weigh it against the benefit to be obtained by above-level river crossings, in effect, bridges.

It seems from the investigations of the hon. member for Merthyr that the cost of a tunnel would be something in the order of £10,000,000. From advice that I have received it would be quite possible to construct certainly two, and possibly three, bridges which would carry far more traffic, and be cheaper to build and maintain, than one tunnel.

Mr. Bromley: Easier to jump off, too.

Mr. SMITH: Yes. We have plenty of candidates for that activity. If the hon. member wants me to, I will name a few. There is at the mouth of the river available for development a large area of land conservatively estimated at some 10,000 to 12,000 acres. There is on both sides of the river this open space or land that can be reclaimed and made into first-class industrial land. I submit that the port of Brisbane should be at that end of the river. It is the logical thing to do. The Treasurer announced that there are to be changes in shipping arrangements now that a second refinery is being developed. That being so, provision is to be made for a swinging basin in the river for shipping to use the two refineries which are fairly well down towards the mouth of the river. If facilities are made available for shipping, that is the sensible place for them. If necessary, quays could be constructed. Wharves, certainly; but, if necessary, quays somewhat like a circular quay arrangement into which shipping could come, moor, be unloaded, and not come right up the river into the populated part

of the city. It is rather stupid to bring diesel and steam ships into the centre of the metropolitan area when we are already plagued by a smog menace. It would be much better, I suggest, to keep the ships in the reaches of the river near its mouth.

The only installations that would be affected by bridges across the down-stream section of the river would be, say, Evans Deakin and two graving docks, one at South Brisbane and one at Cairncross. I ask hon. members to consider how often ships use the river when they are in port for docking. They use it once to go into dock and once to come out again, and if bridges were fitted with a movable section by means of a lift, slides, swings, or something of that sort, occasional use could be made of the river for this purpose.

Mr. Murray: That is quite common.

Mr. SMITH: I thank the hon. member for his interjection. It is quite common. For instance, Tower Bridge in London has had such a device for some time.

It is important to the city that we have easy and reasonably economical rail crossings somewhere downstream. After all, there is a large area of land on the south side suitable for industrial purposes—the Ampol refinery is being built there—and it is only common sense that rail traffic—

Mr. Bennet: You leave the south side alone; I will look after that.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member has enough trouble looking after himself.

It would be only common sense to have a rail link from the 4 ft. 8½ in. gauge virtually circling the city, coming round through the Wynnum area and, if possible, crossing the river into the Meeandah-Myrtle town section, which I expect will develop and become a heavy industrial area, then joining up with what I hope will one day be a standard-gauge line running north. It is important that we have a rail link of this type to bring our produce, be it primary or secondary, to the port.

Mr. Davies interjected.

Mr. SMITH: I am not worrying about how long ago proposals for tunnels were made. I submit that the day of reckoning has arrived. We must look at the cost and see from which scheme we will get most value for our money.

The land that would be needed could be reclaimed with the idea of quays in mind, and if it were done in sections the installation of dock and wharf facilities would be made very easy. There could be an integration of the facilities that are now being planned and built with those which we can reasonably expect to get. I do not overlook the possibility, of course, of another 4 ft. 8½ in. rail link from the Northern Rivers of New South Wales through Tweed Heads and the South Coast to Brisbane. This could be a

high-speed, heavy-duty line, and it could carry commuters from the South Coast. What better place could that line come through than from the Wynnum-Redland Bay side?

With crossings above the river, we could still preserve river traffic. Victoria Bridge does not provide for an immense clearance above the water, yet quite a deal of large traffic uses the Milton and Oxley reaches of the river. Traffic could be preserved up and down the river, and any lighterage required could be provided. One advantage of having the wharves and the railway line brought to the mouth of the river would be the decrease in traffic through the city. At present, any heavy load that is taken off a vessel at the Hamilton wharves and loaded onto a heavy truck or semi-trailer comes along Kingsford Smith Drive, over the Story Bridge, and then out to the heavy industries in the Salisbury-Moorooka area. All that traffic could be, and should be, avoided. We should be looking for ways and means to avoid cluttering up city streets with these off-loaded goods from overseas ships.

Mr. Bromley: Have you discussed this with Sam?

Mr. SMITH: Certainly. As well, I have discussed this scheme with people who know, such as engineers—people who are in a position to say whether or not it is feasible. One objection that could be raised is that on the downstream side of Story Bridge we have an airport, in the eastern sector of the city, with runways pointing towards the river. Admittedly we have; but those runways are at bearings of something like 080 and 140, leaving a 60-degree arc.

Mr. Bennett interjected.

Mr. SMITH: Now that I am getting slightly technical, members of the Opposition are immediately confused. I should have thought this was common sense.

Mr. Murray: It is 8 o'clock.

Mr. SMITH: 080 has no reference to time. It is based on the compass bearing of the strip for an aircraft taking off into an easterly or south-easterly breeze from that strip. Irrespective of the technicalities, which appear to be still beyond hon. members opposite, it means that there is a large section of the downstream portion of the river available for a river crossing because aircraft that had to use either of the strips I have referred to would not be in the line of flight of this particular section. There would be a clear space. The level of the decking of the bridge could be sufficiently high to permit ships of a reasonable size to pass underneath.

I am not sure what clearance there is under Story Bridge but I understand it is something over 100 feet—maybe 120 feet. In any event, I submit that there is ample space available for approaches that would permit building a bridge of a reasonably high level. It would

also carry rail traffic. We had a suggestion from the Lord Mayor a few days ago, on his return from a visit to Sydney, of some attempt to sling another carriageway under Story Bridge. There is no reason why such a structure could not be built into the bridge that I propose, putting road traffic above and rail traffic underneath.

These matters should surely be investigated by some authority, possibly by a port authority if such an authority were constituted. I am not advancing any arguments for or against that authority but I am advancing a strong claim for the development of the lower reaches of the river into industrial and dockyard cites. When I refer to dockyards, I want it clearly understood that it is possible to have high density mooring of ships by having piers one after the other in a sawtooth fashion or just the ordinary quay-side fashion. Particularly with the swinging basin now being constructed in the river the facility can be more easily provided and bigger ships than ever can be handled. Overseas ships are at present hindered to a large extent by a very difficult river. The Brisbane River is not easy to navigate.

Mr. Windsor interjected.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member for Ithaca suggests a similar scheme to that of Liverpool. Such devices are resorted to in all densely populated areas and heavily used traffic areas, and it is about time we got into it. Now we have an opportunity to do it and to prevent any further installations upstream which would prohibit the development of a scheme such as I have suggested. There are many wharves in the upper reaches of the Brisbane River which have now fallen into disuse. We have the spectacle now on the south side of the river of some wharves being pulled down and of others being used as car parks. I suppose we will see more and more of these dilapidated and disused wharves being demolished. I am all for that because no longer do we have river traffic requiring them.

Mr. Bennett: What do you think about the extension of Evans Deakin's shipyard at Kangaroo Point?

Mr. SMITH: That is one of the undertakings which I think should be taken down the river. If they build a ship at Evans Deakin's it will take them months and months to complete it. They will build one, or perhaps two, in a year. That ship could be easily taken downstream through a bridge which has some form of opening provided. If necessary it could be done at night-time when it would cause less dislocation of traffic. It could be done even in the day-time because it would not take a ship 1,000 feet long travelling at even only 4 knots very long to pass through the width of a bridge, and traffic would be interrupted for less time than if there was a bad traffic accident on the bridge.

Mr. Tucker: It is only good for submarines.

Mr. SMITH: It is somewhat soul-destroying when one is making a sensible suggestion to have somebody who has either not been here listening, or who has not been able to follow what one is talking about, say that it is only good for submarines.

I draw the attention of the House to the fact that a tunnel requires constant supervision. It requires constant conditioning of the air to prevent contamination. With the increasing use of diesel motors, and even petrol motors, there is a very high level of danger of air pollution inside a tunnel. Once there is an interruption in the flow of traffic there are grave risks of air pollution. On an overhead structure it does not matter what happens. If there is an interruption in the traffic flow there is no risk of air pollution because the traffic is in the open air. It is not necessary to have men stationed on pylons every 80 yards or so to keep an eye on the traffic or to have somebody there saying, "Speed up" or "Slow down". That is all done on the bridge by the users themselves. Look at the Story Bridge where—

An Opposition Member: Where there is a rat race.

Mr. SMITH: It may be a rat race but it is not necessary to have people regulating the rat race. The rats seem to sort themselves out, but in a tunnel—

Mr. Bennett: It is a rat race in the peak periods.

Mr. SMITH: I think it is the people who are in a hurry to leave the South Brisbane electorate who cause most of the trouble. In a tunnel constant supervision is necessary. You require a means of recharging and replenishing the air. That goes on for 24 hours a day.

Mr. Houston: Would you suggest it should be a toll bridge?

Mr. SMITH: I am very grateful that the subject of toll has been raised. Make no mistake, if a tunnel were built at a cost of £10,000,000, that £10,000,000 would have to be paid by the residents of Brisbane. That amount of money paid in tolls could provide two or three bridge crossings of the river. These would serve the people far more conveniently than one tunnel.

I am not saying that the idea of a tunnel is not good. A tunnel is desirable—it is feasible, anyway. It would be desirable if all other things have been met. But in a community such as ours, which has a lot to do with its money, I think we have to look at the best way we can spend our money and try to get the most for the money we spend. For that reason I think we should leave the tunnel until such time as we have money to spare. There are some places where tunnels have been necessary because bridges could not be built. In such places, of course, a tunnel is not merely feasible, it becomes an absolute essential. I am not denying

that here we have the feasibility, but we also have the feasibility of bridges. So in my submission the test is between the usefulness of a tunnel and the usefulness of bridges. When we go into the cost of each of these facilities, and the length of time the people of Brisbane would be burdened with paying for them, I come down very heavily on the side of the bridges.

I point out that a bridge, by its design and by its location, could be so sited as to affect very little of the present upstream industry. Evans Deakin has been mentioned, and so has the graving-dock. As far as I am concerned the crossing could be north or west of the graving-dock. In any event, if whatever is put there is at a point lower than the Story Bridge, it could have some device built into it which would permit the passing of anything with a high superstructure. It will not be open for long and the dislocation to traffic in that way would be far less than the dislocation caused by traffic banked up waiting for a ferry.

Mr. Bennett: Do you think it is time to replace the Victoria Bridge?

Mr. SMITH: That again is a matter for the engineers. It seems that the time to replace it is just about due, although it seems that it is able to do its duty.

If we could have a heavy-duty river crossing towards the mouth of the river, incorporating a rail crossing, the load on Victoria Bridge, the Story Bridge, and the Indooroopilly Bridge would be lessened.

Mr. Houston: Where would you suggest it be put?

Mr. SMITH: I am not going to site these bridges; I am simply saying that they should be there.

Mr. Houston interjected.

Mr. SMITH: I said that it should be down towards the mouth of the river. I do not set myself up as an expert in every authority. I know a bit about the law and I try to stick to that subject. When it comes to bridges and their placement, I make what I regard as a sensible suggestion. Living as I did near the Hamilton area as a child, I saw the breakwater being filled up with mud pumped from other parts of the river. That could be done at the mouth of the river, bringing the banks closer together; thus the bridge would cover a shorter span of water than at present. We do not need width in the river there; all we need is a navigable channel. Once we have that, so far as shipping is concerned the width of the river is of secondary importance. Towards the river mouth there is a golden opportunity to reclaim land and establish a first-rate industrial area. I submit that we should investigate that suggestion at this juncture rather than the feasibility of a tunnel.

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

SUPPLY

CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEE

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

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

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS

CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEE

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

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

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.30 p.m.
