

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 22 OCTOBER 1964

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 22 OCTOBER, 1964

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

QUESTIONS

SERVICE LEAVE PAYMENTS.—Mr. Duggan, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

In view of the fact that two Liberal Premiers, viz., Mr. H. E. Bolte, Victoria, and Sir Thomas Playford, South Australia, have indicated to the unions concerned that they would grant service leave payments to Government employees without first going to industrial tribunals, will he following these decisions, indicate his willingness to review applications for service leave payments made by Queensland industrial unions?

Answer:—

"I am not altogether clear as to what is intended by the term 'service leave payments' used by the Honourable Member. If the matter is one pertaining to the granting of increases in rates of pay prescribed by awards, then this is a matter which should be decided by the State Industrial Commission upon the application of interested unions."

OPERATION OF FINANCIAL EMERGENCY RELIEF EXTENSION ACT.—Mr. Duggan, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Justice,—

In view of the Answer to my Question of September 25, 1963, in relation to considering an appropriate amendment to or repeal of "The Financial Emergency Relief Extension Act of 1932," that the Financial Emergency Acts generally are kept in force year to year by Orders in Council, involving a review of the position annually, is he now in a position to indicate any changed outlook in this matter?

Answer:—

"The operation of these Acts was extended by Orders in Council until December 31, 1964, and the question of a further extension of these Acts has not yet been examined."

COPIES OF BRISBANE TOWN PLAN FOR METROPOLITAN MEMBERS.—Mr. Houston, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Local Government,—

Will he make available to Honourable Members for Metropolitan Constituencies a copy of the Town Plan as it applies to their own Electorate?

Answer:—

"It is impracticable to comply with the Honourable Member's request. However, the plan as submitted by the Brisbane City Council is available in the Department of Local Government."

"CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION" SUBJECT IN SECOND-YEAR JUNIOR COURSE.—Mr. Houston, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) Why is the subject, "Citizenship Education," not part of all courses for the new second-year Junior?

(2) Why is it considered that students doing the special course require this subject, while those doing the general course do not?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "Education for citizenship is one of the recognised aims of the secondary school. The formal subject 'Citizenship Education' has, however, been designed as an alternative to History or Geography. The syllabus for 'Citizenship Education' is pitched at a lower level than the syllabuses prescribed for History and Geography and it is therefore more suitable for students enrolled in the special course. Although the subject 'Citizenship Education' has not been included specifically in the general course, many of the topics will be covered in addresses, debates and forums in which all students will participate. These experiences together with the study of History and/or Geography will provide a sound citizenship training for students undertaking the general course."

"OCCUPATIONS" SUBJECT IN SECOND-YEAR JUNIOR COURSE.—Mr. Houston, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) Are any subjects in the special course of the new Junior second-year course of the same standard as the subjects in other courses?

(2) What does the subject, "Occupations," consist of?

(3) Who will determine what course a student shall take—the principal or the parent?

Answers:—

(1) "The special course is a secondary school course which will not normally be taken by students desirous of presenting themselves for the Junior Public Examination. Some students will, however, attain approximately Junior standard in practical subjects."

(2) "‘Occupations’ involves a study of the various jobs available, and the qualifications required for each."

(3) "The final decision will rest with the parent, but the principal and teachers will assist the student in his choice of a suitable course."

TENDERS FOR STEELWORK, NORTHERN SCHOOLS.—Mr. Coburn for Mr. Aikens, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Works,—

(1) When tenders or quotations are invited for structural steelwork or any other materials for schools, must Northern firms quote a price for delivery in Brisbane, thus incurring a handicap in the form of the freight to Brisbane?

(2) If Southern firms quote for steelwork or materials required for Northern schools, must they deliver to the Northern sites or is the freight from Brisbane to these sites borne by the Department?

Answers:—

(1) "Structural steelwork other than portal frames for schools is usually obtained on a supply and erect basis. Portal frames are obtained for State-wide usage and delivery to store in Brisbane is specified. Northern firms should quote for delivery as specified. Other materials are usually obtained from local suppliers on either a delivery to job or free on rail basis."

(2) "When materials required for Northern schools are obtained from Southern Queensland firms the freight to the job sites is borne by the Department. Landed costs of materials are borne by the Department whether supplied by a Southern Queensland firm or a Northern firm."

DEATH OF RAYMOND ROY SOLIS.—Mr. Coburn for Mr. Aikens, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health,—

(1) Did Dr. Tonge, State Laboratory Director, give evidence before a Coroner's Court held on September 18, 1964, that there had been lack of skill or care in the treatment of a six years old boy named Raymond Roy Solis, who died in the Biloela hospital on December 13, 1963?

(2) In view of this doctor's evidence, have any charges of a criminal nature or otherwise been laid or are they contemplated against the doctor responsible?

Answer:—

"As the Honourable Member is, of course, aware, the Coroners Act is administered by my Colleague the Honourable the Minister for Justice. For the Honourable Member's information I am informed that the inquest into the manner and cause of death of Raymond Roy Solis has not been completed. The depositions covering the evidence given by Dr. Tonge still remain in the hands of the Coroner conducting the inquiry."

EXPENDITURE ON HOUSING FOR ARMED FORCES.—Mr. Hanson, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

(1) Has his attention been drawn to recent information as supplied by the Commonwealth News Information Service which stated that 3,700 houses will be built for members of the Regular Forces in the next three years throughout Australia at a total cost of £14,500,000? If so, can he ascertain what actual proportion of the above amount will be spent in this State?

(2) Can he also ascertain what amount has been spent in Regular Forces housing in this State over the last three years and how would the amount compare with expenditure in the States of Victoria, South Australia and New South Wales?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "The State is involved with housing for Serving Members of the Forces only to the extent to which such housing is provided under the terms of the Commonwealth State Housing Agreement. For the three financial years 1961-1964, the amount of £1,984,250 (Commonwealth—£1,258,500; State—£725,750) was provided for Service housing in Queensland under that Agreement. For 1964-1965, the Commonwealth has requested the State to set aside £115,500, being the proportion named in the Agreement and has offered a further £595,500, making a total of £711,000. The State is agreeable to this proposal. Preliminary discussions have taken place in respect of 1965-1966, but to date there have been no discussions in respect of 1966-1967. Figures comparable to the above applicable to the States of Victoria, South Australia and New South Wales are not available."

PAPER

The following paper was laid on the table:—

Report of the Queensland Meat Industry Board for the year 1963-64.

PARLIAMENTARY PRINTING COMMITTEE

APPOINTMENT OF MR. E. C. O'DONNELL

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that a vacancy exists in the Printing Committee consequent upon the death of Mr. Wallace.

Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Premier), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That Eugene Christopher O'Donnell, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Barcoo, be appointed a member of the Printing Committee to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Mr. Wallace."

Motion agreed to.

CHARITABLE FUNDS ACTS
AMENDMENT BILL

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Dr. Delamothe, read a third time.

SUPPLY

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE—ESTIMATES—
FIRST AND SECOND ALLOTTED DAYS

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

ESTIMATES-IN-CHIEF, 1964-65

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT
CHIEF OFFICE

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Industrial Development) (11.12 a.m.): I move—

“That £194,569 be granted for ‘Department of Industrial Development—Chief Office’.”

This is an increase of £55,917 over the actual expenditure for the previous year, made up of an increase of £17,366 in salaries, and an increase of £38,551 in contingencies. The increase in the salaries Vote is due to provision being made for an increase in staff, annual increments, and the basic wage adjustment awarded by the State Industrial Commission.

The Department of Industrial Development was constituted on 26 September, 1963, and commenced operations with a Chief Office staff of 18, which had increased to 29 by 30 June, 1964. The department has not yet reached the required strength to give the services proposed, and provision has been made for the appointment of a senior research officer and economist, a publicity officer, one additional clerk, and one typist.

This year's appropriation for contingencies represents an increase of £38,551 over the actual expenditure for 1963-64. Comparing this year's contingencies appropriation with the previous year's actual expenditure, the principal variations under the respective sub-headings are—

Travelling Expenses, Printing, Stationery, Incidentals—Decrease £7,552.

Maintenance and Incidental Expenses of Industrial Buildings—Increase £5,020.

Special Investigations—Decrease £1,641.

Publicity for Attraction of Industries—Increase £22,172.

Subsidy—Clausen Shipping Line—Increase £20,552.

I think it might be helpful if I made a few brief remarks about the three items in which there are increases. The increase in the maintenance item is due mainly to increase in water and sewerage rates on industrial buildings, while there is also an increase of £2,403 in the maintenance and painting provision for industrial buildings.

The publicity sub-vote includes £25,000 which has been specifically provided for continuation of the “Buy Queensland Made” campaign. This amount was provided in the Vote of the Treasurer in each of the last two years, but it has been made available through this department this financial year.

In terms of the agreement under which the Clausen Company carries on a shipping service for the conveyance of live cattle from the Gulf and Peninsula areas to ports on the east coast of Queensland, subsidy is to be paid at the rate of £3 per head for cattle transported from Queensland Gulf and Peninsula ports and at the rate of £2 per head for cattle transported from Northern Territory ports. The agreement provides that the amount of subsidy in respect of any one year shall not exceed £30,000, and that the total amount of the subsidy in respect of the five-year period up to 24 May, 1967, shall not exceed £120,000. An amount of £39,114 is provided this year. The additional amount of £9,114—that is, the excess of £39,114 over the £30,000—is to cover subsidy due on cattle carried during the period 25 November, 1963 to 24 May, 1964, which is in a different subsidy year.

In relation to the activities of the full ministerial Department of Industrial Development, which includes the separate Department of Electricity Supply, it may be of interest to note that, although the estimated departmental expenditure from the Consolidated Revenue Fund amounts to only £251,577, there are substantial amounts of other expenditure which customarily are provided for either from Trust and Special Funds or from Loan Fund. The grand total of the estimated expenditure for activities of the combined departments through Consolidated Revenue Fund, Trust and Special Funds and Loan Fund is £5,057,737, as shown in the summary on page 105 of the printed Estimates.

As this is the first occasion on which hon. members will have had an opportunity of debating the Estimates of this new department, it may be of interest if I take this opportunity of giving a brief outline of its main objectives.

The establishment of the department with full ministerial status is indicative of the Government's awareness of the importance of encouraging the expansion of existing secondary industry and of attracting new industry to this State. This is a necessary activity, not only for the purpose of increasing our productivity and providing more and better jobs for Queenslanders, but also so that we will make our contribution to the welfare and security of our Australian nation in the years to come.

A great American leader, quite a few years ago, said, “Only the strong can be free, and only the productive can be strong.”

We are, of course, working for world peace in many different ways, but if we keep our feet on the ground we will realise

that one of the most important contributions we can make to our security in the years to come is to make our Australian nation industrially strong—and firm and strong in other ways as well.

Under the Industrial Development Act that was passed by Parliament in December, 1963, the newly-created department absorbed the activities previously undertaken by the Secondary Industries Division. In addition, its functions were extended to cover the conduct of economic and feasibility studies, including market surveys. Specialised staff is being recruited for this work.

The department is charged with the responsibility of encouraging the expansion of existing industry. It is required to take such action as may be necessary to attract new industry to Queensland. It has an obligation to assist industry, once it is established, to find a market for its products. In the furtherance of these objectives the department is required to use its best endeavours to encourage the decentralisation of industry.

In considering the Estimates of this department it will be kept in mind that in the early years Queensland's overall development was directly related to the progressive expansion of its agricultural, pastoral and mining activities. With the passage of time, manufacturing industry was established to process the products of our primary industries and to service the needs of those engaged in these industries.

We can be well satisfied, and indeed encouraged, by the remarkable progress which has been made by our primary, processing and extractive industries. As evidence of these accomplishments, I need refer only to the great advances which have been made by the beef-cattle, dairying and sugar industries, and to the phenomenal increase in mining throughout the State, particularly at Mt. Isa, Weipa and in Central Queensland.

Mindful of this solid background of achievement, the present Government has taken positive steps to create a political and economic climate conducive to the expansion of the State's secondary industries. This, of course, has not been at the expense of our primary industries. The Government's aim is to produce a more balanced economy, and by this means to offset the hazards of seasonal employment.

We are now entering a new phase of industrial activity in Queensland, and the Government is determined to ensure that all possible encouragement is extended to those who are, or who may be, prepared to establish or expand industry in this State. As the Department of Industrial Development sets about this responsible task, it is perhaps not inopportune to survey briefly the successive steps which have been taken over the years in an endeavour to promote the development of secondary industry in Queensland.

The policy of assistance and encouragement to industry, which is now the principal function of the Department of Industrial Development, was first commenced in 1929. In that year the Industries Assistance Act was introduced. It provided for the establishment of a Bureau of Economics and an Industries Assistance Board. In 1932, the Bureau of Economics was replaced by the Bureau of Industry. Its role was to increase employment opportunities and to assist in the rehabilitation of industry which had suffered as a result of the world-wide depression at that time.

The Secondary Industries Division was established in 1946. It was required to direct its attention to all phases of secondary industry development, including the availability of raw materials, labour, finance, markets, and suchlike.

Immediately following the Second World War, industry generally was faced with many problems. War-time controls of various types were still in operation, factory space was scarce and building materials other than for housing were virtually unobtainable. In 1947 the State Government purchased the Rocklea installations of the Commonwealth Munitions Department.

Mr. Houston: Do you agree with that?

Mr. MUNRO: Yes.

Mr. Houston: The Labour Government did something, then?

Mr. MUNRO: Oh, yes. The hon. member's interjection rather indicates his train of thought. So far I have not said one word against the Labour Government. I am rather sorry that that theme has been introduced. If it is persisted in I will definitely reply at a later stage.

Mr. Lloyd: As a matter of fact you have been very fair in dealing with—

Mr. MUNRO: I am endeavouring to be quite fair in my presentation. If it is the desire of any hon. members of the Opposition to alter the method of approach and to "box on" in different terms, I am prepared, as I usually am, to reply to anything that may be said.

Mr. Duggan: We do not want to tell you how to handle your Estimates. That is your responsibility.

Mr. MUNRO: I appreciate that. I take it, by that comment, that the hon. gentleman approves of the way I am handling them.

I was referring to the Rocklea installation and I was about to say these very useful buildings, in turn, were leased by the Government to industry at reasonable rentals. At the same time many other surplus war-time buildings in Brisbane and provincial centres were made available by the Commonwealth for industrial purposes. Some of them were purchased by the Queensland Government and leased to industry, some were leased

direct from the Commonwealth on the sponsorship of the Secondary Industries Division, while others were sold to industrialists for re-erection elsewhere. Similarly, through the sponsorship of the Secondary Industries Division, many Queensland firms were able to acquire valuable plant and equipment which had become surplus to the requirements of the Commonwealth Munitions Department. As controls eased, land in the Rocklea area was leased to private enterprise and additional buildings were constructed.

Rocklea, with its moderate rentals, convenient transport facilities, and full basic services, has proved most attractive to industrialists. As at 30 June, 1964, no fewer than 98 industries were accommodated there, providing direct employment for 1,981 persons.

Since 1949, in addition to the Rocklea area, certain lands between the Hamilton wharves and Pinkenba have been progressively reclaimed and developed for industrial purposes. The total area of the Hamilton Lands is of the order of 1,330 acres and, in all, over 100 industries are established there. The Co-ordinator-General of Public Works is currently developing 30 acres of this land to make it more attractive to industry. Later, it is planned to improve a further 300 acres.

All applications for leases at Hamilton are subject to sponsorship of the Department of Industrial Development, each case being fully investigated and considered on its merits.

Because of the nature of the soil structure and the need to provide adequate foundations, the Hamilton Lands are, generally speaking, more suitable for light than heavy industry. In order to keep pace with the increasing demand for sites, especially for the heavier type of industry, it has been deemed necessary to reserve certain additional lands for industrial purposes. As in the case of the Hamilton Lands, these will be progressively developed to meet the growing need of industry.

As hon. members will be aware, Australia's first industrial park—"Queensfield"—is being developed by private enterprise on approximately 400 acres of land which has been leased from the Government at Wacol. Clearing of the first 60 acres is now well advanced. When the developmental roads have been constructed and other essential services completed, "Queensfield" will be able to offer industrialists land, and, where desired, factory buildings in an area which is most favourably situated for rail and road access.

In 1961 the Amoco company, following negotiations with the Government, announced its intention to establish an oil refinery in Brisbane. Later it was announced that Ampol Petroleum Limited would also establish an oil refinery in Brisbane. Both these refineries are now being constructed and are expected to become operative next year.

More recently, the consortium of companies concerned with the development of the Weipa bauxite deposits announced their intention to establish an alumina plant at Gladstone and construction of this plant has also been commenced.

The Ford Motor Company of Australia Ltd. announced a large expansion scheme for their Eagle Farm plant. Farm Chemicals Pty. Ltd., a subsidiary of Chemical Industries (Kwinana) Pty. Ltd., decided to establish a basic chemical industry in Queensland for the manufacture of hormone weed-killers.

Mount Isa Mines Ltd. embarked on a further programme of expansion; General Motors-Holden's Pty. Ltd. commenced construction of their motor body and assembly plant at Acacia Ridge; Murphysores Incorporated Pty. Ltd. announced plans for an ilmenite plant at Gladstone; the Ammonia Company of Queensland Pty. Ltd. announced their intention to establish a synthetic ammonia plant at Pinkenba; A.C.F. & Shirleys Fertilizers Ltd. also announced expansion plans. These positive developments are indicative of the confidence of these companies in the future of our State. They are also, of course, striking evidence of the success of the Government's efforts.

As I have said, one of the department's foremost tasks is to encourage the expansion of existing industry. As a Government, we believe that Queensland industry, Queensland capital, and Queensland workers should be given every opportunity to develop the resources of this great State. By fostering local industry so that it can grow, diversify, and provide more employment, we are establishing a solid foundation for further industrial progress throughout the State.

The development potential of Queensland is very great—quite possibly greater than that of any other State of the Commonwealth. If therefore we are to develop our resources to the fullest extent, and within a reasonable space of time, we must supplement our own efforts by attracting to the State additional capital and industry. In the smaller and medium-size industries, development should as far as possible be accomplished through the utilisation of our own financial resources.

Because there is naturally a limit to these resources, we must of necessity look further afield when we think in terms of really large-scale development. In major undertakings, the ideal is undoubtedly to bring local and outside capital together in some form of joint venture.

The policy of the present Government, briefly stated, is to achieve the maximum of industrial development in this State consistent with the reasonable protection of Australian and Queensland interests.

Mr. Lloyd: Have you given any consideration to "turnkey" jobs, that is, inviting overseas companies to come here and develop, on the understanding that we later take over?

Mr. MUNRO: I do not know that that is a matter which could be arranged specifically by the department. It is quite an attractive proposition, in relation to some basic industries, to consider the initial establishment being carried out by some large organisation, with the opportunity for local capital to participate at a later stage when the future profitability of the enterprise may be more clearly seen. In pursuance of this policy, we will continue to welcome to this State those who are prepared to establish new industries here, particularly those involving special skills and techniques.

The department is now geared to provide a worth-while service to those engaged, or about to engage, in industry in this State. Ways in which it is able to assist include advice on such matters as manufacturing opportunities, markets, and the availability of manpower, raw materials, industrial sites, and premises.

In a sense, the department acts as a co-ordinating authority and a liaison between industry and other departments and instrumentalities. In this way it is able to help in such matters as transport, freight rates, port facilities, electric power, water and other services—in short, in most matters of industrial significance.

The department's interest does not cease once an industry is established. As I have already indicated, one of its responsibilities is to help manufacturers find markets for their products. In practice this is done in three ways—

by participating in special trade exhibitions;

by joining overseas trade missions; and

by sponsoring, in conjunction with the Queensland Chamber of Manufactures, a "Buy Queensland Made" campaign.

It was my privilege to lead the recent trade mission of Queensland manufacturers to South-East Asia. In each of the countries visited the mission was particularly well received. We were given a most extensive press and radio coverage, and there is no doubt that it was an eminently successful venture, particularly in the field of public relations. The mission was to a large extent exploratory and experimental in its concept. In this sense, I am satisfied that the long-term benefits that might reasonably be expected to follow it will extend far beyond the range of products promoted by the individual members of the mission.

The "Buy Queensland Made" campaign continues to make a strong impact on the community at large. The basic aim of this promotion is to increase the sales of locally produced factory products so that Queensland manufacturers can consolidate, expand, employ more, and perhaps engage in new avenues of production. So successful has the campaign been that it has now been decided to maintain the promotion on a regular and continuing basis.

It is also intended during the current year to engage in a more intensive publicity campaign, both interstate and overseas. Through this means it is hoped to keep before southern and overseas industrialists the undoubted opportunities that exist in this State for the investment of capital and the establishment of new industries.

I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without making a brief reference to my recent overseas tour. The purpose of the tour was to acquaint myself as Minister with what was being done in the industrial field in other places; to promote Queensland generally; to encourage overseas interest in our industrial projects; and to stimulate action, either directly or in association with established Queensland industries.

On my return to Brisbane I furnished a report to Cabinet summarising my conclusions and commenting on the many useful contacts that I had made. A great deal of supplementary information is contained in a series of interim reports that I and my Director of Technical Services prepared following interviews with leading overseas industrialists. Follow-up action on these reports is now being taken by my departmental officers.

There can be no doubt that the immediate objectives of the mission were fully accomplished. The knowledge gained will be most valuable. We were able to arouse a deal of interest in our State, its natural resources, and its industrial potential. As one important result, it is confidently expected that a number of industrialists will in due course visit Queensland with a view to making on-the-spot assessments of opportunities for investment and development here. This has actually begun, and within the last fortnight I have had the pleasure of welcoming overseas visitors and discussing matters of this kind with them.

As will be appreciated, in any large-scale venture considerable research and study is necessary before a final decision can be made on the economics of any particular proposition. Factors which are taken into account cover all aspects of production, marketing, and distribution. Good industrial relations are an essential requirement for the successful conduct of industry. In this respect both management and labour have a responsibility. If we fail to maintain industrial harmony, if our record of productivity is not comparable with accepted standards, then we cannot hope to attract to this State our rightful share of investment capital and industry.

Mr. Bennett: You are not doing too well on that side at the moment, are you?

Mr. MUNRO: On which side?

Mr. Bennett: On the side of creating industrial harmony.

Mr. MUNRO: If I might deal with that interjection, I would say to the hon. member that industrial harmony is one of the objectives of this Government, and pursuant to

that objective we are making every effort. But if the interjection is related, as I assume it is, to current developments, I should say that the best way of attaining and maintaining industrial harmony is to ensure that there is respect for the law and our system of industrial conciliation and arbitration. I would ask the hon. member for South Brisbane to do something about putting his own house in order and have a talk to some of the people who may be using tactics that are very contrary to that objective, instead of making interjections of that kind.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Bennett: I think it would have helped somewhat if the Premier had answered the question about making agreements before the parties go to court.

Mr. MUNRO: As I said, I think it should be agreed that good industrial relations are essential for the successful conduct of industry.

Mr. Sherrington interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the hon. member for Salisbury that continual interjections will not be permitted. The hon. member is sufficiently acquainted with the Standing Orders to know that a barrage of interjections is not permitted in this Committee.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Mr. Hooper—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order: The hon. member has been interjecting continually while the Minister has been speaking. I will not allow him to continue doing so.

Mr. MUNRO: I should like to emphasise again that both management and labour have a responsibility in this respect. It is quite clear that the Government is doing all it can to create and maintain industrial harmony, but it must be achieved on the basis of respect for the law and respect for the established institutions of the State. In short, if I may sum it up so far as it is relevant to my earlier remarks, industrial development is not so much a responsibility of Government as of the community. Primarily it is the responsibility of business enterprise, of labour and management, of employer and employee.

We in Queensland are blessed with vast natural resources, but it would be a mistake to conclude that all we have to do is to sit back and wait for industries to establish themselves. We cannot overlook the effect on our State of the heavy concentration of people, wealth and industry in the southern States of Australia.

This concentration of industrial strength, particularly in New South Wales and Victoria, is one of the very real problems which we face when considering the attraction of industry to this State and the related question of decentralisation. It is not easy to change any well-established pattern of growth. In addition, there is in the world today a very strong tendency towards centralisation in many forms of industry. The development of mechanisation, automation and other modern techniques all tend to encourage the industrialist to mass-produce in one large plant in close proximity to a major centre of population.

These are hard facts that we cannot escape. The important thing is that we should recognise the problem with which we are confronted so that we can direct our efforts towards finding a solution. It is in this field that the Department of Industrial Development can make, and in fact is already making, a most useful contribution.

I have dealt at some length with the activities of the Chief Office of the department. In addition, the Office of the Registrar of Companies and Commercial Acts and the Department of Electricity Supply both come under the jurisdiction of the Minister for Industrial Development. The provision of adequate capital is a prerequisite of industrial expansion. As capital for development is normally provided through corporate bodies, it is appropriate that the Office of the Registrar of Companies should be associated with the Department of Industrial Development.

Similarly, the provision of electric power at a reasonable cost is essential for the conduct of large-scale industry. It is natural therefore that there should be a close affinity between the Department of Industrial Development and the Department of Electricity Supply.

The Office of the Registrar of Companies and Commercial Acts, which was formed in 1962, is responsible for the administration of the various State Acts relating to companies, business names, cash orders, co-operative societies, hire purchase, money lenders, auctioneers, real estate agents, debt collectors and motor dealers.

Present-day economic and social conditions make it desirable that there should be a certain measure of uniformity in legislation throughout Australia, and it is of interest to note that three of the Acts in which a substantial degree of uniformity among the States has been attained are administered by this particular office. I refer to the present Companies, Business Names and Hire-purchase Acts, all of which prior to enactment were the subject of combined study and a full interchange of ideas between Ministers and officers representing the various States and the Commonwealth.

The Hire Purchase Act is of course designed primarily for the protection of hirers, more especially those who may not possess the experience and legal knowledge enjoyed by the organisations with whom they enter into

contracts. Nevertheless the Act does not overlook the rights of other parties. All complaints which are referred to the Registrar are thoroughly investigated. It is pleasing to report that following the intervention of inspectors of the department many agreements have been reinstated to the mutual satisfaction both of the hiring company and the hirer.

The amendments to the Companies Act that were effected earlier this year were also designed to provide increased protection to the public. Although the law cannot give absolute protection to investors, much can be done to ensure that true and accurate information is available to them; also that those who are entrusted with investments act honestly in carrying out their duties.

The Acts administered by the Office of the Registrar are of great public interest, and in the implementation of these Acts the office is rendering a valuable public service.

In relation to the Estimates of the State Electricity Commission, which are dealt with through Trust and Special Funds, it is scarcely necessary for me to call attention to the fact that the electricity supply industry of Queensland is in a period of record growth. For the past year the rate of increase in electricity sales averaged 11.4 per cent. for the whole State, and in some areas was as high as 17 per cent.

The Commission has played, and is playing, a most important part in the control, organisation and development of the industry to meet this rate of growth. It has responsibility for forward planning, for advising the Government on new projects, for ensuring utilisation of the most efficient and cheapest sources of power, and for their interconnection by transmission lines so that the maximum economic advantage may be obtained.

It is directly concerned with the efficient organisation of the industry. This is evidenced by major changes in structure which have been successfully accomplished in the past two years by the establishment of the Southern Electric Authority as a bulk-supply authority supplying the interconnected systems of Southern Queensland, and by the setting up of the Northern Electric Authority with similar functions in relation to the North Queensland grid.

These reorganisations are directly aimed at more efficient production and cheaper power in the future. They are of major importance to the industrial development of Queensland, particularly in the case of industries requiring large blocks of power and where the cost of power is an important factor in the cost of production.

As members of the Southern Electric Authority, the Northern Electric Authority and the five Regional Electricity Boards, the Commission also participates directly in the operation and development of major electricity undertakings. In addition, it is directly responsible for electrical work in Western Queensland as consultant and constructing authority for a large number of

local authorities. There has been very rapid electrical growth in the West in recent years and a large programme of work is in hand, including, of course, the construction of the natural gas power station near Roma.

The Commission is a large raiser of funds for electrical development, and with the rapid growth of the electricity supply industry this has become a most important activity.

Other important activities of the Commission include the fixing of bulk-supply tariffs, matters of electrical safety, standards of construction, electrical inspections, testing and approval of electrical appliances, investigation and determination of electricity tariffs for consumers, and many other matters arising from its responsibility as a statutory authority.

In addition, responsibility was recently transferred to the Commission for the general administration of the Electrical Workers and Contractors Act. The Electrical Workers and Contractors Board and its staff are now located in the Commission's office, and the Chief Electrical Inspector of the Commission has become chairman of the board. These activities and responsibilities are, of course, growing with the general growth of the electricity supply industry in Queensland.

An indication of this general growth is shown in some figures which I will cite. In the seven-year period since 1957 the annual rate of capital expenditure on the electrical development of Queensland has increased from £12,800,000 to £17,000,000, and is estimated at £19,600,000 for the current financial year. The aggregate capital expenditure has risen from £105,000,000 at 30 June, 1957, to £196,000,000 at 30 June, 1964; that is, it has nearly doubled in seven years. At the end of the present year it is expected to reach £216,000,000.

In the seven-year period the total installed capacity of generating plant has increased from 483,000 kW to 917,000 kW, and the total number of miles of transmission lines has increased from 16,490 to 30,600. During the same period the number of consumers has increased by approximately 107,000, and the percentage of Queensland's population supplied with electricity has increased from 81.3 per cent to 93 per cent. These are reliable indicators and they give some reflection of the growth which has taken place during the past seven years.

The Commission is being efficiently and economically conducted, and it is noteworthy that, notwithstanding this tremendous growth in electrical development, the number of staff directly employed by the Commission has increased by only 28 since 1957.

I feel sure that hon. members generally will agree with me that the Estimates of these various departments under my control are well-founded and will join with me in my expression of appreciation of the very efficient services rendered to the Government by their executive officers and staff.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I desire to inform hon. members that on the Chief Office Vote I propose to allow a full discussion on the whole of the ramifications of a department (Consolidated Revenue, Trust and Special Funds, and Loan Fund Account) and then to confine the discussion to each particular Vote.

For the information of hon. members, I point out that the administrative acts of the department are open to debate, but the necessity for legislation and matters involving legislation cannot be discussed in Committee of Supply.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (11.58 a.m.): I sometimes regret that all Ministers and Government members do not follow the pattern set by the Minister this morning in introducing his Estimates. I think it will be agreed that it was a calm, dispassionate appraisal of the work of the department that he administers. It is true that when he set out to make his points on a couple of propositions dealing with electrical development, to a very mild degree he did engage in political propaganda. However, if the Minister's approach were to be consistently applied by Government speakers, we on this side would not have any serious quarrel with the Government in its endeavours to promote industrial development in Queensland. On the political hustings and away from the calm atmosphere of the Committee stages, we have some opportunity to engage in thrust and counter-thrust on political claims. Unfortunately Government speakers do not as a rule follow the pattern set by the Minister this morning.

I should like to see a political climate in industrial development in which we could fairly and calmly put forward proposals and propositions which have as their objective the building-up of a stronger State industrially. We have been the victim of attacks from time to time. We have been accused of laying the dead hand on development particularly industrial development, and of making excessive demands outside the ambit of arbitration for a fair share of the potential wealth of industry.

When the occasion is appropriate, we have all sorts of extravagant claims by Government members about how the State has taken off on its mission to the golden era, or the achievement of this happy millennium which Government spokesmen say is possible only with the application of a Country-Liberal political philosophy.

Because of the wide field covered, and the fact that I can speak only once on this Vote, my address this morning may be regarded as somewhat discursive when I make my comments. I reiterate for the record that apart from any patriotic motives—and I claim we are not less well-endowed with those qualities than Government members—and purely for selfish reasons, the Australian Labour Party in any State is happy to see the

States prospering and Australia progressing towards becoming a better and stronger nation than it is now as a result of industrial development, because in the main the strength of the Labour vote is drawn from industrial communities. True it is that we have had our fair share of representatives from rural areas over the years, but where industrial development takes place in a decentralised area, such as Vale's Point, and the new coal-field at Liddell in New South Wales, the Country Party is fearful of the new distribution or the influx of so many workers, because it will be more difficult for it to retain seats in those areas. From a selfish point of view we realise that strong industrial growth in the State is more conducive to our political fortunes than if it remains principally a primary-producing State. Therefore our aims at all times have been motivated by a desire to create a climate such as the Minister described today. I repeat that other Ministers and people outside the Chamber should adopt as a pattern the approach which the Minister adopted this morning.

The Minister might accuse me of adopting a lofty sort of approach by dealing with one or two matters. He has shown that he has assumed the responsibility of this particular department with much more caution and political sagacity than some of his many predecessors, and has learnt the lesson that many of those very easily phrased statements about potential and the golden vista, the fact that we are in the jet age and have a jet political policy for this requirement, and all of these people who are bursting to get to Queensland as quickly as possible because of the Liberal Government, are not being realised and he therefore has adopted a more cautious approach than his predecessors.

Mr. Windsor: He is an accountant, so he is very cautious.

Mr. DUGGAN: The hon. member is an industrialist, but that does not make him competent to utter some of the statements he does in this Chamber from time to time.

Mr. Hughes: You must admit that there has been noticeable progress.

Mr. DUGGAN: I shall deal with that in a moment.

I have here an article, written in 1958, which reads—

“Men who count’ turn out to talk
Queensland

“Mr. Morris’ line has been “Queensland—land of sunshine and opportunity.”

“At the House of Commons luncheon, Mr. Vaughan Morgan was happy about the opportunity and ‘hot for the sunshine’ after Britain’s bleakest Easter in 50 years.”

At every election the Government has been saying the same thing as Mr. Morris said on that occasion. The remarks made about these things are not borne out by results.

On the same page it is reported that Sir Leon Trout, who went overseas with the trade delegation, said that 200 American tycoons would come out to surf, fish, and sunbake, and presumably investigate the industrial potential here.

There were also large headlines announcing a £9,000,000 fertilizer plant for Central Queensland. The Premier gave it his blessing, and Mr. Morris said how delighted he was with it. That was back in December 1959, and there is still no fertilizer plant in Central Queensland. I have about 25 examples of this sort of thing.

Mr. Chinchen: You always deal with the past.

Mr. DUGGAN: Hon. members opposite are always taking us back to 1957. I am going to 1958. As recently as yesterday the Treasurer again said that we were unhappy in 1957. I suggest that the hon. member who interjected have regard to what was said by the Treasurer only yesterday.

Mr. Windsor: We do it for comparative purposes.

Mr. DUGGAN: That is exactly why I am doing it. I pay a compliment to the Minister. He is much more cautious and harder to pin down than are the rest of his colleagues. He says it will take some years for these plans to unfold. It then becomes a question of deciding what is "a few years". He will say, "You, in your impetuosity, want all these things done in a few years. I regard 'a few' as 10." It is hard to pin the Minister down when he speaks in that manner. I am, however, not criticising him. He has been extremely cautious, and I compliment him on the general tenor of his remarks this morning.

I should like to say for the record that it is not much good hon. members opposite taunting and challenging us from time to time unless they are prepared, by their deeds, to set a pattern that justifies such an attitude. If they are prepared to do that, we will not waste time by bringing these things forward.

Mr. Chinchen: You opened this up.

Mr. DUGGAN: I am telling the hon. member the reason why. I intended to deal with this matter only in passing. We have a good case here, although I do not want to waste time on it. I advise hon. members opposite not to provoke me into continuing in this strain, because I am just as happy to spend the rest of my time on this subject as on the other things that I have to say. I have many convincing arguments to support me.

The Department of Industrial Development is new. If its establishment was motivated solely by the desire, as explained by the Minister, to promote secondary

industry and enable new industries to become established in Queensland, well and good. I do not mind that. It is a department to which some of our most talented officers have been appointed. If I have any complaint at all in this direction, it is that possibly it is overloaded with capable and highly-paid officers. Sir David Muir was brought back to Queensland to become Director-General of Industry. When it was thought that he would be unable to take up this appointment, Mr. Curtis, who is also a competent officer on a high salary, was regarded as the departmental head. When Sir David Muir resumed duty, which we were very happy to see, the department then had two officers where originally it was intended to have only one. I think that one of these men could be employed to better advantage, as it is obvious that the intention in the first place was to appoint only one.

I should like to say in passing, and not in any unkind way, that I think Sir David Muir's return from overseas was somewhat premature. Dr. Summerville would hardly have had time before the Minister's arrival in England to pave the way for him by making the necessary contacts and gaining the knowledge needed to acquaint him with the political, economic, and financial climate in that part of the world. I feel that it would have been better if Sir David had remained as Agent-General till the Minister had left England. It would have been much better from his point of view, and certainly much fairer to Dr. Summerville. It is true that Mr. Young was sent over ahead of the Minister; but he had to arrange contacts with the help of a man who had been in London for only a short time.

Dealing with development, I wish to say on behalf of the Opposition—I may, perhaps, be somewhat at variance here with some other Labour spokesmen, not necessarily in the Opposition at present but in various Parliaments throughout the Commonwealth—that I believe that all political parties, including the Labour Party, have to face the fact that we are living in a time of "bigness". The Labour Party must learn to live with "bigness", subject, of course, to the proper control of restrictive trade practices and monopolies. I am conscious that "bigness" sometimes operates to the disadvantage of the public, and I emphasise that my remarks are made subject to that qualification. There is a need—a very definite need—for Federal control over some of the monopolies and restrictive trade practices that are operating throughout Australia and are doing a very great disservice to the nation.

Something similar is happening with trade unions in some countries, and Mr. Nolan mentioned one case in point. I shall not spend more than a moment or two on this point, but he emphasised that in a small State such as Queensland we have a multiplicity of unions, sometimes with more than one union having jurisdiction over a particular industry,

whereas in Russia that state of affairs does not prevail. What has happened in Russia and other countries is symptomatic of what is also happening in business. We find chambers of commerce and chambers of manufactures; we find architects, business men and other professional men grouping together.

Consumer goods can be made available more cheaply only by mass production. These days one does not find hand-made motor cars, refrigerators, or washing machines. They obviously are the product of a highly mechanised through-put system by means of which goods can be turned out very cheaply. Once the initial cost of designs, dies, and so on, have been met, a repetition of the processes enables the final product to be marketed at a price that is within the reach of the great majority of consumers in the community.

This "bigness" is a feature that, whether one likes it or not, will probably prevail. Let us consider for a moment the alumina project at Gladstone. It is obvious that we are going to use our own resources, and again I qualify my statement by saying that I think the present Federal Government has been remiss in not insisting upon a greater measure of Australian participation in some of the big overseas firms that have invested in this country. Mr. McEwen is the only member of any note of the Federal Government who has consistently and ably drawn attention to the need for some control over the degree and nature of foreign investment in Australia. Members of the Australian Labour Party have been talking about it, and for six or seven years I, personally, have been on this hobby-horse of mine—I referred to it during the debate on the Financial Statement—and only a fortnight ago Sir Robert Menzies came to the party and suggested that there ought to be some form of control.

Almost every other country in the world insists on the retention of a good deal of local capital and that companies established there should engage in the processing or partial manufacture of their products in the country concerned instead of merely exporting the raw materials overseas. I realise that some measures have been taken overseas, and I do not think that we are doing quite enough in Australia. However, it is obvious that if we are to compete successfully, we must have the most efficient methods of production, and these will be attained only through "bigness".

We know that there is a consortium operating in relation to bauxite, alumina, and aluminium, and it is obvious that if a plant costing £50,000,000 or £60,000,000 is to be established, it cannot be done with a handful of capital by shareholders who cannot afford to wait five, six or ten years for dividends. It must be done by big companies with other interests that will provide them with returns until the new plant is earning money. A company may have all the facilities it requires for the production of cheap goods, but it still has to market those goods and an Australian market is not always available. Consequently,

the alumina has to be sold to European and other countries. That explains the reason for the formation of the Kaiser group, the Pechiney group, representing French interests, and the Alcan group, representing Canadian interests. They must have outside markets in their efforts to pit themselves against other large overseas companies. We must learn to deal in "bigness". I think that is very desirable. I feel that the bigger companies are very often better employers than the smaller ones.

I have only a few minutes left and there are many subjects on which I should like to speak. It is easier to be destructive than it is to be constructive in these things, but I should like to show that the Government has not been successful in decentralising industry to any extent. The population of Brisbane is increasing at a greater rate than when the Government took office.

Mr. Hughes: That is a world-wide trend.

Mr. DUGGAN: I confess it is a general trend, but unfortunately the department does not help us very much. We used to have statistics of the number of factories and employees in decentralised areas, but that practice was stopped. The only reason for that was that the figures revealed the trend about which I am speaking. One can bet that if they revealed the opposite trend the Government would have put a far larger volume on the table giving us the opportunity of examining what the position is.

Going on very briefly from there, I confess that incentives may have to be given to industries to come here. I realise the point made by the Minister that the geographic location and concentration of population give a great advantage to Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia. Against that, I do not think this talk of sunshine and warmth is influencing people to come here. After all, the Minister knows that money will go where it is likely to produce a profit. If people have £500,000 or £1,000,000 available for investment, you can bet your bottom dollar that they will invest it in the State where they think they will get the greatest return from it. True, if conditions are roughly comparable and the return is approximately comparable the person who is spending the money might be influenced to come to Queensland if he feels he is welcome and will receive some sort of red-carpet treatment. I have no objection to this red-carpet treatment. If I were Premier I would go out and meet these people. I think much of it is fruitless and wasted effort, but I suppose one has to set a sprat to catch a mackerel.

I am not unmindful of the difficulties confronting the State in this regard. We may have to do something in the way of particular incentives, but in doing this we have to be careful that we are not discriminating against some existing industries that are prepared to expand and develop. There is always a feeling of resentment on the part of firms that have been here for many years if special privileges

are given newly established industries. They get upset and annoyed, as I think they are entitled to. I realise that there are some real problems in offering incentives to people to come here.

As I say, this department confronts some very great problems and I would be the first to welcome any direct benefit that might flow from its operations. I regret very much that up to this stage, in my view, one of the serious failings of the Government has been the misdirection of effort and also the dispersal of effort in so many directions. There have been many changes of personnel. I am not very happy about a position in which the Premier is also Minister for State Development and the Deputy Premier is Minister for Industrial Development. The Minister for Mines and Main Roads also has a finger in the pie of development, and, of course, so has the Minister for Labour and Industry.

I think the Minister should have the right to co-ordinate the activities of some of these departments. We have had the spectacle of the Minister for Industrial Development heading one trade mission to various parts of the world, the Minister for Mines and Main Roads visiting Hong Kong for a similar purpose, and the Minister for Transport attending a trade fair in Malaya and saying that we will provide the technical know-how for the establishment of factories in Malaya. How will it benefit Queensland to establish factories in Malaya with our know-how and their money? That does not contribute very much. I would rather see some of their money and some of our know-how in factories here. I could draw attention to many such contradictions. There must be some more definite objective with a clear following of the line that leads to the attainment of that objective than has been the case in the Government's previous seven years.

In the field of electrical development we have been rather fortunate in having a very good man in charge in the person of Mr. Neil Smith. However, the Minister tried to make some propaganda out of electricity development in Queensland—

Mr. Munro: Not propaganda; I merely gave figures. And I must say that they were very convincing figures.

Mr. DUGGAN: That is the sort of thing I object to. The Government uses figures to show the greater amount that has been spent, the inference being that if Labour had been in power it would have spent only what it spent in 1957.

Mr. Munro: I did not say that.

Mr. DUGGAN: No, but many of the Minister's colleagues do that sort of thing.

Mr. Munro: Had I said that, that would have been propaganda.

Mr. DUGGAN: Generally speaking, I have no serious quarrel with the Minister's approach this morning—I think it was a very good one.

A recent newspaper article gives details of electricity consumption by various users. In millions of kilowatt hours the average annual growth from 1959 to 1963 in New South Wales was 9.4 per cent., in Victoria 8.4 per cent., in South Australia 8.1 per cent., and in Western Australia 8.7 per cent., compared with 7.8 per cent. in Queensland. Despite all the talk of spectacular development in Queensland there has been greater electricity development in all the other States, including Labour States. Indeed, the highest rate of annual growth is in New South Wales. Because of its connected grid system New South Wales has been able to announce a reduced price for electricity.

I do not blame Mr. Smith for this because he has done a good job in convincing the Government and the Minister on the need for some sort of co-ordination here, but there is room for criticism of our ability to meet the industrial demands of the future unless we have inter-connection between the whole of our grids in Queensland.

Mr. Windsor: The quantity used can reduce the price.

Mr. DUGGAN: Exactly. The size of the generator determines that. That is why New South Wales is spending £100,000,000 on the Liddell Station—one station alone. We have a multiplicity of generating stations throughout the State. The construction of powerhouses at Swanbank and Calcap adjacent to coalfields is a move which I think should have been made many years ago. Although such a move was not favoured by people in earlier times it now seems to be popular. Obviously it is achieving results. About 85 per cent. of our thermal stations are served by black coal, about 12 per cent. by the Barron River hydro-electric scheme, and the remainder by diesel plants in small places. There should be a greater move than is envisaged under the Government's policy, which has been crystallised around this opportunity of getting additional funds at a variable interest rate.

All in all, I am sorry that we have not a longer time to express some constructive thoughts on this matter, but I appreciate the attitude of the Minister this morning.

(Time expired.)

Mr. EWAN (Roma) (12.24 p.m.): First of all, I congratulate the Minister on the presentation of his Estimates and the clear manner in which he explained to the Committee the functions of the new Department of Industrial Development. I was somewhat shocked to think that the Leader of the Opposition would waste the 25 minutes allotted to him on purely political criticism—

Mr. Duggan: You are not very fair, you know.

Mr. EWAN: He did not advance one suggestion for the development of this State industrially. At the end of his remarks he

saw fit to apologise for not being able to advance something concrete to help the industrial development of Queensland because of the limited time at his disposal.

Mr. Duggan: If you want a rough-and-tumble debate, I will arrange it with our speakers.

Mr. EWAN: I am not going to fall into the trap the hon. gentleman has set for the unwary. It is not my intention to waste my time, or the time of the Committee, in speaking on generalities.

Mr. Duggan: What about natural gas for Roma?

Mr. EWAN: My word! I shall deal with that very fully in the limited time at my disposal.

Having been given the lead by the Leader of the Opposition, let me say that the natural gas at Roma is of such State-wide and national importance that I intend to devote all my time to dealing with it. It has been proved conclusively that we have reserves of over 125 billion cubic feet of natural gas in Roma. With the rapid advances and further discoveries week by week, speaking conservatively, it should be proved within the next six, eight or 12 months that there are 200 billion cubic feet of gas reserves. With such a tremendous reserve of natural fuel, we would be remiss if we did not devote some of the energies of the Department to carrying out a full investigation into the potentialities and possibilities of the use of natural gas.

In conformity with what has happened in all other countries where natural gas has been found, it must be realised that gas is possibly the cheapest fuel available, particularly if industries can be established adjacent to the source of supply. The statement is true if expensive pipelines do not have to be provided.

I am sure that hon. members will not accuse me of being parochial if I appeal to the department to conduct a full investigation into the possibility of establishing secondary industries in the local area, close to the source of natural gas. I ask the Minister to have the department conduct an investigation to determine what industries can be established close to the source of this cheap fuel.

Mr. Tucker: You are now indicting your own Minister.

Mr. EWAN: I have never previously heard such a statement as that, although I should expect it from the hon. member. I have the greatest admiration for the Minister, and anyone with ears to listen or brains to think with must also admire the Minister if he listened closely to his remarks.

I understand that some of the prime functions of this new department are to inquire fully into the possibility of establishing industries; to give advice to people who may

wish to establish or engage in industry; to make a survey of the opportunities that may be open in certain fields; and to give advice on manpower, housing, water, and all the other things necessary for the establishment of secondary industries. Those are admirable ideals.

I hope it is the function of the department to conduct economic surveys into the possibility of success of industries so that advice may be given to any persons who have a yen to establish industries in certain areas. After all, the economics of any industry depend on its enduring qualities. When such an investigation is complete it will be essential for the functions of the department to be extended to advertising the potential of various districts for certain industries so as to attract secondary industries from all parts of Australia and, indeed the world. Unlike the Leader of the Opposition, I am not concerned about where the money comes from. I am surprised that he and other members of the Australian Labour Party should be worried about that, because their policy is nationalisation and socialisation, which can deal effectively with that problem if it should ever arise. There are many avenues open to deal with overseas monopolies. That can be appreciated by reading the anti-monopoly legislation brought down in the United States of America.

This young country is rushing to attract industries here and get them established. We will be able to look after Australian interests in those industries. We have industries in Australia today that are exclusively owned by Australia and the Australian Labour Party is not concerned about helping them.

One of the matters which I have often enunciated in asking for this investigation is decentralisation, and the necessity for the diffusion of industry throughout the State. It should be obvious to any person that in these times, with hydrogen bombs and nuclear energy, if we have diffusion of industry all over the State, on an economic and enduring basis, the functions of this new department, and of the Minister, would be amply rewarded because of the security that future generations will enjoy.

I shall now deal with the State Electricity Commission. I see my friend Mr. Neil Smith sitting in the lobby. In conjunction with the Roma Town Council, he set an example of what I am advocating today, that is, the establishment and the utilisation of the potential at hand. I refer to natural gas at Roma and the establishment of the new power house at a cost of approximately £500,000. It will be functioning within the next six months, and will be driven entirely by natural gas drawn from a bore within a-quarter of a mile of it.

Mr. Duggan: And two years ago the Government would not support the Roma Town Council by subsidising that work.

Mr. EWAN: Again the Leader of the Opposition is living in the past.

I congratulate the State Electricity Commission on setting such an example. I feel that that example should be followed in many other avenues in the use of the great natural resources that have been discovered on a commercial basis in the last few years. I ask that this investigation be carried out in an effort to determine what by-products can be recovered from natural gas. Natural gas has been used in the powerhouse at Roma, and will be for many years to come. Many by-products are being recovered. Some that come to mind are polythene, carbon black, plastics, ammonia, synthetic rubber, and liquid or bottled gas. Any investigation would be incomplete unless those factors were taken into consideration so that we can inform people who may be influenced to invest money and support industries in those areas as to the possibilities.

These things gain momentum once an indication is given of how they can be used. An example has been given at the powerhouse at Roma, under the management of Mr. Charles Shand, whom I have complimented on several occasions for the magnificent work he has done there. As I say, these things snowball. The local hospital is being equipped for the use of natural gas. The meatworks at Roma will use natural gas for power. The Roma Town Council has applied for a franchise to use natural gas in the production of power for the town of Roma. Once an example is set in these things, they start to snowball and draw to the areas concerned the industries that we desire.

I think all will agree that this State must depend to an increasing extent on secondary industries to support a larger population. The reliance till now has been largely on primary industries. Although I have been engaged in primary industry for most of my life, I appreciate its limitations in supporting an increasing number of people.

I appeal to the Minister, will all the vehemence at my command, to have this newly formed department carry out a full investigation of the possibilities of establishing industries in or near Roma. If this is found to be uneconomic, I ask that every consideration be given to possible uses of our great natural gas resources.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (12.36 p.m.): It gives me pleasure to take part in this debate because I realise that this is one of the key departments in the State. It is not a key department in the sense that service departments such as the Railway Department, the Main Roads Department, and the Department of Education are, but in the sense of reflecting the thinking of the Government towards industry.

I think it is abundantly clear that to a great extent the Government has over the years used propaganda to keep itself in

office. This has been apparent year after year. Anyone hearing the Minister speak in quiet and well-chosen terms would be led to think that there had never been any propaganda on industrial development. We all know, however, that his predecessor in this field, namely, the now Senator Morris, consistently resorted to propaganda concerning the State's development.

It does not surprise me that the department was set up and has been allowed to build up its functions. To gain some idea of how it has grown, I refer to official records. The Estimates show that in the Chief Office the number employed in 1962-63 was seven, and the cost of salaries was £14,933. Travelling expenses amounted to £4,286, special investigations £8,735, publicity for attraction of industries £25,209, and expenses of Queensland Development Advisory Committee £3,173, giving a total of £56,336.

The difference this year, as the Minister explained, is the result of the great advance in the potential of the State. The staff has increased to 33. What astounded me was not so much the number of officers but the titles given to some of them. I suppose that if an officer is to be paid a large salary, given an attractive office to work in, and is required to mix with industrialists and other people from overseas who themselves receive large salaries, he should have an appropriate title. There are in this department a Director of Industrial Development, an Associate Director of Industrial Development, a Director of Technical Services, an Interviewing Officer, a Chief Clerk and Accountant, an Economist, a Publicity and Promotion Officer, a Liaison Officer, an Administration Officer, a Regional Industries Officer, two Research Officers, a Private Secretary, and eight ordinary Clerks. There are then eight Clerk-typists, a Chauffeur, an Assistant, and two Messengers. I am sure that the Clerks and Clerk-typists must be very elated to know that they have over them so many officers with such high-sounding titles.

The Minister probably will say, "All these men have different jobs." But this department is no different from other departments. Let me draw a comparison between the Department of Industrial Development, which comes under the control of the Deputy Premier, and the senior department, that is, the Department of the Premier and State Development. That is a very important department, and one would naturally expect that its officers would be high-ranking officers whose work was of great importance to Queensland. However, we do not find any high-sounding titles there. In fact, there are only 31 in the chief office, and the total cost this year is estimated at £66,765. I have no quarrel with that, but I think it is unnecessary to have such varied titles for a number of officers. In my opinion, the titles probably are used for propaganda purposes.

Let us now consider the cost of the Department of Industrial Development in its second year of operation. The estimated expenditure on salaries is £40,512, on travelling expenses, printing, stationery, and incidentals, £11,500, on special investigations, £2,500, on industry promotion, publicity, &c., £49,070, the total amount being £103,582. If we compare that with similar expenditure in the Premier's Department, I am sure that we must come to the conclusion that it is certainly not used for only one purpose. In fact, when I read the report of the department and the Estimates, and then looked at the development of the department, a thought came into my mind, and I think that the officers of the department have the same feeling themselves. The report of the Director of Industrial Development for the year ended 30 June, 1964, had this to say—

“As at the 1st July, 1964, the Chief Office staff numbered twenty-nine (29). Some new appointments have been made to cope with the increased responsibilities and duties imposed on the Department consequent on its elevation to full Ministerial Department status. However, care has been exercised to avoid any suggestion of ‘Empire Building’.”

I do not think such a statement would have been made unless that thought was in the minds of departmental officers. I mention the matter on this occasion so that if, over the years, the staff of the department increases greatly without much worth-while result, I shall be able to refer to this debate and say, “We warned the Government not to allow the department to get completely out of hand.”

One important aspect of the department's work is selecting industrial sites and making them available to people interested in developing industries in this State. This is not something new; it was done through other departments by officers with different classifications. The present Government is merely continuing the practice of former Governments. However, co-ordination is still lacking between all sections of council and Government administration when sites are selected and made available. I am concerned because in Queensland, and in Australia generally, we are blessed with an abundance of open spaces, and it vexes me to see homes being built on small allotments and buildings being crammed in one beside the other. We are not using the spaces that are our heritage. I know I will be told that the cost of services becomes greater as the distance between premises increases, but that is a small price to pay if future generations can avoid having to live all clustered together.

I have been informed by the department that in my electorate it is throwing open for industrial development a tract of land on Lytton Road, Bulimba, extending from Taylor Street right down to what is commonly known as the Colmslie Reserve, between Lytton Road and the river. The land between

the road to the docks and the Colmslie Reserve has always been shown on the Town Plan as an industrial area. I have no fight with that because it is opposite a high school and an open paddock, and there are industries adjacent to it. But the area between Taylor Street and the road to the docks was Commonwealth land and according to the Town Plan it is to be used for special purposes. That land has been thrown open for industrial development.

I ask the Minister to release it from use for that purpose because right next to it, over the last four or five years, a residential estate has been developed. That estate may not have been in existence when it was decided to use this land for industrial purposes—I do not know the exact time when the decision was made—but on this residential estate land was selling for between £800 and £1,500 a block. Some blocks may have sold for even more. Those I have investigated were priced within that range and new homes have been built on them at a cost of up to £6,000 and £7,000. Some, of course, may have been cheaper. Nevertheless, these people are worried that they will be looking straight across the street into some type of industry. I am sure all hon. members have seen industries, big and small, starting up. Some of them are housed in tin sheds. They certainly conform with local-authority regulations but they soon become very unsightly.

I believe that when an industrial site is being selected, the interests of residents, other industries, and everyone else in the neighbourhood should be taken fully into account. I ask the Minister to investigate whether or not this area cannot be released from the proposed industrial development and perhaps converted into park land or used for some other purpose.

That brings me to the point that in planning for development, as I said earlier, there should be co-ordination so far as the selected areas are concerned. When an industrial area is adjacent to a residential area there should be a buffer area between them. There is no better buffer, of course, than playing fields or open park lands. I think that is something the department should keep in mind, and whenever an area is set aside for industrial purposes it should make sure that such a strip is left.

Mr. Munro: I suggest you have a word with the Lord Mayor if you are dealing with town planning.

Mr. HOUSTON: I am not dealing with town planning. I do not want the Minister to get smart, because there is much I could say about the Town Plan. This morning I asked the Minister for Local Government and Conservation if he would make available to me a copy of the Town Plan of my area so that I would know what was going on in these matters, but he said he could not do that. I know many people who have a copy of the Town Plan.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hodges): Order!

Mr. HOUSTON: I am referring to what the Minister said about the Town Plan. The land to which I have referred is shown on the Town Plan as Commonwealth land but the Minister for Industrial Development shows it as an industrial area. I have no quarrel with asking the Commonwealth to release land for industrial purposes but I have here a map on which the area is clearly marked as an industrial area. If that is compared with the Town Plan map of the Bulimba electorate it will be seen that it is shown as Commonwealth land for special purposes. All I am asking is that the Minister release that land from use for industrial development or, if it is persevered with, that a worth-while strip of land is left so that the people living in the homes to which I have referred—they have put their life savings into them—do not have to look across the street at unsightly buildings, but at something more attractive. I ask that not only for that area, but for development areas throughout the State.

I have made a very close scrutiny of the Report of the Director of Secondary Industries and Chairman of the Industries Assistance Board for the year ended 30 June, 1957—the predecessor to the present Report of the Director of Industrial Development. There is much detail in the 1957 report that is lacking in the 1964 report. All matters covered in the Report of the Director of Industrial Development for the year ended 30 June, 1964, are covered in the 1957 report.

I know that the hon. member for Mount Gravatt does not like us going back over history. However, we have heard a lot about this Government's being responsible for the discovery of the bauxite fields. Let me refer briefly to the 1957 report, which was published prior to this Government's coming into office. On the first page it states—

“Despite the somewhat adverse conditions of the past year it is pleasing to note that the planned development of industry has not been curtailed to any appreciable extent. In the North of the State continuing discoveries of valuable mineral deposits form a guarantee that the growth of secondary industries in the North will be maintained in the future.

“In the Peninsula the position regarding the Bauxite deposits is becoming somewhat clearer and it now appears to be definite that the production of alumina will be carried out on the Peninsula and conversion to aluminium may be carried out in New Guinea. The results of this development will be far reaching and will have a big effect on the development of the sparsely populated North.”

That was in 1957. The development that has taken place in the bauxite industry between 1957 and now was in hand at that stage. I do not take any credit away from

the Government for keeping it rolling and for encouraging the companies to come in. But let us forget all about this suggestion that had the present Government not come into power this State would have suffered stagnation.

When I interjected during the Minister's opening remarks I had no intention of being deliberately rude. I was prompted to ask a question because I felt that, being the gentleman he is, he would admit that it was a fact, whereas if I asked some of his colleagues the same question they would not give me the same answer.

Later, the report says—

“Interstate enquiries have continued and it is increasingly evident that southern manufacturers are realising the advantages of establishing branches in Queensland.”

That again was back in 1956 and 1957. The same report deals with “Hamilton, Pinkenba land and other industrial areas of Brisbane.” The shortage of industrial sites is referred to, and it deals with what the Government of the day had done to relieve the problem.

It has been said that bulk handling was a development that took place only under this Government, but that suggestion is negated on page 7 of this report, which states—

“In the sugar ports of Central and North Queensland, the development and installation of bulk-handling equipment is only a matter of time. The first installation at Mackay is well under way and will be in operation handling this season's sugar.”

The basis was set—it has been carried on. I am quite happy that it has been carried on but I am not happy at the claim, merely for propaganda purposes, that the Labour Party fell down on its job and that all development in Queensland has been brought about by this Government. That has not necessarily been said by the Minister, and I make it quite clear that our criticisms in a debate such as this are not directed at the Minister personally. However, as the Minister in charge of the department, I suppose he must take responsibility for what Government members say.

I pass now to other matters associated with this department. One of the main problems is the development of factories. I agree that their numbers have increased, and that they have developed. However, Government members like to quote £ s. d. as a basis for development. They prefer to say, “We spent more than Labour on this project,” or, “Industries coming here are spending more than any industry during Labour's time.” We expect that as propaganda.

Let me now refer to the number of factories and the increase that has occurred. According to the official record, in 1955-56 there were 5,305 factories in Queensland, 1,874 of which

were in the metropolitan area and 3,431 in the rest of the State. In 1962-63 the total number was 5,895—590 more; there were 2,197 in the metropolitan area—an increase of 323—and 3,698 in the rest of the State, an increase in the number by 267, and in the development of factories, and I am quite happy about that. Although the statistics show the numbers, they certainly do not give us the size of factories. We must admit that a refinery or an alumina works is better than many small factories, but the development is centred more in the metropolitan area than the Government's claims about decentralisation would lead us to believe.

I regret that ways and means have not been found to increase the number of factories in country areas. On almost every trip I make to the country I am told that local people are sick and tired of their youth being the main export commodity. This trend is preventing the development of the State. The country areas are denuded of young people because of lack of opportunity of employment. If a man is looking for a centre in which to establish a factory—particularly if it is a small industry—he will not go to country centres because of the difficulty in getting labour. One thing adds to the other, and the drift of population to the city is bad for development. The pattern is constant throughout the State.

The department must find suitable areas for quick development because many major industries, such as the oil refineries, are being established. To gain the maximum advantage, subsidiary industries must be established quickly. Without land, electricity, water and other amenities which help to establish industries we will miss out, and as Queenslanders we do not want that to happen at any price.

The Government must find ways and means of using our primary products to develop secondary industries. If time permitted we could debate how our natural resources, such as wool and ores, could be used here. I trust that by next year Moonie oil will be refined and used in Queensland.

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

Mr. WHARTON (Burnett) (2.15 p.m.): I congratulate the Minister for Industrial Development on the presentation of his Estimates. They not only represent real progress in the past year, but serve also as a blueprint for future development. It is a fairly factual report, and shows that this Government has done a good job. It is easy for members of the Opposition to say, "If we had been in power we would have done something else, or would have done better." The real facts are those that have been presented to us by the Minister.

I do not want to repeat what the Minister said about projects such as oil development, the motor industry, and the Mt. Isa and Gladstone projects. We want to encourage the development of new industries, but not at the expense of those already established. My attitude to life has been, "Hold what you have, and add to it." We should encourage the establishment of new industries as quickly as possible, but not at the expense of existing industries.

A great deal of development has taken place in Brisbane, and close to Brisbane. There has been a relatively small amount of secondary industry development in other parts of the State. I am concerned at the forecast that by the year 1970 numbers equal to the present Australian population will reside in Brisbane, Sydney, and Melbourne. That is good in itself, but not for the defence of our country or for development. Development must be planned and it should be decentralised as much as possible so that we will have a number of communities well and fully developed. I know of no better way of developing them than to establish secondary industries in the provincial towns.

I do not want to introduce political bias into the debate, but the Leader of the Opposition mentioned that his interest in secondary development was political. This Government has approached the problem on a statesmanlike basis. It is catering for the needs of the working man particularly well. In its desire to establish new industries, it has created stability of employment and a new era to live in; it has provided the working-class with the green light to get a bit of private enterprise into its thinking. The Minister mentioned private enterprise in the development of this State, and I commend him for it. Some leaning towards private enterprise is born in all of us, whether we be self-employed or ordinary workers. In this country today I say that the working man is fully considered. The policy of the Government is to cater for all. Each is encouraged to own his own home.

My view is that we should aim for development of a decentralised pattern. Nothing can be accomplished without a proper plan, and in this planning consideration should be given to the smaller towns. One hon. member who spoke this morning referred to education. In my electorate secondary departments have been established in schools at Gayndah, Biggenden, Miriam Vale, Gin Gin, Rosedale, and other places. Children in these areas are now being as well educated as those in the large cities.

Mr. Tucker: Does education come under the Department of Industrial Development?

Mr. WHARTON: Some hon. members opposite would be very difficult to educate. I should hate to have the job of doing that.

I shall restrict my remarks to saying that children in my area are at least as well fitted to be educated as those residing anywhere else, and they appreciate that they are receiving as good an education as could be obtained elsewhere. Giving these boys and girls good scholastic records is, however, not sufficient; there is also the problem of providing work for them when they leave school. If employment opportunities are concentrated in Brisbane and other major cities, population will drift to them from rural areas. That is the natural tendency, and I believe it to be wrong. Having educated our children, it then becomes our duty to create jobs for them so that many, if not all, remain in the districts in which they received their schooling.

Heavy industry, of course, must remain in the larger cities; it would not be workable or economic to take it elsewhere. There is, however, scope for development of light industry, and secondary industry closely associated with primary industry, in some of the larger provincial centres. I am advocating industrial development where the raw products are produced. The five sugar mills in my electorate are doing an excellent job. They are engaged in an expansion programme and we look to them to provide additional employment for the people of the area.

Mr. Houston: When were they established?

Mr. WHARTON: It is not a matter of when they were established. I am one whose interest is in the present and the future. That is what is most important to me. The fact is that mills have been established; they are now expanding and will provide work for some of the boys and girls in my electorate.

The dairying industry is also playing its part. With the assistance of irrigation, it is hoped that the present expansion will continue. The citrus and tobacco-growing industries and the vegetable-processing industry should also be encouraged.

Let me digress for a moment and say that three New Zealand companies are interested in processing peas in Queensland, and I believe that there are other opportunities for the establishment of vegetable-processing plants in districts in which vegetables are grown. A Queensland-nut industry is being established in my electorate, and I hope that before long a secondary industry based on the growing of Queensland nuts will be developed in the area in which the nuts are produced.

I can cite some industries that are doing very well. For example, the Schultz Engineering Co., an engineering company, which started in only a small way near Bundaberg, is producing hammer mills and other implements and in that way is catering for people in primary industries who need mechanical assistance. Horwood & Sons are operating a canning plant in the Gooburrum Shire, near Bundaberg. They are producing canned fruits and jams. I might add that they are also

canning papaws and rock melons, something that has been attempted only rarely in Queensland. Many papaws and rock melons are grown in my electorate, and Horwood & Sons have shown that a canning plant can be established and can do a pretty good job of work in food processing.

Industries such as these are of great benefit to the district because they assist in overcoming high freight charges and losses in transit. Half the cost of our food is attributable to freight to and from the markets and processing charges. If we can overcome this disadvantage by means of industrial expansion in country areas, I think we shall have achieved something worthwhile. Employment will also be provided for those who wish to stay in the country. I know that we cannot expect to hold all the young children in the district, but at least some will have the opportunity of staying. In the field of education, we have saved parents the cost of sending children away to be educated by providing facilities for their education in country towns, and I think we should also provide employment opportunities for the children.

The two matters with which I am primarily concerned are adequate financial assistance for the establishment of secondary industries in country areas and freight concessions, and no-one knows better than I do the problems associated with them. However, I think we must all accept that the advantages far outweigh the disadvantages, and I ask the Minister to give careful consideration to expanding secondary industries not only in city areas but also in country areas far from Brisbane.

Mr. COBURN (Burdekin) (2.29 p.m.): It is well known to hon. members who have been in this Parliament for some years that frequently, and without any abatement of enthusiasm, I have advocated the implementation of two mighty projects for the development of the northern portion of this State. I refer to the completion of the Burdekin Dam scheme and the establishment of an iron and steel works at Bowen. On many occasions I have pointed out what great projects they would be for the development of North Queensland, and I am convinced that ultimately the Burdekin Dam scheme will be the foundation upon which industry in North Queensland is built. I am not alone in that belief; I share it with many influential people who are leaders of industry and who are anxious to see this important part of our State, which is rich in natural resources, developed fully.

Having spoken in detail and at great length in this Chamber on what the proposed Burdekin River irrigation, hydro-electric and flood mitigation scheme involves and on its worth to the Commonwealth, I will content myself on this occasion with a much more general outline of the scheme. For hon. members who are not fully cognisant of what this mightily important project will mean not only to Queensland but to the

Commonwealth of Australia, I point out that the great multiple-purpose Burdekin River irrigation, hydro-electric and flood mitigation project for development of the water resources of the Burdekin River and its tributaries is planned for three main purposes, namely, the growing of food and other agricultural produce, the generating of hydro-electric energy, and the mitigation of floods. To these must be added the supply of water in enormous quantities to Townsville and Bowen if they are to develop into the great industrial centres that we in North Queensland expect they will.

This project will utilise the waters from the Burdekin River and its tributaries, which form one of the great major river systems of Queensland, draining an area of over 50,000 square miles, equal to the area of England, and will gradually bring into production large areas of land that offer great possibilities for development.

When the dam is completed, reservoirs will store 6,500,000 acre-feet of water. If that was converted to gallons it would be almost impossible to read the number of gallons that it would represent. It is 16 times as much water as is contained in Sydney Harbour and three times the capacity of the Hume Weir on the Murray River. The storage will be appreciably greater than the combined storage of the proposed seven major dams in the Snowy Mountains project, where the estimated total water storage will be 4,250,000 acre-feet.

The capacity of the completed Burdekin Falls reservoir will provide for a continuous daily output of water equal to a flow of 17,000 gallons a second. It is sufficient for the firm generation of 100,000 kilowatts of electricity at 50 per cent. load factor and for the irrigation of at least 350,000 acres each year without restriction in operation.

A typical statement from the report of the Burdekin River Authority that was furnished to this Parliament in 1951 is as follows—and it will be remembered that the personnel of that authority were among the most eminent and highly-ranked public servants this State has even had—

“The Burdekin River Authority is convinced that the project is a sound one and that its implementation is essential in both the State and the national interests. It will bring closer settlement and industrial development to an area which is at present sparsely populated and which could not be developed without irrigation.

“Primary production from agricultural and pastoral activity as irrigation development expands will be accompanied by the processing of raw products. Railways, harbours and shipping facilities are adjacent to the area to be developed and the hinterland will provide store stock. The availability of substantial quantities of hydro-electric power at lesser cost than would be possible by other means of

generation will encourage general industrial development and attract important special industries such as electrolytic zinc refining.

“The development of North Queensland and its resources is essential if Australia is to hold this country, and it must be regarded as of major importance as a defence measure. The Burdekin project when fully developed will have a value in the future perhaps much greater than can be envisaged today, having brought to the area a greatly increased population, stable primary industries protected against drought, producing much-needed animal and vegetable produce, accompanying service and processing industries and secondary industries assured of adequate supplies of power.”

We could add “and water”.

Mr. Muller: Have you any idea of the cost?

Mr. COBURN: Yes. The costs have all been gone into.

These recommendations are not made on some superficial investigation of the project; they are made on a full and intensive investigation. As I said before, they are the findings of the most eminent public servants in this field. It is their findings on which we base our hopes for the future—and, of course, the application of our own common sense.

The report continues—

“It is felt that no greater contribution could be made to the development of North Queensland than the early implementation of the Burdekin River Irrigation Hydro-electric and Flood Mitigation Project.”

Much more could be said about this project, which is of paramount importance to the State. However, as my time is limited in this debate I will content myself by making a wider and more detailed reference to it at some more opportune time in the future. We are now confronted with a problem on the Burdekin River which was not foreseen when that report was compiled. It was thought at that time that the only use to which the land in the Burdekin Valley could be put was the growing of tobacco as the staple product, and the growing of peas, beans, potatoes, sunflower and other crops of lesser importance. The Central Sugar Cane Prices Board has now seen fit to grant a further 140 cane assignments to farmers in this area. As the report said, there are large areas of land there suitable for the growing of sugar-cane if there is any necessity in the future, because of the expansion of the industry, to bring them within the ambit of the sugar industry.

As a result of the great expansion that has taken place in that industry we find that the water we were able to get from the aquifers of the Burdekin Delta are insufficient to meet cane irrigation requirements. Whereas previously we irrigated more than 40,000 acres we now will be required to irrigate in excess of 70,000 acres. It has been necessary to evolve a scheme, which will be implemented in the

very near future, for pumping water from the river into the recharged channels to replenish the underground supply.

We were told by the Commissioner for Irrigation and Water Supply when he was on the Burdekin just recently that he would not recommend any further industrial development, particularly at the primary level, until some controlled storage on the river was provided. It means that if we do not do something about damming the river so that we can have a controlled supply that will assure us at all times of a full requirement of water for the industry, we will have a stalemate. It means that we will be stymied in the further expansion of the industry. We cannot afford to let that happen in a young country which is bursting at the seams for industrial development.

The second matter is one for which I have been urging ever since I entered this Parliament. At that time Bowen was a part of the electorate that I had the honour to represent. I have always considered that Bowen's development depends on the establishment of a steel and iron industry in the area. The establishment of such an industry at Bowen would be of inestimable value in the development of the State. On many occasions I have brought before the notice of hon. members the practicability of, and the necessity for, the establishment of heavy industry in this State. I have advanced reasons why Bowen, because of its natural resources, should be the centre of the iron and steel industry in Queensland. Others have believed as I believe, but they saw limiting factors which, at that stage, made them consider that it would be difficult for Bowen to establish the industry. When former Premier, Mr. Gair, went to Great Britain, he interviewed some of the leading steel and iron industrialists there and asked them to come to Queensland to make an on-the-spot examination for the purpose of deciding on the establishment of an iron and steel industry. He reached the stage where he thought that Lloyds, a big steel and iron manufacturing company, would visit the State, but their visit did not eventuate. On one occasion the present Leader of the Opposition, in answer to a question that I directed to him, said that if sufficient quantities of iron ore were available he would favour the establishment of a pig-iron industry at Bowen for the production of about 60,000 tons of pig-iron annually. There were others besides me who believed that Bowen had the possibilities for the establishment of this industry.

I believe that Bowen has justifiable claims to this industry, and as there is now a new agitation for the establishment of such an industry in Queensland, I think it is an opportune time to let hon. members know what I think about Bowen's claims for it. All hon. members will concede that the Australian iron and steel industry is the most important of our secondary industries. It is the nerve centre of our whole industrial system. The truth of that statement was brought home to us during the Second World War and in the post-war

period. The shortage of steel and our vulnerability to attack proved that very forcibly during the war years and it was most apparent in the years subsequent to the war. In peace, iron and steel are essential to development, and in war time, they are absolutely indispensable. The saying, "As steel goes, so goes the nation," is now more widely recognised and believed, and the consumption of steel per head of population is the best yardstick of the standard of living and the industrial strength of a country. The Australian production of steel is certainly the yardstick of our manufacturing strength, but the Australian steel industry has failed to expand its capacity to meet our requirements. For that reason, the national economy has suffered considerably.

When I spoke here in 1955 about the establishment of a steel works in Queensland, we were at that time—nine years ago—importing a million tons of steel a year. The national economy suffered considerably because of that. Imported foreign or British steel costs more than the steel produced by Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. I am very much concerned about the urgency of providing greater steel production so that this country, which experiences substantial shortages of steel from time to time, will not have its development retarded by the failure of Broken Hill Pty. Ltd.—which has a monopoly on the manufacture of iron and steel in the Commonwealth—to adequately expand its production.

Mr. Windsor: We make the best steel in the world.

Mr. COBURN: I realise that we make the best steel in the world—not only that, we make it cheaper than any other country—but we do not make sufficient to meet our requirements. If an iron and steel plant were to be established at Bowen—

Mr. Muller: The water supply is most important—

Mr. COBURN: I realise that, and I will deal with that subject as I continue.

An iron and steel plant established at Bowen would be of unquestionable value to this State, as everyone concerned with the economy of the country is forced to admit. If we want to develop our country soundly and provide the greatest possible measure of security we should do our utmost to have an iron and steel works established, I say, at Bowen. Of course, others may say it should be somewhere else. I recommend Bowen because, after investigation, I am convinced that no other place in Queensland offers as many advantages as does Bowen. What economic requirements determine the location of a steel-producing centre in Australia where basic raw materials and markets for finished products are widely dispersed? They are—

1. Proximity to one of the two basic materials, iron or coal. Experts tell us that it is possible to conduct an iron and

steel works economically by transporting one of the basic materials to a smelting works, but not both.

2. The site should be on the coast in order to obtain the benefit of cheap transportation of both the raw material and the finished products of the steel works.

3. The availability of cheap power. Electric power, of course, is preferable, although we may prefer atomic power later on.

4. Proximity to places of consumption for the finished article.

All of those requirements are fulfilled at Bowen. We have there large quantities of excellent coke, coal, and lime. Port Denison is an excellent harbour in which great quantities of goods can be handled economically. The production of cheap electricity is a simple matter today. The hydro-electric station being established on the Broken River could be supplemented by a hydro-electric power station on the Burdekin River capable of producing 100,000 kilowatts at 50 per cent. load factor, if required. The Townsville Regional Electricity Board has assured the Bowen Development Association that it will provide all electric power needed for Bowen's industrial development at a competitive cost. The great development programme that we can envisage for North Queensland will give us a market close at hand, and the ever-increasing demand in the Far East, with its teeming millions, will be a happy hunting ground for our great industrialists.

Prior to the discovery of the enormous deposits of high-grade iron ore at Constance Range, the one disadvantage for the establishment of an iron and steel works at Bowen was the absence of iron ore in close proximity. This disadvantage has now been overcome, as Bowen is as well placed to receive iron ore from Constance Range as any other seaport on the eastern coast of Queensland. Bowen now, therefore, has the three major raw materials required for the manufacture of steel, namely, coal, iron and limestone. Excellent coking coal and a very good quality lime are available in ample quantities in the Bowen district, and iron is now available at a site from which transport to Bowen would be economic. For those reasons, and for others which time on this occasion does not permit me to mention, I advance the claims of Bowen as the logical site in Queensland for an iron and steel works.

As I have a few minutes at my disposal, I point out that living conditions at Bowen are excellent. Bowen is regarded as having one of the most equable climates in the whole of the Commonwealth. There is ample land available for housing the workers who would be engaged in the iron and steel works and the smelters. There would be no difficulty in housing the people in the most congenial of conditions. Bowen has everything to offer that a person would require, and so diversified are the amenities there that anyone

would be happy to live in such a pleasant place. The amenities cannot be excelled anywhere in the Commonwealth. There are fine fishing grounds, excellent beaches, facilities for sailing, and plenty of shooting and other types of sport.

Living conditions in a place such as Bowen approach almost the ideal. From economic, social, and all other points of view it would be grand if Bowen could get this heavy industry. For a long time it has been "on the outer", as it were. Bowen's sugar trade was lost to Mackay and Townsville, and its tourist trade went to Proserpine. All along the line Bowen has missed out. The possibility of a steel industry seems now to be the brightest spot on the horizon for Bowen. Everything required for the establishment of a soundly based steel and iron industry is available there, and I hope that the Government will exert every effort to see that it is the place chosen by industrialists for the establishment of such a plant.

I realise that in this country there is no direction to industrialists on where they are to establish plants. We believe in free enterprise and the right of an investor to choose where he will invest. I think that we can, however, be of help to these people when their choices are being made, and in some cases we may be able to make provisions that would induce them to go to certain places. I believe that the granting of incentives to bring about the establishment of a steel and iron industry at Bowen would meet with the approval of not only the people of North Queensland but of the entire State. There is a realisation that the security of Queensland is wrapped up with the strength of North Queensland. More population in the North means greater security for all.

I believe that the establishment of a great industry at Bowen would give tremendous impetus to the development of North Queensland. It would be an aid to decentralisation and would take industry away from those places in which it is now developing fairly rapidly. I know that the Government will not establish this industry. Indeed, I do not even make a plea for it to do so. I know that there will be people interested in it now that deposits of high-grade iron ore are known to exist at Mount Constance, and good coking coal, lime, and facilities for the handling of the products are available in close proximity. Markets are developing rapidly not only in North Queensland but in the Far East, where people are already looking for higher standards and are using products that some years ago they would never have dreamt of using.

For these reasons, new vistas are opening to industrialists. Bowen is as close to the iron-ore deposits of Mount Constance as is any other place that might be considered for the establishment of an iron and steel works. It therefore behoves the Minister for Industrial Development to give close

attention to Bowen. If he can offer inducements and incentives that result in the establishment of such an industry there, his name will go down in history.

(Time expired.)

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Industrial Development) (2.54 p.m.): It was not my intention to speak at this stage. However, as various contributions have now been made covering rather diverse subjects, the thought occurred to me that perhaps I should make some comments on a few of the points raised whilst they are fresh in our minds. For instance, on the matter of the iron and steel industry, in respect of which the hon. member for Burdekin has made a plea, I thought it would be better if I took the stand now and made my reply instead of doing it at half past 9 this evening when the hon. member may perhaps have put the matter out of his mind.

I propose, then, to make some brief remarks at this stage, and in deference to the Leader of the Opposition I think I should commence with some reference to his contribution, although I may pass over it fairly shortly and come back later to some of the more constructive suggestions that have been put forward.

I must say that I appreciate very greatly the spirit in which the Estimates have, up to the present, been received and debated, not only by the Leader of the Opposition but also by all hon. members who have spoken. It is true that the latter part of the speech of the Leader of the Opposition fell away to a slight extent from the very high standard of his early remarks. Some references to other Ministers and former Ministers were made that were not very important; I regard them as side issues and, therefore, as not requiring any particular reference. However, I was in full agreement with the Leader of the Opposition when he expressed himself very realistically in recognising—I think I am using his words—that “bigness” of industry is something that is with us and, consequently, something with which we must learn to live. That is very relevant to one or two remarks that I shall make later on decentralisation, because we find, in common with people in all parts of the world, that whatever might be our particular views and policies in relation to decentralisation, the economic trend today is not towards decentralisation but towards centralisation. That is only another way of expressing the same thought.

Mr. Coburn: It is difficult to prevent it, too.

Mr. MUNRO: Exactly. A similar thought is that, with the trend to mechanisation and automation, we must have large-scale production if we are to have certain basic industries carried on here. It is quite inevitable, therefore, that there will be a trend towards centralisation, in terms of which large-scale industries tend to be established and developed in the larger centres of population where there

are markets in close proximity. In the light of that, the Leader of the Opposition said that the Government has not succeeded in its efforts to bring about decentralisation. As I say, that is true to an extent. It is not that decentralisation does not have some advantages.

Mr. O'Donnell: You are amazingly honest.

Mr. MUNRO: Of course. The hon. member could leave out “amazingly”.

Decentralisation is very desirable, and it is the policy of the Government; but we realise that in an economy with large-scale production it is impossible to avoid some degree of centralisation. I would not say that our policies have not succeeded; rather would I say that we are realistic and that the implementation of our policies is more along the lines of a recognition of this world-wide trend towards centralisation and seeing that that trend does not get out of hand in Queensland. If you take that as being our policy then we are more successful than the authorities in any other State of Australia and, incidentally, more successful than people in most other parts of the world.

Passing on to subsequent speakers, the hon. member for Roma made a most interesting contribution. Of course, that was to be expected. His comments related very largely to the very important discovery and development of natural gas in his area.

Mr. Bromley interjected.

Mr. MUNRO: I did not have a stop-watch on him because I found his contribution very interesting. To speak rather colloquially, I would say he had something to crow about.

The hon. member for Roma was followed by the hon. member for Burnett and the hon. member for Burdekin in very much the same theme, namely, promoting the objectives of their particular areas and putting forward claims for development in those parts of the State in which they have a degree of responsibility. It is quite right to do that. I think it is a very good thing if people in different parts of the State—not only members of Parliament but business men and industrialists—make an effort to develop their own particular areas.

As a matter of policy I should say—and I think I speak on behalf of the Government generally in this—that nothing would make us happier than to see some way in which we could bring about large-scale development in the western part of the State, in the northern part of the State, and in Central Queensland. That broadly is our objective, but still, as I say, we have to be realistic and consider those things in relation to the hard facts of life.

In any discussions in which I take part—I think the same thing applies with the senior officers of my department—if we feel that a particular project in one part of the State, whether remote or otherwise, has some potential or some advantage, we are always

at pains to bring such advantage under the notice of anybody who might be considering establishing an industry.

Reverting to the remarks of the hon. member for Roma, he suggested that a special investigation should be conducted in his area. Of course, I could not consider that. Our policy is not to single out any particular area of the State and try to develop industries there; our policy is to consider the whole of the State and to see which are the areas that are most capable of development and then to bring about development there if we can. So far as Roma is concerned, another important point, as hon. members know, is that we have engaged the services of an eminent Canadian expert, Dr. Hetherington, to make a complete investigation of the potentialities of our natural gas resources. Any specific action in that direction will, of course, have to await the receipt of his report.

The hon. member for Bulimba, as usual, made a quite interesting speech. He took exception to the number of officers and the titles of officers in the department, and their salaries. I will not pursue this point very far; there was not very much in it, really, because as I look at it and compare it with other departments, I think the amazing thing is that we have such a small department with such great responsibility.

Mr. Houston interjected.

Mr. MUNRO: We have already indicated that we do not propose to go in for any empire building.

Mr. Houston: But your successor might. They tell me that you are not standing any longer.

Mr. MUNRO: I am standing at the moment.

Mr. Houston: But they tell me you will be retiring at the end of this Parliament.

Mr. MUNRO: This is not an appropriate time to make any announcement on that subject.

On this matter of the titles of officers, the hon. member took some exception to the fact that we have set out our Estimates in a very detailed way. Instead of merely showing the number of officers in total, we have detailed them. We have gone to a lot of trouble to give all this information for the benefit of hon. members. When the hon. member thinks it over I am sure he will be very much more appreciative.

The hon. member also made a point about the development of industrial sites in his area. The action taken in that area is very recent. We were quite well-informed as to the residential development but the plain

fact is that that is an area eminently suitable for industrial development. I am afraid it would not be wise to limit industrial development to any area—

Mr. Houston: Don't you think that any industrial development there could be kept apart from the residential area by a strip of parkland or something like that?

Mr. MUNRO: It is inevitable in a growing city that you have industrial areas mixed with residential areas. Of course, if you can have something in the way of a little bit of green space in between, it is very desirable.

Mr. Houston: Tristrams have that idea on the south side.

Mr. MUNRO: That is to some extent the responsibility of industry, but to a much greater extent it is the responsibility of the civic authorities. It was for that reason that I interjected, perhaps somewhat facetiously, that perhaps the hon. member might make his suggestion to the Lord Mayor.

The hon. member also quoted figures relating to factories. I do not think that the number of factories is important. I think all hon. members are sufficiently conversant with the present factual position of development to make it unnecessary for me to quote figures in rebuttal. The plain fact is that the test is not the number of factories. Two or three small factories could have their places taken by one large one. The test is the number of men employed and the production. On both of these tests—the really important ones—we have made wonderful progress in the last 12 months. In common with most of the other Australian States we are in the fortunate position of having substantially full employment at the present time.

The hon. member for Burdekin made his contribution. To those of us who have had the pleasure of being here for 10, 12 or 14 years it was no surprise that our old friend regarded this as a very good opportunity to tell us about the Burdekin Dam scheme and the complete suitability of Bowen, which is adjacent to his own area, for the establishment of an iron and steel industry. I do not propose to say very much about the Burdekin Dam scheme, other than to point out two things. Firstly, this is not primarily a matter for the Department of Industrial Development; it is more a matter of State development. Secondly, if such a proposal were to be instituted at the present time I do not think the electricity potential would be the most important.

Mr. Coburn: It would be necessary to get the different processes under way before you came into it.

Mr. MUNRO: I do not regard it as a matter directly for my department, but from what I know of the economics of it I am not prepared to give it my blessing at present.

I am more interested in the second point raised by the hon. member for Burdekin, namely the establishment of an iron and steel industry at Bowen. I prefer to discuss the question of establishing an iron and steel industry in Queensland. Just as in the case of the hon. member for Roma, I am not prepared to support any one area against another, but I think that the establishment of an iron and steel industry in our State is very important and it has been given much thought in our department in the brief period that it has been established.

Mr. Coburn: I gave good reasons why Bowen should be the choice.

Mr. MUNRO: I do not doubt that if the hon. member for Port Curtis had made a contribution to this debate he would have given very good reasons why Gladstone should be chosen. I do not wish to enter that controversy. However, while I was overseas I made fairly extensive inquiries into this matter. In the net result I came to the conclusion that, because of certain difficulties, we should regard this more as a long-term proposition than a short-term one. It is not an easy matter to solve. There is not the slightest doubt about its desirability; there is no doubt that the establishment of an iron and steel industry in Queensland would bring great benefits to the State. However, there are very great difficulties when we keep in mind the fact that in Australia at the present time there is one very efficient iron and steel industry very firmly established, with a very firm grip on the existing Australian market. On the first prerequisite alone, the question of markets, very careful consideration is required before any large organisation undertakes the tremendous capital expenditure involved in an iron and steel industry.

Apart from the best location, the precise nature of such an industry involves many difficulties. I gave much thought to this matter when I was overseas, and in reports that I have since made available I went so far as to set out six possible alternative approaches to the problem. While in my reports I set them out in some detail, I do not think there is any harm in offering a guide to hon. members to give them some idea of different approaches to the problem. All of the approaches have some relation to the basic facts.

The hon. member pointed out that we have very rich coal resources in Queensland quite suitable for an iron and steel industry, whether on a large scale or a small scale. On the other hand, our iron ores in Queensland are not actually well established. It is true, as the hon. member pointed out, that there are all the indications of very large resources of iron ore in the Constance Range country.

Mr. Donald: You said the same thing about coking coal. You said that we had no hard coking coal in Queensland.

Mr. MUNRO: I have never said that.

Mr. Donald: The Government has said it. "People have said it." Put it that way.

Mr. MUNRO: I am not saying that we have not the iron ore.

Mr. Donald: You did say it before.

Mr. MUNRO: What I am saying is that the iron ore resources in the Constance Range country have not yet been fully explored or fully proved. They are some distance from the coast, and the coastline is one which does not readily permit of development. I am only saying that because it does not do to be unduly optimistic about these things and paint a glamorous picture when there are certain obstacles to be overcome. Nevertheless, having said that, I still say that we have the potentialities in Queensland for the establishment of an iron and steel industry.

As I said, I shall try to summarise and take some of the basic points from my reports. I indicate these six possible alternative approaches to the problem. The first is rather attractive to me, but it is not easy to arrange. It is establishment of a full-scale iron and steel industry in either Central Queensland or North Queensland with special Commonwealth financial assistance, as part of an overall plan for the development of Northern Australia. On the basis of its being the plan for the development of Northern Australia, I think it would be most economic to consider it on the basis of the utilisation of iron ore from Western Australia and coal from Queensland.

Mr. Tucker: Why from Western Australia?

Mr. MUNRO: The reason I say ore from Western Australia is that, without question, the iron ore resources of the northern part of Western Australia are richer than ours, and are tremendously extensive. I have had figures made available to me in this regard. They are much closer to being developed. Although we would like to see such an industry established purely on the basis of Queensland's resources, it may well be that we would have a better prospect of establishing it on a North Australian basis rather than on a basis of purely using our own resources.

A lot of information has been made available to us. This would support the interjection of the hon. member for Ipswich East. The background information of these things is always changing. We have to take the information that is made available to us at a certain time, yet 12 months later that information might not be accurate because of further testing.

Among the various alternatives, one problem in relation to the basic resources for an iron ore industry is the cost of transport. It appears to me that there could be a case for the development of an iron ore industry on the basis of producing pig-iron in

Western Australia, primarily by the utilisation of coal from our great coalfields in Queensland. It is possible that that would go a long way towards overcoming the cost of sea transport by taking coal from east to west, and perhaps either iron ore or pig-iron from west to east.

Mr. Donald: That is what was done at Woollongong and Newcastle.

Mr. MUNRO: That is so.

The third approach is that if it is not possible to come to some overall arrangement for the development of an iron and steel industry of Northern Australia, it might be necessary for us to proceed further with the development of the natural resources of Queensland only, even if it is necessary to commence with a limited plan for the production of pig-iron or sponge-iron for export.

Mr. Sherrington: As long as we don't get "Pig Iron Bob".

Mr. MUNRO: That phrase is completely out of date.

Mr. Sherrington: But still true.

Mr. MUNRO: At the time when it was first used there may have been some justification for it. If my memory is correct, it emanated from activities at that time in relation to iron ore deposits in the northern part of Western Australia. I can assure hon. members that at present the known iron ore resources of Australia are so great that there is no need to worry at all about any that might be exported. There will still be ample for our requirements, and a very substantial surplus for export.

Mr. Graham: And enough for Japan, too.

Mr. MUNRO: Yes. Does the hon. member for Mackay consider it wrong to export to Japan?

Mr. Graham: I would sooner it be used here.

Mr. MUNRO: So would I. We must not, however, adopt a narrow-minded, parochial attitude in these matters. It must be recognised that the prosperity of the world depends on world trade; it does not depend on every little country thinking that it must produce everything for itself. By all means let us proceed at all times with our endeavours to establish an iron and steel industry. Let us not, however, be so narrow-minded as to attempt to deny to any of our neighbours in the Pacific or anywhere else resources that are necessary for them.

Mr. Graham: What chance is there of building an iron and steel works in Queensland when you can send the steel to Japan and get it back in manufactured form in Australia cheaper than we can manufacture it ourselves?

Mr. MUNRO: I quite appreciate the point made by the hon. member for Mackay. To get some production to pay the cost of

development, port facilities, and transport, possibly in the early stages we would have to export something that is not by any means completely processed. But let us start that way. Let us get production of the things in which we are rich. Let us take it to the stage of pig-iron or sponge-iron and develop from there.

I am not going to amplify those remarks because they involve quite technical questions. I am going to place on record a few words that can be regarded as a hint to those who have sufficient technical knowledge to carry it forward and perhaps examine the possibilities.

The fourth approach is the possibility of establishing on a small scale an iron and steel industry using certain new technical processes that at present are not in operation but are being developed in other parts of the world.

The fifth approach is a somewhat similar question. It is the possibility of establishing an alloy steel industry using various mineral resources available in Queensland and certain new technical processes which do not appear to have been fully developed up to the present.

The sixth alternative has a different approach. Even if all the others were to fail—I do not think they will; it is just a question of which develops first—as our population develops, we might work from the other end, as it were, from our own Australian market, and consider the establishment of something in the way of a limited industry, such as a steel-rolling mill, or something of that kind, even if we were dependent on the South for the biggest portion of its supplies.

I have made those remarks because I think that the introduction of this subject by the hon. member for Burdekin was particularly interesting, and from that point of view I express my appreciation of his contribution. To hon. members generally, I would say this: do not look at this question as merely a local or narrow one for the development of the Bowen area—although I agree that it has certain advantages—but something that is a very desirable objective for industrial development in Queensland. I assure them that it will receive the closest consideration of the Government as the opportunity arises and as we are able to gather together more data on some of the technical and other developments both in Queensland and overseas.

Mr. SHERRINGTON (Salisbury) (3.26 p.m.): In introducing his Estimates, the Minister quoted the words of an American statesman, or some such person, and conveyed the impression that we should make our nation industrially strong. I, in common with other hon. members on this side of the Chamber, heartily concur with what he said, Australia was originally a primary-producing country, but it has developed over the years and its population has grown. We have had to find employment opportunities for an ever-increasing population and, because of

discoveries of natural resources any many other developments, we are now reaching the stage where we must make ourselves industrially strong.

The Minister also pointed out that one factor in becoming industrially strong was the need to have good industrial relations. Again I wholeheartedly agree. Good industrial relations are essential, both for the good of the community and for the good of the nation. But a remark such as that sounds like so much political clap-trap to me when it comes from a Government that has made few incursions into the field of industrial relations. I remember reading only a few nights ago a statement by a member of the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission, Mr. T. C. Winter, in which he said that anybody who did not make use of the conciliation process was industrially demented.

Mr. Munro: I did not say that. I referred to using the existing law relating to industrial conciliation and arbitration.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I do not want the Minister to take up my valuable time. He will have plenty of time to comment when I have finished my speech. I did not allege that he said that. I quoted what a responsible member of the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission had to say about anybody who did not use the process of conciliation; he said that persons who did not make use of it were industrially demented. The record of this Government in conciliation is very poor—shocking, in fact—and never have I heard a Minister of this Government rise in this Chamber and support the principle of conciliation. I have been here some 4½ or 5 years and the only reference I have heard has been to arbitration. This Government has not once mentioned conciliation and its actions over recent months have shown that it has no idea of being conciliatory in these matters, particularly with industrial relations.

There is no doubt that the Government will extend conciliation to various big businesses that wish to enter our community but its record of conciliation in industrial matters is indeed shocking. So I say that this Government is industrially demented because it makes no use of the process of that very important feature of our arbitration system. The very existence of arbitration laws in this State shows—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell): Order! The hon. member is debating matters concerning the Department of Labour and Industry. I ask him to confine his remarks to the Estimates under review.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I wish to make it clear that the Minister, in presenting his Estimates, dealt with this subject of industrial relations and I am only instancing sufficient of the sorry record of the Government to prove that it has no idea of conciliation in industrial matters.

Since I spoke in the Budget debate, certain information has come into my possession about fatalities through electrocution, and, because I do not intend to let up on this matter until I see in this State some positive results, I propose to deal a little further with electrocutions in industry. The information I have, of course, is contained in the 27th Annual Report of the State Electricity Commission which has been presented to Parliament. A study of electrical accidents proves that in 1964 electrical accidents, both of a domestic nature and to men working in industry, showed a greater increase than in any other year since 1939. My purpose in raising this matter is, as I say, to see that positive action is taken, to see that every possible step is taken to stop this type of happening. Because of my natural interest in the subject through my former industrial background, I went to great trouble to read about, and attempt to analyse, the fatal accidents that have occurred. The other day, I asked a question of the Minister for Industrial Development concerning the part played by unearthed power outlets in accidents in the home and I must admit I was somewhat surprised at his reply that, I think it was over the past six years, only one fatal accident had been due to an unearthed power outlet. While that record may be good and while it may be heartening to know it. Nevertheless prior to the Standards Association decision to earth all power outlets for a number of years in this State before those standards came into existence where there was what is known as an "unearthed situation" there was no requirement to earth the power outlets. I think the Commission and the Minister should recognise that.

The number of years the regulations did not require that they be earthed would suggest that there must be thousands of homes throughout Queensland with this type of general power outlet. Most of them would be in such places as dining rooms and bedrooms, where there would be no possibility of a person's making contact with earth and the general purpose outlet at the same time. The position has changed and today all of them must be earthed, but before the change thousands of unearthed outlets would have been installed.

Today, with the increasing use of portable tools and appliances, such as saws, sanding machines and polishing machines, each and every unearthed power outlet is a potential accident hazard. The risk applies immediately a person uses an appliance downstairs, or wherever he is likely to make an earth contact, if it is connected with an unearthed outlet, as happens when polishing cars or using electric drills. My information is that when making periodic inspections throughout the State the inspector can merely recommend that a power outlet be earthed. To prevent accidents we must do better than that; we must insist that all power outlets be properly earthed.

In my Budget speech I mentioned the fatalities and accidents that have occurred throughout the electrical industry. At that time I complained that employers throughout the State who engaged in electrical work—and the Minister himself when he bought into the argument by his answer to my question a couple of weeks ago—threw onto employees the onus of ensuring that they were not electrocuted.

In its annual report the State Electricity Commission listed six fatal accidents that had occurred through carelessness. One can only interpret that to mean it was because of the carelessness of the person concerned that he or she was electrocuted. I think I have made a fair assessment of the cause of these accidents, and I would say that in five cases out of the six the evidence pointed to unsafe working conditions. If there was any carelessness it was on the part of the employer and not on the part of the person who was electrocuted.

Mr. Ewan: Blame the boss always.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Don't you buy into this! As my colleague said, on an important subject you ran out of gas in 12 minutes.

Let me deal briefly with the accidents that, according to the Minister, occurred through carelessness. The first one concerns a workman who received a fatal electric shock when a mobile crane lifting the load he was holding came in contact with energised 11,000-volt overhead conductors, and he received a shock of an estimated 6,351 volts. From the Commissioner's report it is apparent that he has attempted to lay the blame on the operator of the crane. I want to know why the line was not de-energised to provide for perfectly safe operation, if there was any danger of the crane coming into contact with 11,000 volts. If there was any carelessness it was on the part of the employer because, if there was danger of any machinery coming in contact with 11,000 volts, the line should have been de-energised.

The next case in the report is of a field worker on a sugar-cane farm who received a fatal electric shock when a cane-harvesting machine came into contact with energised, 11,000-volt overhead conductors. I will not give the rest of the details. Suffice it to say that to me it is passing strange that a cane harvester could come into contact with overhead conductors. My memory of cane harvesters is that they are not more than 15 feet high but I will be conservative and say they may be 20 feet high. I want to know what 11,000-volt conductors are doing in a cane field at such a height that machinery working in the field can come in contact with them. Furthermore, if there was any danger of electrocution through the use of the machine, that line should have been de-energised to enable the machine to operate safely within the area.

I come now to a different type of accident; it concerns an apprentice electrician who received a fatal electric shock when he fell forward onto energised terminals of a switch cubicle on which he was working and received a shock of approximately 240 volts. I think this accident is a shocking indictment of the employer, and a shocking indictment of the Government that allows these practices to continue. The apprentice was working in contravention of two regulations under the Apprenticeship Act. Firstly, he was working on live mains despite the provision of the Act that no apprentice may work on mains connected to the supply until he has had 4½ years' experience, so the employer who required him to work on the live mains without the necessary qualifying period was guilty of a breach of the Act. Secondly, he was working on his own on a live main, which is contrary in every sense to safe working. Yet, this is the type of case the Commissioner has listed as an accident due to carelessness.

I say quite frankly—and I am not ashamed to say it—that certain employers in Brisbane are flagrantly breaching the Apprenticeship Act. Only recently one employer who was requested to do some work at the Trades Hall sent along an apprentice in the very same circumstances—to work on live mains—right within the Trades Hall! It was only because the lad had a good sense of unionism that he reported the matter to the Electrical Trades Union secretary. The employer was told very quickly about his obligation to look after the safety of his employees.

I come now to an accident I dealt with during my Budget speech. It concerns an electrical linesman who received a fatal shock when low-tension overhead conductors which were being strung below energised high-tension conductors were over-tensioned and came into contact with the 11,000-volt mains.

I dealt reasonably fully with the unsafe practice of requiring linesmen to carry out work of this nature in proximity to high tension mains. It is a bad practice to ask men to perform this type of work under such conditions.

The next case reads—

"A labourer received a fatal electric shock when his head came in contact with overhead crane collector cables as he was climbing structural steel metal work. He fell approximately twenty feet to the cement floor and subsequently died from head injuries."

It is quite evident that all the potential danger in electricity use must have existed on this steel tower, as it was possible for a workman climbing the tower to come into contact with live mains. It is obvious that there must have been careless construction, or a dangerous situation created, resulting in the death of this person.

I think I have been fair; I have no wish to be personal, but I would be remiss, both as a member of the Electrical Trades Union and as a member of this Assembly, if I did not make every effort to see that every phase of safety, not only in the electrical industry but in all other industries, is put into operation. I have no intention of ceasing my attack on whoever is responsible for the administration of any of these matters until in my own heart I am satisfied that every course has been pursued to ensure that there will be a diminution in the number of electrocutions whether of a domestic nature or of members of the Electrical Trades Union working in any part of our State.

Recently, following my speech in the Chamber, the Minister for Industrial Development conferred with members of the Electrical Trades Union and I sat in at the conference. I do not want to divulge details of the negotiations beyond saying that the Minister and the union agreed to an industry conference in an endeavour to hammer out a policy on safety. I think that, on the information given to the Minister by the union, he could have taken immediate action.

One of the matters discussed was the use of vacuum-pressure-impregnated poles. At the moment the union has banned work on these poles. Only this morning, men who refused to work on them while they have live mains on them were suspended by one of the authorities. There is no doubt that the use of vacuum-pressure-impregnated poles creates a hazard to the electrical industry. Their use as high-tension-carrying mediums creates a hazard to the safety of the public; I make no bones about saying that. I forecast that, if we persist in the use of vacuum-pressure-impregnated poles, particularly those carrying high-tension mains, under our present system we will see more and more poles becoming live with the breakdown of one insulator, and that will be the beginning of all sorts of danger to the public at large.

Mr. Windsor: What is the composition of the poles?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: They are merely poles of second-class quality that have been chemically treated ostensibly to make them white-ant proof. Because copper arsenate is used in the treatment, the poles immediately become conductors of electricity. Only last week-end a member of the Electrical Trades Union received a shock from one. My information is that on another occasion recently a linesman who bored a hole into a pole and inserted a steel pole step found an almost full glow on his test lamp when testing the metal step to a phase. This shows that there is a drop of little less than 5 or 10 volts. The pole was a conductor. Yet, when men refused to work on these poles this morning because they carried live mains, they were suspended.

Mr. Munro interjected.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I have only a few minutes left and I wish to finish what I have to say. The Minister should immediately order the Commissioner for Electricity Supply to outlaw these poles till their safety has been tested to ensure that men are not electrocuted through their use. Let it not be forgotten, either, that there is danger not only to linesmen climbing the poles but also to those who are required to lift them between live low-tension mains.

(Time expired.)

Mr. PILBEAM (Rockhampton South) (3.52 p.m.): In the first place I congratulate the Minister on the presentation of his Estimates. I congratulate him also on surrounding himself with efficient officers to ensure that the aims of his department as enunciated by him are satisfactorily carried out. I commend him further on those aims, which are, of course, encouragement of new industries, expansion of existing ones and decentralisation of industrial development. The latter is particularly important to me because I live in an area, part of which I represent, that has been depressed for years. It sadly lacked industries, and there has been much unemployment.

Let me say that we have been working for some years past to make 1965 the start of a new era of industrial development. Signs are not wanting that our forecast will be correct. As from next year, there will be quite substantial industrial development in Central Queensland, particularly in Rockhampton. In order to assist the Minister in the administration of the department, I mention that in the local scene a Research and Promotion Bureau has been set up, financed by individuals and firms in the city of Rockhampton. The Minister and his officers are very welcome to make full use of the services of any member of that Bureau, particularly those of the full-time manager, Mr. Frank Rudd. The department is doing very good work in the field of industrial investigation and promotion.

The ingredients necessary to ensure industrial development in any area are cheap power, a plentiful supply of water, availability of raw materials, and, of course, markets, particularly those resulting from increased population in the area.

I was very interested to hear the Minister say that the trend is towards centralisation. That is true, because of efforts being made to level out overhead costs, and so on. That trend must be recognised because the surest way to go broke is to run against trends; but at the same time I think we must endeavour to introduce ingredients that will create such an atmosphere for industrial development that decentralisation will follow.

Let us take cheap power first. We are very fortunate in Central Queensland that there are large near-surface deposits of coal at Moura, Blackwater, and Baralaba, and,

thanks to the good offices of this Government, a major power station is being constructed at Calcap that will give us power at a very much cheaper rate.

We are fortunate, too, as the hon. member for Burdekin is fortunate in his area, in having a wonderful source of water supply. In Central Queensland it is the Fitzroy River, and I am particularly appreciative of the Government's efforts, even though at this stage they are only investigatory, towards the construction of large-scale dams on the various tributaries of the Fitzroy, particularly the Nogoa and the Dawson. I am quite sure that if those conservation dams come into being we will see a wonderful industry, the cotton industry, developed as it should be in Queensland, the home of cotton. All the other ingredients are there; all we want is irrigation. It has been proved conclusively that rain-grown cotton is not satisfactory—the rainfall is not sufficiently consistent—and we are losing the race for the industry to other States in Australia. At last we are beginning to recognise that irrigation must be provided to develop the cotton industry. A water supply is very necessary, too, to develop the beef-producing lands that are being cleared in the brigalow belt.

I can report that the Government's policy of relying on private-enterprise meatworks in Rockhampton now appears to be the right one, because a very fine and efficient meatworks—I should say quite the best in Australia—is being constructed by T. A. Field Pty. Ltd. at Nerimbera. It will employ up to 400 men and will be able to kill up to 600 head of cattle a day. A person seeing those meatworks under construction could be pardoned for thinking that a motel was being constructed, not a meatworks, and I think the people of Rockhampton and Central Queensland are going to be very proud of them. The Central Queensland Meat Export Company is answering the challenge by providing a very large sum of money to modernise its works. Both companies are moving towards the ideal in the industry of killing throughout the year, and both recognise the need to have substantial cold-storage accommodation at Port Alma, where, between them, they intend spending about £500,000 on these facilities.

We are fortunate in having a supply of cheap power and water available, and increased population would provide a market. While Brisbane has a large population it will always be the big market, and with good bitumen roads down the coast and inland from Longreach, Blackall, and places such as that, there will always be an inducement to bring products straight to the market. For this reason, I strongly recommend, as I did during the Address-in-Reply debate, the earliest possible construction in bitumen of the east-west roads between Rockhampton and Longreach and between Townsville and Cloncurry. We will be losing the fight for decentralised industrial development until we get these roads to allow the products of

the West to be brought to coastal ports and cities and processed there. I make the strongest possible representation for the earliest possible construction of these roads. It seems to me that about £8,000,000 would be required to deal with these two sections of road in the one project but it will pay handsome dividends. It would present a changed face of development in this State.

I think I should enlarge a little on my remarks regarding the beef industry in Rockhampton. It has been our main industry for years, and within a 200-mile radius of Rockhampton we have more beef cattle than any other part of Australia. There are about 2,000,000 head of cattle there and there is every indication that, thanks to this enterprising Government and its wonderful scheme for developing the brigalow lands, there will be a tremendous increase in cattle numbers before long. That is why I am very appreciative of what the Government is doing and why I am very grateful to it for allowing private enterprise the opportunity to meet the challenge of the increased cattle numbers by increasing killing facilities in the city of Rockhampton.

We in the Rockhampton Abattoir Board have been charged with being dilatory in the completion of the agreement which allows utilisation of 20 per cent. of those works by other operators. Let me say that, under the Labour Government, the abattoir board existed for 14 years and then simply withered on the vine. For 14 years the members of the abattoir board did nothing but meet and collect their fees. The board was revived about five years ago and already a very satisfactory arrangement is being brought to conclusion. We are not behind with the programme in regard to the agreement for allowing a 20 per cent. utilisation of works because the arrangement that was made between the Government and T. A. Field Pty. Ltd. was to take effect from next year's killing season. We have only about two or three small matters to settle before we reach complete agreement, and the indications are that next year we will have a full utilisation of that 20 per cent. by other operators because we have already had requests from other operators that will more than adequately fill the 20 per cent. surplus allowed for.

Mr. Hanson: You sabotaged the construction of the abattoir there, didn't you?

Mr. PILBEAM: I make no excuses at all for resisting an abattoir for the city of Rockhampton and I repeat what I have said on many occasions. My belief on district abattoirs is that I see nothing wrong with their being established in areas where there are no killing facilities in existence. For the sake of hygienic killing I have no objection in those circumstances to a district abattoir being set up to kill at one point, even if people have to pay the appropriate charges to make it an economic proposition. But I see a great deal wrong in it where

private enterprise that has been in existence for years is closed down, even to a minor extent, on local killing by an abattoir being brought into being. I have never yet seen such an undertaking meet private enterprise successfully in open competition.

I have no argument against district abattoirs in centres where there are no other killing facilities, but I have still to see any district abattoir deal satisfactorily with a reasonable export quota. Abattoirs in all parts of Queensland are cited here but the only one that exports to any extent is the Brisbane Abattoir, which last year exported at a ruinous price and incurred a substantial loss. The others are not even tackling the export side; they are purely and simply wholesale butcher shops.

Mr. Houston: You say the Brisbane Abattoir lost money?

Mr. PILBEAM: It lost £90,000 last year.

Mr. Houston: What was the cause of that?

Mr. PILBEAM: The hon. member would have to go into the matter of private enterprise versus socialistic schemes to arrive at the answer.

Mr. Houston: I think you are completely lost, too.

Mr. PILBEAM: Not a bit. We have an example in Brisbane of private-enterprise works in the same area making substantial profits. I think that should answer the inquiry of the hon. member. Private enterprise has proved that, in the same area as a district abattoir incurs a substantial loss, it can make substantial profits.

The Mackay district abattoir has proved before it starts that it will be a losing proposition because the agreement negotiated with the Government contains a clause in which the Government guarantees to pay losses over the first five years. That provision would not have been included if losses were not contemplated. If losses were not contemplated it would have been just a waste of paper. What would be the position if a private-enterprise works in Rockhampton went to the Minister and said, "Will you guarantee our losses for the first five years? They would be told, "If you are going to suffer a loss, that is your business." I do not favour any uneconomic proposition in any industry.

Mr. Marsden: Toowoomba set a record profit last year.

Mr. PILBEAM: They raised their prices to a tremendous degree. They had very big losses the year before last.

There is another matter I wish to discuss on the subject of decentralised industrial development. The Minister is working hard to develop the State industrially. He must recognise that provincial cities must be allowed to grow. Industries are associated naturally with cities. We have heard a lot

of claptrap to the effect that Rockhampton should not be allowed to grow. It is only one city in Queensland, although much the same problem applies in most of the other provincial cities. Whether people like it or not industrialists go to the city—

An Opposition Member: Who said that?

Mr. PILBEAM: The hon. member for Rockhampton North.

I will give the facts. In Rockhampton in 1963 we introduced industrial development near Parkhurst. We had an area in which there were seven igloos set aside for industrial development. Every one of these igloos was taken up by some form of industry—P.M.G., Queensland Oil Refineries, Wheat Board and Queensland Can. The cement works were set up in an area just outside our boundary. An engineering firm set up there also. The Railway Department had a big reserve there, and the city council had a site set aside for a future cemetery. We asked the local authority controlling those sites to extend the city by an area of 1,646 acres. It had a rating of only £170. We offered the Livingstone Shire Council five times the amount of rates it would lose if it allowed the extension of Rockhampton's boundaries to include these industrial sites, in the form of financial assistance towards the construction of seaside roads and amenities. In regard to the rate-payers of the area, we promised to charge them no rates for a term of five years. I do not know whether you were in the chair at the time, Mr. Campbell, but in this regard I understand that I was called a liar by the hon. member for Rockhampton North, who said I had no authority to do it. He was asked to withdraw the remark but he still said it was an untruth.

I refer to the Local Government Acts, 1936 to 1961, Section 27 (4) (ii) which states—

"Notwithstanding anything in this Act, the Local Authority may, in any case it thinks proper to do so, remit and wholly discharge any rates due—"

It has to be done on an annual basis. There is no local authority in Queensland that does not take advantage of this section of the Act by, for instance, giving churches remission from rates. We allow the Boy Scouts Association half rates and pensioners—

An Opposition Member: What do you do?

Mr. PILBEAM: We give all the churches free rates, Scouts and Girl Guides half rates, and pensioners a 25 per cent. rebate. Under this clause we can give anybody 100 per cent. It is legal. The pensioners and the small farmers at Parkhurst were worried. They said, "If the industrial part of the city comes out here, whether you try to protect us or not our values will go up and we will be forced off our farms and out of our homes." It would be just the same as on the Gold Coast.

Mr. Lloyd: You could make a differential rate.

Mr. PILBEAM: The only way we could allay their fears and deal with them leniently and fairly was to offer them a remission of rates for 10 years. We could not have treated them any better than that. We promised them freedom from rates for 10 years, which we are legally entitled to do. I have not been a liar. I have not been untruthful in telling the people I can remit their rates. I am making this explanation because some people in Rockhampton do not realise that this statement emanated from a source of ignorance and illiteracy. For that reason I feel bound to make an explanation and to put it on record in "Hansard".

A similar situation arose in the Nerimbera area. T. A. Field Pty. Ltd. told us they wanted water and we had to get permission from the Livingstone Shire Council to supply it. They also want a bitumen road and again we will have to seek permission from the Livingstone Shire Council to build it. For the Parkhurst area we are providing a source of water by means of a barrage that will cost over £2,000,000. We are providing a high-level bridge over Limestone Creek at a cost of more than £50,000. We have to build roads to help them at a cost of £100,000, yet we have no authority over that area. We are not in a position to encourage industry or to establish an industrial area. We are frustrated because the boundaries that were fixed 50 or 100 years ago must always remain the boundaries. Instead of the Minister making a decision on boundaries—and according to the Act he is the only person who can make any decision on boundaries for local authorities—in every case we find that the local shire makes the decision. The local shires say, "We do not care if an industrial area is growing in our area; we will not allow the boundaries to be altered. We are set up as the authority to administer the industrial heart of the city although we have no money to do it."

An Opposition Member: You have no faith in the Minister.

Mr. PILBEAM: We ask the Minister to consider these matters and, in the interests of industrial development in provincial cities, we ask him to have a look at the boundaries. If we are to be ultimately successful in industrial development and develop the State on a decentralised basis we must recognise that there will be substantial industrial development in all the provincial cities. However, the provincial cities cannot develop if they are bursting at the seams.

It is difficult to make any advance in attracting industries when we have no control of the area in which they are seeking to become established. In Rockhampton we were asked to provide sewerage in one area in which there were no sewerage facilities at all. We have had to provide water for people in another local authority area, and at times we

have carted water in tanks to some out-of-the-way places. We have no control over the area where the seaside resorts are, yet the shire has asked the Rockhampton City Council to assist to provide roads, which it has done. We give that shire £2,000 a year towards the provision of these seaside roads and amenities. In some years the amount has been as high as £5,000 and during that period we have asked them for nothing. However, when we do make a request to them it is refused.

I repeat that I do not want anyone to be under any misapprehension on this point. I did not tell a lie! I had every authority to tell the people in the area that we could grant them freedom from the payment of rates. Everything was done openly.

I hope that the Minister will consider my representations and that he will give Rockhampton an opportunity to develop industrially by allowing us the use of land to do so.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (4.15 p.m.): I think that every Queenslander today would derive a deal of satisfaction from the buoyancy of the economy and, to an extent, the industrial development that has taken place in this State, but note, as has been pointed out previously, that that is general throughout the Commonwealth and other parts of the world.

No doubt the Minister, as a Queenslander, would share in that satisfaction. Frankly, I do not think that he and his Government can take very much credit for any contribution they have made towards reaching the present stage of development in Queensland. I say in fairness to the Minister that the Department of Industrial Development has been in operation only 12 months, and when I refer to his department, I refer also to the work carried out earlier by the Department of Labour and Industry.

If we examine one of the places with a great deal of industrial development in progress at the moment—Gladstone—we find that the development, beginning there, and expected to take place in the next few years, appears to have come about despite the Government rather than because of the Government.

We know that the Government's plan for the development of the bauxite deposits at Weipa was up till early 1963, the establishment of an alumina plant at Weipa. It became apparent in 1960, when the late "Watty" Wallace as member for Cairns, pointed out to the Assembly that there was little or no prospect of this township of 5,000 or 6,000 people with an alumina plant ever being established at Weipa. He was roundly condemned by the Government as a "knocker" for saying the company did not intend to proceed with the alumina plant at Weipa. As time went on, on 28 September, 1962, Consolidated Zinc Limited's director, Mr. C. A. Byrne, still assured us that the alumina plant was going to Weipa. On 19 February, 1963,

Mr. Byrne was still telling us publicly—and the Government was backing him up—that the plant was going to Weipa.

I think that Consolidated Zinc Limited and its associates in Comalco knew what they were doing. I doubt whether the Government knew much about it. Only a month or so after that, the decision was released that the alumina plant site was to be transferred to Gladstone. Now, some seven years after the Government negotiated the agreement at the end of 1957, we find that we are starting to get, not a smelter, but an alumina plant under construction in the Gladstone area. I will not take up more time on the subject, because I feel sure the hon. member for Port Curtis and others will deal in more detail with the situation at Gladstone.

I turn to a matter I raised last year when discussing the Estimates of the Department of Labour and Industry. It concerns the guarantee of £700,000 given to Thiess Peabody Coal Pty. Ltd., under the Secondary Industries Assistance provisions, in relation to accommodation for that amount secured from the Bank of New South Wales. The approval of the guarantee was for £700,000, but the actual balance as at 30 June, 1964, was £583,333. Whether that has been availed of, or the amount reduced, I do not know. Last year I asked the Minister for Labour and Industry, Mr. Dewar, to give us some background to this guarantee to the Thiess-Peabody people. He said that he did not propose to deal with it because, technically, at that stage it had been passed over to his colleague, the present Minister for Industrial Development, and consequently it was not his responsibility, although I imagine the guarantee would have been given during his time as Minister. I ask the present Minister to provide us with some information as to the background of that guarantee to that company. I am not saying that I am necessarily opposed to such a guarantee. Of the 24 guarantees still in force, as shown on page 62 of the report of the Auditor-General, many were in existence when this Government came into office. It was a common practice of the Labour Government to give guarantees in an endeavour to develop the State industrially. It was quite a successful method which made a useful contribution to the State, and the present Government continued the practice.

I repeat that there are some peculiar or ironic features of the guarantee to the Thiess Peabody company. When the Thiess Peabody Coal Pty. Ltd. Agreement Bill was introduced, the view was put forward that it was a pity that a completely Australian concern was not engaged in these operations rather than people from overseas. I appreciate, however, that the Thiess component of that company is a Queensland organisation. When we expressed regret that it was necessary to bring in an overseas firm, we were told that local capital could not be obtained and that it was not possible for people here to command the financial resources

necessary to carry out such a venture at Moura. Despite that argument, the Government guaranteed £700,000 which was raised through the Bank of New South Wales in this country.

When I said that this matter had an ironic feature, I was referring to the fact that, during the introduction of the Bill, the Minister for Mines referred to the obligation on the company to build a certain railway line and he pointed out that the company had to put up £100,000 in cash or bank guarantee, not bond. It seems rather peculiar to have the Minister for Mines justifying a provision in the agreement on the ground that the company had to put up a bank guarantee of £100,000, to the Government, whilst another department guarantees the company for £700,000. I think that is rather ironic, to say the least. Who is guaranteeing whom and what value can be placed on statements made by Ministers, I do not know.

I would appreciate the Minister's giving some of the background that necessitated that guaranteeing of this company. I do not say that the project will prove to be a failure and that the Government will become financially involved through the company's falling down on the guarantee.

During the debate on the Thiess Peabody Coal Pty. Ltd. Agreement Bill, the Minister informed hon. members that, if the company did not build the line, not only would it forfeit the £100,000 that it was obliged to put up but the area would revert to a coal-mining lease, which would virtually break the company. I want to make it quite clear that I am not asking for the company to build that line. I would be much happier to see the Railway Department and the Government secure the business that will arise from the carriage of the coal. In view of the fact that this guarantee has been given to Thiess Peabody Coal Pty. Ltd., the Committee is entitled to some explanation of what is going on under the provisions of the agreement, including the obligation to construct the railway line. I would prefer to see it handled by the Government. But I do not want to see the company released from this obligation without penalty. If the guarantee is enforced on the company and it has to pay £100,000 and come under the provision of the Coal Mining Act, the Minister said that would send the company broke. I think the Minister should give some information on the current situation about the railway line.

I wish to draw the Minister's attention to rumours that Japanese banking interests are snooping round in Australia. In view of the trade developing between Australia and Japan, I should like the Minister to inform us whether he has any knowledge of that situation in relation to Queensland's economy, because Japan's participation in not only the coal export trade but also the internal trade of the State could have far-reaching consequences. We have seen the sudden impetus

that Japanese participation in the motor vehicle industry has received in recent years, and it is unfortunate that industrial unrest in Australia has grown and reached an explosive point at General Motors-Holden's because it is logical to assume that any lengthy shut-down will give Japanese interests an opportunity to strengthen their grip on the market in all Australian States.

Mr. Smith: You would wait for a Holden. You would not buy one of the others.

Mr. HANLON: I am not saying that I would buy one of them, but I do say that the Japanese are increasing their percentage of motor vehicle sales rapidly each year. I raise the question of the ramifications of General Motors in Japan and whether they are very worried about the industrial trouble in Australia. Because of their world-wide ramifications, they may be quite happy to allow an extension of the Japanese market in Australia. Everyone employed by General Motors-Holden's in Australia would be worried, perhaps with the exception of a few people in the top salary bracket, but I wonder whether General Motors in a world-wide sense would be as worried as one might expect.

As I said earlier, there have been rumours about Japanese banking interests trying to get into Australia, and one wonders where this will end. For many years Britain squeezed the life out of us. Naturally, we got a great deal of benefit from her patronage over the years, but we also got many kicks in the pants from her because she dominated us financially for so long contrary to our own interests. Is Japan, the Britain of the East, as she is often called, now going to take over Britain's role and dominate us in the fields of banking and industrial development?

I wish to refer now to the report of Mr. Peter Connolly, Q.C., on the special investigation that he carried out, under an Order in Council dated 18 April, 1963, into the affairs of Reid Murray Developments (Qld.) Pty. Ltd. and certain other companies. I thought that the Minister might have made reference to it when introducing his Estimates, because in my opinion Mr. Connolly's report, which I think was in the hands of the Government in February, 1964, is one of the most interesting that have come before Parliament for some time. Certainly all hon. members will find it worth reading. Because of the conclusions reached by Mr. Connolly, the inspector appointed by the Minister under the Act, as to some alterations that he considered should be made to the Act, particularly to Section 167 relating to auditors, I thought that the Minister might have made some reference to the report.

I know that the interstate conferences of Ministers are continuing and that these matters are being dealt with at them with

a view to amending further the uniform Companies Acts throughout Australia. But this is a Queensland report prepared by Mr. Connolly, an inspector appointed by the Queensland Government. Whilst Mr. Connolly might not have had the political cunning to enable him to fend off the now hon. member for Kurilpa, Mr. Hughes, I think at the same time everyone in this Parliament will agree that his capacity in the legal field, and as an inspector under this Act on this occasion, is such that he does a very good job. Many people may disagree with his report. Naturally, people about whom he made deprecatory comments do not entirely agree with his conclusions; but I think that most will agree that he has done a good job. Although the investigation took from 18 April, 1963 to February, 1964, when one considers the ramifications of the matters he had to go through I think it will be agreed that he presented to Parliament a report that well merits some attention from the Minister in the course of our discussions on his department and his administration of the Companies Act.

Many matters are dealt with in the report and, of course, it would take a long time to go through them, but it is quite apparent right through it that the existing Companies Act is not adequate despite the successive amendments to it.

In the matter of supervision, I am not reflecting on our companies officers in this State because it is not possible for them to give adequate supervision with the staff and other facilities they have. Nevertheless, the supervision was not sufficient to meet the circumstances that developed particularly in the boom period of 1960.

When Reid Murray is referred to, of course, it is easy to throw in the suggestion that the principal interest of these people was in the development of land deals, which are notoriously subject to violent fluctuations in periods of boom or recession. Of course, much of the report deals with this aspect of the ramifications of Reid Murray in this State and the extent of its interest under this heading certainly could not be applied to many other companies operating under the Companies Act. Nevertheless, on the extent that malpractices occurred, Mr. Connolly's report on page 7 under the heading "Financial Statements" reads—

"How then did the financial statements for 1960 and 1961 contrive to present a situation in which profits were earned, dividends declared and the shares were apparently backed by adequate assets. The answer is to be found in a number of unorthodox and misleading accountancy devices of which the following are the main sources of inaccuracy and to which I shall turn in order—

(a) Inflation of the apparent profit and asset value of the 'Torbreck' project.

(b) Capitalisation of interest and other charges associated with the acquisition and holding of land to a stage at which the realisable value has been left far behind."

They are matters, of course, not necessarily restricted to the financial statement of a land development company. They could be of vital effect in the financial statement of virtually any company. Further, on what he calls "The Roger Glenn Affair" we have this remarkable situation set out on page 36 of his report—

"The contract of sale, a copy of which is in evidence (Exhibit Q9) is dated at Brisbane on 1st June, 1960. It was executed under seal in the presence of Messrs. Betts and Madden for RMD (Qld.) and Mr. Nichols (a director of the vendor) and its secretary. The consideration is expressed to be £103,000. . ." and so on. This contract is dated 1 June. He continues—

"Searches of the title however revealed that Roger Glenn Pty. Limited, the vendor, did not obtain a transfer of these same lands to itself until 30th June, 1960, and then for a consideration of £24,000. . ."

As I read that, the vendor was actually buying the land for £24,000 after he made the sale to Reid Murray for £103,000. Eventually, portion of the £103,000 for which he had sold the land to Reid Murray was used by him to pay off a contract of sale for £24,000 for the same land.

These all point to the old practices. I know that if I asked the Minister what was being done arising out of this report he would refer me to the fact that it is being examined by the company squad and the Crown Law Office. I appreciate that these matters cannot always be disclosed until appropriate action is taken. However, they should be raised in Parliament after Parliament has gone to the expense, and justified expense, of asking Mr. Connolly to do the job, and we should ensure that they are being followed up. I understand there are some difficulties over a test case in Victoria. I realise that appeals in other States can have an effect on what happens here. This ruling was given in February, and this is October. Action in this direction seems to grind extremely slowly compared with what happens when the ordinary citizen gets himself into a little bother. He is quickly pounced on by the authorities and promptly dealt with.

In the section dealing with the audit, Mr. Connolly examines a number of suggestions put to him for strengthening the position of the auditor in the interests of the investor, shareholder, debenture-holder, whatever he might be. One suggestion was that auditors should be appointed in rotation by governmental agency. He admits that, if they were, they would be independent, but he pointed out that much mischief might also result therefrom. He said that the relationship between the auditor and his client would be impaired and efficiency would not necessarily be

prompted by such a system. He pointed out that consideration had been given to the formulation of a set of regulations apart from the Act. I think the hon. member for Windsor would appreciate this more than I can. Mr. Connolly suggested that a set of regulations might be a better vehicle for putting these things into written form—or into legislative form if it could be termed that—than a section of the Act. He referred to the opinion of experienced accountants from whom he had sought to inform himself. That opinion appears to be that the formulation of such a code would prove difficult in the extreme, and that it might involve the mischief of appearing to state exhaustively principles which cannot be so stated.

He went on to the point that it is generally accepted that the auditor has no duty to report breaches of the Act. He points out that the only way breaches of the Act can be revealed through an auditor's report is under Section 167, when the auditor must publicly declare that the Act has not been complied with. Otherwise his report may disclose an offence incidentally only, that is to say, where the facts he reports as constituting an untrue and unfair view of the company's business or affairs show that an offence has been committed. He said that it would be an unnecessary and quite unreasonable burden to place upon the auditor to require him generally to police the Companies Act. I agree with him, but who is going to police it? The shareholders, to whom he is answerable, have a direct interest in such matters. If a duty to report on offences is not cast upon the auditor by law, he reports at his peril, and Mr. Connolly points out that in many cases the auditor feels constrained to remain silent because of the legal implications involved. He makes the recommendation that consideration be given to requiring that an auditor report any facts that have come under his notice that appear to him to constitute or involve the commission of an offence against the Act and to have a bearing upon the shareholding or financial affairs of the company. I feel that Mr. Connolly has made a number of these suggestions in a very worth-while manner and I hope the Government will act on the latter one.

Mr. WINDSOR (Ithaca) (4.41 p.m.): I am very happy as a member of the Parliamentary Industrial Committee to support the Minister's Estimates. It is hard to predict the State's future requirements because world technical advances are moving at a rapid pace. However, I think we can be sure that the basic energies for power, namely, electricity, coal for steam, diesel, and natural gas—which is coming into the field now—will be with us for a long time.

The hon. member for Roma pointed out that natural gas has a tremendous potential in this State. It is very useful for providing uniform heat in engineering shops. If we could have hydro-electric power from larger

dams—which will cost much money although ultimately it would be recovered—we would have an even cheaper source of energy.

The State Electricity Commission has done a magnificent job over the years and has spent millions of pounds on development so that today the system virtually covers the State.

Mr. Duggan: Where do you think these hydro-electric schemes should be built?

Mr. WINDSOR: That is a difficult question to answer. They will cost a great amount of money to build but the cost would be recovered fairly quickly and we would have very cheap electricity.

I am somewhat opposed to what is happening to local Queensland industries. Southern firms are buying out local businesses and taking the production to the South. I can cite a recent instance concerning a firm in Fortitude Valley which employed 120 persons. The normal wages bill for this firm would be £100,000 a year, the material used would be worth about £100,000 a year, and distributing costs would account for another £100,000 a year, representing in all £300,000. It was taken over on the pretext that it would be carried on. However, in a few short weeks the plant was closed down completely. The firm was quite a landmark in Queensland. I am referring to Bennett Chain Company Pty. Ltd., which is almost as well known as Falkiner Chains Pty. Ltd. in South Brisbane. It is not right that southern firms should do that. This firm provided a living for 120 people, and spent about £300,000 a year.

Mr. Duggan: That is the Government's policy.

Mr. WINDSOR: It is wrong, no matter whose policy it is.

I am very glad that the Government has seen fit to establish this department so that it may look ahead and see what is right for the State.

I can cite two or three instances of big manufacturers taking over our city stores. Since that has been done the bulk buying has been done in the South, and a lot of rubbish is sent here. That is a terrible thing to happen to Queensland, and we must stop it.

Recently the Parliamentary Industrial Committee, of which I am a member, toured Central Queensland. Everywhere we went we saw a hive of industry. I was thrilled at the work going on at Gladstone, particularly the rapid handling of coal. Each day 47 trains of 50 hoppers were handled, each hopper containing approximately 12 tons of coal. The coal is unloaded automatically into a pit, and then conveyed automatically to ships at the rate of 700 tons an hour. Further down, wheat was being loaded and, from the Mackay area, sugar was being loaded at the rate of 650 tons an hour. That is a tremendous advance for Queensland. All these industries mean a great deal of wealth.

We went to Callide and saw the Calcap power station. I agree that power stations should be built at the source of fuel, because that results in cheaper power. Electricity can be transmitted cheaply to any part of the State, whereas the bulk handling of coal is rather expensive. We were delighted indeed to see the progress being made there, and the enthusiasm shown by the Queensland workers in handling the big earth-moving implements and trucks. It was a remarkable eye-opener, and we were thrilled to see such vast progress. It does one's heart good to see these things happen.

The American who was in charge of building the plant has been around the world and has seen Australia during the last two years. He said, without any fear of contradiction, that whatever we require in Australia today will have to be doubled within the next 20 years. That was the opinion expressed by an outsider, giving an engineering view of what is happening. We will have to get moving quickly. We cannot let the grass grow under our feet.

The hon. member for Burdekin said that we need another iron and steel works. If we can get something like that it will no doubt boost our economy tremendously. Although Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. has a monopoly throughout Australia, I give that company credit for producing the best and cheapest steel in the world.

Mr. Melloy: If you can get it.

Mr. WINDSOR: You can get it. Construction steel at £60 a ton is two-thirds of the imported price. In addition imported steel is not regular in texture; it has not the uniformity and quality of Australian-made steel. Some of the steel imported from Japan looks all right, but if it is picked up and bent, because of inconsistency of texture, one piece will snap like a carrot and the next piece will bend like lead. That sort of thing should be looked into. It is bad for Queensland because the faulty steel is put into our manufactured goods and gets our firms a bad name. There are special industrial steels, such as spring steel, which are put into disc ploughs and shovels. They are second to none, and can be treated easily because they are uniform in texture. That is of tremendous importance to the industry. In a test run recently by a firm the name of which I shall not mention, this tool steel was shown to be particularly good. Usually, after running for four hours the knives in the machine used in the test have to be taken out and sharpened. However, knives of this particular steel were used for one month and barely required sharpening at the end of that time. That gives some indication of technical advances in steel manufacture and what they mean to industry.

Mr. Donald: Is this a local firm?

Mr. WINDSOR: Yes.

Mr. Sherrington: Produced by Australian workers?

Mr. WINDSOR: Yes: Hon. members know my feelings on that subject. I have said that the Australian worker is second to none in the world. I have heard that opinion substantiated by several American officers who used to come to us to get things done during the war. They said that the Australian worker had the greatest initiative of any workers anywhere in the world. Their words were "He can do anything. Give him a handsaw and a tomahawk and he can make anything." That statement is not far wrong, either. In this country we had to get over our difficulties as best we could, especially if we lived in rural areas.

Mr. Smith: It would be nice if Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. extended their activities here.

Mr. WINDSOR: I believe a bit of competition to be a good thing. There are in this Assembly those who advocate day-labour work. We on this side favour contract work. I think one attitude balances the other. We have the Australian Labour Party and the Liberal Party, each contracting the other. We have various religions each contracting the others. This seems to be nature's way of keeping us in check.

When I travelled round Queensland I was very thrilled to see all that was going on. It was so very different from what was stated by Messrs. Calwell, Duggan, and Keffe when they went round the State. I call them the Calwell-Duggan-Keffe knockers, because everywhere they went they knocked everything done by this Government.

There is at present much friendly controversy proceeding on whether the Brisbane River should be crossed by a tunnel or a bridge. I say that we want both. No-one could have foreseen 10 years ago the advance that has taken place in motor transport. No-one can predict what will happen in ten years' time. I urge the Minister and the Government to keep their thinking caps on and get these tunnels and bridges sorted out. If this is not done, there will be the greatest traffic bottleneck of all time. I can see it coming now. There must be a ready outlet for our products, and without lines of communication we might as well shut up shop.

I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (4.54 p.m.): The latter part of the speech of the hon. member for Ithaca deserves, I think, quite a considerable amount of thought. Unless the Government is prepared to face up to the traffic problem in the metropolitan area and its immediate vicinity, there will be in Brisbane a very great and costly bottleneck. I do not know whether it is realised by the Minister, or the Government generally, that in the days of horses and buggies, when horse trams were being used in Brisbane, the speed of traffic in the city was faster than it is now.

Mr. Chinchin: What has the Council done about it?

Mr. LLOYD: What a ridiculous interjection! I would not expect an apparently intelligent man to make an interjection such as that. About one-third of the population of the State is in Brisbane, and the major part of the industrial production of Queensland goes through the port of Brisbane. Most secondary industries are in southern Queensland, yet we have an hon. member asking in this Chamber what the Brisbane City Council has done about this matter. It is obviously the responsibility of the Government to ensure that the cost of marketing industrial production of all types is kept as low as possible by reducing transport costs to a minimum, and we must insist that the Government accept that responsibility. If goods are to be transported through the streets of Brisbane at a speed similar to that achieved 50 years ago with horse-drawn vehicles, costs will be so high that Queensland industries will be unable to compete successfully on overseas markets.

The remarks of the previous speaker were of some significance, and I hope the Minister will take heed of them. Whether the committee appointed by the Government recommends the construction of a bridge, a tunnel, or freeways, it is essential that its report on the traffic problem and the transportation of goods through the streets of Brisbane should receive careful consideration. It is to be hoped that it contains recommendations that will make it possible for the Government to reduce transport costs.

When the Minister was introducing his Estimates, I said by way of interjection that he was very fair in giving credit to former Governments for fostering primary industries. Labour Governments always had a deep sense of responsibility in relation to fostering the expansion of primary industries and the secondary industries dependent upon them. The sugar industry, the beef cattle industry, and many other industries upon which Queensland has relied heavily over the years developed considerably under Labour Governments, and that is something of which we can be very proud.

The organisation of the sugar industry would be called a Socialistic policy in countries overseas. It would be regarded as Socialistic because of the acquisition of the entire sugar production in the State. However, it is organised in such a way that the growers are an integral part of the industry and they receive a guaranteed price for a certain number of tons of cane, and the stability of the sugar industry is a matter of pride to the Australian Labour Party.

To some extent former Labour Governments were responsible for stability and guaranteed markets in the wheat industry. We were not quite so Socialistic, perhaps, in our attitude to beef production, but there has to be some form of Government intervention at all times. As the hon. member for

Sandgate reminds me, if we are to progress there must be Government intervention. We cannot rely on a *laissez faire* policy as do many overseas Governments.

Government intervention is necessary on some occasions to provide an incentive for establishment of industry. On previous occasions the Minister has said that he is not prepared to accept this principle. But over the past few months we have learned that the Government intends to spend many millions of pounds in providing harbours and facilities for townships following the development of the bauxite field at Weipa and the establishment of the alumina plant at Gladstone. A sum of £8,000,000 will be spent in providing housing facilities, port development, and other township facilities. That money must come from the people of Queensland, and I believe that what has been said by the Australian Labour Party for many years and what is now being accepted by some members of the Federal Government—but not by the Queensland Government—must be insisted upon. There must be an Australian equity in these undertakings. We have now passed the stage of development in this country where we can allow this form of direct investment of foreign capital—developing our resources, utilising our potential mineral and land resources, reinvesting profits without bringing in any further capital, taking complete control of ownership and sending the resultant profits out of the country.

That might have been all right 20 years ago or immediately after the war when a Prime Minister of Australia, the late Mr. Chifley, allowed General Motors-Holden's Pty. Ltd. to come into Australia with a capital investment of £1,750,000 and gave them by way of bank guarantee sufficient capital to allow them to establish themselves. They reinvested their excess profits in Australia and built up their capital reserves. This company is now continually being built up as a foreign-owned company which, by way of reinvestment of profits, has built up a tremendous capital asset. As I say, that might have been all right 20 years ago, but today we are in a position where we do not have to take these things.

Countries like India have a "turnkey" operation of investment of foreign capital. Western Australia has it at present. This "turnkey" operation, as it is called in international trade, is an operation by which overseas companies are asked to contract to some firm investment policy by which, over a number of years, they bring to a country their knowledge, their technical resources and their capital, and invest them there. Western Australia has done that with its bauxite and steel resources. It is done on the understanding that within a period of time there will be a ready-made Australian company with Australian equity, and Australian managers and technicians, to take over control of the company.

As I say, it has been done on many occasions in India and many other countries in the world. If ever there was a backward country that needed the kind of investment that we are now begging for, on our hands and knees, it was India. We have reached a stage at present where we can afford this "turnkey" contract system of overseas investment, inviting overseas companies into this country in an attempt to develop the resources we possess if we have not the finance to do it ourselves.

That brings me to the second point of my argument. I believe quite firmly that we can manipulate our overseas balances in such a way as to find the finance necessary for the development of this country from our own resources if we are keen to do so.

Let us examine what this Government has done in this matter. A great deal has been said by the Premier about development, and I believe he is quite sincere. I pay him that compliment. The establishment of a Queensland alumina plant at Gladstone is something which has been badly needed for many years. We now have it, but it is the outcome of an agreement negotiated originally by a Labour Government and finalised by this Government. So it is more or less what we could call a "mixed Government negotiated" agreement. It is unfortunate that we have had to wait so long for the completion of the agreement and the implementation of the scheme.

Let us compare the terms of that agreement with the offer of assistance by the Commonwealth Government in relation to the bauxite deposits at Gove. I have here a publication issued by the Australian News and Information Bureau of the Department of the Interior—"Australia in Facts and Figures", No. 82. Dealing with the Gove bauxite leases, it says at page 44—

"The Minister for Territories, Mr. C. E. Barnes, said on June 7 that the Government had given consideration to proposals invited last year for the development of the bauxite deposits formerly held by the British Aluminium Co. Ltd. on the Gove Peninsula in the Northern Territory.

"Mr. Barnes said the Government's policy objectives included an immediate firm commitment for an alumina plant in the Northern Territory of not less than 300,000 tons annually conditional only on the ore body proving to meet certain requirements with regard to quantity and quality; provision for Australian equity participation in the project; a clear demonstration of availability of adequate market outlets and ability to organise and finance the project; and a willingness to establish an aluminium smelter in the Territory when that could be done on a demonstrably economic basis."

One of the most important conditions that the Commonwealth Government has included is that there will be an Australian equity.

I turn now to the Queensland alumina plant at Gladstone. I am not being critical. I think it is a wonderful thing that the plant is to be built, but let us look at it on a comparative basis. This publication says—

“Queensland Alumina Limited has concluded a credit agreement between its participating partners and 11 United States banks for the provision of \$117,000,000 (approximately £A52,000,000) for interim finance for the construction of the 600,000-ton alumina refinery and related facilities at Gladstone, Queensland. In addition, the Queensland Government has agreed to spend £4,000,000 in providing a wharf and jetty, housing facilities, roads and public utility services for the plant and township.”

Not only is the Government going to spend £4,000,000 at Gladstone but it is also going to spend some millions of pounds in the provision of harbour facilities at Weipa.

To avoid continuing along these lines, with the State Government completing agreements with overseas interests in which Australia has no equity while the Federal Government is insisting on an Australian equity, it is quite obvious that in Australia a standardised national agreement must be reached with any overseas company before anything can be done to develop our resources properly. The Queensland Government is obviously prepared to give away, as cheaply as possible, the whole of the resources of the State. While the Commonwealth Government is insisting on 1s. a ton royalty on bauxite from Gove, the Queensland Government is insisting only on 6d. a ton. The State Government is prepared to make an agreement with the pipeline company to bring Queensland oil from Moonie to Fort Lytton under which it allows them to charge 8s. 6d. a barrel, or about 68s. a ton, whereas the charge for the carriage of the same oil from the terminal to Sydney by sea is only about 5s. a ton. Queensland will lose the whole of its equity in all its products, because the Government is prepared to give them away without insisting on an equity for the Queensland people. It is time that the Commonwealth Government stepped in. No other State Government has been able to do what the present State Government has done.

Mr. Munro: This has been a most interesting story. What has been the total capital invested under the conditions you have described?

Mr. LLOYD: There has not been a great deal of capital invested.

Mr. Munro: Substantially, your answer is “nil”.

Mr. LLOYD: In effect, the Minister is in complete agreement with me because, for some immediate political gain, he is prepared to give away the whole heritage of the people of Queensland.

Mr. Munro: No; at some great economic gain.

Mr. LLOYD: I ask the Minister not to talk nonsense. He knows as well as I do that the Australian Government is endeavouring, after allowing these things to occur for many years, to insist upon some Australian participation. That is exactly the point I was trying to make.

If there are bauxite deposits in one part of Australia not administered by the Commonwealth Government, and deposits in another part of Australia, the Minister cannot tell me that the national interest is concerned with a geographical line drawn on the map. As Australians we must be concerned with Australian interests and the national welfare, intent on building for the future; not with political interests or with attempts to make political capital out of the people's assets. We should be concerned with what will happen in 20 years' time. We are gradually reaching the point where overseas capital will control all Australian production. The percentage of overseas capital has increased from 20 per cent. to 25 per cent. in the four years since 1960. At the present time, in mineral resources, it represents about 60 per cent.

Mr. Munro: I would like to follow your point. Are you trying to prove we would be better—

Mr. LLOYD: I am trying to prove that what the Government has done is to give away the rights of the many people who will be living in this country in 20 years' time; it has given away the profits from the industries and the resources that we possess.

Mr. Munro: Just answer the question.

Mr. LLOYD: I have not much time.

Mr. Munro: You know full well that the question I want to ask will make your argument look foolish.

Mr. LLOYD: Is that a fact?

Mr. Munro: Yes. I want to ask you if you are trying to prove that we would be better off without the alumina plant at Gladstone. Is that the tenor of your argument?

Mr. LLOYD: The question is really too stupid to answer, but I will answer it in this way; naturally we all want to see an alumina plant there but I point out to the Minister that there will be an aggregation of capital interest over many years as the profits are gradually put back into the company. We will gradually reach the same stage as has happened with General Motors-Holden Ltd., where the policy of the company will be dictated from overseas. We will have industrial trouble because the administration in Australia will be tied to a policy dictated from overseas by those who have no knowledge of Australian industrial conditions. That has happened at General Motors-Holden Ltd. because the industrial policy is

dictated from overseas, where there is collective bargaining and many different industrial conditions from those here. The people in America know nothing about industrial conditions here.

I have not much time left but I wish to raise one or two matters, one of which concerns my area particularly. The Minister said that the Government is trying to assist local industry. I believe that the majority of people and companies in Queensland in the past years have felt that the Government has been subservient to the interests of overseas people coming to this country, and in many cases has neglected the interests of local industries. I am happy to see a change of heart by the Minister.

Recently the hon. member for Aubigny raised a matter of housing Napier Bros. employees at Dalby. He also referred to the fact that the Government is to spend a lot of money building homes at Tin Can Bay for workers employed by an overseas company. That could be an indication that there are many other industries established locally which require many services. But the Government says that it must reserve or set aside for expenditure on new industries the amount of money it has available. Local industry has been very important, and is one of the most important aspects of local industrial development.

In many primary-producing areas there has been an ever-present opportunity for the establishment of many of our primary industries on a secondary-industry basis. I instance processing. One of the biggest problems in the Kingaroy district is the competition from imported peanut oil produced from New Guinea peanuts, which are grown under cheap-labour conditions. There is an opportunity for the local industry to produce the peanut oil that is required, but it cannot compete. A case should be put before the Tariff Board for greater protection. The Minister could intervene before the Tariff Board in a case such as this and insist, on behalf of the people of Queensland and the people producing the product, that there be more protection. It is important to this State, and to the national welfare.

In many cases we have a great deal of legislation that is wrongly contrived to produce a form of industrial development. It has been recently drawn to my attention that the Government has insisted that a local-option poll be taken in part of my electorate, at Mitchelton, on the granting of a licence for a hotel. The company involved is owned and controlled by a Queenslander, Mr. Donald McKenzie. He has been a school-teacher and a grazier. He is now prepared to reinvest everything he has built up in his lifetime in a local Queensland industry. I am not against anybody putting his views, personally or otherwise, before the public. I believe that a person is entitled to do that. How can we get past the present legislation when a man is prepared to spend up to £1,000,000 to develop a small part of

Brisbane? He wants to build a hotel and a motel for the tourist industry, as well as a bridge in an area where it is badly needed. He will build up an undeveloped area in Oxford Park and Mitchelton and will provide employment in that area. But there is legislation which precludes the people in that area from knowing beforehand where the project will go. The fault of the legislation does not lie with the Temperance League, which is doing what it thinks is right. I have no objection to that, but nobody knows where the final site will be. The Licensing Commission cannot tell us where it is. The Licensing Commission and the Government should be in a position to say exactly where the hotel is to be built.

(Time expired.)

Mr. CHINCHEN (Mount Gravatt) (5.19 p.m.): On investigation I find that, when I spoke on the introduction of the Industrial Development Bill, I said—

“... all that we heard from the Opposition was a lot of historical reiteration that contributed absolutely nothing.”, and

“All we had was this business of bringing out newspaper cuttings.”

We had the same spectacle this afternoon. The Leader of the Opposition delved back into history by reading from 1958, 1959, and 1960 cuttings. That is an old technique. The Department of Industrial Development is only 12 months old. It was a wonderful conception. Apparently that has not been recognised by members of the Opposition.

One hon. member said we should increase our rate of industrial development. That is possibly a good thing. This is a department established by the Government to do just that. Its purpose is to increase the industrial content of the State, which is very necessary. I thought that all speeches would have contained helpful contributions. All that we have heard from hon. members opposite has been reasons why things are wrong and how the State has not advanced. There has been no new thinking and no ideas that may have been of assistance to the department.

Mr. Duggan: What would you say if—

Mr. CHINCHEN: I am talking at the moment. The Leader of the Opposition has had his opportunity. I had imagined that at least constructive suggestions would have come from members on both sides of the Chamber.

We know that this department must take some time to get its bearings. Its operations cover an enormous and quite exciting field. However, it will be some time before there is sufficient information available to it to allow it to get its feet firmly on the ground and do the job for which it was created. It will be a lengthy process, but ultimately it must produce results. The potential is there and the willingness is there, and the department eventually will get wonderful results.

The concentration of industry in the South was mentioned. It is rather strange to find anybody wondering why this should be so. The reason is obvious; the volume of business is there because that is where most of the people are.

Another point worth mentioning is that if the political situation in Queensland more than seven years ago had been a little different, there would have been more industrial development in Queensland. There is no doubt about that. I was associated with industry when a Labour Government was in office, and there was not then the sort of climate in which industrialists like to work. There is a new feeling abroad now, and it is obvious that things are going to happen.

It seems to be thought that only large industries must be considered. It is, of course, pleasing to see them. I suggest to hon. members opposite, however, that they note what is happening along the road to Pinkenba, beyond Rocklea, and along Beaudesert Road and Ipswich Road. Everywhere will be seen small plants. The best feature of all is that the people who were out of work 18 months ago are now in employment. Surely production today must be greater than it was 6, 12, or 18 months ago. Hon. members opposite know very well that what I am saying is correct.

Where do we go now? It is on this that I had hoped to hear constructive contributions from hon. members opposite. Instead, they do not seem to be willing to contribute anything. The work of development will proceed in spite of that attitude. It is ridiculous to ask why industry is concentrated in the South and not here. Townsville people may just as well say, "Why is industry concentrated in Brisbane and not in Townsville?" Those in Darwin could say, "Why is there industry in Townsville and not in Darwin?" There is a sensible and logical reason. Queensland, with population increases, is reaching the stage at which it will begin to attract industry. The Department of Industrial Development was established for just that purpose. Other factors are necessary to bring it about. Volume is important to an industrialist, as is the climate in which he works.

There has been much talk of large industries. There are no such things. Every big industry is owned by thousands of little people.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. CHINCHEN: Hon. members opposite know that as well as I do. Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. has 20,000 shareholders. Making these things known annoys hon. members on the other side of the Chamber.

Another requirement is economic stability, with freedom from fear of nationalisation or socialisation. These are the things that will attract industry and create the necessary industrial climate. Another essential is industrial stability, with everyone playing his part. I do not say that employers are always blameless. Union leaders, however,

must make earnest endeavours to play their part in establishing proper relations between employers and employees. This is where hon. members opposite must play their part, because on some occasions unenlightened union leadership creates situations that should never be allowed to occur, and I gave an instance of this during the debate on the Financial Statement. If members of the Opposition are interested in the future of Queensland, they should do everything they can to promote harmonious relations between employer and employee. Goodwill on both sides is necessary if this is to be achieved, and assistance in this direction could pay big dividends and help the department to do its job.

Another factor is the available services and the willingness and interest of the local authority in the area to which the industry is willing to go. I emphasise "to which the industry is willing to go", because I do not believe in the direction of industry any more than I believe in the direction of labour. Many hon. members opposite say, "Why not put them here or there?" The moment we begin to direct them, we will lose them altogether. We must allow them to go where they want to go. The profit motive has been responsible for the development of this country and for the development of half the countries in the world, and a system of private enterprise is the only one under which we will prosper. Industries will come here and seek out their own sites, and they will receive much assistance from the Department of Industrial Development in doing this.

It has been stated that a particular industry has gone to Gladstone, and this is a happy choice for that area. However, it was chosen because of its geographical location and many other factors, and the company concerned worked these things out for itself. It is impossible for a Government department to make such a decision. It can assist by providing as much information as possible to allow a wise decision to be made, but the suggestion that it can direct industry here or there is totally unrealistic.

The job being attempted by the Department of Industrial Development covers a very extensive field, and I think it must be interested in migration because increased population is necessary if industrial development is to take place. It is interested, too, in technical education, and it should play its part in seeing that technical education reaches the high standard required by industry. A move is being made in this direction, and I am glad to see the way in which it is developing. Road, rail, sea and air transport are also of interest to the Department of Industrial Development, and, of course, it works in close collaboration with all other Government departments in Queensland. The field is enormous, and it

will be some time before the smooth working of the department has an effect on industrial production. We must be patient in this respect.

The hon. member for Roma dealt with the use of natural gas, and the point he made was very interesting. I am worried that, if we delay too long in making a thorough survey of our natural gas resources, we may lose the opportunity of attracting a large number of industries to the State. In my opinion, a survey at this stage of the known reserves should make it possible to indicate the cost of power to industry in Brisbane. I do not think we need wait any longer to do this. I know that legislation must be introduced and other steps taken, but let us say to industrialists in the South and overseas at the earliest possible moment that in one or two years we will be able to provide a certain form of power at a certain price. We all know that power is a basic need for the development of industry, and if we wait too long I think gas will be piped to Sydney and Melbourne from Central Australia before it is available in Queensland. There is no question about that. We know that they are providing £75,000,000 to do this very job, and that is not big money for them. We have a chance to make a decision now if we are going ahead with this and if we are going to use this product. Overseas experience has taught us that when we have it in our power to do this we should tell the world and we will soon find a great deal more interest taken in the area.

To indicate the importance of power—as we know, an alumina plant is going up in Gladstone but, so far as I know, the location of the aluminium plant has not yet been decided. The decision, of course, must depend on the cost of power. What we can do here, I do not know, but the significance of the cost of power is demonstrated by this case. I understand that 0·1d. per unit of power to an aluminium works means a difference of £10 a ton in the finished product. One can imagine the situation where we are trying to sell power for, say, 7½d. to 9d. a unit while they can get it for, say, 3·3d. to 3·6d. in New Zealand. We are not in the hunt.

So I feel that the cost of power is vital. We have other problems, of course, because we have large areas and a small population. However, let us look at this matter and, if it is one that we can handle, let us get going. I think the position as it will be in, say, 50 years' time, should be thought about now, not in the next 10 or 15 years and, whatever the estimated figures of usage are, I think we can double them in 10 years' time. That is the confidence I have in this State.

It is well known and worth repeating that the sensible thing to do is to process to the maximum everything you have in your country before you send it away and, anything you import, import it in its least-processed condition. I agree with this in principle. Some

hon. members opposite agree with this principle in regard to bauxite and I am sure it is the policy that is being observed strictly by the Department of Industrial Development because that is an avenue for increased development in the State. They first look at the raw material and ask, "What can be done to this before export?" That is not overlooked, because it is one of the sources for further industrialisation of the State. I am sure that is a fundamental policy in their minds at all times. I am sure, too, that, in the next year or two, when there has been time for them to produce results, we will find a big change.

Another matter that they will not overlook is advertising. Overseas they advertise for industry and industrialists. I showed a copy of one of these publications to the Minister for Industrial Development recently, and this will be another move by the department. It is rather strange what small things interest people when they are thinking of investing their money. That is the attitude adopted largely in America. I will read this advertisement to show hon. members how Americans approach the possibility of attracting new industry. It is taken from the "U.S. News & World Report" and it is typical of what appears in a number of magazines overseas. It reads—

"Free to Company officials looking for a new plant site.

"We will prepare for you a confidential survey of selected locations for your new plant in New York State.

"Table of Contents

"Subject—

- Introduction
- Growth Trends
- Climate
- Public Utilities
- Financial
- Government Services
- Taxes
- Protective Services
- Water Supply and Sewerage
- Community Facilities
- Housing
- Education
- Recreation and Culture
- Industrial History
- Labour
- Natural Resources
- Transportation and Markets
- Sites."

"Tailor-made. This confidential report is not taken off the shelf. It will be prepared specifically for you, based on the requirements for your new plant as you give them to us. Send these requirements on your business letterhead to Commissioner Keith S. McHugh, N.Y. State Dept. of Commerce."

This one was an advertisement for New York State. It is a technique that perhaps we could use overseas. No doubt you do not catch a fish every time you throw out your bait, but this is the sort of thing which must add up to more interest in the industrial side of our State. No doubt that is in

the minds of the Minister and his department. When speaking of industrial enterprise, the Leader of the Opposition made the interesting comment that we must learn to live with bigness. That is very true. There is nothing wrong with bigness unless, as he said, it is not operating in the interests of the public. In a way bigness is necessary. With bigness in industry we obtain greater efficiency, and efficiency can keep us to the front or establish us in industry. Recently investigations into this were carried out in America. There had been a little worry over there about the size of some of the combines but it was found that they were operating in healthy competition. It was found also that, because of the industrial complexes being developed, particularly in the European Common Market, America, without its large industrial organisations, would lose a lot of export markets, and would end up with greatly increased imports and the establishment of large Common Market industrial set-ups.

Bigness has developed throughout the world. We must not be frightened by it. Whatever we do, we must be efficient. As long as we operate under a free-enterprise system where there is honest and true competition, we need have no worry because there will be this in-built efficiency which is so necessary to withstand competition.

Mr. Hughes: Doesn't that make it hard to get an industry into Queensland where we have so small a population?

Mr. CHINCHEN: That is a point, but because of freight charges it becomes economically desirable to establish an organisation in this State. To many firms their factory is their show place. Undoubtedly a firm does better here if it has a branch established in this State. Of course, State preferences do operate. There is a problem with complicated industrial items where bigness is necessary to produce the article at a reasonable price.

I have great confidence in small industries being set up in this State, preferably by Queensland people. As Queensland grows, so the small industries will grow with it, and eventually become big industries. We have many examples of this in Brisbane and other parts of Queensland. I do not think it is always a matter of going outside to get big men. Of course, if we get an iron and steel industry, that will be necessary. I should like to see a lot of small firms develop. A one-man show becomes a two-man show and eventually an industrial empire develops from such small beginnings. It is time for people to start. The development that is taking place will allow them to move forward. That the time is ripe for this development cannot be denied by anybody. Everything is ready, so long as we have the stability in the labour field which is so vitally important. It appears to me that at the present time there is a concerted effort, and not only in this State, to bring about problems

in the labour field. It is just like "His Master's Voice" in the Chamber to hear the way that the Budget debate, and the present debate, have been used by hon. members opposite to talk about the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, and to make some capital out of it. They seem to be making a concentrated, determined attempt to create problems and difficulties, many of which are unreal. Our industrial machinery is excellent machinery. When I was in America I learned that the industrialists there believed that we were well ahead of them with our machinery for handling industrial matters. America has industrial anarchy, the law of the jungle, which creates problems and difficulties that it does not know how to overcome.

Mr. Houston: You just held it up to us a few moments ago as an ideal country.

Mr. CHINCHEN: Because of the tremendous competition and energy of the people. However, they have industrial problems that we have not got, thanks to our very wise legislation for handling these matters. They have not got that legislation and they are very sorry, as they freely admit to outsiders. All of us know that America has virtually the best of everything in the world, but Americans realise how lucky we are to have our industrial machinery. However, there must be a will on both sides to make it work. At present a few people are trying to put a bolt in the machinery so that it will not work. I firmly believe that that is so.

An Opposition Member: There are many on your side of the Chamber.

Mr. CHINCHEN: I am not talking about our side of the Chamber. These attacks come from the mouths of the people on the other side. I should like to see a little sanity so that the State may move forward to industrial development, and so that the resources of the State may be used to the best advantage. With recourse to a little sanity in this matter, nothing can stop us.

Mr. CORY (Warwick) (5.42 p.m.): I congratulate the Minister on his presentation of the Estimates. They cover quite a broad field and he gave us a good indication of what he has in mind in assisting the development of the State. It is also interesting to see, in the Auditor-General's Report, how the money has been spent in the last 12 months or two years.

We have heard a great deal today about bringing industries to Queensland and the type of industries that are most necessary. Most of the comments have been very much to the point. The establishment of an iron and steel industry in Queensland has been urged. I do not think any one of us can deny the importance of a steel works. Much emphasis has been placed on large industries, as if they could come here as going concerns, and be big businesses in a short time.

I was most interested to hear the hon. member for Mount Gravatt say that industries have to start in a small way. We know that a lot of money has been spent in assisting the establishment of industries. We know also that trade delegations such as French Technique came to Queensland about the end of last year. We were fortunate in having it visit Warwick. That visit was made possible by support from the Department of Industrial Development. We were grateful to be included in the survey made by this French team as we were given an opportunity to put before them the facilities in our area.

I entered the debate to press the claims of my area, which is spending a great deal of money to attract industry. We are fortunate in that we have coal available at an attractive price. We also have electricity. In the near future we will have an adequate permanent supply of water.

Much has been said today about large industries. There are, though, a number of small industries which are battling to exist in many areas. They would have a chance to develop if we gave them a little assistance. There should be more decentralisation so as to get as many industries as possible away from the metropolitan area and to spread employment to as many parts of the State as possible.

To establish or encourage industry in any area it is essential that there be a permanent supply of water. There must also be, as the hon. member for Mount Gravatt said, power at an economic price. Cheap power is important. Electricity is one of our staple sources of power, and we must strive to make it cheaper than it is today so as to give those industries every possible chance. We hope everybody will have access to natural gas as a source of power in the not too far distant future. A good supply of raw materials is also essential.

Not only will the permanent supply of water from the Leslie Dam encourage industry, but it will also encourage the growing of more crops. We will then be able to establish irrigation, which will enlarge the deciduous fruit-growing industry. It is only a small industry at present because it is dependent entirely on natural rainfall, but it will soon be supplied from the new dam as well as the present dam. In addition to deciduous fruits, there will also be any amount of vegetables, such as peas, beans, cabbages, and tomatoes.

With water and power available, a canning industry could be established in that area. It could make use of water not only as a cannery but to provide a profitable return from growing those crops for canning purposes, just as Gordon Edgell Pty. Ltd. is doing in the Bathurst and Cowra areas in New South Wales. Not only does that company own large factories, but it guarantees the producers of those crops a certain price for them. There is an ideal opportunity for establishing such an industry in our area.

We can grow the crops, and we have the power and water necessary for the establishment of a canning industry.

We must remember that this water facility will cost the State approximately £2,000,000, and it is the responsibility of us all to do everything possible to see that that amount is spent in the most profitable way.

Many small industries that are trying to become established are having great difficulty in getting power. A small industry starting with limited capital is not in a position to spend large sums of money on the installation of electric power. Such companies have limited resources, but the fields in which they begin their operations could have far-reaching effects. At the moment they are being held back and could quite easily go out of business unless some assistance is given to them. A return of 12 per cent. on the capital invested is considered necessary by the Southern Electric Authority before an installation is considered an economic proposition. Originally it was 15 per cent., and we are thankful that it was reduced to 12 per cent. It is also appreciated that many areas previously denied this facility are now being included in rural extension schemes.

Although many areas would produce returns below the required 12 per cent., they have considerable potential. The provision of electricity would permit them to expand and return well in excess of this percentage. At present they are not in a position to guarantee this figure, so the extension of electricity remains uneconomic for the Southern Electric Authority, or, for that matter, any other authority. If it were possible to subsidise some of these installations, I feel sure that the reward would be found in the establishment of small industries, and the power then used would be well in excess of the minimum amount required.

I have in mind the Texas lime works. This is a mining lease at Elbow Valley, 15 miles from Warwick. The company crushes lime only, and is in business in only a small way. Although it is prepared to expand, all that it can guarantee now is consumption of the power necessary for a 20-h.p. motor, which is not very much. If electricity is not supplied in the near future, this company obviously will use some other source of power, and a potential consumer of electricity will be lost. Not only will this undertaking then become less economic; the electric authority will lose a very important source of revenue which, if included, could, in the long run, make it easier for all consumers in the area.

A mile or two from the Texas lime works is a new company. It quarries, crushes, burns, and hydrates lime, and at present is in a position to use two 15-h.p. motors. It is a small company and is just beginning operations. It is prepared to expand, and wants to go ahead. At the moment, however, no greater consumption of electricity can be guaranteed. I feel that if electricity

could be made available in an area such as this, where there are two companies, the benefit would be obtained in the near future.

The Stanthorpe Mining Company Limited has a mine at Silverwood, outside Warwick. It is a copper mine, yielding sulphide ore. A flotation treatment plant will be installed near the mine where power is available. I should like to read part of the prospectus of the company. It says—

“The Warwick ore lends itself readily to flotation treatment. As the project develops extensions will be made and other plants erected when needed.”

That shows what companies of this type want to do. They are already in existence and have the ore available, but they must be given power if they are to progress as they would like to progress.

The same company has a mine at Tooliambi, near Silver Spur, which produces mainly silver and copper and smaller quantities of zinc and lead. It is prepared to erect a blast furnace at the mine. The area will be served with electricity by the North-West County Council, and although the electricity facilities are only three miles from Silver Spur, which is about four miles from the Tooliambi mine, it will cost the company more than £1,000 to make the connection. No small company in its infancy would be prepared to spend such a large sum. We are retarding the progress of industries such as this, and I think we will regret it in the long run if we do not assist them to expand now. Not only will they benefit; our electrical installations will become more economical because the companies will eventually use fairly large amounts of electricity.

Mr. O'Donnell: A few of our farmers are in that position, too.

Mr. CORY: I shall come to that in a moment.

I think the Department of Industrial Development should also give assistance in geological surveys and drilling operations. I know that some companies have received a sympathetic hearing on this question, but I think it is very important to give the smaller companies an opportunity to make use of expert services so that they can put their entire resources into the project with confidence. Let me say that people starting in a small way do put their entire resources into these small enterprises. If we are sincere in our desire for decentralisation, I think those are two practical ways in which we can give assistance. We talk a great deal about industries that are not here. These are people who have floated small companies and are prepared to go ahead immediately.

The hon. member for Barcoo was a jump ahead of me when he mentioned farmers. There are areas in my electorate in which the return is 11 per cent., and people are on the verge of being denied this facility. It is very difficult for a farmer who has never

used electricity to say what he wants or how much he will use. Again, I think we might assist with installations. I do not say that the Southern Electric Authority should be asked to do this, but it is a matter that comes within the ambit of the Department of Industrial Development and the State Electricity Commission. If we assist farmers by connecting electricity supply, I think they will quickly realise the usefulness of electricity and use more and more electrical appliances. The supply authority will receive a greater return and in a short time the cost of installations will be reduced. As I said, these people have not had personal experience of electricity and would not know how much use they would be prepared to make of it when it became available.

[*Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.15 p.m.*]

Mr. CORY: There are other industries than the few I have mentioned that are in exactly the same category. I will not go any further in pursuit of that point but I should like to say that we may expect increased population from increased industry. I think we all appreciate that any development that takes place must be industrial development if there is to be any marked increase in population.

As to primary production, we must always bear in mind that our home market is our best market and the one we have to foster and keep foremost in our minds. We need to produce goods that are most suitable to our home market. We are at present going through a period of expansion in primary industries. Our production is rising constantly and we have to do everything possible to keep the population increasing so that it will at least keep pace with the increase in primary production. In addition, we want to ensure that, as far as possible, the population is scattered as widely over the State as possible, yet as near to the sources of production as we can get it.

In dealing with industrial development, let us not neglect any area because of its inland position and its relatively small population. Inland industries are just as important as those on the coast. However, because of the smaller population in these centres, industries there will have to start in a smaller way.

Mr. Sherrington: Are you saying that the Minister is neglecting them?

Mr. CORY: No. I am urging that they be not neglected at any stage.

In most cases these small enterprises would have only a small amount of capital and would find it very difficult to overcome their initial problems, but they are invaluable to these areas as a means of holding the population, especially the younger people, and at the same time of decentralising the State. Once they have started, associated industries will form about them. We must ensure that a proportion of the available assistance is given to these industries and

that it is not all granted to industries in coastal areas or used in attracting overseas enterprise. Such assistance would need to be only sufficient to create a favourable economic climate and enable these small industries to overcome the initial problems. I feel very sure that, given a suitable start, they will play a very important part in the economy of the State.

Mr. Windsor interjected.

Mr. CORY: We find that where there is a job for the male, automatically there is a job for the female.

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) (7.19 p.m.): If anyone is aware of the need for industrial development, it is those of us who represent northern electorates.

Mr. Windsor: You want to help them, too, don't you?

Mr. TUCKER: There would be no doubt about it. I should say that significant rises in population only follow industrial development such as the establishment of secondary industries in an area. In the North we are very much aware that the population of an area increases with the establishment of a secondary industry. We want to increase our population up there suddenly and quickly. We realise that primary industries will not be the whole answer. Therefore we are very much aware of the need for industrial development in the North. After witnessing the employment created by the establishment of the copper refinery in Townsville I am doubly aware of this, and I wholeheartedly support the hon. member for Burdekin in his plea for the establishment of a steel works in North Queensland. I can well understand the hon. member's advocacy. He, too, realises that if we were to establish a steel works in North Queensland we would be doing something quickly to help satisfy the need to populate the North. It is obvious that if a steel works were established there, many subsidiaries would follow.

The hon. member for Burdekin put forward the town of Bowen. I agree that Bowen would be an admirable site because of its proximity to the various raw products in that part of the State. I could put forward the claims of Townsville as another very good location for a steel works, but I must think about it on a wider basis and agree that Bowen would be an admirable site because it is very close to Collinsville with its tremendous reserves of coal. We do not know yet just how much is there. We have the open-cut mine operating and there are thousands and thousands of tons of coal on grass at the moment. I know the argument will be advanced that Collinsville coal has too much sulphur in it, but I still think that those reserves should be used. I am sure that present-day industrial processes could deal with this coal so that the tremendous reserves at Collinsville could be used to supply a steel works at Bowen. I will enlarge on that in a moment.

The Minister for Industrial Development said this afternoon that the extent of the iron ore deposits at Constance Range had not yet been proven.

Mr. Munro: Not yet fully proven.

Mr. TUCKER: I will allow the Minister that interjection; they are not yet fully proven. This is strange because only a few weeks ago the Minister for Mines and Main Roads was reported in the Press as saying that the reserves of high-grade ore at Constance Range were tremendous. He said also that it would not be long before we started to export iron ore through a port in the Gulf to overseas countries, possibly Japan.

Mr. Munro: That is not inconsistent. I went on to add—

Mr. TUCKER: I think the Minister is getting on my bandwagon now that I have quoted the Minister for Mines. This afternoon he was not nearly as definite as he is beginning to sound now. I read this statement of the Minister for Mines in the newspapers. He said that there were tremendous reserves there, and that we would be exporting high-grade ore through a port in the Gulf before very long. I do not say that he said it would be tomorrow, but possibly in some years this could come about. If this raw product could be exported through the Gulf, a road could be constructed from Constance Range down to Mt. Isa without much trouble because, after all, we have constructed the beef roads in the Gulf area, running for hundreds and hundreds of miles. Today they are an established fact. The road could be built from the range to Mount Isa without too much trouble.

Mr. Evans: You have never been up there. There is only one way to get it out, and that is by ship.

Mr. TUCKER: If the Minister says we can get it out by ship, so much the better; it may be cheaper. It may be hauled to Mount Isa or go by ship. In any case, it can be brought to Townsville or Bowen and ultimately processed there or at some other town in North Queensland. If arguments are advanced that Bowen should not be the place—and I think it could well be—some other town in North Queensland could have a steel industry. For too long we have been exporting our raw materials for a song. We export thousands and thousands of tons for a very small return. No-one in the Chamber can deny it. We do not get very much for the products that we export, and while we export we continue to line the pockets of foreign manufacturers by buying back the manufactured articles. We all know that the greatest profit is in the manufactured article. There is no doubt that we buy the manufactured articles at a tremendous cost.

When the Minister replied earlier today, he said that it may be preferable to bring iron from Western Australia. Surely the

Minister knows that the Kaiser Steel Corporation of America, and Japanese interests, are very busy in Western Australia. As they are very busy there at present, if we do not get busy in Queensland the next steel works could well be established in Western Australia with the capital backing of the overseas firms. I know that the Kaiser Steel Corporation has sent many men to Australia, because I have met them, and they have gone to the Hammersley Range in Western Australia, as have other interests, to look at the extent of the iron ore reserves in that State. They are prepared to get busy in Western Australia.

I repeat that we have large reserves of coal, limestone, and everything needed to treat the steel. I know that to establish a steel works may cost about £100,000,000, which is a tremendous sum of money, but we should try to do something. We have reached the stage where we must think big; we must think in terms of bigness. We cannot quail before the fact that it may cost £90,000,000, £100,000,000, or £110,000,000. Everyone who runs a business knows that in business you cannot stand still, you can go forward and progress, perhaps by spending tremendous sums of money. Perhaps the hon. member for Ithaca will back me up when I say that with changing processes you have to be game. Occasionally you have to spend tremendous sums of money for a big return. If we are the type who quail, and are not prepared to spend to progress, we will go back, and the process of going back always accelerates and, very soon, the business fails.

At present, Queensland is faced with a dilemma; either we will go forward with those who have a proper conception of all these matters or we will try to stand still, which cannot be done in business, because once it is attempted, business drops back in the face of competition, and today competition throughout the world is very keen. I have watched this happening in Western Australia. The Minister's reference today brought it back to my memory. Many representatives of American interests call in to see me on their way through, because my relatives in America ask them to. When I ask them where they are going, they say, "Western Australia! Kaiser Steel Corporation has sent us to have a look at the Hammersley Range."

We stand on the threshold of tremendous development if we are prepared to have a go. If we are not, we will run backwards. If Bowen is to get this industry, well and good. I believe that it should be established in North Queensland. At present the Brisbane area is well served with industry. I went up Mount Coot-tha yesterday and looked across this area. I was amazed at what is going on, and I think everybody who comes here does the same. Brisbane is growing at a rapid rate; unfortunately, we in the North are not. If we are to have industrial development there, and an

increase in population in the years to come, we must be prepared to establish industry of this type in the North quickly.

The Minister spoke about markets. Every industry is faced with the problem. Mount Isa Mines established the copper refinery in Townsville, and from that time the refinery has never looked back. It found markets for all of its production and is now employing 300 to 400 people in Townsville.

I realise what big industry can do. It can provide employment and add to population overnight. It can give security to hundreds of workers.

Mr. Windsor: You would not have to find a market for steel.

Mr. TUCKER: I agree with that interjection. Northern industries have always been hamstrung by a shortage of steel, real or artificial. Quite often, if companies cannot get onto the quota of B.H.P., they get nothing from that company and have to buy steel on the retail market. It is easy to imagine what that does to industry. Those companies are forced to use imported steel, and that increases their costs. The hon. member for Ithaca said that we could manufacture good steel in Australia cheaply, but if you cannot get it, it is no good to you. In tendering, these companies have to base their tenders on the cost of imported steel. Is it any wonder then that they cannot compete with southern firms who can get B.H.P. steel? Obviously their tenders must be high in comparison with those of southern firms.

If the tenders from southern firms are accepted that work is lost to the north. The Minister has said that we should buy Queensland-made products. If we cannot compete because we are forced to use inferior imported steel our tenders will be miles above those of our southern competitors, and we will lose work from the North to the South—not to Brisbane, but right down to Melbourne.

The steel used in many of the large northern projects is prefabricated in Melbourne. I refer to the Burdekin Bridge and other large projects which cost millions of pounds. We hoped that northern firms would win those contracts so that some of the money spent on those structures would be used in the North. They tendered but were unable to compete in price. In these and other projects the work was allotted to Melbourne firms who prefabricated the steel in that city. This has caused very great loss to northern firms and supports my argument that if there are to be constant crippling shortages of steel in the North, it is high time someone else came in and filled the gap. Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. is often suspected of creating artificial shortages so that tenders will be won by southern firms. A steel works in the North would correct this situation.

The Minister always says we should buy Queensland-made goods. I could not agree with him more. If we cannot buy goods produced in Queensland, we should at least buy those of Australian manufacture. It therefore seems strange to me that a Minister should stand up, as happened some months ago, and find some excuse for having steel wagons to be used to haul coal from Moura to Gladstone manufactured not in Queensland, or even Australia, but in Japan. These things strike the ordinary man very forcibly. If the Minister is sincere when he says we should buy Queensland-made goods, why does not the Government set the example? I know the argument is always advanced that these wagons were needed quickly.

I am now going to make use of the information made available to the Committee this afternoon by the hon. member for Ithaca. Because he has had considerable experience in the engineering field, I take what he said as being the gospel truth. He said that Australian steel was a really wonderful product, and that he found steel imported from Japan to be "inconsistent". In other words, he said, if pressure is applied at some point the steel will crack like a stick of chalk, yet if it is applied at another point a little farther away the steel will bend like lead. I do not think I have misquoted him. Apparently the Government has ordered from Japan wagons that will be manufactured from this poor type of steel. This work was not kept in Queensland or even in Australia; the order was sent to Japan, where, if the statements of the hon. member for Windsor are accepted, the steel produced is inferior. The Government must feel doubly guilty in this matter.

Let us remember also what happened in connection with the Moonie oil pipeline. It was said that the pipes supplied could not be obtained here and had to be imported from Japan. Again the excuse offered was that they could not be manufactured in Australia. Whenever it suits the Government, they allow these outside interests to tender and eventually they give the work to them. The people of Queensland—indeed, of Australia—rightly feel that local manufacturers should be supported. Each time a substantial amount of money is to be spent, it is passing strange that the work goes out of Queensland and Australia to some other part of the world. I think that is very wrong indeed. I am reminded by one of my colleagues that it is doubtful if even the oil being pumped from the ground of Queensland is to be refined in this State. Again, I think that is an indictment of the Government. The Minister for Mines and Main Roads had the intensional fortitude to say, "Well, as far as I am concerned, it is going to be done." But he was expressing his own view; he did not say, "The Government says it is going to be done."; and he left the impression that Cabinet might have a different idea. There would have been no

doubt in our minds if the Minister had said, "The Government is going to see that the oil is refined in Queensland."

As I said earlier, I support wholeheartedly the industrial development of the State, but people in the North cannot pin the Government down and get an undertaking from it that they will be given a chance to tender for steel work and other work on big projects, even though prices may be a little better. We are not receiving the backing of the people who say we should "Buy Queensland made" or "Buy Australian made". I do not believe, to use the vernacular, that they are fair dinkum when they say it. I judge people by their actions, and the actions of the Government do not back up the lip-service that they give to North Queensland.

Mr. Sullivan: Are you opposed to us selling our wool to Japan?

Mr. TUCKER: I am not going to deal with side issues at this stage. This is my submission. If the hon. member for Condamine wishes to make a submission—he rarely does—he can get up on his big feet and make it.

I wish to make two points, and I wish to make them very strongly. I do not believe that we are getting a fair go in the North in the field of industrial development—I speak of the North generally—and I have given reasons why I believe that. If the Government were prepared to assist North Queensland, it would see that the quota system did not operate with steel. It would see that all northern manufacturers were assisted in that way. By doing so it would be assisting the people of the North generally and providing an incentive for the establishment of further industries. But when a manufacturer hears that he will be forced to use imported steel, he says, "It is a lovely place. I like your palms. I like your beaches. Hooray.", and goes back to the South because that is where he can make profits. When profits are under consideration, it is the head that talks, not the heart.

I think that the Townsville Regional Electricity Board, which has now been taken over by the Northern Electric Authority, should be congratulated on the work it has done as an electric authority under Mr. Priestley. Mr. Murray of the Northern Electric Authority has taken over in Townsville. He seems to be a very decent sort of fellow, but, since he has taken over, industrial trouble has occurred. When Mr. Priestley was in charge, there was never any trouble. His door was always open and he was prepared to meet the unions, and there was no industrial trouble, as far as I can remember, in seven years. I do not know Mr. Murray well enough to make any accusations against him, but I can see the beginnings of industrial trouble. The union has already approached him on certain matters and he has said, "No." If that is to

the way in which the N.E.A. operates, I deplore it. As I said, the T.R.E.B. and Mr. Priestley were always prepared to meet the unions in conciliation and each side respected the other. I understood that, when the N.E.A. took over, things were to remain as they were for six months, but already somebody is starting to issue directions. I suppose that somebody has to be in charge, but I deplore the fact that this attitude is creeping in. I believe that conciliation is far better than arbitration and if it can be left to conciliation it will be better for the people up there.

(Time expired.)

Mr. HANSON (Port Curtis) (7.45 p.m.): It is rather significant to enter the debate on these Estimates as this is the first time we have debated them. Last year special legislation was introduced under which a special Minister was charged with the responsibility of industrial development in this State. In the early part of the year an amendment—more or less of a technical nature, but nevertheless an amendment—was introduced in an effort to streamline this department. It is passing strange that when the Government, after seven years in office—this is the eighth very uncomfortable year we have had—decided to bring down legislation to form this department—

Mr. Windsor interjected.

Mr. HANSON: I advise the hon. member for Ithaca that he can now wake up. He has been asleep for quite some time. He can awaken and listen to a few words of wisdom.

In regard to this legislation, every "Hansard" that is printed and given to members to send out to their various electorates reveals that there is a Premier and Minister for State Development, namely, Hon. George Francis Reuben Nicklin, M.M., LL.D. I do not think many members in this Chamber are cognisant of the fact that the Premier is also the Minister for State Development.

Mr. Windsor: Apparently you did not know.

Mr. HANSON: I should like to tell the hon. member that I do not waste my time. I am a very energetic member and work industriously on behalf of my party.

As I say, we have a Minister for State Development. Is there a separate department that controls State development? Is there an annual report tabled in this Chamber by the Department of State Development?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the hon. member intends to tie up his remarks with industrial development. We are not dealing with State development.

Mr. HANSON: Most definitely, Mr. Hooper. I am trying to convey to this Chamber the utmost confusion that exists in the administration of industrial development.

Indeed, in this State, by virtue of the creation of this Ministry for State Development, we now have in addition to that one, a Ministry for Industrial Development, a Ministry for Conservation, which after all is very much bound up with development, and a Ministry for Mines, in which emphasis is laid on Weipa, Moura and Kianga and on oil. They all come under the Ministry for Mines. Incidentally, as hon. members know, the Minister for Mines was formerly also the Minister for Development.

We are tied and hogtied by so much development that the whole business is confusing. As a matter of fact, I personally think that this department was created in haste and I doubt very much whether the administration knows where it is going. That is obvious when we remember the intemperate remarks of the Minister for Industrial Development recently in this Chamber in answer to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who said, "Surely in discussion prior to reaching this agreement you insisted that Ampol install units suitable for the processing of Moonie oil," and The Minister replied, "No. I do not think that is a matter for us at all; it is a matter for the company." As my colleagues the hon. member for Townsville North said, what an indictment of the Government! To think that we have a Minister for Industrial Development who is prepared to get up in the Chamber and make a statement like that in reply to a question! Surely to goodness we should know where we are going! Surely the person charged with the responsibility of doing something about industrial development in this State should be sufficiently responsible to see that there were units installed at this refinery to handle the production from the great Moonie oil-field! It is absolutely disgusting that we have a Minister so irresponsible as to make such a statement. Surely the company has been given sufficient Government aid to realise that it has some responsibility to the people. The oil is found in Queensland and the people of this State should share in the benefits, whether they be of a primary or a secondary nature.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. HANSON: I am trying to drown the budgerigars on the other side of the Chamber.

On 26 July, 1964, the Minister was interviewed in London. The London staff of "The Courier-Mail" reported the interview as follows:—

"In championing the manufacturing potential of Queensland he has compared the State's role in the development of Australia with the rapid growth of California as the 'new' State of the U.S."

Every time Ministers or Government members get to their feet we hear how the State is poised for development—"Development is right here; we are developing into a land filled with milk and honey; liquid gold will be flowing everywhere; we will all be

smoking Corona Coronas, lying on the beach on the South Coast, and enjoying the great blessing that is to be bestowed on us by a beneficent and munificent Government." What rot!

Let us see how intemperate he is—this Minister for Industrial Development. On 23 August, when he got off the plane in Brisbane, he said, "It is all poppycock to think that Queensland will become the greatest industrial State in Australia." What a statement to make! If he wants to be realistic, if he really thinks in his own mind that we will not become the greatest industrial State in Australia, why tell anybody? Why not have some optimism? Ever since I have been here—that has not been very long, but I have been reading about it ever since the present administration took office—we have been hearing about the State's great development. But now the Minister for Industrial Development says it is all poppycock. Why issue such a statement? As Minister for Industrial Development the hon. gentleman's loyalty lies with this State. He should be saying that we will advance. He should be saying that we will become the greatest industrial State of the Commonwealth. We hear it all the time from many other Government members who get up like well-trained budgerigars. Obviously they recite it in front of a mirror each morning. They come into the Chamber and then, the first thing after prayers, they start on this great development that is in hand. Fancy making a statement like that!

Government Members interjected.

Mr. HANSON: The debate has been rather dead, but I will brighten it up for them!

It is always noticeable in a debate on the Estimates that it is very difficult to get hon. members opposite to their feet. If they do rise they find difficulty in spinning out their full time. The reason is obvious: they are disgusted with the administration.

The Queensland Year Book shows that in 1962-63 the total exports of this State were valued at £340,193,000, whereas imports totalled £343,419,000. Two years previously there was an excess of imports over exports. But what was the position in the last few years of Labour's administration? In 1955-56 imports totalled £223,000,000 and exports amounted to £242,000,000. There was an average excess of about £40,000,000 when Labour was in office. We had a very favourable trade balance. The latest figures, however, reveal an unfavourable trade balance in certain quarters of the year. I do not know what the figures up to the end of June last year will reveal. However, if they run true to form they will not show any very favourable result. If we go to the stores where we were formerly proud to purchase articles and where good quality goods were displayed, we now see that they are a haven for junk that is manufactured in

the South. Our own manufacturers, who could employ Queenslanders, are being denied the opportunity by the colossi and the moguls who control the large chain-store organisations. They are peddling goods to Queenslanders that have been rejected by the people in the South. If that is typical of our industrial development, I dissociate myself from it.

As I said in my Budget speech, there certainly has not been good economic planning for the State. The Treasurer made a statement that unlimited funds would be available in the private sector, with a modest restraint in public or Government spending. Last week I said that with the stop-go policy of the Federal administration and the incompetence and impotence of the State administration, we do not know where we are going. We find as recently as 17 October, in "The Morning Bulletin" the statement that industry cannot complain that the Reserve Bank's action was unexpected when it took £27,000,000 out of the trading bank funds. We must remember that industry needs an ample supply of trading bank funds to function. That action was merely following the policy of restraint when there is not a good economic policy. If this Government does not insist on a well-planned economic policy and does not tell its Canberra brothers that we must have one, industry cannot progress. As my colleagues have said, there has been too much bending over backwards in trying to assist overseas investors. I repeat that the more industries that can be started in this State to employ Queenslanders and use our primary products and minerals, the better it will be.

At Mount Morgan there is such an industry awaiting development. There are millions of tons of pyrites lying at grass. If the Minister for Industrial Development is anxious to do something to assist Queensland industry and is anxious to put this State on the map by giving it something worth-while, he should try to assist this industry. I have pointed out that in the statistical section of the Bank of New South Wales Review it is reported that there has been a considerable increase in the production of sulphuric acid in this country. There has been a rise in the nine months from July, 1963 to March this year, from 104,000 tons to 130,000 tons. Surely this should awaken the Minister to the fact that there has been a considerable increase in sulphuric acid production and that there will be a greater use of it when people become more conscious of its uses in the grazing and farming industries in the form of sulphate of ammonia and the other fertilisers produced from sulphuric acid and its derivatives. This is an opportunity for the Minister to do something well worth while for the State—something that will belong to the people in the State; something that is part of us. I trust that the Minister will see his way clear to see if it is at all possible for the State to enjoy the benefits of this industry, which rightly belongs to it.

I cannot resume my seat without referring to the significant development occurring in my area in the establishment of the alumina plant. This requires a considerable amount of planning, and in any discussions it has or overtures it makes, the Government should look to the long-range plan and ensure that emphasis is placed on the fact that not only should we have an alumina plant, but we should also, at a later date, have an aluminium smelter.

In recent years there have been discussions with the New Zealand Government about the establishment of a smelter at Lake Manopouri in the southern island of New Zealand. A consortium of companies is engaged in this gigantic project. A considerable tonnage of alumina will find its way to Bell Bay in Tasmania and, as the companies concerned have overseas interests, a considerable amount of alumina will go overseas.

Like the hon. member for Townsville North, I should like to see a smelter established in this State where the primary product, namely bauxite, is produced. Having economic self-sufficiency is something of great benefit to this State. It will employ people in this State, and remove for all time the fear of unemployment which has been present—but not in my electorate—for many months. The way to approach this problem is to see that we are poised and ready with power stations with the necessary capacity to supply these enterprises. The mine at Moura, with reserves of 4,000 million tons, is the envy of the other States. We can establish a through transport system to bring that coal to the coast, and we should ensure there are ample supplies of water to generate cheap power.

Recently we read that it is anticipated in New South Wales that a large power station will be established at Vales Point. It will be supplied with coal from three mines, by a conveyor-belt system direct to the power station. But neither that power house nor the gigantic one mentioned in the Press recently is able to reach the stage where it can supply power at a price conducive to the establishment of an aluminium smelter. I believe we can do it in this State. We have great watersheds and sufficient reserves of coal. Now is the time to approach the problem. Now is the time for the Minister for Industrial Development to forget his statement about Moonie oil and the poppycock he gave to "The Courier-Mail", and really do something to assist.

Since becoming a member of this Assembly I have realised that, compared with Federal members, we do not have sufficient air travel to visit the various industries throughout the State and see this gigantic industrial development. Recently, in the sphere of industrial development, Mr. Jack Renshaw took members from both sides of the New South Wales Parliament overseas so that they could have a look at what is being done there.

We have a piecemeal and mean administration, one that is afraid of its electors. It is fearful of what the public will think if it spends money. It fears that it will lose votes. I am not afraid. In a spirit of industrial development we should do everything possible to gain a knowledge of our industries. I am not afraid to go before my electors and tell them that.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. HANSON: I am not afraid, but Government members are trying to back down. I always tell the truth, and that is the main thing. In Victoria, the Vote for travel for members of Parliament is enormous. They are able to go where great industries are on display. The administrators of this State are so frightened and fearful of the public that they would hate to pay even the bus fare to Mt. Coot-tha. In New South Wales, members of the legislature were given an opportunity to look at some of the gigantic enterprises in that State. If it were suggested that we be given the same consideration, we would find members of the Government throwing up their hands in horror.

Mr. Sullivan interjected.

Mr. HANSON: I remind the hon. member for Condamine that "Gabby" Horan will look after him.

Details of industrial assistance in Northern Ireland can be found in the Ulster Year Book 1960-62. An Aid to Industry Act was introduced in 1953 under which industry in Northern Ireland was assisted by a reduction in the cost of coal. Under this scheme the Ministry of Commerce distributes some £750,000 a year among industrial users of coal, including gas or electricity derived from coal. The minimum annual consumption required to qualify for the grant is 50 tons of coal or its equivalent.

The rateable value of premises used for industrial purposes has, since the passing of the Local Government (Rating and Finance) Act of 1929 been assessed at one-quarter of the net annual value of the premises. The local authorities are compensated by the Exchequer for the loss of rate revenue. Industrial premises have continued to be exempted from three-quarters of their normal rate liability, although the corresponding concession in Great Britain was reduced to one-half in 1958.

What do we find here? A department has been created, and the appropriation required for the Chief Office is £194,569. When sums amounting to millions of pounds are dealt with here every day, with Ministers peeling off these amounts almost as if they were in a poker game, £194,000 is a lousy appropriation. It is typical of the Government's attitude to these things. If someone said to me, "What wonderful offices the Department of Industrial Development has," I would say, "So it should have." I have not seen them, but if they are of a high

standard, that is quite all right with me. But do not let things stop there. See that sufficient funds are made available so that officers doing this work for the State are not hindered in any way. If staff are going here, there, and everywhere, that also is all right with me. They can go anywhere twice so far as I am concerned if their so doing will be of benefit to the State and to the working-class people. It is the people that I am interested in. They are the ones that inherit the earth, and anything good for them is good from a legislative point of view.

It is all very well to talk of industrial development, machines, and the wonderful benefits that automation will bring to the community. My concern is for the people. If industrial development in this State is going to provide more jobs and more social amenities for the working class, I am all for it. I do not envy the Minister his task in this portfolio. As well as having the responsibility of seeing that the State is geared to meet changing world conditions, he has, to my mind, the task of seeing that the people are well looked after and that the changes that will come with automation are not significant enough to be detrimental to them. I do not know whether Government members think this way. I hope they do.

(Time expired.)

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Industrial Development) (8.10 p.m.): As I have remarked on a number of occasions in this Chamber, this is a rather funny place. If one did not have a well-developed sense of humour, one would occasionally become very angry. I sometimes wonder how many hon. members have the capacity to imagine how they would appear if some completely impartial person were having a look at them through a little hole in the ceiling. I make that remark not wholly in relation to the contribution of the hon. member for Port Curtis but in relation to the general development of the debate during the day.

As hon. members will remember, I studiously endeavoured at the commencement of the debate to make my remarks constructive, free from party political bias, and free from those types of propaganda with which we are all too familiar.

I congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on following my example. He made what I regard, on the whole, as a really constructive contribution to the discussion of the Estimates.

Mr. Tucker: When you praise anybody, they get worried.

Mr. MUNRO: I am not getting worried. The example of the Leader of the Opposition was followed to a certain extent, and during the debate a few valuable contributions have been made. It has been my endeavour during the day to pick out what I regarded as the most important points

that might be worthy of some comment having regard to the broad objective, which should be—I emphasise "should be"—the objective of every one of us, that is, to promote the industrial development of Queensland.

As I said, I am not in any way angry, but I do very often become a little frayed, and on this occasion I might not be so generous in my praise of the more constructive comments put forward by hon. members opposite as I sometimes might have been. Since I made an interim reply at about 4 o'clock this afternoon, there have been six speakers from the Opposition and three from the Government benches.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. MUNRO: The point I wish to make is this: on the basis of the value of the contributions, I think it is perhaps weighted a little heavily on the Government side.

Mr. Sherrington: You would be joking, of course.

Mr. MUNRO: No, that is an endeavour to make a fair appraisal. As I said, the standard of the debate has deteriorated during the day, and I am rather sorry that it has. I do not mind being described by the hon. member for Salisbury as having criminal tendencies—

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I rise to a point of order. Not at any time during the debate did I say that the Minister for Industrial Development had criminal tendencies. I might have thought it, but I did not say it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MUNRO: I did not say that the hon. member said it during the debate today.

Mr. Sherrington: Let us be factual about it.

Mr. MUNRO: This is really a continuation of the same Committee that considered the Financial Statement, and the hon. member made the statement during the Budget debate.

As we have gone through, it has seemed to me that in the contributions during the latter part of this debate there has been a mixture of viewpoints. First of all—and this very often happens—some of the speakers from the Opposition side have told us that the Government has succeeded in doing nothing at all. In fact, they have said, the State is not getting on well at all and we are not achieving anything in the way of industrial development, notwithstanding the fact that they know in their hearts that the State of Queensland has never been more prosperous or developing more rapidly than it is today. They represent a section.

The other section have taken a new line of attack—and this is rather refreshing after some of us have sat in the Chamber and

listened for four or five years while we have been criticised for having taken, in the view of the Opposition, so long to get the State moving after taking office in 1957. But the particularly important part of this attack perhaps comes from the fact that I put the position fairly this morning when I pointed out that and spoke for approximately three-quarters of an hour and did not endeavour to make one political point. As a result of that, what has been the response from several Opposition speakers? The general line has been that this was exactly what would have happened if they had been the Government, that many of these things just flowed from what they did when in Government. In fact, we have had the spectacle of some reasonably responsible members of the Opposition wanting to climb onto the bandwagon. I do not want to take up too much time on that but I feel that it has become essential for me to say something of that kind because of the deterioration in the tone of the debate as it has gone along.

Obviously, with nine speakers, it is not practical for me to make detailed comments on many of the rather valuable suggestions that have been put forward so, if I do omit to refer to any, I ask the forbearance of the hon. members concerned.

Mr. Mann: We will forgive you.

Mr. MUNRO: I thank the hon. member for Brisbane. I really appreciate that.

In view of the response of the hon. member for Salisbury to the chance remark I made as a result of some provocation, perhaps it will not be out of place for me to quote from his remarks on 8 October during the course of the Budget debate before this same Committee, and this, of course, is a continuation of that debate. He said—

"I intend to bring to the notice of hon. members a very grave position which has existed in this State for some time in which the Minister for Industrial Development has shown such a singular lack of interest that his present attitude is approaching criminal negligence."

Mr. Sherrington: Every word true and correct. I do not make any apology for that statement.

Mr. MUNRO: I am glad to get the explanation. As the hon. member says, every word true and correct. By way of elaboration he went on the same day—and this is recorded at page 635—

Mr. Sherrington: I thought you could not quote from current "Hansard".

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MUNRO: I thought the hon. member would not like this. He went on to say—

"Let us now have a look at the attitude of the Minister for Industrial Development on this matter. Recently I asked him a question as to whether he would consider

amending the Electric Light and Power Regulations to prevent the many accidents that are occurring in the industry. In reply, he said—"

and then there is a quotation. I will not take up time by reading the whole of it, but it is there on page 635 of "Hansard". The point I draw attention to is that, designedly or inadvertently—I am not sure whether the Committee should give the hon. member the benefit of the doubt—he left out the most important part of the answer. He left out the first and main paragraph of the answer, which was—

"I can assure the hon. member that any accidents are viewed with serious concern, the circumstances of all cases are thoroughly investigated by the State Electricity Commission, and where necessary appropriate action is taken."

I ask the hon. member what is his justification for quoting in the Chamber an answer of the Minister, but leaving out the important part?

Mr. Sherrington: In the whole of the time of this Government they have done nothing about these electrical accidents. I do not make any apologies for anything I said.

Mr. MUNRO: The hon. member is raising a different point now. When one is being bowled out, one shifts one's ground. I might have something further to say about that later. I do not propose to waste too much time on the hon. member for Salisbury.

Mr. Sherrington: You are not wasting any of your time on industrial safety in the electrical industry.

Mr. MUNRO: As the hon. member for Salisbury is persisting in his interjections, I will ask him one question. It is with reference to what he said this afternoon. If I understood him correctly, he said that an employee had been suspended. I may not be correct in the words, but the substance of what he said was that an employee had been suspended this morning for refusing to work on vacuum-pressure-impregnated poles.

Mr. Sherrington: On which there were live mains.

Mr. MUNRO: On what authority was that employee suspended?

Mr. Sherrington: How do you mean?

Mr. MUNRO: Who suspended him?

Mr. Sherrington: The authority that he was working for told him that his wages ceased from 9.30 this morning. If that is not a suspension, I go "he."

Mr. MUNRO: What was the name of the authority?

Mr. Sherrington: I am not frightened to tell you that. It was the Electricity Department of the Brisbane City Council.

Mr. MUNRO: Ah, the Brisbane City Council! There you are! Here is an hon. member who makes a blistering attack on

the Minister for Industrial Development because it so happens that one of his administrative responsibilities is in relation to the State Electricity Commission. He bolsters up his case in an attack flagrant with party political bias by giving this example of unsympathetic treatment of an employee. He says that this employee was suspended. By whom was he suspended? By the Labour-Party-controlled Brisbane City Council!

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. Sherrington: You administer the Act. You know—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have already warned the hon. member for Salisbury once today that persistent interjections will not be permitted. I take it that he will accept this as a final warning.

Mr. MUNRO: I will help the hon. member out a little bit. From the inquiries I have made I do not think it is true that any employee has been suspended even by the Brisbane City Council because of a refusal to work on vacuum-pressure-impregnated poles.

Mr. Sherrington: I qualified that by saying "where live mains are on the poles".

Mr. MUNRO: I think there is a little more in it than that. The point is that no hon. member has the right to attack a Minister in the Chamber on the basis of something done by the Brisbane City Council—

Mr. Sherrington interjected.

Mr. MUNRO: The hon. member is raising a different question. I do not want to take up too much time on the hon. member for Salisbury. It is only when things of this kind occur—things which I think are just a little bit beyond what we regard as the proper ethical approach to Parliament—that I make some protest.

The next speaker was the hon. member for Rockhampton South, who, of course, is a very active and energetic member. As usual, he advanced a very strong case for the development of industry in Central Queensland. I think it is of interest to note that the hon. member referred to the existence of the Rockhampton Regional Research and Promotion Bureau and offered the use of its services. I may say that the department, of course, is aware of the objectives of the bureau and, in fact, works in close contact with it. We acknowledge the good work it is doing and the contribution it freely makes. I may say, too, that a very happy relationship exists between the officers of the bureau and my department. My main reason for mentioning it is that this is very relevant to questions of decentralisation. There are quite a number of organisations of this kind in different parts of the State and, as a department, we welcome their contribution.

The hon. member for Baroona referred to our buoyant economy, which he regarded as very satisfactory; but, of course, he said that no credit was due to the department or to the Government. I am not worried about that. I think I can speak for myself and for all the members of the Cabinet; we are not looking for any personal credit for this. It does not worry us very much. What matters is that we should get this development. The State is getting it, so what does it matter? That is how I introduced this discussion this morning. I did not claim any credit at all, and I did not claim any particular credit for the Government, but I did expect a constructive discussion of these Estimates.

The hon. member for Port Curtis is amused by this. I am glad that he is in a happier frame of mind than when he spoke a little earlier. Perhaps I may refer to his comments about what I had to say when I used the expression "all poppycock". That was when I was at the airport on my return from an overseas trip. Hon. members know what it is like when they are on a television interview (Opposition laughter). What I said was quite right. One of the reporters asked me a straight-out question. He said, "Do you think Queensland will soon become the greatest industrial State of Australia?" I said what I would say today if anybody asked me. I said, "No, I think that is all poppycock." I continued and, although I do not remember my exact words, this would be their substance: "We must keep our feet on the ground; it is not as easy as all that. We must recognise that Sydney and Melbourne, New South Wales and Victoria, are the established industrial and financial centres of Australia." During the day the Leader of the Opposition, and other more experienced members, have shown that they recognised the tendency in industrial development is towards bigness. That is a great advantage in the established centres where there are large numbers of people.

Mr. Duggan: Is it true that you also said that Queensland had a great future and always would have?

Mr. MUNRO: Yes, I said that. Recently, I said—and this went into the Amoco capsule—that I expected that 100 years hence Queensland may be the most productive State in the Commonwealth, and I think it will be.

Mr. Duggan: We will not be here to see that.

Mr. MUNRO: No. Nevertheless we do not gain anything by blowing out our chests and saying that in a few years Queensland will be the greatest industrial State in the Commonwealth, because the big industrialists overseas know the position, and the only conclusion they could draw is that we do do not know what we are talking about. Therefore we have to put up a sound case.

Mr. Hanson: Are you a centralisationist yourself?

Mr. MUNRO: I realise the difficulty of the hon. member for Port Curtis. He may not have been in the Chamber during my introductory speech. I appreciated a number of the good points he raised, but I rather recognised most of them from my introductory speech.

The hon. member dealt with the allocation for the expenses of my department and, if I understood him correctly, he said that, although somebody else said it was too much, in his view it was "lousy". I was rather glad to hear that after other Opposition members had said it was too much. In a matter of this kind, if one hon. member says it is far too much and another says it is far too little, I conclude that we are not very far out.

The hon. member for Baroona raised a number of matters concerning the arrangements entered into with Thiess-Peabody-Mitsui Coal Pty. Ltd. These matters are, to some extent, connected with industrial development, so that the hon. member was in order in raising them. But he should understand that it is not my place to go into them, because the arrangements were primarily entered into by the Department of Mines and Main Roads to find a profitable market for our coal, and the Department of Railways to make transport arrangements.

Mr. Hanlon: You will acknowledge that it is ironic that one Minister says that this Company has to give a £100,000 bank guarantee and you, as Minister for Industrial Development, guarantee the Company for £700,000 with another bank. The company guarantees £100,000, and the Government guarantees £700,000 to it, so it is £600,000 on top.

Mr. MUNRO: That is quite an interesting point. It is like one or two other matters that have been criticised. It may be a somewhat unusual arrangement, but it did result in the establishment of a large export market for our coal, and it did result in the establishment of a very profitable industry in Central Queensland.

The hon. member for Baroona referred to the Reid Murray report. That covered many complex matters and caused a great deal of concern to all of us. The hon. member made two points. The first was the question of the introduction of legislation based on the comments and recommendations contained in the report, and the second was whether legal action might be taken against some of the persons mentioned.

The hon. member will no doubt remember that in the early part of this year we amended the Companies Act. Those amendments were based largely on what we learnt from the Reid Murray report—not particularly the Queensland one, but the one in Victoria. The amendments to the legislation are not necessarily final. We are still working on them and have tidied up the position to quite an extent.

Mr. Hanlon: You have not incorporated Mr. Connolly's suggestion about auditing?

Mr. MUNRO: No, not necessarily. I am sure that the hon. member for Baroona will agree that when dealing with a companies Act that we are endeavouring to keep uniform throughout Australia it does not necessarily follow that because a barrister in Queensland makes a suggestion it must be a good one and should be incorporated.

Mr. Hanlon: Don't you think it is a good one?

Mr. MUNRO: In my opinion, no. There might be in it the germ of an idea that is good, but it is not something that we could adopt in toto.

The hon. member for Ithaca raised some interesting points concerning takeovers. We are all concerned at this trend. It must be recognised that Sydney and Melbourne are the financial centres of Australia at present. With this general trend, as the Leader of the Opposition mentioned, towards bigness and amalgamations in industry, it is quite inevitable that in many cases control of companies will pass to either Sydney or Melbourne. We are doing everything that we can to resist it, because it is not a good thing for Queensland. It is, however, a world-wide trend, and I think that our attitude as Parliamentarians should be to put forward constructive suggestions on it, if we can, without using it as a basis for party political propaganda.

I might say that it is not all one-way traffic. There have been very interesting cases in which Queensland companies have absorbed smaller businesses based in the South, the whole concerns now being directed from Brisbane.

The hon. member for Kedron dealt with quite a number of points. He spoke of transport, main roads, and planning for the future of the city of Brisbane. They are interesting points but not ones to which I feel that I should endeavour to reply at present.

I thought that he was a little astray in his statements concerning the bauxite deposits at Gove in the Northern Territory. He read out quite glamorous conditions that applied to the deposits at Gove. I confess that they are a better set of conditions than those that we have applied at Weipa. One point that he did not put forward is that for years past there have been these immense bauxite deposits at Weipa. There have also been vast deposits at Gove, and there has been some competition to see which were to be developed. The important point is that we did get the industry for Queensland. I endeavoured by interjection to make this point: is it better to have conditions that are so perfect in an academic way, or to have conditions that have been modified to make them competitive with anything offered elsewhere in order to gain the

industry? I point out that if we had been too hard in imposing conditions for the development of bauxite at Weipa we would not have an alumina plant at Gladstone, and if we did not have an alumina plant at Gladstone we would not have any prospect of getting the aluminium smelter that the hon. member for Port Curtis thinks is possible.

Mr. Hanson: Don't you think we should make a start in relation to the aluminium smelter? That is the point I tried to make.

Mr. MUNRO: I agree with the hon. member on that point. That has one of the highest priorities in the Department of Industrial Development, and I have made a number of reports and memoranda on it myself. It is not an easy one, because the same difficulties arise as arose at Weipa in the early days. We have to meet competition from New Zealand, Tasmania and, I think, Victoria. We are working on that, but we will not achieve much if we lay down the law in every respect. We must be prepared to discuss these matters with anybody who is prepared to come here.

There is only one other point that I wish to deal with. I just cannot remember who raised it—it might even have been raised by the Leader of the Opposition very early in the debate—but I have been thinking about it. The suggestion was, as I recollect it, that problems could be solved by building much bigger power stations and having a grid system covering the whole State.

Looking back, I confess that in the early days power stations probably were built with a somewhat lower capacity than might have been justified on the outlook at that time and that, as a result, we might have slightly higher costs now than would otherwise have been the case. This is the important point: that in planning—we have very competent engineers doing the planning—all the elements of cost are considered. It should not be thought that the capital cost and running costs of the power station are the only important costs to be considered. The capital cost of high tension mains and transmission lines is very great indeed, and if we are to have a larger generating unit, we must set off against the cost advantage of that the higher cost of very long high tension transmission lines. It is no good going into those matters in detail, but those are the broad principles. The economics of various proposals are constantly being studied so that a system of electricity generation and mains transmission will be developed progressively for the whole State, each step being taken having regard to the demand for power.

Mr. Duggan: What departure, if any, are you making from the Merz and McLellan report and recommendations?

Mr. MUNRO: That is a very technical question. The Merz and McLellan report was a very technical report and I would not

attempt to answer that question at this stage, other than to say this: that no matter how highly qualified the persons are who make a report, there are new developments each year in relation to our coal reserves, the cost of transport, and so on. At the moment we are working on a 10-year plan that broadly covers the position from 1960 to 1970, and our engineers are now developing a plan for the next 10-year period. The facts affecting decisions for that second ten-year plan may be materially different from those that affected the planning in 1957 and it would be quite out of place for me to attempt to deal with them. It would not be practicable to cover the technicalities, but our State Electricity Commission—and that is a body for which I am administratively responsible—is doing a very good job. I say they are doing a very good job not only in relation to power, but also in relation to this other matter of personal safety which, despite my little altercation with the hon. member for Salisbury, is dear to the heart of every one of us.

Mr. O'DONNELL (Barcoo) (8.46 p.m.): I suppose it is unusual for a member from an electorate such as mine to take part in a debate on industrial development, particularly as virtually the whole of my electorate is engaged in primary production. However, it is important to realise that I represent part of the great hinterland of Central Queensland and whilst in the foreseeable future there may not be any possibility of major secondary industry in my electorate, or even in adjacent electorates, my electorate will be able to contribute greatly towards the development of secondary industries along the seaboard, particularly in the important towns of Mackay, Rockhampton and Gladstone.

It is very important to realise that we must decentralise our industries. Whilst we hear criticism of the lack of decentralisation in the south-east corner of the State and the lack of enterprises in the North, it is up to members from Central Queensland to bring before the Minister the importance of development in that division so that there will be a balanced growth in this State.

Before I proceed to deal with items concerning my electorate particularly, I should like to take up the point raised by the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt, who referred to the United States of America as being the great country of free enterprise and capitalistic success, and, of course, an example for Australian development in the future. I challenge that claim for the United States of America because undoubtedly that country does not give enough to its people.

We know that 30 per cent of United States people are living in sub-standard conditions. If it is our ambition to put the people of Queensland, or Australia, into the same position as those in the United States, I should say that our ambition is a very poor one indeed. We perhaps have many examples of wonderful things in the United States, and

naturally we should wish to obtain all those good things for our own country. But if we take the United States as a whole I am afraid we are taking a very bad example, for no matter what aspects of human endeavour one takes in that country, one can go from the best in the world to the worst. We hope for the best, and I think we should eliminate the worst from any proposal for our future development.

I should also like to take up the point raised by the hon. member for Warwick, which was a very good one. He was kind enough to respond to an interjection I made about the supply of electricity to the properties of farmers and graziers. I regard this as an important matter. From time to time people on the land are faced with many expenses. Having spent a lifetime in the country I realise the difficulties, particularly seasonal ones, that have to be faced. I appreciate the great expense, and often the inconvenience of expense, that is occasioned to these people. They are making a wonderful contribution to Queensland, which is undoubtedly the greatest primary-producing State in Australia. At times the Government is rather slow to assist them—I do not mean by giving them things but by generous gestures. Not very long ago a person I know had electricity connected to his property. The charge for the service was £1,000. He previously had an electric-light plant on his property but it needed replacing. After looking at the economics of it he considered that a new plant would not be as profitable as getting reticulated flow of electricity. Fortunately that man could afford to pay the £1,000.

Mr. Sullivan: Was that for three-phase?

Mr. O'DONNELL: It does not matter what it was. Had he wanted to purchase a new electric-light plant he could have gone to a firm which undoubtedly would have let him buy it on time-payment, or he could have gone to a bank and obtained a loan, but as he was dealing with the State Electricity Commission he had to find the cash. Another person not so fortunately placed financially would not have been able to take advantage of the amenity that had been brought almost to his front door. Because of a lack of consideration on the part of a State instrumentality in dealing with something that would have been of immediate benefit to him, he would have been denied the encouragement and advantage of a long overdue amenity on his property. I appreciate the attitude of the hon. member for Warwick, and I thought that that additional point might be of some interest.

I am concerned about Comalco, not because my electorate is anywhere near Gladstone but because in recent years Comalco has had an option over the mining leases at Blair Athol. I am afraid that with the lapse of one option at the beginning of this month and with the second option lapsing in perhaps two or three weeks' time,

hope for the coal-mining industry at Blair Athol will have receded. As time has gone on we have been worried about the future of Blair Athol.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the hon. member is now dealing with a matter that comes under the administration of the Minister for Mines.

Mr. O'DONNELL: The development of electrical power in Central Queensland comes within the scope of this department. When Comalco was moving towards Gladstone to establish its alumina plant we realised that it would be interested in power processing and would need sources to produce the power. It was hoped—probably it was a forlorn hope—that a decision would have been made earlier by the Government, and later by this firm, to develop a powerhouse at Blair Athol or close to the source of coal supply, which would be tied up with Blair Athol because of the high quality of its coal.

I do not know if the Minister for Industrial Development can give us any indication of Comalco's intentions but I assure the Committee that we would greatly appreciate some glimmer of hope. As time has passed by and one option has lapsed, the people have become dejected. But still, sometimes when the outlook is hopeless, something turns up.

We know that everyone wishes Comalco every success in Central Queensland. We know very well what it will do for Gladstone. Everyone regretted the closure of the meat-works. The loss of that industry must have been a terrible blow to the people who had been associated with it all their lives, and no doubt the hon. member for Port Curtis has had many anxious moments. However, if the promised development takes place it will put Gladstone somewhere back on the path of progress from which it was so ruthlessly taken.

Whilst Calcap will probably relegate a powerhouse at Blair Athol to the far distant future, I remind the Committee that recently research work has been carried out in relation to gas discoveries and its possibilities in this State. We have had a visit from Dr. C. R. Hetherington of Canada, who at my request, through the Minister, visited Blair Athol. Although no reports have been made to date, this statement was made—

“Dr. Hetherington said he did not hold that coal was ‘finished’ as a source of energy. ‘Coal has a very definite use in industry,’ he said, ‘particularly in electricity generation where it is often more economic than gas or oil.’”

Last year, I think, I referred in this Chamber to the fact that the Minister for Industrial Development was faced with a real poser. The Government had to choose from four or five sources of power. Everyone was thinking that steaming coal was on the way out. Dieselsation in the railways has been a very serious blow. However, Dr. Hetherington

said that there is a possibility that coal is more economic than gas or oil. I bring that point before the Committee. Of course, because of its location, Blair Athol is at a distinct disadvantage. At this stage I wish to refer to the question of natural gas. There have been natural gas discoveries in my electorate, at Rolleston and Arcturus Downs. Dr. Hetherington and those associated with him are at present reviewing an assessment of the quantities nature has stored for us, and the possibilities for the future.

In considering natural gas we have been more concerned with the development on the Darling Downs and farther west, because until recently this has been more spectacular. We know that opinions have been expressed in the Press from time to time as to where and when this gas will be used. Brisbane and Sydney have been suggested.

I took out some figures on this subject. The figures I have are as at 31 December, 1963. I find that in Queensland there are 16 gas companies with an aggregate net profit of £316,912. They serve 138,716 customers. For this service there are 1,821 miles of mains. The consumption exceeds 3,381 million cubic feet of 500 British Thermal Units of gas. I understand that there has been further interest in the possibility of expansion or extension of gas supplies in the State. At present there are 80 applications for 25 new gas franchises. Some of the new gas undertakings will distribute liquid petroleum gas. We are becoming familiar now with gas that is supplied in cylinders.

When we enter this new phase of natural gas we go back to Canada as the basis of our examination, realising that it took 17 years to develop the industry in that country. The pipeline there is known as the Trans-Canada Pipeline. It is 3,000 miles long, and, I think, 34 inches in diameter. It serves 5,000,000 people in Canada. Naturally we are aware of the many industries which are dependent upon that source of supply.

Have we, in Australia, the same set-up? It is hoped that we will have it in the future. An examination shows that to build a 300-mile pipeline from the Darling Downs to Brisbane would cost £4,000,000. There have been discoveries of natural gas south of Alice Springs, 1,400 miles inland. An estimate of £65,000,000 has been given for a pipeline from Alice Springs area to supply southern States. We are thinking, of course, progressively, and I believe that the use of these resources would be of great satisfaction to the people served by them.

We do not, however, watch progress without feelings of concern for those in the industries superseded. Consequently it is a matter for regret if the coal industry, which has been responsible for much development in Queensland—and with all the wonderful work performed by miners—has to give way to this new source of power.

I hope the Government will keep constantly in mind the statement of Dr. Hetherington that for the production of electricity there is still some use for coal. When I think of the quality of coal available in my electorate, I cannot help but urge that the erection some day of a great powerhouse on this site be kept in mind.

I should like to repeat also that although we live in a hinterland in Central Queensland, we are interested in development on the coast. I noticed in the departmental report a reference to the vegetable oil industry. The report states that further inquiries have been made during the year regarding the establishment of a vegetable oil extraction mill either in Central Queensland or on the Darling Downs and that all encouragement and assistance possible is being given, but to date no definite decision has been made.

A vegetable oil extraction mill to serve my area would no doubt be established at Rockhampton. I should like to emphasise that there has been in Central Queensland a very serious drought, and I sincerely hope that no premature assessment of the district will be made. The drought has lasted in some areas for over four years, and for varying periods in other parts. Consequently a true assessment cannot be made as yet.

I assure hon. members that in this district, particularly in the Central Highlands area, experiments in the growing of crops are continuing from year to year. A wonderful feature of that area is its ability to produce in variety. As time passes, it will be found that crops in Central Queensland useful for the vegetable-oil industry will increase, because farmers are constantly seeking the truth about their district. It is not as yet a proved area. Perhaps it could be said that its capacity to grow summer crops is pretty well known, but there has yet to be proof of success over a period of years with winter crops.

There is finally another matter in which I am sure the people of Rockhampton are interested. I refer to future possibilities of development in the cotton manufacturing industry. I am very pleased that some move has been made regarding the Nogo Gap dam in the approval to establish two pilot farms near Emerald to test what can be grown in this area under irrigation, with special reference to the production of raw cotton.

(Time expired.)

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) (9.10 p.m.): I represent an electorate whose future is bound up very closely with the industrial development of Queensland—the electorate of Nudgee. It contains the industrial area of Pinkenba and Meeandah, so I am particularly interested in industrial development that takes place in the Brisbane metropolitan area. I am prepared to play my part, no matter how small it might be, in fostering that

development and to add my small weight to the industrial development of the State as a whole.

The Minister has a very responsible job, and we expect from him not a little assistance in the development of Queensland. As a matter of fact, I should say he has time to give to his department that many other Ministers do not have to give to the departments under their control. According to the Estimates, his portfolio covers only three departments—Chief Office, Companies Registration, and Electricity Supply. In the Chief Office he has the services of three very able men—Sir David Muir, the Director of Industrial Development, whose salary is higher than that of the Minister, Mr. Colin Curtis, the Associate Director, and Mr. Young, the Director of Technical Services. If those three gentlemen are doing their job—I have no doubt whatever that they are—it leaves little for the Minister to do. If they are not doing the job that they were appointed to do, the Minister should inform the Committee and take some action, but I think he is quite satisfied that they are doing it.

Mr. Munro: On what you say, I should say that you do not know much about the ministerial responsibilities of any Ministers of the Crown, otherwise you would not say it.

Mr. MELLOY: Judging by your remarks, I should say you do not know much about it, either.

Mr. Houghton: Are you going to hang him, too?

Mr. MELLOY: If he likes to hang himself.

Mr. Munro: If ever you become a Minister you will know something about that.

Mr. MELLOY: When you have a man such as Sir David Muir in charge of a department, I think you can rest assured that the work will be done. I do not think you would have to go into it very much. You would, of course, dictate the policy to be followed by the departmental officers, but you would leave the responsibility for administering that policy to the officers appointed to these particular positions. It might be said that I am no supporter of the Minister for Labour and Industry, and it might be said with some justification; but as I went through the departmental reports in my file, it seemed to me that about every second report was directed to the Minister for Labour and Industry, whereas I could find only three reports pertaining to your portfolio. So if you are going to base the amount of work done on the number of departments under a Minister's control, the Minister for Labour and Industry is over-worked. In your department—I do not think you are any authority on industrial development—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hodges): Order! The hon. member is supposed to be addressing the Chair. The Chair has no departments. I ask him to address the Chair.

Mr. MELLOY: I accept your guidance, Mr. Hodges. I refer to the portfolio administered by the Minister. Again, if we move on to the Registrar of Companies we find that there, too, the Minister has a very able officer who would carry out the work in the department without any particular knowledge on the part of the Minister himself.

Mr. Munro: Just to short-circuit it a bit, I might help you by pointing out that every Minister has very able officers to assist him, and we gratefully acknowledge that.

Mr. MELLOY: I acknowledge that, also, but I should say that the ramifications of other departments are infinitely greater than those of the Minister's department.

Passing on to electricity supply, I think we have as chief of the State Electricity Commission one of the most able men the State could have and no doubt the Minister is content to leave to him the responsibility for the electrical undertakings of the State.

I do not want to be critical of the Minister in any way at all but I think that, as his department is under review, we should make certain statements just to keep him on the ball, as it were. He has shown a propensity for overseas trips to stimulate interest in Queensland industry and I am a bit doubtful as to the success of those trips because, after all, we have trade commissioners overseas who should be doing the work the Minister presumably goes overseas to do. When he returned from his recent visit he said he could not give any definite indication of what industries had been attracted to Queensland and that perhaps this would not be apparent for another three or four years. We will accept that, but I do not think we can give him three or four years to find out because, after another couple of years, he probably will not be a member of the Government.

I hear one hon. member opposite say that we are in the dark. If there is any darkness here, it is brought on by the activities of this Government. They have left Queensland in the dark as to their plans for the development of this State, particularly industrial development.

The Minister has stated that there has been no inclination to set about empire-building in the Department of Industrial Development. The Estimates provide for an increase of nearly 100 per cent. in the staff of Chief Office, increasing it from 18 to 33. If that is not empire-building, I think it is much akin to it. If the Minister is going to have this increase in staff to help him—particularly when one considers that this is apart from the work done by the Department of Labour and Industry, which

has a certain responsibility in regard to the development of Queensland, and by the Premier, who is also Minister for State Development—we are going to expect more results that we have seen in the last 12 months, during which this portfolio has been effective.

I want to pass on to the Registrar of Companies, who, I feel, is doing a good job in his department. I have had occasion several times to refer to him matters that have come up in relation to my electorate and he has attended to them to everybody's satisfaction. However, I suggest to the Minister that he takes a look at a matter I am going to raise about the registration of companies, namely, misrepresentation in advertising.

Recently I was listening to a radio programme and, when the time came for the commercial, a television firm came on with a certain offer. They told listeners that if the name of their present television set started with certain letters of the alphabet, and they were one of the first 20 to phone in within a certain time, for the sum of £10 their existing set would be replaced with a brand-new 23-inch 13-channel set. It did not sound genuine to me that you could get a new set for £10. I rang the company without telling them who I was and made inquiries about their advertisement. I said, "What is the catch in this offer?" The gentleman who answered said, "There is absolutely no catch in it at all. It is a perfectly genuine offer. If you have a television set whose name commences with a certain letter, and you are among the first 20 to answer this advertisement, we will place a brand-new TV set in your home." I said, "As a matter of fact, my set begins with one of the letters you mentioned. I will take advantage of that offer." He said, "Well, we will be very pleased if you do so." I said, "Am I or am I not in the first 20?" He said, "You are, sir; you are in the first five." I said "Good; I will accept that offer." He said, "When can we come to see you to finalise the deal?" I said, "Make a time yourself." He said, "We will come out on Tuesday at 2 o'clock." I said, "Very well, I will be there." He said, "Our representative will come out and fix the deal with you." I was at home at 2 o'clock and a gentleman came out. The first thing he did was to take a service contract out of his pocket. He said, "We will get down to the details. You just sign this here and we will fix the TV set up for you." I said, "What is this I am going to sign?" He said, "It is a four-years' service contract." I said, "What is that going to cost me?" He said, "That will cost you £80." I said, "Well, you can forget about it. I just wanted to find out what it was all about. You have satisfied me. What you are going to do is take my present TV set, which has recently had a new tube fitted. I paid £220 for it and I now assess the value at about £100. You are going to take that £100

set from me, another £80 for a service contract, and then you are going to take another £10 on top of that—approximately £190 in all. You are going to replace it with a brand-new TV set. All you are doing is giving me a TV set for £190 and four years' service for nothing."

Mr. Hanlon: They give letters to cover the names of all TV sets manufactured.

Mr. MELLOY: Yes.

Mr. Hanlon: It is the same as the numbers on the milk bottles. Every number given is the number used at that time on everybody's milk bottles.

Mr. MELLOY: That is true. I suggest that the Minister should have a look at this type of thing. A lot of people will come in on that sort of advertisement. It is complete misrepresentation. I had no intention of letting him have my set because it is a perfectly good one. The only way I had of finding out what was behind the offer was to get these people out.

I wish to say a little about the industrial development of the lower reaches of the Brisbane River. I am particularly interested in this area, as will be realised, because the new refinery on Bulwer Island is in my electorate, and many other new industries are being established in that area. That brings me to the subject of the provision of cross-river transportation facilities, in other words, a bridge or a tunnel. This is a matter that the Government, through the Minister, must do something about immediately, for in a few years the position will be very serious for industries at the mouth of the river. The refinery at Colmslie on the south side will need access to the airport because of the increasing traffic in air cargo, which must further increase. It will also need access to the wharves on the northern side of the river. Then there are the subsidiary industries as well which will spring up on the north and south sides. They will need access to the facilities on both sides of the river.

There has been much argument about the merits and demerits of tunnels and bridges, which I will not deal with at any length. The Government and the Minister for Industrial Development must look into this immediately because action in a few years will be too late. The Story Bridge—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN
(Mr. Hodges): Order! I take it that the hon. member will tie this up with industrial development.

Mr. MELLOY: Yes. I will come over the bridge to it. With the industries developing on the other side of the river, those on the north side will want to transport their products to the south side, and those on the south side will want to transport to the north. They will need facilities down-river which do not exist at present. With

the growing traffic in the city and the increase in public transport, the Story Bridge will be overtaxed in five years at the most, and there must be an alternative river crossing by then.

Mr. Ewan: What do you favour—a tunnel, or a bridge?

Mr. MELLOY: I think I can answer the hon. member. Estimates of cost seem to favour the construction of a bridge.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hodges): Order! I warn the hon. member that I have given him sufficient latitude. I ask him to tie up the discussion in relation to transport, bridges and tunnels with industrial development. I ask him to get on to the Estimates before the Committee.

Mr. MELLOY: Because of the large number of industries at Pinkenba it recently became necessary for the Government to make a special loan to the Brisbane City Council for the construction of a four-lane highway to that area.

Mr. Windsor: The road is not yet finished.

Mr. MELLOY: No, but the portion that has been finished has done a remarkable job to alleviate the chaos down there.

In furtherance of the remarks of the hon. member for Ithaca about takeovers, and work going south from Brisbane industries, I repeat that southern firms take over our retail stores and then import a large proportion of their goods from the southern factories. Much of their printing for brochures and catalogues no longer goes to the printing houses in Brisbane.

Mr. Duggan: For the last election the Liberal Party got all its election material from Sydney.

Mr. MELLOY: Yes, that is so. That is another matter to which the Government should direct its attention. Much of the printing normally carried out in Brisbane for the retail houses has been lost to the local printers. That is despite the fact that the Government initiated a "Buy Queensland Made" propaganda drive last year. The Government cannot have it both ways. If we are to encourage the establishment of local industries, we have to begin at home and make sure that the Department of Industrial Development will not only attract industries to the State but protect those that are already here.

The hon. member for Ithaca said that he knew of one factory employing over 100 people which closed down as the result of a take-over. It is part of the Government's job to protect such industries.

I again quote the hon. member for Ithaca, who praised the work performed by these people who have played a substantial part in the industrial development of this State. He said that they are 100 per cent.,

and second to none; therefore they cannot be blamed for wanting a fair share of the rewards of industry. I hope that the Minister will add his weight to any demands they make, and so assist in the industrial development of the State.

In his report the Director of Industrial Development said—

"Some staff strengthening in the industry publicity and promotion field will also be necessary."

There has been an increase of almost 100 per cent in the staff of the Chief Office. As well as seeking to establish the Ministry, the Minister should help those who are looking to this State, and make sure that the facilities they require are provided when they come here. It is no good going overseas and attracting industries if they are frustrated in their efforts to establish themselves when they get here because of a lack of interest on the part of the Government. Everything should be done to enable them to establish their industries once they have been attracted here. The policy of the Government seems to be that you do not feed bait to the fish once you have caught it.

There is some Crown land available at Pinkenba for the establishment of industry. I appeal to the Minister and to the Premier to do all that they can to provide land for these new industries. As the Premier knows, two firms in the last two weeks have asked for my assistance to secure land in that area. There is a shortage of Crown land at the mouth of the river. In many cases it would be most expensive reclamation but the Government must put its best foot forward. Industries will come here if the facilities are provided. That is one of the basic needs of new industry in any area. Industries must be given the necessary encouragement by the provision of land.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (9.34 p.m.): I find it a little difficult to enter the debate on this department's Estimates because I find the portfolio somewhat nebulous. It is hard to grasp its function and purposes, what it is for, and why it was created. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, it would appear that the functions of the portfolio have been distributed among the Minister for State Development, the Minister for Labour and Industry, and the Minister for Industrial Development.

Mr. O'Donnell: Would you call the Minister an Alice in Wonderland?

Mr. BENNETT: Would I call the Minister an Alice in Wonderland, I am asked. It does create some wonderment. I was inclined to think that perhaps this portfolio had been created as a pre-retirement portfolio.

Mr. Hanlon: Do you think it's a step towards the Senate for him?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, following closely in Mr. Morris's footsteps, as a slowing down from more arduous labours. There does not seem to be any real purpose in the portfolio. A close perusal of the report prepared after his trip overseas shows that the Minister did not appear to achieve very much. It is somewhat difficult to understand why the number in Cabinet was increased by one to make provision for this portfolio, for which it seemed that adequate provision had already been made.

Mr. Windsor: It would be all right if you could do your job as well as he can do his.

Mr. BENNETT: I am not the standard of comparison. I happen to be a comparatively insignificant back-bench member of the Opposition, and, when dealing with the Estimates of the Minister's department, I consider that I am entitled to make submissions independent of my own standard of efficiency. There would be little for any member to say when comparing himself with the hon. member for Ithaca; there would be no comparison at all.

In his speech this morning the Leader of the Opposition gave the impression that he considered the subject matter, if not the portfolio, to be of great importance to the State. He directed his remarks with the obvious intention of doing nothing to damage the reputation of the State and its ability to attract industry. Obviously he made an erudite submission with the clear intention of endeavouring to persuade people to develop this State further in the way in which Queenslanders want it developed.

Having made that valuable contribution, he was immediately taken to task by the hon. member for Roma who proceeded to work the parish pump and made little contribution to the debate. As a matter of fact, in my estimation the Leader of the Opposition elevated the standard of this debate to a level that perhaps was beyond the capacity of most members of this Parliament. After the hon. member for Roma spoke, I think that we all felt well qualified to enter the forum. He even said at one stage that he was not interested in where the money came from for industrial development. He was not interested in its source or what it could, or possibly will, eventually do for the development of Queensland. He made that manifestly obvious in his statements.

Let me say quite clearly that the Australian Labour Party is vitally concerned lest control of key assets and industries moves completely into non-Australian hands, with the result that the basic control of the economy shifts from Australia to the financial centres of New York, London, Paris, and certain Asian capitals as well.

Mr. Ewan: Don't be a shyster.

Mr. BENNETT: I listened very carefully to the hon. member for Roma. As a matter

of fact, I was disgusted with his statements. He speaks of legal practitioners in the usual colloquial terms.

Mr. Ewan: You are a shyster unless you quote me fully.

Mr. BENNETT: At least we practice our profession with sincerity in the forums in which we appear, and do not, like the hon. member for Roma, endeavour to run grazing properties from the South Coast.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hodges): Order!

Mr. Ewan: You are a prevaricator, that is what you are.

Mr. BENNETT: Before the hon. member for Roma lowered the standard of the debate, I expected that he would indicate to hon. members some of the difficulties that are at present besetting the Queensland Cabinet's efforts in the field of industrial development. I expected that, because of his knowledge of what goes on in his party circles, he would tell us something about the dispute—it is a very live dispute—that exists between the deputy leader of the Government (the Minister for Industrial Development) and the Minister for Mines and Main Roads, Mr. Evans, in relation to this very matter of industrial development. As members of Parliament, we know that there is great antagonism between the two Ministers on matters of departmental policy. We know that the Minister for Industrial Development has said that it does not necessarily mean that the refining of our indigenous crude oil will be carried out in Queensland. He has made it clear in parliamentary circles and Cabinet circles that he is not particularly worried about where it is refined. On the other hand, the Minister for Mines, whose portfolio surely overlaps to some extent the portfolio under discussion, has said—I quote him—

"I have no doubt that Queensland oil will be refined in Queensland. I am sure the majority of my Cabinet colleagues hold the same view. Any other arrangement would be ridiculous."

They are rather strong terms from the Minister for Mines, who has used his influence, his power and his position to deny the claims on policy made by the Minister for Industrial Development. I have no doubt that to some extent, anyway, the respective Ministers have differing views on this particular policy. I know, too, that their antagonism and the views that they have expressed in opposition to each other have been motivated by political differences in relation to the Country Party and the Liberal Party. The Minister for Industrial Development is saying, "We really do not care who refines our oil. It can be done by non-Australian hands", to use an expression to which I referred previously. On the other

hand, the Minister for Mines is saying quite clearly and categorically that it must, and will, be done in Queensland. I think that the Minister for Industrial Development, in replying to this debate, should clarify the position and state whether he agrees with his colleague the Minister for Mines, whether he has changed his personal attitude, and whether he accepts that industries developed in Queensland should remain under the control of Queenslanders.

I must also mention that the claim made not so very long ago by the hon. member for Rockhampton South to the effect that Central Queensland was getting a murderously raw deal from this State Government has not been suitably dealt with by the Minister for Industrial Development since he assumed this portfolio. I am wondering whether the Minister still denies the claim made by the hon. member for Rockhampton South to that effect, whether the policy of the Government has been altered since that claim was made, or whether the hon. member for Rockhampton South has modified his claim because of political developments since that time.

Mr. Pilbeam: No. I am prepared to do something that you are not prepared to do, and that is face up to truths.

Mr. BENNETT: I suppose the hon. member has faced up to many things in his day that I would not have been proud to face up to.

Mr. Pilbeam: Only a coward would make such a remark under privilege.

Mr. BENNETT: For instance, he faced up to being a Liberal candidate after signing a pledge that he would not embarrass his own party colleagues.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member for Roma claimed that he would do his utmost to promote industrial development in this State. Not so long ago the Roma Town Council applied to the Government for a subsidy to purchase plant that could be used in tests for the exploitation of Roma's natural gas.

Mr. Ewan: You are a bit behind the times.

Mr. BENNETT: I may be a bit behind the times, but it is true, nevertheless. The Roma Town Council was prepared to bear the whole of the expense if the tests proved successful, but its application was rejected.

Mr. Hanlon: They did not mind guaranteeing Thiess-Peabody.

Mr. BENNETT: As the hon. member for Barooka says, the Government did not mind guaranteeing Thiess-Peabody. There again, that is what might be termed guaranteeing a firm that did not have completely Australian interests.

Mr. Ewan: What utter rot.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member need not listen if he thinks it is utter rot.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the hon. member that he need not listen, either.

Mr. BENNETT: In keeping with parliamentary practice I am perfectly entitled to listen if I want to and to deal with what is said if I want to.

The activities of the Government in relation to industrial development do not appear to be completely harmonious as among themselves. I pointed out by way of interjection when the Minister was introducing these Estimates that in his expressed desire for harmony in the industrial field to promote industrial development has not been completely successful. I should like to repeat briefly the claims I made last Thursday evening in the Budget debate, namely, that when a man holding a responsible position in the community, particularly in community industrial life—I refer to the president of the Trades and Labour Council—asks a question, I believe that the Premier should answer it. I further believe that if the question is left unanswered one can only come to the conclusion that, were the Premier to answer it, the answer would be embarrassing to his Government.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the hon. member that we are not discussing the Premier's Estimates. We are dealing with industrial development.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not know whether you were here, Mr. Hooper, when the Minister was introducing his Estimates. He dealt in great detail and for some considerable time with industrial peace and the necessity for industrial peace in promoting the welfare of the State. It was during the course of those observations that I made my interjection, which was dealt with by the Minister. I am saying that I have the right to make my observations on his remarks about industrial peace. Put it this way, if you want it this way, Mr. Hooper: if the Premier did not deal with the query, then the Minister for Industrial Development should have dealt with it. As a lawyer and a parliamentarian I say that it is a serious allegation to suggest that the Industrial Commission has pronounced on at least three occasions that it is futile, in fact, dishonest, to appear before it unless an agreement has been reached between employer and employee. If it is true, it is a shocking indictment of the Industrial Commission. It is something which must surely undermine the public's respect for the Commission—certainly the unions' respect for it and the respect of those advocates who appear before it from time to time. If that observation or pronouncement was made by the Commission it was completely improper for the Commission to have made it, and I have no hesitation in saying so. If the Commission did not say it, it behaves some

responsible Minister to clarify the position for Queenslanders. Quite frankly, as a lawyer and one who respects the authority of all courts, and one who would sincerely hope that that respect is maintained, I would say that people cannot be blamed for losing their respect for the Industrial Commission unless that point is clarified.

Mr. Ewan interjected.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member for Roma interjects about the National Hotel. Time would not permit me to reveal——

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would not permit you, either.

Mr. BENNETT: I appreciate that. I was wondering whether the hon. member was one of the missing witnesses.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BENNETT: The portfolio of Industrial Development is closely related with the future of Australia. Australia's future prosperity depends upon our ability to expand her trade and her existing markets, and to find and develop new ones. After a temporary flurry generated by Britain's abortive attempt last year to enter the European Common Market, the Menzies' Government—and I quote an authority much more qualified than I—" . . . the Menzies Government has quickly returned to its customary lethargy." I believe that, in debating these Estimates we should consider the Federal Government's attitude to industrial development, because Australia's industrial development is definitely co-related with our own industrial development. This short-sighted dependence on overseas capital has obscured the fact that Australia is simply not paying her way, and neither is Queensland. I have already pointed out that the Queensland debt has reached staggering proportions.

I do not know that the Treasurer has given this Parliament any satisfactory explanation as to the Government's method of dealing with the debt, which is growing to record proportions year by year. Under a Federal Liberal-Country Party Government, and for some years under a State Country-Liberal Government, the national debt has grown out of all proportions. The Federal Treasurer and the State Treasurer have given us no indication whatever as to the arrangements that have been made to meet that debt.

One may well ask: what has this Government done for the North? Let us take the net value of industrial production for the year.

At 9.55 p.m., under Standing Order No. 307 and Sessional Order agreed to by the House on 14 October, progress was reported.

The House adjourned at 9.56 p.m.