

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 7 SEPTEMBER 1965**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

**TUESDAY, 7 SEPTEMBER, 1965**

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

**CENTENARY OF LAYING OF FOUNDATION STONE OF PARLIAMENT HOUSE.**

Mr. SPEAKER: At 4 o'clock p.m. on Wednesday, 14 July, 1965, His Excellency the Administrator of the Government of the State, Sir Alan James Mansfield, K.C.M.G., unveiled a plaque to commemorate the centenary of the laying of the foundation stone of Parliament House. For record purposes I lay upon the table of the House a copy of the speeches delivered on that occasion, together with photographs of the plaque.

Whereupon the paper and photographs were laid upon the table of the House.

**QUESTIONS**

NEW GOLF COURSE LEASE, TOWNSVILLE.—  
Mr. Aikens, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Lands,—

(1) In reply to Questions in this House, did he state that some months ago a large area of the Town Common at Townsville had been leased to a Golf Club for a very small rental?

(2) Has his attention been drawn to an advertisement appearing in the *Townsville Daily Bulletin* of August 17, asking persons interested in the formation of a "Second Golf Club" in Townsville to attend a public meeting to be held in the Town Hall on September 14 next?

(3) If so, will he consider alienating other large areas of Crown land on the assumption that some organisation or club will be formed in the future to assume the responsibility of such alienation?

*Answer:—*

(1 to 3) "In answer to the Honourable Member's Question, the situation, stripped of all colour which the Honourable Member has attempted to lend to this transaction, is simply that the negotiations for the proposed new golf course lease were carried out with my department by the North Queensland Golf Association.

That association is constituted by affiliated clubs covering a wide area of northern and north-western Queensland. My department has concluded that the proposed lease should be held not by that association of clubs but by a particular local club properly constituted to carry out the developmental and improvement conditions of the proposed lease. In our experience we considered that it was preferable and more desirable to have control localized in Townsville rather than in the name of the association. We advised the North Queensland Golf Association of our views and to comply with our wishes the association has called the public meeting referred to by the Honourable Member in order that interested citizens of Townsville may attend and participate in the proper constitution of the new club which will control and manage the new golf course. In spite of the inference contained in the Honourable Member's Question, I point out that a lease which contains a condition that the land comprised therein may be resumed without payment of compensation on the giving of six months' notice, does not constitute an alienation. In effect we are allowing a small part of a 9,000 acre reserve to be cleaned up and used by a body interested in healthy outdoor sport until such time as the area is required for expansion of the city of Townsville. Furthermore, the calling of the special meeting is in conformity with departmental requirements and not on the basis of any assumption alleged by the Honourable Member."

**TRANSPORT DRIVERS CONVICTED OF MAIN ROADS BREACHES.**—Mr. Duggan, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Mines,—

(1) During the six months ended July 31, 1965, how many transport drivers have been sentenced to terms of imprisonment for overloading breaches of the Main Roads Acts?

(2) How many of such transport operators were (a) owner-drivers and (b) employee drivers?

(3) What was the maximum term of imprisonment imposed?

*Answers:—*

(1) "None."

(2 and 3) "See answer to (1)."

**PAYMENTS TO GROWERS BY GIN GIN SUGAR MILL.**—Mr. Davies for Mr. Byrne, pursuant to notice, asked The Treasurer,—

(1) Did the Gin Gin sugar mill not make payment to its suppliers of sugar cane on the due date, viz. August 20, 1965, and, if not, has payment yet been made?

(2) Has the Government taken any action to ensure that the sugar mill crushes the 1965 crop and will make payment to canegrowers for all cane supplied?

*Answers:—*

(1) "There was a hold-up in the payment referred to for causes that I am satisfied were warranted. The delay has since been overtaken."

(2) "The Government has joined in discussions with a view to ensuring that the mill in question will be able to complete its crushing of the 1965 crop. I have reason to believe that this crushing will be completed. The full details are not settled to the point at which a public statement can be made."

**TRAFFIC BREACHES BY BRISBANE TAXI DRIVERS.**—Mr. Davies for Mr. Graham, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Mines,—

How many taxi drivers operating in the City of Brisbane have been charged with breaches of the Traffic Acts in the years 1963 and 1964 and in 1965 to date?

*Answer:—*

"The numbers of charges of breaches of the Traffic Acts preferred at Brisbane against taxi drivers were:—In 1963, 593; in 1964, 790; in 1965 (to April 30), 270."

**LICENSING AND PERMIT FEES PAID BY BRISBANE CITY COUNCIL.**—Mr. Duggan, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport,—

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, what was the total passenger service license or permit fees paid by the Brisbane City Council in respect of motor or service omnibuses and trolley buses?

*Answer:—*

"The present system of licensing and permit fees payable by the Brisbane City Council to the State Transport Department was introduced by a Labor Government, and for the twelve months ended June 30, 1957—the last year of Labor administration—was £32,141. No new fees have been imposed by the present Government—in fact some have been reduced—but because of increased volume of revenue the volume of fees has correspondingly increased to £45,568 for the twelve months ended June 30, 1965. However, under the present Government, the Brisbane City Council now receives a proportion of the charges collected under "The Roads (Contribution to Maintenance) Acts," and for the year ended June 30, 1965, the State paid the Brisbane City Council £187,636."

**MOTOR REGISTRATION FEES PAID BY BRISBANE CITY COUNCIL.**—Mr. Duggan, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Mines,—

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, what were the total registration fees paid by the Brisbane City Council in respect of motor or service omnibuses?

*Answer:—*

“£17,140 4s.”

**“ON-THE-SPOT” TICKETS FOR TRAFFIC BREACHES.**—Mr. Lloyd, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) How many “On-the-spot” tickets have been issued in Brisbane for traffic breaches as at midnight on September 3, 1965?

(2) In how many cases have the accused offenders (a) elected to go to Court and (b) not paid the fine?

(3) Are police officers stationed at suburban and country stations who have been issued with these tickets (a) paid the usual allowance for police officers on traffic duty and (b) trained in the duties of policing traffic regulations and of checking the mechanical efficiency of a motor vehicle?

*Answers:—*

(1) “1,992.”

(2) “It is not possible at this juncture to answer this question as the first period of twenty-one days in which to pay the prescribed penalty expired at midnight on 6th instant and this period, of course, applied only to notices issued ‘On the spot’ on August 16, 1965, the day the system commenced.”

(3) “(a) Members of the Police Force stationed at suburban and country stations who have been issued with books of Traffic Offence Notices and who, prior to the institution of this system, did not qualify for the traffic allowance are not being paid this allowance simply on the basis that they have been issued with books of these new Traffic Offence Notices. (b) The Traffic Acts provide that every member of the Police Force shall at all times cause the provisions of those Acts to be observed and the training of Police is and always has been directed to ensuring that they possess the necessary knowledge to carry out the duties required of them by those Acts. Police instruction is not directed to the finer and expert aspects of mechanical efficiency of motor vehicles but during the course of their training as recruits, Police are instructed by a qualified mechanic on the matter of the maintenance and care of motor vehicles. In addition they are either taught the correct method of driving a motor vehicle or are tested as to their ability to so correctly drive a motor vehicle. A Motor Car

Manual and a Motor Cycle Manual, both specially printed by the Police Department for the guidance of members of the Police Force in any duties they may have to perform in relation to motor vehicles, are held at every police station in Queensland. Police, incidentally, for more than thirty years, have been appointed under the Main Roads Acts to examine vehicles prior to registration.”

**BRISBANE CITY COUNCIL POLICY ON RETENTION OF TRAMS.**—Mr. Knox, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

In view of the decision of the Queensland Central Executive of the Australian Labor Party to muzzle the elected aldermen of the Brisbane City Council in regard to policy concerning the future of Brisbane trams, what information has he received from the Brisbane City Council concerning this policy? If no information has been received from the Brisbane City Council, has any been received from the Queensland Central Executive of the Australian Labor Party?

*Answer:—*

“I have received no intimation from the Brisbane City Council on its policy on the future of trams in Brisbane. Neither have I had any communication from the Queensland Central Executive of the Australian Labor Party.”

**NATIONAL SERVICE TRAINING CALL-UP.**—Mr. Newton, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

(1) What is the number of persons called up for National Service Training from all Government Departments as at August 31, 1965?

(2) What is the number of apprentices called up for National Service Training in this State, who have not completed their apprenticeship indentures as at the same date?

(3) What is being done by the Government to protect these persons’ superannuation, long service leave and other entitlements and their positions?

(4) What arrangements are being made for apprentices to complete their indentures after completing their National Service Training?

*Answers:—*

(1) “There were thirty (30) persons called up for National Service from all government departments as at August 31, 1965.”

(2) “I have been informed that the National Service Training of apprentices who might have been called up for such training is deferred until they complete their period of apprenticeship.”

(3) “The provisions of the Commonwealth Defence (Re-establishment) Act of 1965 protect the rights of National Service

trainees with respect to re-instatement in employment and the recognition of National Service for leave and superannuation purposes."

(4) "See answer to No. (2)."

**S.R.A. READING LABORATORIES AND CUISENAIRE METHOD OF TEACHING MATHEMATICS.**—Mr. Sherrington, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

In view of the Department's decision to approve of the use of the S.R.A. Reading Laboratory and the Cuisenaire method of teaching mathematics on a subsidised basis—

(1) Has a full investigation been held into the advantages or otherwise of these methods being a useful adjunct to teaching?

(2) If so, is it intended to inculcate these methods as standard teaching practice?

(3) If these have been proved to be useful, should they be available to all children instead of being available only to schools whose Parents and Citizens' Organisations are prepared to purchase them?

(4) Under the present system of subsidising the purchase of these laboratories, does the Department intend to supply the students' record books or failing this is it intended to subsidise them?

*Answers:—*

"Two misunderstandings on the part of the Honourable Member for Salisbury need first to be corrected. There has been no recent change in policy regarding the supply of S.R.A. Reading Laboratories. These have been provided on a subsidy basis to Queensland schools for a number of years. The Cuisenaire materials have never been subsidised. From the beginning of 1966 they will be supplied to all State schools using this method of teaching mathematics."

(1) "Several research investigations in Queensland, in other States and overseas have been carried out into both the use of Reading Laboratories and Cuisenaire material. In Bulletin 21 of the Research and Guidance Branch, Two Studies in Reading, the results of one investigation into the effectiveness of the S.R.A. Reading Laboratory are reported. In Bulletin 27 of the Research and Guidance Branch, Studies in Primary School Mathematics, the results of an evaluation of the Cuisenaire method are reported. The findings of these studies together with those from other States and the favourable reactions of teachers associated with the use of the methods provide ample evidence of their value in the classroom."

(2) "It is not intended to prescribe the use of S.R.A. Laboratories in all schools. This is but one of a number of effective aids to reading improvement. It is left to

the schools to determine the aids and methods they wish to use. The new primary mathematics syllabus at present under consideration includes the use of structured materials such as Cuisenaire. In view of the very large number of schools wishing to introduce this method, the Government has decided, as indicated above, to supply the material from the beginning of next year."

(3) "See (2) above."

(4) "The laboratories are subsidised since they are not expendable and remain in the school for use by classes from year to year. The student record books are the personal property of the students and are accordingly neither supplied nor subsidised."

**NEW SITE FOR CAROLE PARK STATE SCHOOL.**—Mr. Sherrington, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

In view of the answer given by the Minister for Industrial Development relative to the Queensfield Industrial Estate, Wacol, in which he said, *inter alia*, that receivers were appointed in respect of both Savoy Corporation Ltd. and Industrial Estates Qld. Pty. Ltd., has any decision been made regarding the re-siting of Carole Park State school, and, if not, what is intended shall be done with the additional school site which the Government resumed for that purpose?

*Answer:—*

"No decision has yet been made as to whether the Carole Park State School building will be removed to the new site. The new school site will be retained until the future of the surrounding area can definitely be determined."

**HOUSING COMMISSION HOUSES, ZILLMERE, CHERMSIDE AND STAFFORD.**—Mr. Melloy, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Works,—

How many Housing Commission rental houses were there in the Zillmere, Cherm-side and Stafford areas, respectively, at June 30 in each year from 1960 to 1965?

*Answer:—*

"The numbers of State rental houses in these suburbs at the respective dates were—

"At

June 30	Zillmere	Cherm-side	Stafford
1960	770	529	682
1961	759	532	721
1962	742	524	725
1963	730	522	738
1964	709	511	839
1965	686	503	883"

ADMINISTRATION BLOCK, BANYO HIGH SCHOOL.—Mr. Melloy, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

As the site which was to be occupied by the new administration block at the Banyo High School is now being used for the construction of the new Science block, where will the administration block be located and when is construction likely to commence?

*Answer:—*

“Present intentions are to locate the administration block proposed for the Banyo State High School in front of the accommodation now being used for administration purposes, i.e., in that portion of the grounds near the junction of Tufnell and Northgate Roads. No indication can be given at this juncture as to when funds will be available to permit construction on this new block to commence.”

MAINTENANCE OF HOUSING COMMISSION HOUSES IN METROPOLITAN AREA.—Mr. Melloy, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Works,—

(1) Further to his Answer to my Question on August 25, what are the occupations of the thirty-one employees engaged on maintenance of Housing Commission houses in North Brisbane suburbs?

(2) Are any of these employees required to do any work other than maintenance of North Brisbane houses? If so, what is this work and to what extent?

(3) How many employees are engaged on maintenance work on Commission rental houses for the whole of the metropolitan area?

*Answers:—*

(1) “Carpenters, 22; plumbers, 3; electricians, 3; drainer, 1; painters, 2.”

(2) “These employees would be fully occupied with maintenance of North Brisbane houses with the exception of the electricians, drainer and painters who could be occupied on new construction to the extent of 10 per cent., 25 per cent., and 50 per cent. of their times, respectively.”

(3) “103 for the metropolitan area which includes Ipswich. Additional maintenance is carried out by contract in same area.”

HYDRO MINERAL DEVELOPMENT LTD.—Mr. Aikens, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Mines,—

(1) What mining leases are or were held by a company known as Hydro Mineral Development Ltd.?

(2) Is it a fact, as stated in the director's report, that for the period ended September 30, 1964, the company produced only thirty-nine tons of metallic copper and a consolidated nett loss of £10,858 was incurred and, if so, how long was the period?

(3) Has this company been taken over by another company known as VAM Ltd. and, if so, on what terms?

(4) Was a sixty-six square miles of prospecting area in the Mt. Oxide area recently granted to Hydro Mineral Development Ltd. and, if so, under what conditions?

(5) Have Mount Isa Mines Ltd. and Noranda Mines Ltd. of Canada been active in exploration work on the Mt. Cuthbert and Dugald River leases, respectively, held by this company and, if so, to what extent and under what conditions?

(6) Is this company negotiating with another company called Kennicott Copper with regard to work on the Mt. Oxide leases held by the company?

(7) Did Hydro Mineral Development Ltd. sell twenty per centum of its contract with Noranda Mines Ltd. of Canada in respect of the Dugald River leases to another company called Australian Development N.L. and, if so, under what terms and conditions?

(8) Where is the registered office of Hydro Mineral Development Ltd. and who are its directors?

(9) If any leases and/or prospecting areas were granted to the company, was any prior investigation made into (a) the manner in which the company's capital was raised or (b) the standing or reputation of its directors?

(10) Are the shares of Hydro Mineral Development Ltd. listed on any Stock Exchange?

*Answers:—*

(1) “(a) Mineral Lease Applications Nos. 5083, 5451, 5493, 5672, 5673 and 5674, Cloncurry, and Mineral Lease Applications Nos. 5502, 5518 and 5567, Mt. Isa. (b) It also held Authority to Prospect No. 220 M., on Cape York, which has now expired. (c) It currently holds Authority to Prospect No. 271 M. of 66 square miles in the Mt. Oxide (Mt. Isa) area. (d) It holds Authority to Prospect No. 242 M. as a joint tenant with the Canadian Company, Noranda Exploration Limited (No Personal Liability), in the Dugald River (Cloncurry) area.”

(2) “Advices from the Company confirm the production figure quoted for the nine months ended September 30, 1964.”

(3) "In September 1961, VAM Ltd. acquired some 50 per cent. of the shares and control of the Company. As at June last VAM Ltd. has acquired some 94 per cent. of the shares."

(4) "See reply to (1) (d). The transfer of this 50 per cent. interest to Noranda was approved last January."

(5) "See reply to (4). The Department has no knowledge of any association between Mount Isa Mines Limited and the Company."

(6) "It is understood negotiations are proceeding with the American Company, Kennecott Exploration (Australia) Pty. Ltd. and the Company in respect to Authority to Prospect No. 271 M. However, before these can be finalised they must be approved by me."

(7) "Australian Development N.L., the well known gold producer of Nobles Nob, Tennant Creek, is associated with the Company in connection with its interest in Authority to Prospect No. 242 M. and an agreement relating to the same is about to be submitted to me for consideration. This also is subject to my approval."

(8) "363 Pitt Street, Sydney. F. A. Close (chairman), G. E. Rohan, F. Binns and B. E. Capper."

(9) "The Company being registered in Queensland is competent to apply for Mineral Leases, which it has done. Prior to granting its first Authority to Prospect (No. 220 M.) in mid-1963, appropriate enquiries were made."

(10) "No."

**DOCTORS AND NURSING STAFF IN PUBLIC HOSPITALS.**—Mr. Bromley, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health,—

(1) How many doctors are employed in (a) Princess Alexandra Hospital, (b) Brisbane General Hospital and (c) Redcliffe Hospital?

(2) What is the total number of (a) doctors, (b) matrons, (c) sisters and (d) nurses in their various years, employed in all the hospitals and ancillary services controlled by hospitals boards and the Government throughout the State?

(3) How many nurses have left their employment in public hospitals during the years 1963-1964 and 1964-1965?

(4) Is any overtime worked by doctors or nursing staff in general at the Brisbane General or the Princess Alexandra Hospital? If so, what is its extent and do they receive remuneration in accordance with their salaries or award wages?

**Answers:—**

(1) "The numbers of doctors employed are as follows:—(a) Princess Alexandra Hospital—Full time—General Hospital, 64; Pathology, 10. Part time—General Hospital 80; Pathology, 1. (b) Brisbane Hospital—Full time—General Hospital, 96; Children's Hospital, 17; Women's Hospital, 8; Pathology, 11. Part time—General Hospital, 86; Children's Hospital, 29; Women's Hospital, 25; Pathology, 7. (c) Redcliffe Hospital—Full time, 2; Part time, 1."

(2) "(a) The total average numbers of the staffs employed during the year 1964-1965 in the hospitals and ancillary services controlled by hospitals boards were—doctors, 703; matrons, 146; sisters, 1,306; nurses, 3,848. (b) As at June 30, 1965, the numbers employed in sub-departments and institutions under the control of my department were—Doctors—Full time, 61; Part time, 70; matrons and assistant matrons, 29; sisters, 280; nurses (including male and female assistants and trainee nurses), 1,255. Statistics showing the numbers of nurses in their various years are not readily available."

(3) "The records are compiled in relation to the calendar year. During 1963 there was a total of 691 student nurses who left their employment in public hospitals and during 1964 the number was 757. The total student enrolments for these years were 3,908 and 4,147 respectively. The following reasons for leaving in respect to the 757 who left during 1964 were recorded—Marriage, 130; examination failure, 62; health reasons, 65; domestic reasons, 40; personal reasons, 143; not suited for nursing, 115; homesick, 9; unsettled or unhappy, 6; can't study, 9; disinterested, 2; left district, 23; transfer, 14; transfer to assistant in nursing, 4; train elsewhere, 10; another position, 44; mis-demeanour, 2; retired or dismissed, 30; asked to discontinue, 4; no reason given, 10; left without notice, 35; total, 757. The number who left their employment in 1964 represents 18.25 per cent. of the total enrolment which is less than the turnover rate for female employees generally."

(4) "The Manager of the Hospitals Boards concerned has advised that a record of the actual time worked by the doctors has not been kept and that the salary classification structure applicable to the medical staffs of the Brisbane General Hospital and Princess Alexandra Hospital contains a quantum for additional hours of duty which may be required of them in the normal course of the treatment of the sick. This flexibility is essential in meeting the varying situations which may arise in any large hospital. Overtime is worked by nursing staff at both hospitals for which they are paid in accordance with the provisions of the award. For the fortnight ended July 25, 1965, at the Brisbane Hospital 33 sisters worked an average of 10 hours per week overtime and 236

untrained nursing staff an average of 6 hours per week. At Princess Alexandra Hospital over the same period 43 sisters worked an average of 5½ hours per week and 191 untrained nursing staff an average of 6 hours per week overtime."

**FALSE ADVERTISING IN SALES PROMOTION.**

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

As it is more and more obvious that increasing odious practices of advertising gimmicks are being used to promote sales to the public, will he consider a Government-sponsored consumers' protection council or have established an advisory body for this purpose within his Department?

*Answer:—*

"Certain legislative provisions already exist under The Factories and Shops Acts concerning the question of false advertising, and these are identical with those which operated under the previous Labour Government. 'The Trade Coupons Acts,' which operated also under the previous Labor Government, deal with the question of the gift of goods being contingent on the sale of an article. All advertisements relating to the sale of goods are closely scanned daily by the Chief Inspector of Factories and Shops, bearing in mind the provisions of these Acts. However, as I have already stated in this House, it is easy to speak in generalities. Advice is to the effect that, before any legal action can be taken, specific evidence must be available that any such advertising is, in fact, false. Should this evidence be forthcoming, I shall be only too happy, as I have repeatedly stated, to have such cases immediately investigated. In addition, I must point out that I cannot accept the inference made by the Honourable Member that the public generally is gullible, and not selective in the purchases made by it. Furthermore, it is apparent that the Honourable Member has never heard of the age-old doctrine of *caveat emptor*—'Let the buyer beware'."

**PAROLE AND PROBATION OFFICERS.—**Mr. Bromley, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Justice,—

How many parole and probation officers are employed by the Department under his control, what are their duties, and what is the number of parolees under each officer's care?

*Answer:—*

"The Chief Probation Officer, 7 male Probation Officers, and 1 female Probation Officer who is employed part-time, are stationed at Brisbane, and 1 male Probation Officer is stationed at Townsville. Their duties are as follows:—In respect of

probation: (a) To prepare pre-sentence reports as directed by the Chief Probation Officer; (b) To carry out directions of the court in relation to the probation order; (c) To supervise persons placed on probation as assigned by the Chief Probation Officer; (d) To maintain case records and statistics as required by the Chief Probation Officer; (e) To keep a register in the form of Form 'E' of the Schedule to the Regulations; (f) To perform such other duties as directed by the Chief Probation Officer. In respect of parole: (i) To supervise persons released on parole as assigned by the Parole Board; (ii) To carry out the directions of the Parole Board in relation to any parole order; (iii) To maintain case records and statistics as required by the Under Secretary; (iv) To investigate and make reports to the Parole Board on the employment available to each prisoner applying for release on parole; (v) To perform such other duties as directed by the Under Secretary. The number of probationers and parolees under each officer's care is as follows:—

	Pro- bationers	Parolees	Total
Probation Officer—			
G. T. Cornell ..	89	1	90
F. H. Flynn ..	69	10	79
P. J. Hickey ..	79	5	84
M. R. McCouat (Townsville) ..	44	6	50
V. C. Moffatt ..	62	13	75
G. J. Mott ..	64	9	73
J. W. Riggs ..	70	6	76
H. L. Smallbone ..	77	7	84
Female Probation Officer—			
Mrs. G. E. Hamlyn- Harris .. ..	53	1	54

**IRRIGATION WORKS, MAREEBA AREA.—**Mr. Diplock for Mr. Adair, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Local Government,—

What plans have the Irrigation Department in hand for work to be carried out in the Mareeba district in this financial year and what amount of money is to be expended in the area?

*Answer:—*

"The actual total amount of work done on the Mareeba-Dimbulah Project in 1965-1966 will depend on the funds appropriated by Parliament for this purpose. Subject to the actual appropriation being determined, the principal works planned to be completed in the Mareeba-Dimbulah Irrigation Area during 1965-1966 are the completion of permanent irrigation works south of Gorge Creek, the Syphon crossing Gorge Creek, a section of main channel and a small amount of distribution works beyond the Gorge Creek syphon. In addition, a further 200 acres of land will be prepared and planted to pastures in the experimental work being done on irrigated production from the Arriga type soils in the area."

THURSDAY ISLAND WATER SUPPLY.—Mr. Diplock for Mr. Adair, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Local Government,—

As residents of Thursday Island have expressed concern at the limited supply of water on the Island causing severe rationing yearly, will he have the administrator fully investigate the possibility of obtaining a permanent supply from Horn Island?

*Answer:—*

“The undertaking of a scheme as proposed would be beyond the economic ability of the Council.”

PENINSULA DEVELOPMENTAL ROAD.—Mr. Diplock for Mr. Adair, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Mines,—

What plans have the Main Roads Department in hand for further road construction on the Mulligan main road north of Laura in this financial year?

*Answer:—*

“Works with an estimated expenditure of £35,000 are programmed for the section of the Peninsula Developmental Road during the current financial year. These comprise a bridge over the Laura River just north of Laura for which plans are now practically completed, forming and gravelling sections between the 21-Mile and the 38-Mile and forming and gravelling sections between 68-Mile and 92-Mile.”

RAILWAY BOOKING OFFICE, CAIRNS.—Mr. R. Jones, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport,—

Will he take action to have the Railway booking office, Cairns, remain open until 9 p.m. in order to allow tourists and citizens equal facility and convenience with other travel agencies for rail reservations and arrangements to be made?

*Answer:—*

“The matter is being examined.”

RAILWAY CLERICAL STAFF, CAIRNS.—Mr. R. Jones, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport,—

(1) How many clerks were employed by the Railway Department, Cairns, before the Ford, Bacon and Davis Report and how many are employed at the present time and in what branches?

(2) Is it intended to further reduce the clerical staff there in the near future?

*Answers:—*

(1) “Prior to the Report, Administrative Branch, 42; Traffic, 36; Locomotive Workshops, 1; total, 79. As at September 2, 1965, Administrative Branch, 34; Traffic, 35; Locomotive Workshops, 1, total, 70.”

(2) “The clerical staff at Cairns will be maintained at a strength sufficient to cope efficiently with the business to be dealt with.”

CAIRNS BASE HOSPITAL STAFF.—Mr. R. Jones, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health,—

(1) Was the Cairns Base Hospital without a matron for two years prior to the appointment of the present matron because no one would take the job?

(2) What was the turnover of staff in this hospital over this period?

(3) How many doctors, nursing staff and other employees of the hospital have resigned during the past two years?

*Answer:—*

(1 to 3) “The Cairns Hospitals Board, in common with all hospital authorities, and indeed, all employers, is, during this time of full employment, finding difficulty in recruiting and retaining nursing staff. This is particularly so in recognised tourist areas to which trained personnel in various callings go in winter for working holidays. It is an indisputable fact that there are just not enough nurses to fill all nursing positions in Australia. To sort out one hospital and publish its staff turnover figures can do grave harm to that hospital by diverting staff that might otherwise apply for employment. I feel sure that the Honourable Member for Cairns has the interests of the Cairns Hospital at heart and would not wish to prejudice it by creating special difficulties for it in this way in the matter of staff recruitment. I might mention for the information of the Honourable Member that the Senior Medical Officer and the Senior Inspector of Hospitals who visited Cairns last week have reported that, in their opinion, there appears to be a very good atmosphere in the hospital. Generally, relations amongst the staff and between the staff and the administration are cordial and happy.”

RESIDENCES FOR PUBLIC SERVANTS, TOWNSVILLE.—Mr. Tucker, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Works,—

How many Departmental homes for teachers and State public servants have been constructed in Townsville during the years 1962-1963, 1963-1964 and 1964-1965?

*Answer:—*

“During the three-year period to June 30, 1965, eleven (11) residences were erected in Townsville for teachers and State public servants. One (1) residence for a teacher and six (6) residences for public servants were erected in 1963-1964, and four (4) residences for public servants were erected in 1964-1965.”

**EXTENSION OF TOBACCO-GROWING AREAS.—**  
Mr. Wallis-Smith, pursuant to notice, asked  
The Minister for Local Government,—

In view of the need to progressively  
extend the tobacco growing areas in keeping  
with the extension of the Irrigation  
channels—

(1) Is it intended to open new tobacco  
blocks in time for planting in 1966? If so,  
how many and in what area?

(2) When will the ballots be held?

*Answer:—*

(1 and 2) "It will not be feasible to  
open any new tobacco farms in the  
Mareeba-Dimbulah area until the State  
tobacco quota has been increased suffici-  
ently to enable allocation of quotas to  
such new farms. No new farms can there-  
fore be opened in 1966. Extension of the  
channel system at present is aimed  
primarily at serving existing farms."

**CONSTRUCTION OF HOUSING COMMISSION  
HOUSES AT BRACKEN RIDGE, SANDGATE.—**  
Mr. Dean, pursuant to notice, asked The  
Minister for Works,—

Will he indicate if negotiations have  
been completed by the Queensland Housing  
Commission for the allocation of building  
blocks at Bracken Ridge, Sandgate? If so,  
how many homes will be erected and how  
many of these will be for rental purposes?

*Answer:—*

"The Commission has arranged to  
acquire sufficient land for the construction  
of 393 houses which will be for sale in  
the first instance and if not sold will be  
rented."

## MINISTERIAL EXPENSES

### RETURN TO ORDER

The following paper was laid on the  
table:—

Return to an Order made by the House  
on 19 August last, on the motion of Mr.  
V. E. Jones, of expenses of Ministers for  
the period 1 July, 1964, to 30 June, 1965,  
inclusive, showing each separately and in  
detail.

### PAPERS

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

Report of the Auditor-General under The  
Supreme Court Funds Acts for the  
year 1964-65.

The following papers were laid on the  
table:—

Orders in Council under—

The Racing and Betting Acts, 1954 to  
1964.

The Water Acts, 1926 to 1964.

Regulations under—

The Co-ordination of Rural Advances  
and Agricultural Bank Acts, 1938 to  
1951.

The Racing and Betting Acts, 1954 to  
1964.

The Motor Spirit Vendors Acts, 1933 to  
1934.

The Professional Engineers Act of 1929.

The Roofing Tiles Act of 1949.

The Architects Act of 1962.

The Traffic Acts, 1949 to 1965.

## FORM OF QUESTION

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) proceeding to  
give notice of a question—

Mr. Ramsden: It is a wonder he didn't keep  
you there.

Mr. HANLON: I did not want to place  
Inspector Cook in an embarrassing position.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HANLON: I point out that I was  
provoked by an interjection.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member  
is provoking the Chair with his so-called  
question. It would have been much better  
if he had saved it for his speech in the  
Address-in-Reply debate.

Mr. HANLON: I rise to a point of order.  
I could have chosen to raise this as a matter  
of privilege. Instead, I chose to put it in the  
form of a question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I think the hon.  
member would have done better to raise it  
as a matter of privilege.

Mr. HANLON: That is for me to decide,  
unless you think it is out of order for me  
to ask this question. It is a matter of  
importance to the public, if it is not to you.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member  
has shown disrespect to the Chair. I am  
querying the length of his question. If he  
considers that it is of sufficient importance,  
he could have raised it on a point of privilege  
or in some other manner. I will listen to  
the remainder of the question.

Mr. HANLON: I point out that I was  
provoked by an interjection.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member  
should not have been provoked by an inter-  
jection. Any hon. member who interjects  
will be dealt with.

## ADDRESS IN REPLY

### RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—SEVENTH AND EIGHTH ALLOTTED DAYS

Debate resumed from 2 September (see  
p. 289) on Mr. Newbery's motion for the  
adoption of the Address in Reply.

**Mr. LICKISS** (Mt. Coot-tha) (11.57 a.m.): I wish to again associate myself and the electors of Mt. Coot-tha with the expressions of loyalty to Her Sovereign Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, and to express our appreciation to His Excellency the Administrator, Sir Alan Mansfield, for his address in opening this Parliament and for his continued service to this State and the nation.

I should also like to extend my congratulations to the hon. member for Mirani, Mr. Tom Newbery, on his election to this House and on his maiden speech here. Similarly, I should like to congratulate my colleague the hon. member for Ithaca, Mr. Bob Windsor, on his seconding of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. The hon. member for Ithaca has indicated that he will be retiring from Parliament at the conclusion of this session. I feel that he will be gratified in the knowledge that he will be handing over to a man of the calibre of Mr. Col. Miller, who is a very highly respected member of the Ithaca community. I wish the hon. member for Ithaca good health in a very happy and long retirement.

Only a few days ago two American astronauts successfully completed a voyage in space which was the equivalent of a journey to the moon and back. Whilst it was front-page news, it was not such news as to startle or amaze us. I mention this only to show that already we are becoming accustomed to the fantastic achievements of inter-planetary travel. This is a reasonable commentary on the times in which we live: such times of change, of progress, of the fantastic becoming commonplace overnight, as to have no parallel with any previous period in man's history.

I say this to the House not merely to stress the obvious but to support a plea for a new approach to all aspects of our thinking, our planning, our whole approach to the multitudinous problems of planning in this new age. We are in a new age. This has come about whether we like it or not. Change is all about us. Opportunities come jetting towards us and just as quickly jet away, and unless we can lasso and hold them at the psychological moment they are lost to us. It used to be said that opportunity knocked only once. Now, opportunity has not time to knock—it just flies by and we have to be ready to take it on the wing, as it were.

In this new era, where technological change follows technological change with bewildering rapidity, and where today's great industry is tomorrow's example of obsolescence, we need an outlook utterly different from that adopted in the past by those accepting leadership responsibilities. The comfortable, complacent, lethargic approach to development that might have been accepted a few years ago is no good

today. This is not said as a reproach to any particular sector: Government, their specialist advisers, the Opposition, or any other group.

Indeed, this is an earnest plea to all of us to reconsider our attitude towards the needs of progress in a cosmic age. All sections of the Government—indeed, all of this Parliament—the commercial community and the Press must think big, think fast, and be prepared to act accordingly. We must develop a mentality of growth and progress. We live in fast times where competition on all levels is keen and where victory goes only to those who are prepared to act rapidly and decisively. We must be able to recognise the conditions of our times and be flexible in all that we do.

We talk constantly of our State as the one with the greatest potential of all the Australian States—of Queensland, the State of opportunity. This is fine, but I think many people are becoming heartily sick of hearing always about potential and not enough about realisation. This is allied to the need for the new mentality of which I have been speaking. We have to realise that our developmental needs are urgent, that there are other States competing with us for golden opportunities, and that we must move in quicker, with greater enthusiasm, and with more realistic inducements, if we and not our competitors are to gain the prizes.

The urgent, almost desperate, need for a new approach from all sectors of our community is reflected in measurements of growth of the various States over recent years. One significant such growth indicator is the value of factory production. Hon. members will agree that the expansion of secondary industry is a sound way to assess a State's capacity to grow, and to employ.

In the five-year period from 1957-58, Queensland had the lowest growth rate in the Commonwealth, even below that of Tasmania, and certainly not comparable with that of Western Australia. South Australia led with a 30.4 per cent. growth in the five-year period, but we trailed with 21.8 per cent., almost 9 per cent. below the leaders. However, the lag in these five years is no real reflection on our Government. What it does illustrate dramatically is the enormous amount of leeway Queensland had to make up as a result of the long years of Labour Government hostility to capital investment and business development.

**Mr. Bennett:** What have you done in the past eight years?

**Mr. LICKISS:** I shall inform the hon. member in a moment. We had a lot of lost ground to recover before we could start making real headway.

The situation has changed over the last two years, and this shows that Queensland is indeed changing over to the "growth mentality" that I mentioned, even if not sufficiently as yet to meet the demands of our times. But the figures for the seven-year period from 1957-58 are certainly better than for the five-year period that I have mentioned. The seven-year figures show Queensland as running third in terms of increased value of factory production.

South Australia leads with 54.91 per cent., then comes Victoria with 49.2 per cent. (a remarkable achievement for an already highly industrialised State) and then Queensland and Western Australia are almost on the same level with 46.1 per cent and 45.9 per cent. respectively.

This improvement in Queensland's development rate, which is particularly marked over the last two years, is good, but is it good enough? By all means let us congratulate ourselves, but let us also realise that, despite all that has been done, infinitely more yet remains to be done. After all, Queensland is the State with the greatest potential—the one whose capacity for growth is much greater than that of other more industrially developed States. We should be romping ahead of all other States, for we still have much ground to make up. But we are still only in the middle of the field, and, although this is better than being last, it is certainly not as good as being first.

Again let me stress that what I am saying is no criticism of the coalition Government. We have done much, our achievements are first-rate, and all that has been done must be viewed against the background of 1957 and the years spent in hauling Queensland out of the industrial doldrums into which a socialistic and anti-business Labour Government had led her.

Equally, all who can survey the whole scene must admit that our State is unlike other smaller and more compact States. Our development programme bristles with unusual difficulties. We lack population and, as a result, are lagging in the rate of population growth in terms of both natural increase and the securing of a fair share of migrants. We are paying a high price for the hagridden old Labour Government's refusal to let Queensland keep pace with Australia's transition to industrialisation. The anti-industrial attitude of the Australian Workers' Union, which in those days dominated the Labour Party, meant that whilst the rest of Australia was establishing all manner of heavy and light industries in various areas the Queensland image in the South was being confirmed as a scattered rural State back in the era of the billy and the bowyangs.

Indeed, a transportation system which was hopelessly inadequate for the needs of the State as it was, let alone as it should be, is only now showing clear signs of necessary improvement. What we inherited in 1957 has made the task of lifting Queensland out

of the past and into the future a formidable one, and indeed a formidable one it remains as we have to meet the competition of other States who are eagerly seeking new industries and who have enjoyed a flying start in industrial history.

Yes, the Government has achieved much, but that is not a reason for any of us here to sit back or just jog along in a rosy haze of self-satisfaction. I, for one, will never be content to accept Queensland's being well below the national average in growth rate. I do hope that we can learn from the experience of other States and, by observing the pattern of their successful operations, adapt something of this to our own requirements.

For instance, the current trend in other States is towards the concentration of major industrial production units closer to major markets. This makes sense, especially when we take into consideration the inevitable rises in transportation and other service costs that are taking place and will continue to occur. Where, and how, do we in Queensland, with a population of 1,500,000 out of Australia's total of 11,000,000, stand in this regard?

We must recognise that, compared with other States, Queensland is very much in the junior class. With some 670,000 people in the Brisbane area and Redcliffe, we are only modest small fry compared with Sydney and Melbourne. Indeed, it is estimated that our population will not reach the 1,000,000 mark till 1980, although it is my conviction that this figure will probably be reached five years earlier than statisticians estimate.

I have said that industry wants to establish itself, according to the experience in other and bigger States, in areas close to markets. The need to bring industry into the Brisbane complex, and to differentiate between the types of industries that we accept will want to go into the metropolitan complex and those that can properly be induced to go to other centres in the State, is very real. If we do not handle this problem properly, we will only frighten industry away.

Let us face facts. The great mass market in Queensland is in the complex that will surround—and, indeed, already does surround—metropolitan Brisbane. All the plans of experts, both private and Government, recognise that there will be a huge urban area embracing at least Greater Brisbane and Redcliffe, down to the Gold Coast, out to Ipswich, and all the areas in between. This is an inevitable development, with the pattern already clearly set, and it would be foolish—indeed, disastrous—for us to ignore it.

In the last 15 years the population of Queensland has risen by 405,000, or by 34.2 per cent., and in this period the population of the metropolitan complex to which I have just referred rose by 249,200, or by 49.6 per cent. To put this into even

clearer perspective, the expansion of population in the urban complex in the last 15 years has been 61·4 per cent. of the population growth of the entire State.

This does not mean, of course, that populations of a size similar to those of Sydney and Melbourne are necessarily required for an optimum market that makes production worth while, but it is undeniable that Queensland's only chance of achieving the necessary image is to place more emphasis on industrial activity in addition to encouraging the rural sector. In this way we can create a new image for the State. In plain words, we must direct a great deal of attention to industrialisation in its various forms. I think it can be fairly stated that, up to the present, Queensland's major political parties have been more inclined to be wedded to the notion of rural development. No-one will argue that the rural industries are not of vital importance to the State and to the economy of the nation; but in a State lagging behind in population growth, rural industries, by their very nature and because of the use of improved methods of rural production, will do little to assist this problem. Development means State development on all fronts. We cannot avoid this issue, and surely this situation must always be remembered—that markets mean people with income to spend.

Actually, the incentive for business to decide its investment and marketing policy will be influenced very largely by a satisfactory projection of expected population growth. Unfortunately, at this stage Queensland does not appear to be in a happy position in this respect.

The so-called natural advantage of living in Queensland covers a multitude of economic sins. We, as a Government, members of the Opposition, the Press, the business and rural communities and the citizens of the State generally must adopt, for want of a better term, "a growth mentality". In recent years there has been a shift of emphasis from the traditional rural image of farm production to what is in some respects a self-deluding interest in the development of other natural resources. No-one will doubt or question the wisdom and the importance of this activity to the national economy, because it will assist both in reducing cost of production in the domestic industries and in improving our balance-of-payments position.

Unfortunately, the labour content in these enterprises is necessarily low and the greatest benefit of this production at the present time will continue to be, to a great extent, to the industrialised southern States or to some overseas countries—and, of course, to a somewhat lesser extent, to Queensland itself.

I believe that Queensland and such similarly placed States as Western Australia have a very strong case indeed for a revision of the formula for the redistribution of Commonwealth tax revenue to account for

the unrequited contributions by our mineral production. We have learned from experience that basic industry is a prerequisite to ancillary industries which, in turn, cater for employment opportunities and population increases.

It is one thing to be critical but it is more important to determine the real causes of our problems and to set out to correct the situation. Let us look at Queensland's image. The image of a State, or part of a State, is important because it, in fact, depicts what people generally think of us. Surely the history of Queensland does not assist us in this regard, as it would tend to convince people that we are a slow, easy-going State loaded with potential but content to just meander along. Our history of socialist-dominated government and the anti-industrial attitude of the A.W.U., as mentioned previously, will have created this impression. In comparison with other States we have, I believe, lacked the image of progress and virility, of get-up-and-go, of the State of opportunity, advancement and security, and of freedom to operate without undue and unnecessary restrictions. We have to live down that socialist-State image of the past.

The next question we should ask ourselves is whether or not we are correcting this image to produce a more presentable picture. I believe that this Government, in the main, has endeavoured—and, in fact, has succeeded in its aim to a great extent—to remove from people's minds the concern that has historically hindered and thus retarded this State's development. I am not for one moment saying that more could not be done—and, in fact, must be done.

No-one will deny that the mass media of Press, television and radio play a significant role in a State's public relations programme, and I am not suggesting that these media should do other than report the facts. It is most disheartening from a Government's point of view to see such frontpage headlines in our leading morning newspaper as those of 1 September, 1965, namely, "Council is Blamed for Project Delay—Acacia Ridge Protest by Developers." I suggest that interested people looking at the investment potential in Queensland would peruse our newspapers and would not be at all inspired by the picture that is painted by those headlines. No matter what positive action is taken at Government level, this action could be, and in fact has been, nullified and frustrated by the actions of the Brisbane City Council.

Hon. members will know my attitude towards the concept, operation and process of administration within the Brisbane City Council. In fact, I have devoted some time to this subject during debates in this House, and I further hasten to assure hon. members that those comments on this subject were based on, and dealt with, the powers and responsibilities vested in that council, irrespective of political parties. I believe that, as the local authority controlling to the

largest extent the development, progress and, indeed, the ultimate destiny of this State's capital city, a bad image created by the Brisbane City Council is likely to detrimentally affect the splendid record of other very progressive local authorities in the State, such as Rockhampton, Townsville, and many others. A poor performance by the Brisbane City Council not only chases commerce and industry away from this city but tends also to chase it away from the entire State.

The great success story of South Australia in terms of industrial development over the years, the splendid progress in Western Australia, the enthusiastic co-operation given to business in Victoria, New South Wales and Tasmania, all supply the elements of keenest competition that we must meet if we are to divert new development away from other States to Queensland. To the largest degree, this calls for a "get up and go" attitude from our State leaders.

There can be little doubt that the vigorous programme followed by the former South Australian Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, thrust his State ahead. The hardselling technique adopted by Mr. Bolte, Victoria's Liberal Premier, is well known. And the Western Australian Premier, Mr. Brand, with his energetic deputy Mr. Charles Court, makes certain that Western Australia's special inducements are always made known to investing groups. These are men who brook no interference from local authorities or regulation-bound officials. They can—and do—ruthlessly slash red tape in order to make it easy for industry to get established, and so provide production, employment and increasing wealth for their States.

They set the pattern for us in Queensland. We, too, must get on with the job. We must sell, not just in vague generalised phrases, but in terms of real inducements, real assistance, and a welcoming attitude growing out of the new "growth mentality" I mentioned earlier. Not to do this would be a criminal neglect of Queensland's urgent needs at this vital stage in Australia's growth pattern. We must remove all the obstacles that hinder progress, and if particular persons form part of those obstacles, then those persons, too, must be swept aside. Let us not fool ourselves about this task. Nothing good is achieved without effort. Worth-while development will not come if we sit around and just talk about our potential. We have the task ahead of us. Not only must we do as well as other States in attracting industry, we must do much better; for whilst they are already well advanced in industrial capacity we have a long, long way to go before we even get within cooee of catching them up, let alone passing them.

So let us please pull up our collective socks. Let us not imagine that we can comfortably sit and wait for customers. Let us go out and get them. This State Government possesses sovereign powers, and it must use the powers it has for the State's essential needs. Our Government must courageously

accept the role of encouraging the development of all our resources. And what does this acceptance mean? It means vigorous promotion; it means enthusiastic co-operation with all the community seeking progress. But it also means an adamant refusal to brook sabotage or hindrance from any authority, person or group, which wants to slow down State development for selfish individual or political reasons.

I feel very strongly about this, and I believe many hon. members on both sides of the House also feel strongly about it. It is interesting to note the trend of recent events, with statements from Ministers and community leaders which strongly support statements I am now making, but which were first considered when I began preparing my speech over a fortnight ago. I do not need any outside support to encourage me in taking up a positive attitude when I believe I am on the right track, nevertheless I did appreciate seeing the comments that have been published over recent days.

I therefore recommend to this House the urgent consideration of the appointment of a royal commission. I do not attempt at this stage to define precisely the terms of reference for the commission, but in general terms I believe that amongst other things such a commission would need to determine just what effect the ordinances, the procedures, the attitudes and the administrative decisions of the Brisbane City Council are having on our industrial progress. To me it seems incredible that a sovereign State should permit a local authority to hamper, even in the smallest degree, essential industrial progress merely because it is the local authority in a particular area. One would imagine that in Brisbane we had no ordinary local authority, but a new kind of city-State equal in sovereign stature to this State Government. What dangerous nonsense this is!

I commend to this House the establishment of a royal commission whose terms of reference might include, amongst other matters:

(a) The part played by the Brisbane City Council in either hindering or assisting industrial and commercial development in its area;

(b) the establishing of a town and regional planning board, with powers to ensure that proper regional planning and essential development are not impeded by unnecessary local authority requirements or conditions; and,

(c) looking forward to the pattern of development and population shifts over the next 50 years, the feasibility of establishing a new pattern of local authorities in the area I earlier defined as the "metropolitan complex", with overall functions such as water supply, power, transportation, etc., transferred to special statutory authorities set up by the State Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the matters I have covered in this speech are large; they bristle with difficulties, but they are vital to this State's development. It may be contended that to talk about breaking Greater Brisbane into smaller municipalities is a waste of time—that we cannot unscramble the eggs. This is nonsense, and there is no analogy. This sovereign Government can impose any pattern it believes proper in terms of municipal control. And just as a State Government in 1923—when socialist thinking was that the bigger a thing was the more efficient it must be—telescoped 19 suburban councils to make one Greater Brisbane Council, so our Government today can turn this swollen, bloated, muscle-bound, power-hungry Greater Brisbane Council into four, five, six or a few more local authorities, according to advice received from a royal commission that has thoroughly and exhaustively considered the matter.

Finally, Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me make one more recommendation. I believe that our prospects of encouraging industrial development in this State are hindered by a piecemeal approach. At the present time, although we have a Minister for Industrial Development, in fact many of the functions bearing on development are spread over another six or seven portfolios. We need a Minister who controls all the necessary functions, one who can give a special "Yes" or "No" to questions that are asked of him. My recommendation, then, is that the Government should establish a portfolio of planning and development, which would absorb the present industrial development portfolio and also include the many bits and pieces now scattered amongst a number of Ministers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, none of us—on either side of this Chamber or in the community which we represent—can afford any longer to be complacent or to put off until tomorrow what should be done today. We live in a vastly changed world, as an integral part of the changing, restless, unsettled Pacific community of peoples. We are already subject to pressures, internal and external, that were only vague shadows on the horizon a mere 10 years ago. Those pressures will become more urgent, more frightening and more dangerous in the years ahead. It is later than we think. Development at the highest possible pressure cannot be delayed. It must be done now.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (12.29 p.m.): I join with the many earlier speakers in asserting the loyalty of the constituents of my electorate to His Excellency the Governor and, in addition, I possibly sympathise with him in the type of Ministerial advisers he has had for so many years. Nevertheless, he has done well in the circumstances and I wish him a happy retirement.

Before embarking on some major considerations for this Parliament, I feel compelled to refer to the questions that are asked of this Government and its Cabinet

Ministers. I feel that the standard of the answers given has deteriorated considerably in recent times and that the technique adopted by so-called responsible Ministers in the answers they give is not lending any prestige to this Parliament. Any querist, any cross-examiner, or any Parliamentarian representing his constituents is entitled to ask searching questions and to demand proper answers. In his technique and process he can, and at times must, be testing—he may perhaps even cast doubt on the accuracy of certain ministerial statements and on the information given—but it is a bounden obligation on the Minister concerned to answer each question properly and truthfully. That is the concept of parliamentary questions as set out in "May's Parliamentary Practice", and has been the system followed by responsible Ministers in all British Commonwealth Parliaments over the years. If a Minister has a proper, sensible, and truthful answer, he does not need to be insulting, evasive, or provocative, because the undeniable truth is more compelling than all the chicanery adopted by some Ministers in their technique.

Mr. Windsor: Why don't you ask sensible questions?

Mr. BENNETT: And why does not the hon. member for Ithaca pay attention to his duties as a parliamentarian instead of sitting there asleep most of the time?

I have said in another place, and I repeat it for the parliamentary record, that the Minister for Works and Housing, Hon. J. Bjelke-Petersen, is to be commended for the method and technique he adopts. He answers all questions truthfully—or endeavours to do so—he is quite candid and frank, and he does not add any colour to his answers. As a result, parliamentarians who ask him questions treat him with respect because they feel that they will elicit from him, as far as possible, the information they are seeking.

It matters little to members of the Opposition—people like me—who ask questions if they are personally insulted. That does not worry us at all because after all a Parliamentarian is accustomed to being insulted—even by experts—and it cannot be said that there are any experts among the Ministers. But we are entitled, as representatives of a constituency, to demand, in the interests of Parliament, that questions are answered properly and that a Minister does not hold Parliament in contempt. The mere fact that he insults an individual does not matter; however, the fact that he insults Parliament is a different consideration.

Recently, the third Commonwealth and Empire Law Convention was held in Sydney. It attracted some of the best legal brains in the British Commonwealth of Nations. Among the distinguished delegates from overseas were the Lord Chancellor, the Lords Chief Justices of England and of Northern Ireland, the Chief Justices of

India and of Pakistan, and Lord Frazer of the Scottish Judiciary. Their deliberations were of fundamental value to all parliamentarians, and surely the decisions arrived at should be considered by those responsible for a democratic Parliament.

The law convention was held to consider, *inter alia*, statutes of the British Commonwealth as well as common law and case law, and if the decisions of parliaments over the years were discussed at that convention parliamentarians are entitled to ascertain in what manner they were dealt with and the reasons for their being referred to. I asked what I considered was a very appropriate question that was not insulting to Parliament or to the Minister for Justice but was designed to clarify a situation, because I considered that a published statement made by the Chief Justice of Pakistan was not in the best interests of the Parliaments of British Commonwealth countries and their judicial systems.

It was rather coincidental that on the day on which I directed my question to the Minister an almost identical question was asked, apparently by another intelligent member, in the New South Wales Parliament. In sharp contrast to the flippant manner in which the Acting Minister for Justice answered my question, which could well give visitors to this country the impression that the Queensland Parliament is something of a "hick" show, the question asked in the New South Wales Parliament was answered quite properly. In this House a personal attack was launched on me for asking the question.

**Mr. Duggan:** It contained a terrifying threat, too.

**Mr. BENNETT:** The answer given evaded the real issue and, as my Leader points out, contained a terrifying threat of what might happen to me if I came under the jurisdiction of some of the Ministers or their agents.

**Mr. Aikens:** They were going to do it with a blunt knife, too.

**Mr. BENNETT:** All I can say in reply to that interjection is, of course, that if the mental processes of the hon. member for Townsville South were treated in that fashion, his standard of intelligence would not deteriorate at all.

I feel that Ministers would do more justice to this Parliament if they answered questions properly and gave the information sought and ceased making attempts to big-note themselves by giving answers prepared by departmental officers who have taken a few hours to be smart to impress the public, through the Minister, with their flippancy.

**Mr. Murray:** May I ask if the question in the New South Wales Parliament was placed on the notice paper or was asked without notice? I think it would have been without notice.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I am inclined to believe that it was in fact without notice. I am not certain of that, nevertheless I do know that the answer given was dignified, courteous and informative, and did justice to that Parliament and the Minister who gave it.

Having listened over the years to arguments for and against the asking of questions without notice, I do believe, following the silly answer given in an empty-headed fashion by the Acting Minister for Justice, that perhaps that stupidity would not be conceived if Ministers were forced to answer questions on the spot.

**Mr. Murray:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. BENNETT:** Having recorded my protest on that matter, I should now like to refer to a subject dealt with by the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha, who at one stage purported to be an expert grazier from the metropolitan area and now sets himself up as an industrialist. For some strange reason he again took the opportunity to castigate the Australian Labour Party relative to certain municipal matters at a time that seems peculiarly significant. I would be the first to concede that, like any human institution, the Brisbane City Council has its weaknesses. It always has had them.

**Mr. Lickiss:** They tolerated you for a long time.

**Mr. BENNETT:** During my record tenure of office as an alderman of the Brisbane City Council, the prestige of that body improved considerably. On many public occasions not only Labour supporters but men such as Sir Reginald Groom and the late Sir John Chandler, former Lord Mayors, made reference to that fact and paid tribute to me. If the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha does not share the opinion of distinguished men with political ideas similar to those held by him, it is his fault, not mine.

The Minister for Industrial Development entered the debate at a time when one would have expected Liberal Party back-benchers to be given—indeed, to have taken—the opportunity of discussing matters of importance to Queensland. After all, if a Minister wishes to make a ministerial statement, he can do so at any time when Parliament is sitting. However, following the reluctance and reticence of Liberal Party back-benchers, the Minister took part in the debate and made a contribution which, to say the least, was very startling and which, even if true, did no credit to the State or to this Parliament. One wondered why he wanted to get such a cheap type of publicity at this time. Was it because he is locked in bitter contest with the Minister who cannot answer questions properly, the Minister for Transport, and is endeavouring to gain some advantage over him by attacking an authority outside this Parliament when that particular authority is not in a position to defend itself? Or, alternatively, did he take up the debate because at that stage none of the

Liberal Party back-benchers wished to enter it because their endorsements or pre-selections were still hanging heavily over their heads? I noticed that the hon. member for Windsor suddenly rushed back from Sydney. He must have been anxious about his future welfare. After the contribution to the debate made by the hon. member for Brisbane, Mr. Mann, in which he castigated severely the apathy of members of the Liberal Party in not entering the debate and carrying out their responsible obligations, one or two Liberal Party back-benchers have spoken.

Let me revert to the extraordinary allegations made by the Minister for Industrial Development. I have always argued that the concept of this portfolio was very nebulous. It was created legally by the Industrial Development Act of 1963, and, as I said at the time, it was designed mainly to relieve the pressure on the then Minister for Justice, Sir Alan Munro, in his later stages in Cabinet and in this Parliament. It is fairly obvious that Sir Alan Munro wanted to ease himself out of office, and the concept of this portfolio was to retain him in Cabinet and at the same time relieve him of pressure of work. He now sits on the Government side of the House and looks benignly at younger members, and no doubt he must be mentally troubled by the way in which the Industrial Development portfolio has been used and abused since he vacated it.

My contention that the concept of the Industrial Development portfolio was nebulous is borne out by the next appointment to it, which apparently was designed to remove from responsible ministerial obligations a Minister who was making a complete mess of the administration of the Police Force. It was obviously decided to place him in this ministerial office with the thought that he could not do any harm in that capacity because there was nothing for him to do under the Act which created the portfolio. But, lo and behold, again he runs true to form. Instead of containing himself and confining himself to the Gold Coast and other areas where he puts on leis and associates with girls in bikinis, he comes out and makes what is seemingly a responsible statement dealing with the introduction of industry into this State. In doing so, he again disembarked from the role created for him by his colleagues in the Cabinet. It would seem that, when he was appointed to this position, Cabinet was following the English custom of kicking some politician upstairs to the House of Lords when no further use can be found for him.

However, the Minister came out with the extraordinary claim that the Brisbane City Council should be disbanded. He said that in this debate on the Address in Reply when giving a considered speech prepared by him, perhaps for political purposes, but nevertheless prepared and considered. He, as a responsible Minister in this Cabinet, came out with the extraordinary claim that the

Brisbane City Council should be disbanded. True it is that the claim was precipitated by the suggestion of the hon. member for Townsville South, who has been waging a vendetta against all city councils since he himself was sacked from the Townsville City Council.

**Mr. AIKENS:** I rise to a point of order. That statement is untrue. This is the man who objects to criminals being hurt. He will rush in to defend a criminal who mutilates a little child. However, I rise to a point of order to state that I conduct no vendetta against any city council. As a matter of fact, I shall go to my room and bring back a letter from the Townsville City Council in which they thanked me for my assistance and consideration.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Hooper):** Order!

**Mr. BENNETT:** As usual with the hon. member, it is not a point of order but a lot of baloney.

**Mr. Aikens:** Tell us why you defend criminals who mutilate little children.

**Mr. BENNETT:** The hon. member mutilates his position in Parliament. He is the very person who interjects and says that others cannot take it, yet he squeals like a stuck pig every time reference is made to him.

**Mr. Aikens:** I have never dingoed at a royal commission—Old Yellow Belly.

**Mr. BENNETT:** Following that inane interjection by the hon. member for Townsville South, I reiterate that the Minister claimed that the Brisbane City Council should be disbanded. One would think that before making such a rash claim, before descending to such an extraordinary outburst, the Minister would at least have confided in his fellow Cabinet Ministers. I take it that he did not confer with his fellow Cabinet Ministers.

I notice that the hon. member for Townsville South, as usual, is running away.

**Mr. Ramsden:** He is going for that letter, perhaps.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I take it that the Minister has not referred the suggestion to his own party meeting or to a joint party meeting of the coalition Government, but for some strange reason he is prepared to come here and make the claim—he says it is not political and is not directed at any particular administration—that the Brisbane City Council should be disbanded.

Seeing that the Brisbane City Council was created by the City of Brisbane Act of 1924, some 41 years ago, I feel that it is now far too late to make such a suggestion. Indeed, I am satisfied that there is no serious intention of doing what is suggested. Obviously this claim is being made at the present time because this is the last session of this Parliament and the elections are

falling due. In his strange misunderstanding of affairs the Minister obviously is seeking to start the election campaign by waging a war against the Brisbane City Council, hoping that it will embarrass the prospects of the Parliamentary Labour Party in the forthcoming State general election.

That is the insidious reason why this propaganda has been introduced. I do not believe the Minister is satisfied with the truth of all that he has said because only recently his own Cabinet—unanimously, I take it—made a decision to heap upon the Brisbane City Council further burdens and responsibilities by transferring to it the work and the obligations of the Traffic Commission so far as they relate to the Greater Brisbane area. The work of the Traffic Commission in the main did relate to the metropolitan area. This instrumentality which the Minister says should be disbanded is now saddled with obligations and responsibilities in this direction that the Government could not handle.

**Mr. Hughes:** The Council has been asking for it for years.

**Mr. BENNETT:** Every local authority throughout Queensland was foisted with this responsibility, although not very long ago one of the hon. member's responsible leaders said that the Traffic Commission should be set up and controlled by this Government. But they change their leaders so often that there is no consistency in policy. Whether it is going to be Chalk, Porter or Dewar I do not know, but they will make a change within a period of nine months.

**Mr. AIKENS:** I rise to a point of order. May I at this point read a letter I received from the Townsville City Council conveying to me their thanks and congratulations?

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Hooper):** Order! There is no point of order.

**Mr. BENNETT:** Probably it is a forged letter, anyway.

In 1959 this Government enacted the City of Brisbane (Town Plan) Act and there again added to the responsibilities of the Brisbane City Council. I favour the concept of a Greater Brisbane City Council although I realise it has many imperfections. I realise that even after 40 years it is still suffering from growing pains, but in years to come the concept will prove to be well worth while. I am prepared to concede that there are occasions when the Brisbane City Council becomes peevish after losing a case in court. Despite all that, I think the concept of the Greater Brisbane City Council is a good idea for the development of Brisbane and for the benefit of the capital city of the State.

Why does the Minister come in with his claim at this particular stage? Up to the present, so far as I know, all Cabinet Ministers have been expounding to the world and to the taxpayers of Queensland that there is excellent co-operation between the Brisbane City Council and the Government. It is known that the leading protagonists in

this present argument have wined and dined each other and publicly expressed the harmony that existed between them.

Why this belated allegation? Why this serious indictment at this present stage? Why is this Minister rocking the boat of harmony that existed between the Brisbane City Council and the Treasurer and others? Is it because he is getting ready to take over the mantle from the Treasurer? Or is it because, as I mentioned earlier, of the proximity of the State elections? Was it not the responsibility of this Minister and his department to stop this sort of thing, which he says has been going on for years? If it has been going on for years why has he remained in strict silence, waiting until now to make this serious public allegation? If what he says is true it is a damning indictment; it means that the State, and this capital city in particular, have been losing millions of pounds' worth of industrial development. If it is true, why did he not tell us before? Why has he remained so secretive about it? What are the functions of the Minister for Industrial Development if this sort of thing has been allowed to go on?

I am not in a position to deny or confirm the Minister's allegations because I have no records. I am not in the Brisbane City Council nor am I in the Minister's department, therefore I am not in a position either to confirm or deny the allegation. But if this has been going on, what has the Minister been doing in keeping with his obligation under the 1963 Act, which placed upon him an onus to protect and develop industry in this State? The Government created a special position for a man named Vince Gair, and paid him a rather substantial salary to deal with this very situation. Was he not known as the Industrial Establishment and Expansion Officer? Was it not his obligation to see that there was complete harmony between Government and local government authorities and industrialists wishing to set foot in Queensland and establish their industry in this city and other parts of the State? Was that not the very duty of Mr. Gair, who was appointed by this Government? If the Minister's allegations are correct, can he produce any reports from Mr. Gair that will confirm them? If he can, will they be tabled and printed? Will he tell us why they have not been furnished to Parliament long since, because this serious matter was one to be dealt with by Parliament long before today? If the Minister cannot table them, if he has no reports, will he tell us why such reports were not furnished if this ridiculous situation existed whereby industrialists were driven away from this city. If reports were furnished, and if they do exist, will the Minister tell us what he and Mr. Gair did to eradicate the trouble and iron out the problems associated with industrial development in this State? That was their bounden obligation in keeping with their respective positions. If the public was being deluded into the

belief that all was well when, in fact, it was not, the person who should be castigated most is the Minister who concealed this from the public and from Cabinet, who made these appointments but apparently did not see that the objects of the appointments were carried out to material fruition.

There has been talk about lack of co-operation. At this stage I do not wish to deal with the Wilbur Smith Report because the present is far too premature for that. I agree with the submission that it should be carefully studied before any final and conclusive decisions are made. However, the Government is offering completely unrealistic co-operation to the Brisbane City Council on this matter when it says to the Council, "We will not talk with you, we will not offer you finance, we will not co-operate with you in the scheme unless you get rid of the trams." That is the type of co-operation the Government gives. Whether we should get rid of the trams or not is a matter of great controversy and one that is well worthy of serious consideration and study. For the Government to walk straight in and say, "We will co-operate with you only on one basis, that is, if you agree with us", is like holding a pistol at the council's head.

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

**Mr. BENNETT:** As I have only a limited time at my disposal, I intend to dismiss my reference to the Wilbur Smith Report at this stage, hoping that we will be given an opportunity to discuss it fully at a more appropriate time. In considering this report the interests of public transport should have absolute priority over those of private transport.

As to the alleged lack of co-operation by the Brisbane City Council with the Government, the Minister for Industrial Development has been singularly silent on the claim that the Caboolture Shire Council held up the Murrumba Manufacturing Company for some five months. In spite of an arrangement to have electricity connected by the Southern Electric Authority of Queensland, and water connected by the Caboolture Shire Council, these things have not been done. It is strangely coincidental that this council is dominated by Country Party members. Because of that, there are no allegations from the Minister about its tardiness, inefficiency, or lack of co-operation. I know only too well the rebuke the Minister would get were he to make any reference to its lethargic attitude in this case.

Let us examine at least one of the reports tabled by this Government in previous sessions in which it gave some of the real reasons for the lack of industrial development in this State and for the fact that industrialists do not wish to come here. I quote from the 1961 Report of the Director of Secondary Industries which reads—

"Railway and shipping freight charges are also said to be an impediment to industrial development in Queensland.

Many southern manufacturers claim that it is more economic and cheaper to manufacture in centres of big population where they have a big market close at hand, and export their products to Queensland, than it would be to decentralise their production for the limited market that Queensland offers."

**Mr. Davies:** Was the Minister silent about that?

**Mr. BENNETT:** Yes. The Minister chooses to forget that report, which was tabled for our edification. As a matter of fact, it clearly indicates that in the past eight years since the introduction of this Act the market in Queensland has become limited, and interstate industrialists are no longer interested in coming here because of the market facilities, not because of other considerations.

I refer to some of the tactics that have been adopted in amending legislation in a way that is not in keeping with the correct concept of legislation and that disregards one of the fundamental conventions that have been adhered to for many years by the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Firstly, I quote the example of the Transport Laws Validation Act of 1962 which had retroactive and retrospective effect. This was a case—and this Government has often done this—of using the legislature to overcome a decision of the court on the rights of certain parties. Incidentally, the parties who were involved had no audience in this Parliament when it was used as a court to override a decision of the Full Court of Queensland. Therefore, when industrialists and others involved in commercial undertakings know that the Queensland Parliament, by retroactive and retrospective legislation, is prepared to superimpose its will on the judicial authority, they hesitate to come to this State.

There is also section 12 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, which had as its purpose the removal of lead bonus payments. Here again was retroactive legislation designed to override in this instance a unanimous decision of the Full Bench of the Industrial Commission. That illustrates why industrialists are reluctant to come to Queensland. There is in the Transport Laws Validation Act of 1962 the spectacle of the Government's setting itself up as a court of appeal in Parliament.

In doing so, hon. members opposite have disregarded the convention that the Crown will accept judicial decisions. Lord Devlin said—

"If that convention is broken, the first step will have been taken towards domination by the Crown of the judicial process in the same way as it now dominates the legislative process."

After all, it is abundantly clear that the Government dominates the legislative processes of this Parliament. A wealth of

regulations was tabled on the first day that Parliament met, and 78 members were given one hour to consider them. Tomorrow there will be the farcical spectacle of one hour being devoted to debating the disallowance of the regulations imposing on-the-spot fines for traffic offences. I have no doubt that you, Mr. Speaker, would agree that only one-tenth of the members who desire to speak in that debate will, by virtue of the provisions of Standing Orders, have the opportunity to do so. Is it any wonder that some hon. members find it rather futile to attend some meetings of Parliament when the Standing Orders make it necessary for them to sit like logs because they are not able to participate in the debates?

There is on the business paper a motion in the name of the hon. member for Barcoo. I feel absolutely certain that the hon. member, whose high standard of representation follows that of a long line of illustrious predecessors in that electorate, will not be given the opportunity to move it. Because of the existence of such situations, Lord Devlin went on to say in a challenging but anxious warning—

“If now we want to preserve some of the few restraints we have left on the power of the executive to do exactly as it likes, we should do well, on the 750th anniversary of Magna Carta, to get something in writing.”

On this, the 750th anniversary of the signing of Magna Carta, I challenge the Government to appoint a permanent law commission. It is all very well to have transient bodies that come and go, and, according to the exigencies of the moment, operate to introduce legislation designed for political expediency or because of economic necessity. If we wish to preserve our concept of British justice by the passage of correct legislation, there should be a permanent law reform commission of at least three members, and possibly five, presided over by a judge of the Supreme Court who will be free from political interference. There should also be on the commission one practising legal man of substantial standing to be appointed for a fixed term of at least five years, and at least one academic lawyer to be appointed annually. Although we do not want to be overridden by the academics, their presence would be important in enabling the commission and the Government to be advised on the history of legislation and the fundamental points involved.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** Would you call the hon. member for Windsor an academic lawyer?

**Mr. BENNETT:** I do not think he could be called even a lawyer.

(Time, on motion of Mr. Marsden, extended.)

**Mr. BENNETT:** I thank the hon. member for Ipswich West, and I thank the House for granting me an extension of time. I can assure hon. members that, as usual, I shall not trespass on their indulgence.

The question of legal reform is very important. Although the body that I suggest should be a permanent commission, the Supreme Court judge will sit on it only when his presence is required and not necessarily permanently. But permanent research officers, draughtsmen, and other staff, should be appointed, so that legislation can be knocked into shape properly.

It is idle for the Minister for Justice to say, as no doubt he will, that we already have a committee of the Bar Association. They are a Saturday morning committee and they meet as their will dictates that they should. Quite often they meet only when the interests of the Bar Association are at stake. I believe that a permanent commission should be appointed to consider the welfare of the procedure and ordering of law in this State.

**Mr. Smith:** You are a bit unkind to them there, you know.

**Mr. BENNETT:** Well, I do not know whether I am. I do not hear much as a result of their work.

**Mr. Smith:** If you went there, you would know.

**Mr. BENNETT:** If we had a permanent law reform commission, I believe the Government would pay greater heed to its decisions and recommendations. As I understand it, several hon. members, including myself, have individually made recommendations to the Government from time to time about a system of legal aid in this State, but those recommendations appear to have been completely ignored. It is true that the Government did say, through the columns of the Press, prior to the commencement of this session that it did intend to introduce legislation relative to legal aid, but although I listened intently to the Opening Speech delivered by His Excellency the Administrator, I did not hear any reference in it to legal aid.

**Mr. Smith:** The Minister has made mention of this already.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I have conceded that. Apparently the hon. member for Windsor has come back fresh and perky from the law convention. What good he did down there I do not know, but he made no protest when certain extraordinary suggestions were made—in fact, he was singularly silent. He has interjected that the Minister has made certain suggestions about legal aid. If he has, the only supporters of that system of free legal aid in this State will be practising lawyers—I am referring to members of the Bar and members of the profession generally—and if it is his intention to introduce such a system, why has he not submitted it to practising lawyers so that they can inform him whether or not it is, in their belief, a practical system and whether or not they are prepared to co-operate and make it

work? I know full well that the Minister has not taken the trouble to confer with or confide in the practising members of the profession on the subject of legal aid.

**Mr. Smith:** I think you are quite wrong in saying that, and no doubt you will be confounded by your own words in about a week's time. Why don't you ask the Bar Association before you come here and make such assertions?

**Mr. BENNETT:** While the hon. member for Windsor was absent in the South at a legal convention—I would have loved to be there, but I considered that my parliamentary duties came first; he only went down there with an eye to tax concessions, and so forth—I assure him that one of the senior counsel in the Bar Association came to me in a certain place and said, "Col, will you do your best to find out what is in this proposal for free legal aid in this State? We can't find it out through Ray Smith."

**Mr. Smith:** They went to the wrong member.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I said, "That is understandable. Ray is a little weak. I shall endeavour to do my best, but it has been a close secret."

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The hon. member is wasting the time of the House.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I wish you would ask the hon. member for Windsor not to interrupt, Mr. Speaker.

I was saying that the legislation that was introduced here was dictated by the economic circumstances or the expediency of the moment. A committee such as I suggest could review statute legislation and also report on draft legislation. As one writer recently said, in many common law jurisdictions around the world it has become increasingly clear that the work of overhauling the huge volume of statute and case law can no longer be adequately dealt with in periodic forays by part-time bodies. So, for the benefit of the hon. member for Windsor, I say that, sincere as the committee of the Bar Association and its subsidiaries, the auxiliary committees, may be, the statement of that eminent jurist in England would doubtless be accepted by every lawyer in Queensland as absolute truth. It is no use having part-time, periodic forays into this question by part-time bodies. Full-time commissioners would make a remarkable contribution to law reform and law revision. In that regard, I think this Government and this State should, in the immediate future, consider the appointment of a permanent appellate division of the Supreme Court.

To explain briefly the system as it operates at the moment, there are approximately 12 judges working, three of whom constitute the Full Court, which is the top appellate court in Queensland; they

change their jurisdiction at times and become the Court of Criminal Appeal. That court is not presided over permanently by the same three judges. All judges, in turn, are put on a roster system and they each take a turn on the Full Court and the Court of Criminal Appeal. As a result of this they are sometimes delayed with reserved decisions and writing their judgments. There is no expediency in relation to judgments or, to put it another way, there would be more expediency in relation to judgments and more efficiency in relation to appellate work were the court presided over by the same three judges who would be selected for their seniority, skill and knowledge. There would be a more inherent and consistent attitude in that particular work.

At the moment, on many occasions, in a very sincere and genuine fashion, owing to certain complexities in the law and historical background, different judges approach the task with a different mental attitude, and it will be found that the complexion of one Full Court composed of three particular judges differs vastly from the complexion of another Full Court composed of three different judges. So, in order to get consistency, and perhaps to have a greater understanding of the worth of their previous decisions—previous decisions are greatly relied upon—it would be advantageous to have that court presided over by a team of judges who were permanently appointed for that particular work.

Incidentally, in dealing with appellate jurisdiction, I do not think anyone would disagree with me that the time has long since arrived when we should abandon entirely the right of appeal to the Privy Council. Admittedly that is a matter for sections 74 and 78 of the Commonwealth Constitution, but the right of appeal to the Privy Council is now almost an anachronism because the average individual—even if he is wealthy—cannot afford to go to the Privy Council. Furthermore, there has developed a strong tendency on the part of the High Court of Australia in recent years to disregard, to a large extent, decisions of the Privy Council.

Let us get down to tintacks and advocate the abolition of the right of appeal to the Privy Council. Australia is one of the few Commonwealth nations left that has preserved that right of appeal. Oil companies and other affluent and wealthy bodies are the only ones who can exercise it. They drag individuals over to the Privy Council and back. If they cannot drag them over there those individuals lose their final rights to justice. I think it is high time we decided that the High Court of Australia should be the final appellate court. Australians generally have sufficient confidence in the integrity, ability and legal know-how of that court to be satisfied with it as the final court of appeal.

I have on many occasions advocated the abolition of the fault aspect in running-down or road-accident cases. I do not have to

delay Parliament today by advocating at length the reasons for and the justice in that submission, but why should a person's right to indemnity for severe personal injuries—or for any personal injuries, for that matter—depend upon the rather artificial concept in law of negligence? One would find it hard to get skilled lawyers to give a clear and definite definition of "negligence". One person who was knocked down as he crossed the road from Parliament House could get damages in the vicinity of £20,000 for certain injuries before one court, yet another person who had acted in almost the same way might miss out before another court because it could be held that he, and not the driver of the vehicle, was negligent. Why should a person's right to indemnity depend on that artificial concept? Even though a pedestrian was completely negligent in the true legal concept of that word, why should he be deprived of indemnity? After all, that is why the motorist pays his contribution to insurance funds and in his road registration fees.

I realise that this submission would not be popular with many practising barristers. I feel that such a recommendation will never come from a committee of the Bar Association or the Law Society, but it could well come from a commission of lawyers desirous of helping the community and seeing that justice and fair play are done to those who are injured on the highway. In this way quite a lot of time could be saved; the court list would be reduced and certainly the high cost of litigation would be avoided. Although it is not a popular submission to a lawyer, I feel that it is in the interests of the community and one that should be considered seriously by some bona fide commission of inquiry.

In recent times there has been some little conflict between the judiciary and the Executive on sentences. It seems that the Minister for Justice is always intimidated by comments and questions of the hon. member for Townsville South about sentences. Unfortunately, every time the hon. member makes statements or asks questions about the lightness of a sentence the Minister rushes in with an appeal to the Court of Criminal Appeal. Quite frankly, I feel that appeals lodged in those circumstances are commenced, not because of the merits of the case—neither the hon. member for Townsville South nor the Minister has a full and true appreciation of all the facts, circumstances and merits—but for political expediency and fear of public disapproval. Therefore the Minister rushes in with these appeals, which are costly both to the State and to the persons against whom the appeals are lodged. Invariably when the hon. member brings these matters up the appeals are dismissed anyway.

**Mr. Aikens:** I have won them all. The Minister has won them all. Be fair.

**Mr. BENNETT:** The hon. member won them all in his own little imagination.

**Mr. Aikens:** He has won them all.

**Mr. BENNETT:** The hon. member has a very vivid imagination.

**Mr. Aikens:** You are concerned only with the criminal. We are concerned with the victim.

**Mr. BENNETT:** If I was concerned only with the criminal I would devote my whole attention to the member for Townsville South.

The finding of a committee on criminology was that a period of actual confinement of ten years is the maximum which most prisoners can take without physical and mental deterioration. An idea has developed in some circles that an offender must be cast into prison to punish him personally. That is only one of the reasons for depriving a person of his liberty. There is the matter of public protection and the setting of an example to others so that they will desist in any desire or temptation to commit crime. The fact that we want our pound of flesh from the prisoner is a very minor consideration. I believe that no fair-minded parliamentarian or politician would want to commit a person to a period of imprisonment which would have the direct result not of benefiting the community but of causing mental deterioration in the prisoner, unless, of course, in the interests of society it was absolutely imperative. The imposition of long sentences is not always the answer to the problem of crime. I believe that the concept of having prisoners on parole, with officers to look after them and supervise them, giving them the impression that society desires their company provided they are prepared to live properly in society, is the correct one.

This Government has also exercised in full its qualified right of Crown privilege. It has done that in some cases, in my submission, to deny the full truth to our courts of law. I believe that a law commission would notify this Government that such tactics are not only dishonourable but also dishonest. Lord Denning, in Duncan's case, said—

"It is quite apparent to me that the government departments attach overweening importance to ensuring secrecy for their own documents. They think they cannot do their work properly if anyone outside should ever be at liberty to see them. Even though the disclosure of the contents of any individual document may not be in the least harmful in itself, nevertheless it must not be disclosed lest a gap be made in their treasured immunity. I cannot accept this contention."

The Government and the Minister would do well, even before the appointment of any such commission, to inform the Solicitor-General and his Crown Prosecutors that Lord Denning made these observations. The spirit of them should be accepted and adopted in the conduct of their cases, both criminal and civil. I submit that the Crown should describe the nature and class of the document and say

why it should not be disclosed so that the court itself can decide whether the claim is well taken or not.

If an obligation is placed on the Crown to disclose the reasons for its concealment, in 99 per cent. of cases it will be found that there is no valid reason other than the questionable desire of the Crown to win its case at all costs—in spite of all considerations. I believe that the Minister should consider every class of document on its merits and withhold a document only when he is completely satisfied that the proper functioning of the Public Service is at stake. The reason given for the Crown's refusal to produce documents very often is that it is in conflict with the proper functioning of the Public Service. The principles of law say that that is not enough, and that the Minister and the Government should approach the court with complete candour so that justice will be done by disclosing all the material facts.

**Mr. Hanlon:** They do not even like you reading them when they are put on the notice board at the police station.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I shall be interested to hear the answer to that question, and I resent the comments made by the inspector concerned when referring to me. I shall have a little to say about him during the debate on the Police Department. He is a man who is supposed to be not only an inspector of police, but also a member of police boards who have exercised judicial authority. How he would exercise judicial authority it is difficult to understand in view of his extraordinary conduct towards a reputable member of this House seeking information that is public and is pinned up for the benefit of the public.

As a matter of fact, in the resultant trial it was sworn on oath by officers from the Fortitude Valley Police Station—and I can produce the transcript—that any member of the public is entitled to go into the Fortitude Valley Police Station at any time without asking or seeking permission. That was sworn on oath twice in the Criminal Court. I cannot help thinking that it was not completely truthful—in fact, I am satisfied that it was not. It was sworn on oath on that particular occasion obviously for the benefit of the Crown because the Crown had not approached the case with complete candour.

It is rather interesting to know that when this issue was closely considered in evidence-in-chief and in cross-examination, the judge finally said that in order to find the prisoner not guilty he would have to come to the conclusion that the two detectives were unmitigated liars. Subsequently the jury decided that the prisoner was not guilty. The rest was left to public imagination.

In regard to the correction or amendment of our law, I think the time is fast arriving, because of recent happenings in this Parliament, when the right to issue writs of

defamation ad lib should be considered carefully. If they are being issued in a proper and bona-fide fashion by the plaintiff to preserve his good name, that is completely in order, but if on the other hand—and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you would agree with me—if it is done merely to stifle discussion in Parliament, it is completely improper; it is not only contempt of court but it is also contempt of Parliament, and I know from my association with you over the years that you would hate to see Parliament held in contempt. I know that in relation to this matter you have done your best to preserve the integrity of Parliament. But when writs are issued for ulterior purposes such as that, we have reached the stage where the community would demand that rather than see Parliament gagged for a period of two years, the system of law should be changed in some fashion and those who issue writs on those occasions should be forced to prove their bona fides.

When I was granted an extension of time I gave an assurance that I would not speak at undue length. I think it is fair and proper that I should say this, because it concerns me personally. The writ issued against me at the beginning of this year because, in the interests of the community, I made a perfectly decent observation that there appeared to be a desire to have a team of "Yes" men at the headquarters known as the Crystal Palace has been discontinued. I made that statement believing it to be true—in fact, satisfied that it was true—and having a wealth of material to substantiate my allegation, claim, and submission. Because of activities associated with the administration of the Police Force I felt at that time that it was necessary in the interests of the public to make the observations that I made.

A writ was issued against me obviously to close my lips and seal my tongue and deny me, as a public man, the right to say these things. A session of Parliament began and, because of the existence of the writ, I was deprived of the opportunity of addressing myself to certain transfers that I am satisfied were not bona fide and were not carried out in the interests of the Police Force. Again, as a member of Parliament, my lips were sealed—and, for that matter, so were the lips of other hon. members—because of the existence of the writ.

I endeavoured to have it dealt with expeditiously, as there are certain ways and means of getting fairly early hearings in these matters. I indicated to my solicitor that I would apply for a dismissal of the writ if it was not proceeded with. An application was made to the court as a result of which an order was made on summons for direction that a statement of claim be delivered by a specified date. Three weeks after the time allowed had expired, I again caused my solicitor to write to the plaintiff

and inform him that unless a statement of claim was delivered by 21 June, or some date approximating that, I would again apply to have the writ dismissed.

The result of that communication was that a notice of discontinuance was filed and my full costs were paid. That was scant satisfaction to me in the circumstances, because it seemed that the writ was not issued in a genuine fashion but was designed simply to stifle fair discussion by a public man and to prevent debate in this House.

I therefore feel that there should not be any right to issue writs other than for the purpose of initiating genuine litigation. I am not saying that my experience was an isolated case; I merely use it as an example because I have personal knowledge of it and can use it with truth. What happened to me is done regularly. It has been done, of course, by members of Parliament and by many other people. I feel that the right to issue a writ for the purpose of allowing a storm to blow over is not in the interests of the people, nor does it maintain respect for the law. There are many reasons why a commission for law reform should be appointed.

I do not wish to embark on another subject at this stage because it would take too much time to develop. I hope that I will later have an opportunity to deal with the matter to which I have already referred, namely, police transfers generally, because I still am not satisfied with the manner in which they are being carried out. I feel that the transfer of Detective Hallahan immediately on his return from overseas should be properly explained by the Minister. When the Estimates of the Police Department are being debated, I suppose the Minister and I will be able to have a full and free discussion on not only police transfers but many other matters as well.

**Mr. GAVEN** (South Coast) (2.54 p.m.): I am pleased to have the opportunity of associating myself with the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the speech delivered recently by His Excellency the Administrator of the Government, Sir Alan Mansfield, on the occasion of the opening of the third session of the 37th Parliament.

I wish first to congratulate wholeheartedly both the mover and the seconder of this motion for the very able manner in which they performed their tasks and upon their contributions to the debate. The new member for Mirani, Mr. Tom Newbery, disclosed to me, and I am sure to other hon. members, that he was a very good selection and that he has a thorough knowledge of the sugar industry—something that is very necessary in a representative from North Queensland, where that industry is of such great importance. Other hon. members for North Queensland—Mr. Row, Mr. Camm and Mr. Roy Armstrong, for example—have disclosed that they have a sound knowledge

of the sugar industry and are able representatives of the people of North Queensland, and a little later in my speech I shall endeavour to show that I have some knowledge of the milk and butter industry.

This is the last occasion on which I will have an opportunity to speak in generalities in this Chamber, and I want to take this opportunity to thank many people in Parliament House for the many kindnesses and courtesies they have shown me and for the help they have given me over many years. I have already announced that I did not seek the endorsement of the Country Party for the next election and that I shall be retiring from politics at the end of this session, and I should like to thank Mr. Dunlop, the Clerk of Parliament, and his predecessor, Mr. Tom Dickson—a very fine man—Mr. Johnson, the Sergeant at Arms, the messengers, and the many others who are actively engaged in making this Assembly work efficiently. I want to thank particularly the staff of the Correspondence Room, who have done a wonderful job over the years for the private members, or, as they are probably better known, the back-benchers, in this Parliament. Those girls are worth their weight in gold.

I wish to deal now with three or four subjects. The first is the great dairying and milk industry, which has always been near and dear to me. There are too few representatives of it in this Chamber to support it and speak on its behalf.

**Mr. Graham:** I thought you were going to speak about the tourist industry.

**Mr. GAVEN:** If the hon. member is patient, I am sure he will learn something from what I say.

I was really prompted to speak on this subject by an article in "The Courier-Mail" of 26 August this year. It was headed "Farmers 'hit by milk quotas'", and it went on to say—

"Samford district dairy farmers said yesterday they were being forced out of the industry, or compelled to take other jobs to supplement farm income, because of low prices for above-quota milk."

The article went on to list a number of grievances, but the one in which I was particularly interested related to above-quota milk, or what is called milk for manufacturing purposes. Although the farmers in the Samford district are direct suppliers to the milk industry in Brisbane, many hundreds of people in my electorate also sell above-quota milk.

**Mr. Graham:** Why don't you read what the Press had to say about your pulling away from the Country Party?

**Mr. GAVEN:** As I said earlier, if the hon. member will listen, he will learn something from what I am saying.

The article went on to say—

“Milk companies bought the surplus milk for 1s. 10d. to 2s. a gallon, representing a loss to 2s. for every gallon above quota the farmer sold, but which he had to produce to keep the quota.”

That is quite true; but people in the Canungra and Beechmont areas, the Numinbah Valley, the Merrimac area and the Tallebudgera and Currumbin Valleys depend on the milk industry for their livelihood, and they supply a co-operative milk company known as the South Coast Dairy Company, which has a well-run factory in Southport. These people are not direct suppliers to the Brisbane milk market; they supply the co-operative factory, which has a quota on the Brisbane milk market. For the purposes of argument, let me take a figure of 100 gallons. If a supplier to the South Coast Dairy Company sends 100 gallons of milk a day to the factory, in order to retain a quota he must supply 33½ per cent. of that 100 gallons for manufacturing purposes. He is paid for 66½ per cent. of that milk at the Milk Board price less freight and other charges, and the rest he is paid for at the price of milk for manufacturing purposes, which at the moment works out at 5s. a gallon on a butter-fat basis. Previously it was 4s. 3d. and then 4s. 9d., but recently there has been an increase.

Following the statement that was made on Friday, 27 August, the Brisbane Milk Board chairman, Mr. A. A. Ross, whom I have never met but who I understand from many of my friends is a very honourable man who can be relied upon to do the fair and right thing by the farmers, said—

“Claims by farmers that above-quota milk was bought cheaply by milk companies and sold as bottled milk were ‘completely inaccurate and misleading.’”

I do not intend to question that, but he goes on to say—

“The Milk Board fixed the price which Brisbane wholesale vendors were required to pay for milk used for consumption as liquid milk.”

With all due respect to Mr. Ross, with his good reputation, I tell him that he is quite wrong. The Milk Board did not fix the price. It attempted to do it but the price of milk was fixed by the Queensland Cabinet. It did not come before the Government and, as a member of the Government, I will not accept any responsibility for the rejection of the increase in price asked for by the Brisbane Milk Board until 30 September next. The Milk Board made a recommendation that the price of milk should be increased by 1d. a pint because of the unprecedented drought conditions existing in the State and the phenomenal price that milk producers had to pay for feed. I

bought feed at the Brisbane market only last Thursday. I paid £78 a ton for lucerne chaff and £58 a ton for lucerne hay.

When that recommendation was made recently by this board appointed by the Government, it was not acceded to. When a committee is appointed for any purpose the Government should be guided by its opinion. The men on the committee said that the price of over-quota milk, or manufacturing milk, is not governed by the board, the Government or anybody else. It comes willy-nilly onto the market by contract between anybody who wants to sell it and the wholesalers who buy it. Whether it is sold later as top-price milk I would not know, nor would anybody else I have ever met, and I think the time has arrived when a price should be fixed for it. The producer would then know what he would get for it, which would be something better than he has been getting in the past.

This is a duly constituted board, the personnel of which in April, when the decision was made, were J. M. Scott, direct producers' representative—more power to him, he is a good man; M. J. Dwyer, country factory representative; C. J. McDermott, wholesalers' representative; E. W. Atkinson, retailers' representative; and Mrs. E. Byth, consumers' representative representing the housewives of this State. This duly constituted board unanimously decided that conditions were such that the producers were entitled to a drought loading of 1d. a pint. Cabinet—not the Government—did nothing from April to June. If the matter had come before the Government I would have had a say in it, as would many other back-benchers, but it did not and Cabinet procrastinated from April to June. Farmers went on carrying water in an effort to keep their cattle alive but the Government did nothing.

After six or seven weeks of procrastination, Cabinet decided not to accept the recommendation of the board for 1d. a pint and granted the farmers only ½d. a pint, or 4d. a gallon. Having appointed this board and having received a unanimous decision from the board, they rejected its recommendation. I say that that is government by regulation, not government by the people for the people, which is democracy. Government by regulation is doing this Parliament no good and will do it no good in the future. I do not care what political colour occupies the Government benches, I never have believed in government by regulation, and I never will.

Whether it is on-the-spot parking fines, the price of milk or anything else, it should be decided by the Government of the day and not by a handful of Cabinet Ministers. It is like our own railway line to the Gold Coast, which was closed by regulation by a handful of people. Hon. members representing 20,000-odd people on the Gold Coast put up a case to retain what they had, but they were completely ignored. They were

given no say whatever in whether the railway line would stop or go. Is that democratic government? Of course it is not. Neither was it democratic government when the recommended milk price was rejected. Neither was it democratic government to introduce on-the-spot fines without the members of the Government having a say in the matter.

I want to strike a blow for the backbenchers of this Government. If Cabinet is not careful, if it continues to ignore members in this way, it will find one day that it will not have around it any members who are worth their salt. People get sick and tired of that sort of thing. I reject government by regulation by this Government just as I rejected it when I sat on the Opposition side. There are not many of us left today who were sitting in opposition when the A.L.P. Government was castigated "hell, west and crooked" about government by regulation.

**Mr. Lloyd:** We did have a say in the government.

**Mr. GAVEN:** They were only amateurs compared with what is happening today.

Mr. Hunter, who was chairman of the Milk Board and Government representative, has gone. In his place we have Mr. Ross. As I said, I understand that he is a man of integrity and one whose probity is beyond question. I think he will be a good man on the board. Mrs. Byth, the consumers' representative, has been replaced by Mrs. Keys. I hope that the new board, with two new members, will do the right and proper thing. It had been mentioned that the  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. a pint would come off on 30 September. The recommendation was 8d. a gallon or 1d. a pint and the producers were to get  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. a pint until 30 September. It has now been asked that it be kept on till next February. I say that it should be kept on indefinitely. Only those in the industry know how bad the drought has been, and what has been happening. Herds have been completely wiped out.

Only last Sunday a man in Canungra told me he had lost 100 dairy cows out of 120. During the recent cyclonic disturbance a man at Beechmont lost 37 head of his dairy cattle in one night. Yet Cabinet procrastinates about a rise in the price of milk even though the representatives of the Queensland Housewives' Association are only too happy to agree to it because they realise the difficulties of the dairy farmers. What a paradox when a few days after that Cabinet decided to go around with the hat to collect "dough" for people in the drought-stricken areas of the West! Why does it not do something worth while? What is £60,000 or £70,000 in times such as we are passing through? With a 50-head herd of dairy cows a ton of lucerne just would not hit the ground; it would be gone in a night or a day. At £78 a ton, hon. members can realise the position these people are in. They have to keep up their quota because if they are

down 1, 2, 10 or 20 gallons, they are penalised and they lose the quota that they have built up over the years.

I am astounded, amazed, dumbfounded and astonished that the Government I have supported as long as I have lived—a Government I have fought for and worked for all over this State—should play a trick like this and reject the price that the Milk Board suggested. I thought I would never live to see the day when a Country Party man would come out openly in the Press and threaten the Milk Board that if it even attempted to increase the price of milk he would issue an injunction against it. More power to men like Mr. Hunter, who, in spite of these things, had the initiative to say, "It is time the farmers got what they are justly entitled to." He made that recommendation but it was rejected.

I hope that the  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. a pint which has been added will continue indefinitely, as Cabinet has not a very good record so far as the price of milk is concerned. Until the day in June when the drought loading was added, we had had an increase of only  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. a pint in the price of milk from the present Government. The figures show that on 8 April, 1957, we were getting 3s. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. a gallon and, on 16 March, 1964, 3s. 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. When the drought relief was added the price rose to 4s. 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. in Brisbane, and to 3s. 11d. for the people I represent.

I have no desire to leave this House saying things I would not say on the street corner. I have never looked for the protection of this Parliament. Every time I have opened my mouth here I have said things that I would say in any part of the State, and that is what I intend to do today. I will be fair and straight. I will not take advantage of the coward's castle, which I have seen so many other hon. members do. Australia's farm produce for the last financial year was worth £1,560 million. Last year £1,075 million, of £1,380 million of total exports came from primary industry, which gives us some idea of the part primary industries play.

Recently a man said to me, "What about the butter people?" I said, "The milk people are in a bad enough position but the butter people are in a hopeless position." I respect the president of the Country Party, Mr. Ahearn, but he is stampeding around the country telling primary producers, "If you increase the price of milk you will get buyer resistance and people will not drink it." I could just as well say when the working man goes to court and asks for a rise in his wages calculated on the "C" Series Index (and he is justly entitled to it) and gets it, that people will not employ him because of the rise. It is the same as saying that because judges get an increase of £500 a year in their salaries just by a wave of the hand, the courts will not have judges sitting there. I might as well be told that

when the tall poppies of the Public Service, by a wave of the hand, get an increase of £300 a year they should all be dismissed.

If the economy of this country cannot stand an increase of  $\frac{1}{4}$ d. a pint in the price of milk at a time like this, it cannot stand an increase in parliamentary salaries. I am wondering now if any letters will be sent to the Press saying that if there is any increase in parliamentary salaries some members of this Parliament will take out an injunction against the Done Parliamentary Salaries Committee for increasing the salaries. I am not going to say whether or not we are entitled to an increase, although I believe we are. If we are to get in Parliament good men who have to sacrifice the things that are near and dear to them, they are worth at least the salaries of some under secretaries. There is no doubt about that. I do not see any letters objecting to increased salaries or hear any talk about taking out an injunction if they are increased. For seven days a week, in times of drought, flood and fire, farmers face the risks of pests and diseases in their stock which were not apparent a few years ago. All the time the prices of machinery, milk cans and barbed wire are skyrocketing, yet the unanimous recommendation of the board appointed by Cabinet was refused. Is it any wonder that the farmers become disheartened? I only hope that some later decision will be made and that the right thing will be done by both the board and the suppliers.

I want now to make a few remarks about the recent loan allocations. A totally unrealistic approach was made to the loan allocation for the area that I represent. We have a valuation of £32,000,000 and are allowed to borrow £496,000. Last year we had a building record of £8,000,000, an all-time record for this State, transcending every other city in Queensland with the exception of Brisbane. Having had a building record of £8,000,000 last year, a record of £1,000,000 for the first month of this year, having enticed people from all over the globe, and having built up the greatest tourist area in the southern hemisphere, we asked for £1,500,000 for sewerage, water reticulation, kerbing and channelling, beautification schemes, and the other multifarious things that any local authority has to do, and we were given a loan allocation of only £496,000. How unrealistic!

**Mr. Aikens** interjected.

**Mr. GAVEN:** The city of Townsville has a valuation of £20,000,000, £12,000,000 lower than that of the city of Gold Coast. Yet Townsville got £634,000, nearly £200,000 more than the city of Gold Coast.

**Mr. Aikens:** Good political representation.

**Mr. GAVEN:** I do not begrudge them one iota.

The same remarks apply to Gladstone, which has a valuation of £600,000, the same valuation as one street in the city of Gold

Coast, yet its allocation was far greater than ours. On a per-capita basis, on a valuation basis, or any way it is looked at and compared with anywhere else in Queensland, to use the vernacular, we have been left for dead; we are not in the race. For an area that is putting the State on the map and earning thousands and thousands of pounds in the tourist industry, we have been brushed off.

The Gold Coast City Council is doing as good a job as the money it is able to obtain will allow it. No business can be expanded nor can anything be built up without loan money. The State Government could not exist without loan money; neither can the 131 local authorities in this State. Each and every one of them is screaming about its allocation. I can assure the House that, like other local authorities, the Gold Coast City Council is in real trouble. Local authorities today have reached the crossroads from the financial point of view. They are in a critical position.

I wonder how much longer the ratepayers can carry on with enforced higher valuations, and as a consequence, enforced higher rates. They are putting their hands into their pockets for more money every year. Some people on the Gold Coast who have to find Crown rent, and rates on top of that, are paying up to £4 a week to live in their own homes. Where are we going? We have reached a critical stage. There must be some means of raising finance for local authorities other than by a charge against land. The ratepayer can continue no longer to carry the burden of all that must be done to keep local authorities functioning in this State.

That is the kind of allocation we get when the drought is only beginning. We have had some rain and the grass looks green. But there is no feed. This is the most critical time for cattle. Anybody who knows the cattle industry is aware that when cattle come from nothing to a nibble of green pasture they get dysentery and everything else. It is one thing after the other. As soon as the grass turns green there is talk of taking off the  $\frac{1}{4}$ d. a pint, which is helping the farmer out of his difficulty and trouble.

I turn now to the State-wide marine aid programme totalling more than £223,000. It was announced recently that out of the amount of £223,000 the Gold Coast is to receive £10,000. The Gold Coast is the shop window of Queensland with its Broadwater and river estuary, and we get £10,000. Many areas with minor ranking in the tourist industry have been allocated far more than the Gold Coast. Over the years we have had promises and lip service. We have been told that the beautiful Broadwater at Southport would be made the shop window of the State and that this and that would be done with the Nerang estuary. It has been nothing but lip service. The Southport Broadwater and the Nerang estuary are no different today from when I was a boy—and that is longer than five years ago. We get all these promises that this and that will

be done, but in the final analysis nothing materialises and the promises mean nothing at all.

Many other areas on the South Coast need assistance. Slow progress is being made with the provision of a harbour at Currumbin. I have been urging strongly for four or five years the provision of a deepwater port in the South Coast area. It does not look as though those plans are going to come to fruition, either. A technical college in my area is absolutely essential. There is at present a permanent population of approximately 50,000. During holiday periods it increases to 120,000, 140,000, or 150,000. The provision of a technical college is long overdue.

Thousands of people living on the South Coast work in the building trade. Building work to the value of £8,000,000 is not completed in one year without the use of the services of a great number of people, many of whom reside permanently with their families on the South Coast. Very many apprentices are employed, and the number would be doubled if there were adequate local training facilities.

Recently there has been a definite move to separate technical education from academic high-school education, and moves to achieve this end have been made at Rockhampton, Toowoomba, Bundaberg, Townsville, and Cairns. Should not the South Coast put in its claim? After all, it is an area of high valuations; it has a large population; it makes a great contribution to the tourist industry; and it has a building record second only to the capital city of Brisbane.

I notice sitting on the Ministerial benches a man whom I respect and with whom I have worked for a number of years, namely, the Minister for Works and Housing. I know he will do his best for the South Coast. There must be others who do not see things as he sees them, nevertheless the time is overdue for the Government to take cognizance of the situation on the South Coast. Before valuations rise sky high land should be resumed at the far end of the coast, round the Currumbin area, for a hospital and technical college or high school. When that is done, let there be no encroachment on the areas that have been cleared and made available by the service clubs as recreation areas for the people. Let the land resumed be over the old railway line where land adjacent to the main highway is cheaper. This could be held till the Government is ready to build another hospital, technical college, or high school.

I have all the respect in the world for my colleague the hon. member for Albert, but why should everything be centralised in Southport? That is only part of the Gold Coast. There are tens of thousands of people farther down the coast, and these facilities to which I refer are needed in their area. I urge the Government to resume 80 to 100 acres of land to be used for a

hospital, technical college, high school, parks and recreation grounds. There is little land left now, and it is not everyone who wants to sit on the sand. People want to take picnic baskets and enjoy themselves with their families in parks. All who go to England will see that what has been done there in the provision of parks and recreation grounds as breathing spaces for millions of people puts Queensland to shame. We have God's own country, 667,000 square miles of it, but we have not the parks, gardens, and general beautification schemes that we should have.

I now want to say something about erosion. I read in the Press on 27 August that the Government had ordered two pilot launches to cost £92,000. The report stated—

"Harbours and Marine Department director (Mr. A. J. Peel) said the launches would each be 54 ft. long.

"The anti-erosion survey launch has been bought for the Co-ordinator-General's Department.

"This represents the Government's first definite move to follow up the report and recommendations made by the Dutch expert, Mr. J. G. H. R. Diephuis, in May on how to prevent erosion at the North and South Coast beaches."

I have heard about this for a long time. I first raised the problem of erosion the day that I entered this Chamber in 1950. The Premier of the day, the late Hon. E. M. Hanlon, said that he would look into the matter. He also said that responsibility for the foreshores and the beaches was vested in what was then the council of the Town of South Coast, and he went on to say, "This Government will make available to the local authorities in that area a subsidy of 33½ per cent. for any scheme that might be put up for foreshore protection works that meet with the approval of the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works." Today there is no subsidy; nothing has ever been done. There has been a great deal of talk about erosion. I might tell you, Mr. Speaker, that free enterprise has put no less than £40,000,000 into the area that I represent in the past 12 years. They are the people who develop the State and develop the country—free enterprise—not governments nor local authorities, and local authorities and governments should encourage them and give them all the assistance they possibly can to this end.

I have waited long, patiently and earnestly to see the report from Mr. Diephuis, who was brought out from Holland to make a report on our erosion problems. I was also anxious to see the report of that very able engineer—he is one of the best in this country—Mr. John Kindler, who was sent overseas to investigate sea erosion and the problems arising from it. Where are those reports? Are they military secrets? Why have not the local authorities got them?

Why are not the people who have spent millions of pounds in building up the area in a position to know what the recommendations are and what is about to be done?

When I was overseas last year, I took the opportunity to fly to Holland to have a look at the problems there and how the Dutch handle them. The problems in Holland are not identical with our problems here. The North Sea is as flat as a board and there is no surf there. Twice a year the sea comes in with a blow from the north-east, and walls have been built to keep it out. But walls are no good in the area that I represent, and no engineer worth his salt would stake his reputation that walls would stop sea erosion. I do not know what these gentlemen are going to recommend, but my observations lead me to believe that only two approaches are worth while. The beaches can be nourished by pumping sand on them, and this can be done in two ways. In my area, the beaches could be nourished by pumping on to them sand from the Nerang Estuary. This would clean out the Nerang River and the Broadwater, and the sand could be levelled out on the beaches by bulldozer. Quite a long slope is needed—one in four or one in five—so that the breakers come in and spend themselves by running up the sand. By this method, the beaches can be protected to some extent against cyclonic weather. In America the sand is obtained by bucket dredges. They use the old banana-wire system, in which the full banana carrier on the flying-fox pulls the empty one up. On almost every beach one sees a dredge out at the first line of breakers. There are millions of tons of sand in that area, and when the weather is calm the dredge goes out and the sand is brought into the beach, where the bulldozer levels it out and makes the slope on it to which I referred earlier and on which the force of the waves can be spent.

I brought back with me a photograph of the beach at The Hague, Holland's main beach, Scheveningen. It shows thousands of people on the beach. In the thousands of miles that I travelled, this was the only beach that I saw that has the same golden sand on it as the beaches on the Gold Coast have. But it is not surf. It is just flat sea. As I said, although it is flat sea, when they get a bad blow that is what they do to protect the beach. I will pass this photograph around. First there is the beach proper with thousands of people on it. Then there is the first wall built on a curve. The shape of this wall is similar to the shape of a breaker just as it is curling to break. Behind that wall there is a promenade about 100 to 150 feet in width. All this is in concrete. Behind that there is a four-lane roadway and behind that—again in concrete—a parking area for 3,000 to 5,000 cars. Behind that again there is the final wall sloping at a grade of one in four or one in five. When the water gets over

the first wall across the promenade, and across the four-lane highway and the parking area, it spends itself against the final wall.

I have spoken to engineers—not all importations but local men with a ton of knowledge who never get an opportunity to air it—who are all anxiously awaiting the report of this man whom we sent overseas. They all agree that our beaches are hard to protect because under our sand, at a depth of 14 to 16 feet, we have an underground lake from one end of the coast to the other. It contains the best fresh water in the world. It is amazing that the closer one gets to salt water, so long as it is above high tide mark, the purer the fresh water is.

The Pacific Ocean often belies its name; it is not so peaceful. When the breakers come in during cyclonic weather they automatically undermine a rock wall because there is no rock underneath it, and it tumbles into the sea. There is only one way to preserve our beaches, which are worth millions of pounds to this State, and that is by pumping sand from the estuaries behind them by the bucket-dredge method at about where the first breaker is.

I am anxiously awaiting these reports, and so are the local authorities and other members of this Government. Why can't we see them? Are they military secrets? Why don't we get them? As I said before, there should be more confidence between Cabinet Ministers and the men who sit behind them. Otherwise, those men are relegated to the position of glorified message boys. Whether it is right or wrong, I reiterate that I resent the fact that we were not given the opportunity of discussing this matter; I resent the fact that a unanimous decision of the Milk Board was rejected by Cabinet and that we knew nothing about it; I resent the fact that the railway line was taken from the people in my area without any of the members affected being given the opportunity to raise his hand against it. We were completely ignored.

If that is the way the Cabinet acts it will never get loyalty from the men sitting behind it. Unless Cabinet is prepared to work in with members of the Government—some Ministers do—and take them into their confidence and let them know what is going on, it will not get their support. At present, until back-benchers read in the newspapers that the Government is doing so-and-so, they know nothing about it.

**Mr. DIPLOCK (Aubigny) (3.35 p.m.):** As His Excellency the Governor will be leaving Queensland early next year, I join with previous speakers in congratulating His Excellency and Lady May on a most successful term of office. Queensland has been blessed with many excellent Governors, all of whom were held in the highest esteem by the people of this State because of the manner in which they carried out their duties, but I feel sure that all will agree that no ambassador could have done more to

strengthen the bonds that weld us to the British Commonwealth of Nations and to stiffen our resistance to the introduction of any other way of life than our present Governor has done. During the years that he has been with us he has availed himself of every opportunity to meet all sections of the community; to learn, at first hand, of their troubles and their joys, their successes and disappointments. This has given him a complete understanding of the problems of this State. His leaving will mean to the great majority of us the departure of one who has got to know and understand us very well.

**Mr. Aikens:** Do you think Sir Alan Munro will be a worthy successor to him?

**Mr. DIPLOCK:** I do.

Sir Henry came to us as Her Majesty's representative in Queensland; I feel that he leaves us as Queensland's future champion at court. On behalf of the people of the Aubigny electorate, I wish His Excellency and Lady May a long and very happy period of retirement.

In his Opening Speech the Administrator mentioned the effects of the drought and he voiced the sentiments of all sections of the community when he said, "It is our earnest prayer that these conditions will disappear and that normal seasons will return to rejuvenate the main source of our prosperity." The primary producers in the affected areas are undoubtedly the worst sufferers. Some will take years to recover from the losses they have sustained. Others, unfortunately, have little or no chance of recovery. The effects, too, have been felt, and will continue to be felt for some time, by all sections of the business world and the consuming public.

Droughts are not new to Queensland and the prosperity of those engaged in primary industry and the overall economy of our State have been affected adversely by them quite often over the years. To the Government's credit, it did move to assist by making certain loans available and granting certain concessions when matters were really serious for many producers, but when unfortunately it was too late to be of much use to many others. To the credit of the organising committee in Brisbane, too, a fund was opened to enable people who were sympathetic to subscribe to provide relief in some measure. However, the amount of money made available, coupled with the method of distribution—in some cases two or three bags of feed to a farmer who had a fair-sized herd—made the whole thing almost farcical.

Was this assistance timely? Before it became available, tens of thousands of valuable sheep and cattle had died; thousands of breeders had been slaughtered before they became too poor to be of any commercial value, and consequently the effects of the drought must be felt for some time to come,

not only in the price of meat, milk, etc., but also because there will be a great scarcity of these products. Because of the number of breeders slaughtered, it will be more difficult in the course of a few months for the housewife to obtain the family's needs than it will be to pay for whatever meat is available.

Has not the time arrived when the Government must give thought to the provision of some insurance against these crippling losses rather than decide to hope for the best and be prepared to attempt to shut the gate after the horse has gone? Would it not be in the interests of the State generally if something of a definite nature were done to ensure that the producers were prepared when the next drought befalls us? Whether we pray that there will never be another drought or not, it is as sure as night follows day that there will be another, but no-one knows when.

Obviously, if the primary producer is to be in a position to offset the ravages of drought, he must be in a fairly sound position with water and fodder supplies when drought conditions set in, and I suggest that attention should be directed to assisting him in the conservation of both water and fodder. The hon. members for Roma and Gregory referred to the big men, but I am referring to the little men. It is all very well for those who are not aware of the financial position of the majority of farmers to say that farming is a business and it is up to those engaged in the industry to make these provisions on their own behalf. This is logical and fair comment, but to suggest it to a body of men who are not in a financial position to make these provisions is quite useless.

It must be remembered, too, that in working out some scheme whereby these people—particularly dairy farmers and small-crop farmers—will be assisted we will do something to benefit indirectly the big band of consumers—the workers of the State—who have to pay increased prices for primary products as drought causes them to become scarcer. I read in this morning's Press that in some shops prime cuts of meat are costing from 8s. 6d. to 10s. 6d. a lb., and I saw in yesterday's Press that in Sydney fillet steak was selling at up to 16s. a lb. This is because meat is scarce because of the drought, which is by no means finished. And, as its effects become worse, prices will rise still further.

Over the years many of our inland rivers, the waters from which are used for watering stock and for irrigation purposes, have become more or less chains of shallow water-holes except during the wet season. Restrictions are placed on the use of their water as the drought persists, and eventually they become dry. A few years ago they held tremendous volumes of water but at the present time they hold very little in comparison, mainly because during the wet season millions of gallons are wasted.

In their reports over the years Irrigation Commissioners have stressed the need for a water plan for the development and utilisation of the water resources of each river basin. There is a plan, and I agree that good work has been done in some river basins, but the plan must take into account the necessity for doing something, and doing something quickly, in respect of smaller schemes on rivers that have become incapable of holding any great volume of water. I understand and agree that from an economic point of view large schemes are the most attractive because of the very high cost of storage when small weirs, etc., are built. But I consider that some attention should be given to increasing the storage capacities of many of our streams. In other States—Victoria in particular—attention is paid to the deepening of streams by cleaning them out, and to protecting the banks and constructing small weirs. If it is found worth while to carry out this class of work elsewhere, then why not here?

Thinking again on the prevention-is-better-than-cure basis, the Government should give some consideration to assisting producers to conserve fodder and to have at least a worth-while reserve on hand at all times. Speaking generally, I would say that producers in this State are not as conscious of the necessity for fodder conservation as they are in some of the other States. But there are many who would make preparation to meet drought if they were in a position to do so. In an endeavour to make farmers conscious of the value of, and the necessity for, fodder conservation I have encouraged members of school project clubs in my area to make fodder conservation their home project for the year, and I suggest that the Minister for Education give consideration to bringing this matter into farmers' homes through this medium.

It must be borne in mind that many farmers have holdings so small that the storing of their own crops is an impossibility. What they grow is needed for their herds. During good seasons, however, there are many who produce fodder crops to such an extent that the price is very reasonable and it is at this time, I suggest, that assistance could be given in the form of low-interest loans on easy repayment terms. In my electorate there are many instances of farmers who have been able to hold their herds in fair condition because they had this reserve of fodder, some of it years old in the form of ensilage. Unfortunately, human nature being what it is, as the supply of fodder becomes scarcer and scarcer, the price soars higher and higher and men are forced to spend their hard-earned savings on, at times, fodder that has virtually no nutritional value. Whilst it is understandable that individuals who have supplies on hand hold out for higher prices, it is not understandable when the practice is indulged in by a board which really has nothing to gain for itself as a board of control. Recently I had occasion to expose such a practice. After I had

done so the farmers who were complaining received a better class of product and I was content to let the matter drop until there appeared in "The Courier-Mail" of 3 August the following statement under the heading "Charge is unfounded"—

"Charges that the State Wheat Board was taking advantage of the drought and over-charging stock feeders were unfounded, the Board's manager (Mr. J. W. Garsden) said yesterday. Mr. Garsden said there had been no change in the price of wheat since last December. This had been when the domestic consumption price to apply throughout the Commonwealth for the following year was declared in terms of the Australian Wheat Industry Stabilisation Plan. Mr. Garsden said wheat was being withdrawn by the State Wheat Board from the Australian pool and released to stock feeders, both directly and through the Drought Relief Fund scheme, in accordance with the declared price. 'Cover Cost'. The board's handling charges were barely enough to cover the cost of this service. Mr. Garsden said: 'Practically all of the wheat being distributed is of milling quality. Supplies of lower grade wheat which were available at a discount were very limited and are now almost exhausted.'"

No suggestion was made at any time that Mr. Garsden, or anybody else, had increased the price of wheat, but the statement was made that the farmers were being charged top prices for a wheat of very inferior quality. The statement by Mr. Garsden suggests that either I had been misinformed or that I had not made an investigation before commenting on the matter. I consider it my duty to make public the true facts of the case in order to ensure that what did happen does not happen again.

When I was advised by a Brisbane newspaper that a number of farmers in my area had complained because they had been charged top price for an inferior class of wheat and was asked to comment on the matter, I refused to do so until I had made a thorough investigation of the complaint. I arranged with the farmers who had made the complaints to the newspaper to bring samples of the wheat to Quinalow, a centre in my area. I arrived there at a certain time, and there were the farmers with their samples of wheat. Whilst we were looking at the wheat, along came a trailer loaded with wheat that had just been drawn from a dump belonging to the Wheat Board. I went to the driver and asked if he minded my taking samples of the wheat loaded on the trailer. I selected a couple of bags at random—one from the front of the truck and one from the rear—and collected samples from them in bags that I borrowed from the manager of the bank, who happened to be there. I went to where we had been talking about the matter and put the samples on the table. This caused some amusement because the samples that I had drawn from

wheat taken from the dump that morning were worse than any of the samples that the farmers had.

I have here for inspection of any hon. member who knows anything about wheat a sample of that wheat. It was not specially selected, and it is absolute rubbish.

**Mr. Walsh:** Are there any weevils in it?

**Mr. DIPLOCK:** It would not feed a weevil. It consists of wheat with no nutritional value at all. It includes buck wheat, shot wheat, wild turnip, and wheat that is so small as to be of no use at all. I should like hon. members who know wheat to look at it and see if in their opinion the charges made were either extravagant or exaggerated. I also have with me dockets showing the prices paid for it. It cost 13s. a bushel, or 14s. 11d. less discount.

**Mr. Campbell:** That is feed price.

**Mr. DIPLOCK:** This is stock feed. I took it to a classifier and if we were outside I could tell the hon. member how he classified it. I cannot tell him here. The farmers were given no choice in the wheat they should take. They went to the Wheat Board, paid the cheque, and were sent to a certain dump to get the wheat.

A number of hon. members have referred to transport in connection with the drought, and I agree with what they have said. It is true that the Transport Department waived road charges when fodder was being taken to drought areas, and I think everybody will give it credit for that. But this is what happened in my area. People were forced to dispose of their stock because of the shortage of fodder; now it has rained, and in an area with a radius of about 20 miles there is a great deal of feed and the people have no stock. I made application for permission for people in that area to bring stock from drought areas so that they might be fed on the grass that was available, but the department would not waive the charges for this purpose. If it is fair that charges should be waived—I think it is—when one is sending fodder to drought areas, it is equally fair that charges should be waived if one is bringing stock into what were drought areas but in which feed is now available.

I intend now, Mr. Speaker, to comment on what I consider a very undesirable feature associated with the legislation covering drinking at licensed premises during specified hours on Sundays. I do not wish to be misunderstood because of the comments I make and, consequently, wish to emphasise that I am definitely not an advocate for the extension of drinking privileges on Sundays.

Whether we agree or disagree with the principle of hotel proprietors being permitted to trade on Sundays is beside the point and of no account, inasmuch as they have already been extended that right by Parliament. All that we can do, in my opinion, is to have desirable amendments

made to the law by bringing to the notice of the Minister what we consider to be undesirable effects of the legislation as it now stands.

I feel sure that the Minister was prompted to introduce this particular legislation by a desire to encourage those who wished to have a drink on Sunday to do so in a respectable way. Speaking for my own electorate, I would say that the time set for the present specified afternoon session is defeating this purpose, and judging by the number of requests from country centres for a variation of the hours, I would say that would be the case at probably 90 per cent. of country centres.

In centres removed from the coast, where the attraction of the beaches is lost, the majority of young men engage in some form of sport and are keen patrons of sporting fixtures. Usually these games do not finish until approximately 5 o'clock or later. The present time allotted for the afternoon hotel session is from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m., and we find players and patrons hurrying from the grounds at the conclusion of play and making their way to their favourite hotel. Having arrived there, they know there is very little time left before the lounge has to be cleared and they indulge in a quick drinking session. This, I feel, is not in the best interests of the public.

Generally, these men attend sporting fixtures in small groups and when they arrive at the hotel after the game each feels that he, in turn, should treat the rest of the group; so, instead of being able to relax and discuss the game leisurely, the race to beat the bell is on and all the evils of the old-time sessions still prevail. I discussed this matter with the Minister when the Bill was being considered and I gained the impression—I think the Minister was under the same impression—that the hours of the session could be varied if desirable to enable the object of the legislation to be achieved. It is my opinion that the present session period is definitely not in the best interests of the community and I suggest that the Minister give this matter his consideration.

I emphasise that I do not wish to go to any hotel on a Sunday.

**Mr. Bennett:** You have home supplies.

**Mr. DIPLOCK:** That is right. I have home supplies and I have never suggested anything else. I do not wish to go to a hotel. But if we are going to permit men to go to a hotel and say it is lawful and right for them to do so, then it is in the interests of the community to give them the right to drink in an orderly fashion.

**Mr. CAMPBELL (Aspley) (4.2 p.m.):** Before dealing with the topics on which I have chosen to comment in this debate, I wish to accept the invitation extended to members of this House by the hon. member who has just resumed his seat to comment

on the sample of wheat he has presented to us this afternoon. Let me say quite categorically that as stock feed, the sample presented to the House is far superior to f.a.q. wheat because a chemical analysis of pinched wheat—and 95 per cent. of this wheat is pinched—will show that it is higher in protein than ordinary f.a.q. wheat, and in consequence the nutritional value of pinched wheat is superior to ordinary f.a.q. wheat. Anyone who has been obliged to use this wheat in these dire circumstances would have been much happier to receive these samples as consignments of wheat than those we had in years of previous drought when, in 1947, and again in 1952, the poultry industry particularly was given wheat that was of no value whatever because all the nutriment had been extracted from it by weevils. Somebody asked the hon. member whether there were any weevils in this wheat. It is completely free of them.

**Mr. Walsh:** It looks to me like good feed for mice.

**Mr. CAMPBELL:** Perhaps mice are the most selective animals we know; they choose only the best. I think that a rather unfair reflection has been cast upon the Wheat Board in this matter because there is a tremendous demand for wheat and the board has been at its wits end to keep the supply up.

Having commented on that matter, in view of the impending retirement of His Excellency the Governor, I wish, on behalf of my constituents, to extend their thanks to Sir Henry Abel Smith for the very capable manner in which he has fulfilled his high office since he came to these shores. He has fulfilled the duties of his office with dignity and ability. I am sure all Queenslanders will be very sorry to see His Excellency retire. In fulfilling his office he has been ably supported by his charming wife, Lady May, and we will miss her also. Sir Henry exemplified the typical Englishman—that type of person who has made so great a contribution to industry and culture in the English-speaking world. He took a tremendous interest in every activity in the community, but I suppose he will be best remembered for the interest he took in the youth of the State. I am sure that Commonwealth Youth Week will be remembered as one of the highlights of his achievements. On every occasion, particularly during Commonwealth Youth Week, Sir Henry sought to bring to the attention of the youth of this State the importance of the British Commonwealth.

In his remarks the Leader of the Opposition referred to the cost of our vice-regal establishment. I hope the views he expressed are not a prelude to advocating the abandonment of our link with the British Crown and the establishment of a republic in its stead. If I misinterpreted what the Leader of the Opposition said in this connection I am quite prepared to accept his denial. However, I cannot overlook the expressions of some extreme Left Wing members of his party

who have advocated such a course, particularly those Left Wing members who maintain a close contact with the Communists, whose principal objective is the severance of our links with the Mother Country.

I join with other hon. members in expressing my congratulations to the newly elected member for Mirani, Mr. Newbery, who has shown that he will be an acquisition to this House.

**Mr. Bennett:** It is a pity he will not be here long.

**Mr. CAMPBELL:** I am sure he will make many years of useful contribution in the Chamber, which is more than can be said for the hon. member for South Brisbane. The hon. member for Mirani brings to the House wide experience gained in many fields of public and private enterprise.

I take the opportunity of thanking the retiring member for Ithaca, Mr. Windsor, for his representations while he has been a member of this House. He has always conducted himself with characteristic dignity and decorum. Some hon. members opposite may snigger at this comment, but I am sure that if all hon. members were to emulate the conduct of the hon. member for Ithaca the House would be better for it. We look forward to welcoming Mr. Windsor's successor, Mr. Colin Miller, after the next election.

I think it fitting that thanks and congratulations should be extended to the Treasurer, Mr. Hiley, and the hon. member for Toowong, Sir Alan Munro, both of whom have announced that they will retire at the end of this Parliament. Both those hon. gentlemen in their very high offices have made enormous contributions to the advancement of this State. I thank the hon. member for Wavell for reminding me of the impending retirement of the hon. member for Toowoomba East. Mr. Anderson has always conducted himself in the manner I referred to when speaking of the hon. member for Ithaca. We will also be very sorry to lose him.

**Mr. O'Donnell** interjected.

**Mr. CAMPBELL:** As the hon. member for Barcoo has reminded me, the hon. member for South Coast also has announced his pending requirement. I couple him with these remarks.

The Opening Speech of the Administrator, Sir Alan Mansfield, conveyed a picture of steady advancement which has now come to be expected of this Government. The whole tenor of his address indicated the great development, in all aspects, that is taking place in this State. It is amazing how readily we get used to a situation and take for granted things which, a few years ago, were not thought possible. Examples of this may be found in the natural gas and oil discoveries. Who would have thought a few years ago that oil or gas would be

discovered in Queensland in commercial quantities? Of course, the same remarks apply to the oil refineries at the mouth of the river, one of which is already operating and the other about to come on stream. It is interesting to note from the Administrator's speech that no less than £18,500,000 was spent last year on capital electricity generating works and that £21,250,000 is proposed to be spent this year. That indicates the determination of the Government to keep abreast of the power generation needs of the State, for power is the real key to this State's progressive development. Time does not permit me to deal in detail with the various advances at present taking place in the State, except to say that the Government has faced up squarely to the responsibility of directing the destiny of this State in a forthright and capable manner. We on this side of the House have every confidence that we will continue to attract the support of the people, who have come to depend on us to provide stable government in this State. Of course, they have little to look forward to when they consider the alternative form of government supplied by the Opposition.

There is a well-known saying that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones. Quite a deal of stone-throwing has been indulged in by hon. members opposite during this debate. It would be foolish of me to pretend that a certain amount of tension does not exist between us on this side of the House but, of course, this is understandable when we consider that the principal objective of a political party is to win sufficient support to enable it to implement its platform. Indeed, such an objective is the main purpose of a party's existence and is a natural political aspiration. Because we who are Liberals believe that our platform is designed to cater for the needs of all individuals in the community, we desire to enjoy the situation which prevails in Victoria where the Liberal Party forms the State Government.

But since we have not been able to achieve such a desirable situation here and since our two parties possess a similar political outlook, we are quite happy to join hands with our friends the Country Party, as is the case in New South Wales, except, of course, in that State the Liberal Party enjoys a numerical superiority in seats held, as well as votes obtained, whereas we in Queensland enjoy only a minority in votes cast, although it is inevitable that at some time in the future the Liberal Party in this State will attain numerical superiority in seats held. This, then, is the core of the problem. Repeated references which have been made to three-cornered contests only veil the real issue. This term is really a misnomer as three-cornered contests have been the order of things at elections here since the Labour split in 1957. Four-cornered contests would be a more precise description.

However, I repeat that such references merely veil the issue and are really only a means to an end; the end result being the wresting of the balance of power from the Country Party, and reference to experience of electoral contests between our two parties in other States means little in relation to the situation here, as in no other State has the balance of power been in question. This was the issue at our recent party convention at Surfers Paradise. There was a large body of opinion which believed that numerical superiority would be achieved by our party as a logical result of the increased urbanisation of this State, together with opportunities for advancement which would occur as seats become vacant, such as Gold Coast, Wynnum, and Ipswich West, in the forthcoming election, as well as those which will be vacated in the not too far distant future, such as Fassifern, Landsborough, and Balonne.

Those who supported this view were, in the main, members of fairly long standing in the party who have known political adversity as well as political success, and who do not wish to see the political situation confused by the intrusion of new and inexperienced candidates against sitting members. In effect, they were prepared to be patient and accept the balance of power when it occurred through the effluxion of time and circumstances, rather than precipitate a head-on confrontation with the Country Party lest the sensitivity of the electors react against such a course of power politics, and believing that the results of such a course of action are not clearly predictable. But make no mistake, these people are no less keen to see our party advance and prosper than those who take a more aggressive view; nor do they have any less regard for the party's principles and its platform.

It is a matter of history now that at the Surfers Paradise convention the majority of delegates supported the views of those who seek to achieve the balance of power at the forthcoming elections by contesting selected seats currently held by the Country Party, and it is to be hoped that in these contests our parties do not lose sight of our main political enemy.

These are the matters which are being referred to by hon. members opposite. Whatever our problems are, or whatever problems we may have, they fade into insignificance when compared with the grave problems facing the Labour Party. One has only to remember what took place at the Townsville convention last May to realise that the Labour Party is still as hopelessly divided as it ever was. Behind the apparent calm party façade lies smouldering bitterness and hatred which is liable to burst into flames at any moment. There is stark realism in the Labour Party of the need for a new image, and its leaders proceeded to Townsville with hopes that a better Labour image would emerge.

A strong sense of urgency was given to this need by the reverses suffered by Labour in the New South Wales election in that

month. But these fond hopes were shortlived as the result of Left Wing domination, for all along the line the moderates were defeated as the Left Wing called the tune, and Press reports of that eventful conference are still fresh in our minds. It was reported that the conference made an unprecedented and momentous decision to open its proceedings to the Press. I see nothing remarkable about this and cannot see why it should be regarded as a momentous decision, as our conferences have always been open to the Press to allow free reporting of them.

Let us look at the result of opening conference proceedings to the Press. On Monday, 10 May, it was reported that the A.L.P. was looking for a good polling image. Tuesday's report of the first day's tussle stated that the Left Wing was early in control. It also stated that in three ballots all of the Left Wing group's nominees were elected, and unity tickets were freely used. The day ended with an appeal from Mr. Calwell to close the ranks and bring an end to futile faction fighting. If hon. members opposite dispute any of that, they are disputing the reporting of their conference.

**Mr. Donald:** We believe in freedom of speech.

**Mr. CAMPBELL:** The hon. member for Ipswich East says, "We believe in freedom of speech." Was there freedom of speech at Townsville?

**An Opposition Member:** Of course there was.

**Mr. CAMPBELL:** The Press reports showed how free it was—in many cases it was apparently a free-for-all.

Wednesday's Press report was to the effect that the Left Wing had tightened its grip on the Labour Party Convention and was assured of party control for the next three years. It went on to state that in every ballot delegates of the Tades Hall group ticket were elected to convention committees and the Federal A.L.P. Conference, and A.W.U. members were successful only when their nominees were placed on Trades Hall tickets.

The report appearing on Thursday stated the State secretary of the Australian Workers' Union, Mr. Edgar Williams, was again defeated and failed to become one of the two Queensland delegates to the Federal A.L.P. Conference. There were also ugly scenes over pamphlets, and Mr. Pont accused Mr. Egerton of distributing anti-A.W.U. pamphlets. This is the conference that the hon. member for South Brisbane suggests went off like a Sunday school picnic and at which everything in the garden was lovely. The report continued that whilst some constructive planning must have emerged from the conference, nevertheless the Labour Party's image was still as blurred as ever.

Of course, a similar story emerged from last month's Federal conference of the Labour Party in Sydney. I shall quote the heading

of Harold Cox's article in "The Sunday Mail" of 8 August, 1965: "All the talk solved nothing for Labour."

Eighteen months ago the Labour Party copied the example of the Liberal Party by establishing a Federal secretariat, and brought from England a very capable gentleman named Mr. Wyndham to become its secretary. He produced a report in which he made some concrete suggestions for the reorganisation of the Labour Party. They have been turned down, and his efforts to revitalise the party have been completely frustrated.

The Sydney conference even acknowledged the "tag" placed upon the Australian Labour Party by Sir Robert Menzies prior to the last Federal election, when he described those comprising the Federal Executive of that party as the "36 faceless men". In spite of its acknowledgement of the validity of this description, Mr. Wyndham's recommendations to alter this situation have been to no avail. This, then, is the alternative to this Government that will be offered to the people of Queensland next year.

The hon. member for Nudgee referred to window-dressing, and we can expect a great deal of window-dressing from hon. members opposite during this session. But Queensland has come to expect more than the promises offered by the Labour Party—a field in which it is very adept. Great Britain fell for the Labour Party's promises. What has she to show as a result? In an article in "The Sunday Mail" of 8 August, 1965, headed "Where Britain's Wilson Failed", Trevor Smith had this to say—

"Britain's Parliament has just closed one of its most tempestuous and eventful chapters ever. The legislators, torn and tattered, have disbanded for the summer holidays until October 26.

"They have left behind them, however, an economic situation so precarious and the international situation so unpredictable that an emergency reassembly is possible any week.

"The Socialist era of Mr. Harold Wilson began last October with his 'one hundred dynamic days' and a fantastic surge to get things done and revolutionise the way of life here.

"In its immensity and ambition, the programme was positively dazzling.

"Britain was to re-assert herself on the world scene, she was to galvanise the Commonwealth, there were to be bigger and better social services at home, more and cheaper houses, more hospitals, schools, and roads.

"It was to be a new scientific and technological era, industry was to be modernised, all good things were to come to all good men.

"The Government started off by increasing old-age pensions and removing the charge on national health prescriptions,

"Suddenly its whole programme roared to a halt, then collapsed in ruins.

"Pledge after pledge in the Government's election manifesto went out of the window. Setback followed setback. The bank rate went up to seven per cent. A three-billion dollar credit had to be got from foreign bankers and financiers. The imports surcharge was imposed in December. The first credit squeeze was introduced.

"In April the credit squeeze was tightened, then again in May. More Government actions continued, but still the economic situation deteriorated and loss of overseas confidence in Britain increased.

"Then last week came the most shattering of all the clamp downs, that has left the nation still gasping.

"Government spending and purchases were slashed, building of houses, schools, and hospitals restricted, many capital spending schemes deferred, home loans curbed, and hire purchase severely cut.

"All this came on top of the earlier measures involving stiff taxation increases.

"As they have shown in the past, the people of Britain have all the qualities to extricate themselves from their difficulties, but so far there is precious little sign that the Government possesses the know-how to lead them."

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. CAMPBELL:** I feel quite sure that the people of this State can profit from Great Britain's unfortunate experiment.

I wish now to deal with another matter raised by a number of hon. members opposite. It is their attributing the blame for events at Mt. Isa to section 12 of the 1961 amendment of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act.

I charge hon. members opposite with deliberate and malicious misrepresentation of the facts concerning this legislation, for they have misled employees into believing that their interests were jeopardised by that amendment. What utter rot! If that is so, how was it that the Industrial Court, under that legislation, awarded a £3 a week prosperity loading on 24 December last, in addition to awarding an increase in wages, together with a significant number of concessions since the strike ended? Of course the men at Mt. Isa thought they were hard done by; but that was only because they were deceived by hon. members opposite, who repeated these false allegations in parrot fashion in an attempt to discredit the Government.

Section 12 of the 1961 legislation simply states that a bonus payment is what it really is, namely, an *ex gratia* payment. Any business man and most employees—and there are plenty of employees who receive bonuses—understand that a bonus payment is an *ex gratia* payment from company profits and

is determined by an employer in the light of the year's experience. But because the Labour Party sought to make cheap political capital out of this legislation, hon. members opposite continue to prostitute their positions by repeating these monstrous allegations. I say that employees of Mount Isa Mines Ltd., or any other establishment in this State for that matter, have no reason to believe that "The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act of 1961" is not designed to serve their best interests, and the fact that the Labour Party takes such pains to criticise this Act so violently is fair proof that it must be advantageous to employees. One would hardly expect the Labour Party to praise the legislation.

I now wish to raise a matter which is a sequel to the recent industrial trouble at Mt. Isa. It revolves around the recent visit of Messrs. Egerton (President) and Macdonald (Secretary) of the Queensland Trades and Labour Council, together with Mr. Arneil and Mr. Devereux, who visited Mt. Isa from Friday, 13 August to Tuesday, 17 August last, ostensibly in connection with re-employment of certain men by Mount Isa Mines Ltd.

As this matter is the subject of an appeal to the Industrial Court, everyone knows that nothing can be done until the appeal is determined. What then was the real reason for this visit? Reliable information suggests that the reason was to endeavour to obtain from Mr. Bevan Foot, Secretary of the local Trades and Labour Council which acted as the Disputes Committee at Mt. Isa, receipt books in an endeavour to find or trace the whereabouts of an amount of approximately £6,000 about which the Brisbane Trades and Labour Council is very concerned, money contributed to the Mt. Isa Industrial Dispute Relief Fund which cannot be accounted for.

It is suggested that following the arrival at Mt. Isa of these gentlemen on 13 August, Mr. Macdonald was with Mr. B. Foot day and night endeavouring to secure supporting evidence that would justify the disappearance of this £6,000, and it is understood that the Queensland Trades and Labour Council is placing the whole blame for the deficiency on Mr. Foot and Mr. McMahon, president of the local Trades and Labour Council.

It is also known that Mr. Macdonald was in the company of a certain solicitor in Mt. Isa in an endeavour to ascertain the whereabouts of this large amount. Information is also to hand that a pensioner has not been able to get receipts for his contribution to the Mt. Isa Strike Fund and that another of the reasons for the visit of Mr. Macdonald to Mt. Isa was to discover where the money is. It is well known in Mt. Isa that his mission in this regard was not successful.

This is a matter of great local concern as all such moneys were asked to be directed to a certain post office box at the Mt. Isa post office. It is common knowledge that Mr. Pat Mackie went to this box every afternoon about 5 p.m. with a bag and extracted from the box what was in it. In view of

the persistent reports referred to by the hon. member for Townsville South that Mr. Mackie is "living it up" in the South, the inference is obvious. If this large sum of money cannot be accounted for, we can now add embezzlement to the already long list of lawless acts committed by this man Mackie.

I should like to know whether strike funds collected for the purpose of strike relief are subject to the provisions of the Charitable Collections Act and, if not, to whom an accounting is made for moneys so collected. In view of the scrupulous manner in which charitable bodies are required by law to account for moneys which come into their possession, surely it is equally essential that moneys collected to assist in strike relief should be subject to similar supervision in the best interests of those persons and bodies who have made the contributions.

I have much pleasure in supporting the motion moved by the hon. member for Mirani.

**Mr. BYRNE (Mourilyan)** (4.36 p.m.): As is usual, I wish to express my appreciation on this occasion to His Excellency the Administrator for his Opening Speech. I wish him a very long and happy term as Administrator of Queensland. I extend heartfelt thanks to Sir Henry Abel Smith, who will be departing from this great State next year and returning to England. He has been an excellent gentleman and a wonderful chap. On behalf of myself and the electors I represent in Mourilyan, I express our utmost loyalty and devotion to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.

Before getting on to my main subject I desire to mention a subject that will no doubt appeal to many unfortunate people in Queensland. I refer to speech therapy. Professional people, including doctors, have been working for at least nine years towards the establishment of a university speech therapy course. I am pleased to be able to say that there is now such a course established at the university. Previously there were no speech therapists here, and this has been a step in the right direction. Queensland students have been offered scholarships from the South, but it is unfortunate that apart from the metropolitan areas there are no opportunities for our students to be employed. Two of these scholarships have come from Yallourn in Victoria and students as they graduate, as I said previously, find that there are no opportunities apart from in the metropolitan area. This is what we desire to correct. Very often country people have no knowledge of the help that is available to themselves and their children. They do not know what speech therapy means. Even if they know anything about it they cannot afford to come to Brisbane from outlying parts of the State. Even if they come to Brisbane for attention to their children they cannot spend the time here that is necessary because speech therapy

must be carried out over a period of months. Cures or benefits cannot be achieved overnight.

Victoria has 64 speech therapists in the metropolitan area as well as at the base hospitals in Geelong, Ballarat and Yallourn. New South Wales has 86 speech therapists with 35 clinics. There is a need for speech therapists at all base hospitals in Queensland. I have learned that an excellent lady in the person of Mrs. Usher is the speech therapy lecturer at the University of Queensland. She and Professor Shaw are particularly active. They are pressing the Department of Health, seeking to advance this course at the university. In my electorate, and even in other hon. members' electorates, I know of parents and children who are in need of help from speech therapists. Their services are unavailable in the country and I have only been able to advise them, where possible, to proceed to Brisbane to get attention.

It would be a feather in Queensland's cap if we could extend the course at the university and so provide our base hospitals with a speech therapist. We must all realise that from time to time children have difficulty in speaking. We are always most anxious to help them and I ask the Minister for Health to give this matter his earnest consideration. If we do not tackle the problem when the children are young it is very difficult to help them when they grow older. Queensland is a very big State and it is impossible to have speech therapists everywhere, but surely we can provide speech therapists at our base hospitals.

I now desire to devote my attention to the problems confronting the sugar industry as they affect my area. I compliment the hon. member for Mirani, Mr. Newbery, on his excellent maiden speech. I am sure that he put considerable thought and effort into its preparation, for he made an extensive review of his electorate. He is well versed in the sugar industry and has extensive interests in the Mackay district. We on this side always recognise the efforts of new members in this House, irrespective of which side they represent. However, I noticed that the hon. member did not pay the Government any compliments for its handling of the sugar situation. I wondered why he did not. Many cane-growing areas are facing a disastrous future because of the very low overseas price of sugar, which has reduced the overall average price. As we know, two-thirds of our sugar is exported overseas and owing to the exceptionally low price, growers in all cane-growing areas in Queensland are suffering—even the mills are suffering—and the suffering of the growers extends to the Mackay area, in which the Mirani electorate is situated.

The members of the Country-Liberal Government gave full approval to what is known as the Gibbs Report before they had time to read and understand its recommenda-

tions. If they had examined them more minutely they would have hesitated before giving the green light to proceed with such tremendous expansion in the sugar industry. They failed to realise that the price was likely to fall so low as to make sugar production almost uneconomical. The report was based on a price of £35 a ton for overseas sugar. I cannot understand how our experts could proceed overseas, obtain all possible information, and come back and tell us to go ahead with the expansion as quickly as possible when, within a couple of months, the economic position of the industry should become almost disastrous. The price was less than £35 a ton, and today it is somewhere about £18 7s. If this situation continues for some time, God only knows what will happen to the growers in my area.

Following the recommendations, which were approved by this Government, the mills and growers proceeded urgently with the fullest expansion possible. They incurred considerable debts only to be met with a collapse in the overseas sugar price. Naturally they were entitled to expect that the price would remain at somewhat the same level it was in previous years and would not drop so drastically. But owing to this expectation and being led to believe that that would be the case, they went ahead with expansion programmes as fast as they could, to their detriment. The growers in the industry are facing foreclosure because of the huge debts they have contracted, and bankruptcy is in the offing for a great many of them. Many of them have invested their life savings in the sugar industry and now they see them disappearing.

Previously cane farms had a tremendous value; today it is difficult to give them away. Cane cannot be grown at the price that is being presently received for it. A man with a wife and two or three children who had a 1,000-ton peak was recognised as being in a reasonably good position. Under the present system and with the prevailing price he is receiving, he has no chance. He has an opportunity if he participates in the bonuses granted by co-operative sugar mills, but with a privately-owned mill he has no chance whatsoever.

I cannot see any improvement in the overseas price of sugar in the foreseeable future. It is obvious what will happen. Some mills are having a rough time. I asked a question recently about Gin Gin mill. It is reported that this company is in a very bad way financially. I am pleased to have the Treasurer's reply that all the crop will be harvested this year. There is still something which needs further explanation. The Treasurer has indicated that he is not in a position at the moment to make a public statement on the matter. I believe that other mills are not very well off, for instance, Haughton, and North Eton. I am subject to correction, but that is what is popularly mooted. What is going to happen

to this great industry if there is no improvement in the next 12 months? Can we be certain that, apart from the mills I have mentioned, others will not be affected?

We must realise the disastrous effect that this is having, not only on the farmers, but also on the business people, who have been prompted to restrict credit, and the banks, who have stopped making advances. One can quite understand that this is happening to the detriment of this great State of ours. Has the Government asked for an increase in the home-consumption price of sugar? I have not the Government's confidence. In sugar quarters people have asked me, "What does the Government propose to do?" It is a matter for the Government whether it goes to the Commonwealth Government asking for an increase in the home-consumption price of sugar.

**Mr. Walsh:** Do you think the sugar industry could justify it?

**Mr. BYRNE:** At the moment it possibly could justify it. We cannot consider that a year or so ago prices were particularly good and profits were rather high; the position we must examine is the one that exists today, and we cannot hope to see any improvement for some time. I think that there is a case to go to the Commonwealth Government for an increase in the home-consumption price of sugar.

**Mr. Walsh:** The balance sheets of most mills are very healthy.

**Mr. BYRNE:** I do not know about that. If they are examined for liabilities, it will be found that in some cases they have debts amounting to nearly £2,000,000. If the present state of affairs continues, the outlook is not very good. A miller is, however, in a much better position than a grower. Privately-owned mills, particularly those of the Colonial Sugar Refining Co. Ltd., are in the best position, and I often wonder how much influence the C.S.R. Company has had on recommendations for the expansion of the sugar industry. It will not lose as much as the growers may lose. Even if the prospects are bad for this year, the next one, and the one after that, the company will still continue till it has the growers in a quandary. All those engaged in the sugar industry have to recognise the monopolistic influence of this organisation.

**Mr. R. Jones:** The mills have guaranteed percentages, but the growers have nothing. The mills can't lose.

**Mr. BYRNE:** They cannot lose. Growers participate in the profits of co-operative mills, but never in the profits of proprietary mills. When it is realised that from profits of 15s. and 16s. a ton of cane the co-operative mills have been able to return as bonuses 10s., 12s., or 15s. a ton, it will be seen how advantageous it has been to growers to supply co-operative mills.

If the Government is sincere in its desire to help the sugar industry, I suggest that a start be made on the activities of money-lenders who lend money at usurious rates of interest. Their activities should be curtailed. I believe that there should also be control of those monopolistic companies that batten on the cane-growers and sell them what they must have at excessive prices. A few years ago a tractor could be bought for £800 or £900; now the price is approximately £2,000. Rising costs have got beyond control, and there appears to be no limit to the heights to which they can soar.

**Mr. Hughes:** Everyone seems to concede that the sugar industry is the most efficient industry in the State.

**Mr. BYRNE:** The hon. member for Kurilpa is talking rot. Both new and old growers are having a bad time, and unless some changes are made many of them must sooner or later leave the industry. Many men were induced to leave good jobs to go onto the land. They were led to believe that the prices then being paid for sugar would continue. There has now been a collapse of those prices, the money that they expected to receive has not been forthcoming, and the banks are closing their overdrafts. These new growers are obliged to do the best they can under the circumstances, but they regret very much going into the sugar industry.

The Premier proposes to go overseas to attend a conference of those interested in the sugar industry. Apparently he will watch the interests of Queensland in this great industry. That is very good indeed. I think it is the first time that he or any other Minister of this Government has directly represented the Queensland sugar industry overseas. Representatives of the industry frequently go abroad, but so far the political heads have usually remained at home. They are vitally interested, and political representation is of paramount importance.

As I have said over and over again in this House, I do not believe that all our authority should be delegated to representatives of the sugar industry when the State is so greatly concerned. The Premier could have followed the example of the late Hon. E. M. Hanlon and the late Hon. W. Forgan-Smith in regard to the sugar industry. They did not stay at home when the interests of Queensland were at stake. Mr. Hanlon led a delegation overseas at the invitation of the late Hon. J. B. Chifley, who was then Prime Minister of Australia, and many hon. members in this Chamber today will remember Mr. Hanlon getting up here and pressing for representation overseas. The then Country-Liberal Opposition were very hostile to him and did not give him any credit for his great efforts. In fact, I sat dumbfounded when I heard what they said against the late Mr. Hanlon, who, although he was a sick man, went overseas twice and obtained for the sugar-growers of

Queensland a system under which Queensland was able to sell 300,000 tons of sugar at a negotiated price. As a result, production increased from 737,000 tons to about 1,300,000 tons, and the price was really good from 1950 till a couple of years ago. The growers in the industry prospered; their farms were valuable.

What is the position today? The Premier is to go overseas after the horse has left the stable, as the saying is. He knows very well that I wish him every success, but I think he should have gone earlier. The sooner political heads are sent overseas to represent the State when important negotiations are in progress, the better it will be for all of us.

As I mentioned, the bottom has fallen out of the market for cane farms, whereas 18 months or two years ago, or even earlier than that, they were bringing exceedingly good prices. I think I have said sufficient to indicate that the Government has made a mistake in not giving greater attention than it has to the sugar industry, and I wish the Premier well on his trip overseas.

Let me refer now to poor-quality sugar. We cannot go on allowing people to complain to us that our primary products are no good. We must improve them before we sell them, instead of shipping them overseas and giving the customers an opportunity to complain. The time is ripe for the Government to step in and say to anyone in the sugar industry who is producing sugar of bad quality, "You must produce good-quality sugar."

Recently in this Chamber I asked a question of the Minister for Primary Industries in which I requested him to enumerate the mills producing bad-quality sugar and the quantity that they were producing. All that I was told was that the situation had improved considerably. Bad-quality sugar, in my opinion, is the fault of the miller. He gets the penalties and it is his responsibility to see that the sugar is produced to a standard that can be sold overseas without our purchasers telling us, "Your product is no good and we won't buy it unless you improve its quality." If by those penalties the miller can offset his costs in the manufacture of sugar, I think it is altogether wrong. We do not want the purchasers saying, "Unless you produce a better class of goods we do not want them." I think the Government is obliged to take action to prevent that happening.

To go a little further, I suppose other hon. members have read recently in the newspapers that certain meat sent to Britain was rejected. I will read this newspaper cutting for the information of hon. members. It says—

"A spokesman for the New South Wales Government's Meat Inspection Service said yesterday that Sydney housewives were most unlikely to be offered any meat from a shipment which had been rejected by Britain.

"The consignment of 400 tons of Australian frozen meat arrived back in Australia this week.

"Authorities in Britain had refused to allow its sale because the Rockhampton meatworks did not have an export license.

"The spokesman said the bulk of the meat would be re-exported to countries with less severe import restrictions than Britain."

That is a world-wide advertisement that Queensland meat was rejected by our best customer and sent back to Australia, and we tell people that such meat is likely to be sold only in processed form. What would that statement convey to anybody? It is an advertisement that our meat is no good and it reveals the stark position that it has been rejected by our best customer. The advertisement does such great damage to Queensland that it is time the Government sat up and took notice. But I did not see any Press report of the Government's reply to that statement. Whether it be true or false, the Government has allowed to go to people throughout the world the statement that Queensland meat is not worth buying. That is what it says in effect.

Reverting to the sugar industry, there is one matter I desire to mention. The hon. member for Mirani advocates increased representation on the Queensland Cane Growers' Council and asks that the recommendations of the committee of inquiry be implemented. I strongly oppose any alteration in the present voting rights. It would mean greater voting strength to the areas represented by the hon. members for Bundaberg and Mackay and would be a disadvantage to the northern parts of Queensland. I took part in negotiations at the time Tully was included in representation on the Queensland Cane Growers' Council.

**Mr. Walsh:** Why was it included?

**Mr. BYRNE:** Just a minute. At the time, from the production point of view Tully had certain rights of representation. The point I am making is that over the years the present representation has worked very well indeed. It may not be equitable from the point of view of production but overall it has been quite a good thing.

**Mr. Walsh:** It is not equitable from the point of view of the number of growers.

**Mr. BYRNE:** Not from the point of view of the number of growers, but if a situation has given entire satisfaction over a number of years and you want to alter it, you must be sure to alter it in the right direction so as to retain the harmony that previously existed.

**Mr. Walsh:** There have been two inquiries into it up to date.

**Mr. BYRNE:** It may be that the tonnage produced and the number of growers entitle Bundaberg to increased representation.

In view of the history of the Queensland Cane Growers' Council I do not think it would be appropriate at the moment to alter the representation. I can see from the growers' and millers' points of view what the hon. member is endeavouring to obtain.

**Mr. Walsh:** I am not interested in either the millers or the growers, because I have almost none in my electorate. I am interested in equal representation for these people.

**Mr. BYRNE:** I think the present representation is satisfactory.

Let me now refer briefly to the tobacco-growing industry. Statements are made from time to time in Mareeba, and by Mr. Agostinelli in the Stanthorpe area, about the bad time the industry is having, the price being received and so on. I am not a tobacco expert and I do not smoke tobacco at the moment, so I do not know very much about the industry, but I do know that Queensland is receiving very bad publicity. The growers in Mareeba are complaining about the price. The Government should take active steps to see that this sort of publicity ceases as early as possible. The industry wants a fair go but who is taking up the cudgels on behalf of the tobacco growers? Certainly not the present Government.

The time has come when this Government should drop the role of presiding over the State's great primary industries to see that they are destroyed. Nobody can get away from the statements I have made about poor-quality sugar. One need only cite sugar, which has gone in price from the sublime to the ridiculous. What does this Government do to protect the industry? The tobacco industry is in the same position. I understand that hundreds of tobacco farmers are walking off their farms because they cannot make enough out of them. The Government suffers with complacency the bad publicity over meat which is rejected by our best customer, and makes no official complaint. It permits any crack-brained professor to deride the potential of North Queensland without uttering a complaint or saying anything in rebuttal. In other words, it simply takes it on the chin rather than saying, "What right have you to deride this great State of ours? We have poured millions of pounds into it to develop it, only for you to tell us that it is not worth two bob." But we never see anything like that in the Press.

This Government amended its conciliation and arbitration legislation and as a result we had one of the greatest strikes in Australia's history, one that has left behind it a trail of fear and dissatisfaction on both sides. The Government has not been of any service to the milk producers; it has not done anything to make their lot any better. What respect can we have for a Government that neglects the interests of the

primary producers and adopts the role of presiding over the destruction of the State's great primary industries?

I had intended to speak about other matters but I think I have said enough. What I have said has been said very sincerely. The Government has major shortcomings. It has been neglectful of primary producers particularly and our State has not developed as it should. North Queensland is getting along just haphazardly. There has been no great increase in the population of North Queensland nor has there been an expansion of facilities for the employment of labour. If the present rate of progress continues, Lord help us. I do not know what will happen in the near future. I strongly condemn the Government in its attitude towards primary production. I hope that my remarks will have some value and that they may bring about a sense of responsibility in Government members so that they will develop this great State of ours and bring industries to it.

**Mr. HOUGHTON (Redcliffe)** (5.11 p.m.): I join with other hon. members in offering my heartiest congratulations to His Excellency the Administrator on his fine address. I also join with my constituents in expressing their loyalty to Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. I offer my heartiest congratulations to His Excellency Sir Henry Abel Smith and Lady May for their excellent contribution to this State and their understanding of its needs. I hope they may be spared for many years to come when they leave Queensland and return to the Motherland.

I also offer my sincere congratulations to the mover of the motion, the hon. member for Mirani, Mr. Tom Newbery. I am sure hon. members will agree that he is a person well versed both in local authority affairs and in the sugar industry, and that he will be a very able supporter of good government in Queensland. As the years roll on, his efforts will be very noticeable. I also convey my sincere appreciation to the seconder of the motion, the hon. member for Ithaca. I trust that when he retires from Parliament he will be long spared to enjoy the fruits of his labour. I am sure all hon. members will be sorry when he leaves this House. Bob Windsor is one of Nature's gentlemen, and if he cannot do a good turn for anyone there is no way in the world he will do him a bad turn.

The Wilbur Smith Report is one contentious matter exercising the minds of many people at present. There has been great controversy about trams versus buses. I will not enter into the controversy in any way. I had a quick glance at the report; I think it is a good report and that it will benefit the city in the years to come. As I say, there has been great controversy about Brisbane becoming a concrete jungle and so on, but when one sits down to analyse the report, one finds a great deal of merit in it. This is a free country and everybody

has an opportunity to voice his opinion in the controversy over buses versus trams. I am sure the decision will be a wise one and that with the implementation of the report transport will flow faster than at present.

The reported generosity of the Government in this regard concerns me. As a ratepayer of a city adjoining the metropolitan area I object to the contribution the Government intends to make towards the cost of this development. There are other cities in the State with transport problems. They have had to face up to those problems with only a 20 per cent. subsidy, whereas in the case of Brisbane it is 50 per cent. I am sure that I am now expressing the views of every local authority in the State. The implementation of the report will be costly. Owing to the position facing Redcliffe, the time is opportune for the Government to take over the Hornibrook Highway Bridge. If the Government can be so generous in its hand-out to the Brisbane City Council it should assist Redcliffe by abolishing the toll.

Redcliffe has tidied up its road problems, but there are many problems between the bridge and Brisbane. The Wilbur Smith Report advocates the widening of the road between Sandgate and Brisbane in five years' time. That is ridiculous. Once a motorist gets into the line of traffic at Sandgate, he remains in it until he arrives in Brisbane because there is nowhere else to go. I am at a loss to understand why some speedy relief has not been given to that problem so that in the future costly resumptions will not be necessary in order to provide a four-lane highway.

There are four hon. members who represent areas in that locality and they have not had much to say about the widening of that road. They are the hon. members for Sandgate, Nudgee, Nundah, and Windsor.

**Mr. Davies:** What is wrong with the bridge?

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** There is nothing wrong with the bridge. The Hornibrook Highway has assisted greatly in the development of Redcliffe, and I give Hornibrook Highway Ltd. full marks for its efforts in that direction. There are on the Redcliffe peninsula knockers of the political flavour of hon. members opposite who are quite prepared to walk in and take over the Hornibrook Highway and terminate the agreement. I say emphatically that I object to such a proposal. The agreement entered into is binding on all of us. As a ratepayer of Redcliffe, I further say that I am not prepared to see the toll lifted and the responsibility for maintaining the structure placed on the Redcliffe City Council merely to provide a highway for people going to places other than Redcliffe.

**Mr. Hanson:** How many shares have you in it?

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** None, unfortunately. The original cost of the highway was £265,210. The franchise was to operate for a

period of 40 years from 3 October, 1935, when the company was authorised to levy and collect tolls, and the facility automatically becomes the property of the Crown on 4 October, 1975, without payment of compensation. The Crown has the right to take over the highway at any time after 3 October, 1955, upon payment of compensation. The compensation payable in the event of the Government's taking over the facility before the date of expiration of the franchise is the depreciated value of the structure based on the fair original cost, provided that should the company not have averaged a profit of 8 per cent. of the fair original cost over the period that has elapsed since tolls became payable, there is to be added to the depreciated value such sum of money as will make up the deficiency.

It is not possible to say what the average annual cost of maintenance would be should the structure be taken over by the Government. The bridge is now 29 years old, and it can be expected that from time to time fairly heavy expenditure will be involved in replacements and repairs as faults develop and become evident. The average of maintenance expenditure over recent years cannot afford a reliable picture of future maintenance. There is no proposal at the present time to take over the highway before the franchise expires in 1975.

The report of Wilbur Smith and Associates has now been presented, and I think the time is opportune to give thought to these matters. Serious consideration has been given to the construction of another bridge outside the three-mile limit protecting Hornibrook Highway Limited at present. That would take traffic proceeding to the North through the Bald Hills area, and would provide no relief to the city of Redcliffe. The number of vehicles travelling over the Hornibrook Highway has increased from the original small number to over 2,000,000 last year. I feel that if just compensation is paid, the company would be completely relieved of any further liability.

Another matter of interest concerning the company is found in a memorandum that I received from the office of the Public Curator, dated 30 November, 1964. It reads—

"Re Hornibrook Highway Limited.

"Memorandum—

"You will receive with this memorandum a cheque in payment of the distribution of interest for the twenty-ninth year of operations. The distribution is at the rate of 32½ per cent., making a total payment of 55½ per cent. for the year. The sum of £125 13s. is carried forward.

"A Statement of the Income and Expenditure for the year is shown on the back hereof.

"Your attention is drawn to the following:—

(a) In accordance with the Actuary's last report, the amount of £5,000 has been transferred to the Sinking Fund.

(b) Provision has been made for taxation."

I think all hon. members will agree that the people who financed the construction of the Hornibrook Highway showed a great deal of wisdom and fortitude and an insight into traffic problems. It was a clear indication of their confidence in the project, and if the local authority representatives of the day had invested money in it, as they should have, it would have been a great asset for the community today. In my opinion, the people concerned are justly entitled to every penny of profit they have received from their investment.

Now that the Government is giving consideration to these handouts, I ask it to examine the position carefully and make sure that the franchise is ended by means of a Government take-over. I am not prepared to support any further assistance in the way of subsidies to the Brisbane area unless this matter is considered, and I will oppose any other action with all the force at my command.

One of the conditions of the contract that Hornibrook Highway Limited must fulfil relates to keeping the bridge in a safe condition, and the illumination of the bridge is included in this. The approach roads on both sides are main roads, and I take it that the Main Roads Department would regard the highway itself as a main road, otherwise it would be merely a missing link. I suggest that the Minister should ask the Commissioner of Main Roads whether he thinks that the illumination on the bridge at present is up to the standard laid down by his department. It was illuminated before the Second World War, but since then only the approaches have been illuminated.

Whilst I am dealing with transport problems, I might point out to hon. members that the road hazards between Sandgate and the Brisbane city area are of great concern to the people of Redcliffe, who rely heavily on road transport. There are several danger points, and new bridges are needed over Downfall Creek and Cabbage Tree Creek. I understand that a programme has already been laid down for the next couple of years, and I hope that the Minister for Main Roads will see that recommendations for road widening between Brisbane and Redcliffe are not shelved merely because of the recommendations contained in the Wilbur Smith Report.

There is a "Give way" sign at the corner of Board Street and Sandgate Road that I think requires immediate attention. Any hon. member who goes down to that road junction will see the confusion that exists. Vehicles coming from Zillmere along Board Street would normally yield right-of-way to vehicles on their right travelling on Sandgate Road in the direction of Sandgate. However, there is a "Give way" sign on Sandgate Road indicating that the vehicles entering Sandgate Road from Board Street have the right-of-way. Drivers wave their arms round like traffic policemen and quite often vehicles collide. There should be a warning sign to

indicate to drivers of vehicles on the left that vehicles on the right no longer have the right-of-way and that they disqualify themselves if they attempt to take it. There should be some indication at these points that a "Give way" sign has been erected in order to make it known to the driver on the left that he has the right-of-way. As I say, at present it causes confusion. The driver on the left waves on the driver on the right because he does not know that that driver has forfeited his right-of-way.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the submissions of the hon. member for South Coast regarding the responsibilities of local authorities in the matter of loan raising, and I entirely agree with him. The time has arrived when serious consideration must be given to how long increased taxation can be levied on the property-owner to pay for facilities and amenities. The problems that confront every local authority at present are increased valuations and decreased budgets. Increased valuations, of course, have been brought about because the value of land is considered to have appreciated with the effluxion of time and, if it is considered to have appreciated by a certain percentage—for example, the increase in Redcliffe has been 2.7 per cent.—the loan allocation is reduced—again in the case of Redcliffe, by 43 per cent. It is a vicious circle and no local authority can survive under those conditions.

I know the Treasurer has a difficult job; he is faced with the problems associated with the drought and the loss of railway revenue. But that brings me to the very interesting submissions made recently by the hon. member for Townsville North in regard to the requirements of the Townsville City Council in the implementation of a sewerage scheme for the Armed Forces to be stationed in that locality. He said that the Townsville City Council is charged with the implementation of a sewerage scheme in the area to the tune of £60,000. As an ex-service man I strongly contend that requirements for the Army are a Federal matter and should not be made the responsibility of local authorities. Sewerage is a necessity.

I also go along with the hon. member for Port Curtis that Gladstone is entitled to a larger allocation this year in order to meet developments in that area. But I am disturbed at the thought that when these matters arise there might be a reduction in the allocations to other local authorities in order to implement, for instance, a sewerage scheme that is the complete responsibility of the Federal Government. I should hate to think that Redcliffe's budget was reduced by 43 per cent. because of a shortage of loan funds occasioned by an allocation of £60,000 for the implementation of a sewerage scheme for Armed Forces stationed in the Townsville area when that should be a matter for the Federal Government.

Another matter that disturbs me greatly relates to the discovery of oil in this State. This has been the greatest boost Queensland has ever had but unfortunately the benefits have been limited because of the power and wealth of oil companies in the South. Had oil been discovered in New South Wales or Victoria no doubt there would not have been the humbug that has been associated with its discovery in Queensland. I think the present situation is a shocking one when it is realised that although Moonie oil represents only 2 per cent. of Australia's requirements, one of the large oil companies, Ampol, refuses to take for refining purposes even portion of that small quantity. I think it is about time the Government, through the Department of Industrial Development and other departments, took a bold stand in this matter. When Amoco comes on stream in about two months' time I should like to see it take every drop of Moonie oil.

As Queenslanders, let us buy Queensland products. Let us buy our own Moonie oil. We should have a gimmick for Moonie oil just as there are gimmicks for so many other commodities. Just as there is the gimmick about the "big, big beer" let us have the gimmick of "Moonie magic". Let everybody in Queensland get right behind the idea of buying the Moonie product. Every Queensland, irrespective of his political beliefs, would buy Queensland petrol. I am sure that every Queensland would be proud to have a notice displayed on his vehicle that he was using the Moonie product.

If we do not hurry up and do something about it the oil cartels will annihilate us. The Government should look very closely at the whole matter to ensure that our oil is used to the best possible advantage. Of course, the objection of the oil cartels is that they can buy cheap crude oils elsewhere. If there was a war tomorrow and their supplies were cut off they would be only too glad to use Moonie oil. Here we have a golden opportunity to use our own resources to great advantage in this State, and every Queensland would be 100 per cent. behind it.

Recently the hon. member for Roma referred to the use of natural gas. Capital investment in the South and other factors associated with big business are holding back the intense development that can take place. We should use our own resources to the utmost to bring about industrial development in this State. By doing so we could cut our costs down so far that industries in the South would not be able to compete with us.

**Mr. Ewan:** Manufacturers would come to Brisbane.

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** I agree. The sooner we use our own products for the benefit of this State the sooner we will have increased development.

I should now like to make a few comments about the Parliamentary Salaries Committee. It has been made known that a personal

attack was made on me, and on you, Mr. Speaker, as the member for the adjoining electorate, because of certain statements and efforts on your part in the past. Neither you nor I have neglected our responsibilities to our constituents. I should like to make a few passing comments about the two people concerned. I objected to being refused the right to cross-examine for various reasons that I should like to bring to the notice of the House. I had no general objection to Mr. Black or the former Minister, Mr. Frank Bulcock, giving evidence but I objected on personal grounds. I was not prepared to have them, or any member of this House, use the Parliamentary Salaries Committee as a chopping block for my responsibilities. I stand behind anything I have said in this House, without fear or favour.

I should like to inform the House that Mr. Black is a person who has issued a writ for £5,000 against me for defamation. This matter is sub judice. The writ was issued because of certain action which I took while I was mayor of Redcliffe. That is one reason. Another reason is that Mr. Black was named in the Press some 12 months ago for tax evasion in the sum of about £12,000. At present he is on £50 bail on a gaming charge. That matter too, is sub judice. The charge will be heard at the end of this month. Those are only some of my reasons for objecting strongly. He is also the man who ran on the Labour ticket against me. Bulcock and Black are the two B's. I will defend myself on any charges they may make.

It was very interesting at the hearing the other day to listen to the hypocrisy and tripe they indulged in, particularly Black. I was very amused that a person of his calibre should have the audacity to quote the Bible from Matthew: 20. I think he should look at the page that contains the Ten Commandments. There he will see, "Thou shalt not steal". He had nothing to say about that. I will leave it at that.

The hon. member for Brisbane had something to say about the statements made by Frank Bulcock. He said it is regrettable that a person of his calibre and integrity has become senile. I agree with the hon. member for Brisbane; Frank Bulcock has become senile. It is regrettable that from time to time things happen like that. I can easily understand why the hon. member for Sandgate and the hon. member for Salisbury did not want him near the place when he wanted to campaign for Labour. It distresses me that a person with such an excellent record should stoop to the level of these "nings". That is all they are. These are the sort of things that a former Minister of the Crown has resorted to. I should like to read one of the documents he circulated.

**Mr. Duggan:** Seeing that you are trying to demonstrate your impartiality, tell us your thoughts about the Liberals and what they have to say.

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** The hon. member will hear about that. I have no worry about any of them.

This is one document which Bulcock and his cohorts distributed on the Peninsula some time ago—

"Calling all young people:

If you had a vote . . . what Party do you think should govern?

"Well, just take a look at the facts:

"In 1957, Mr. Morris, Liberal Leader, promised to provide work for all, but after six years of Liberal-Country Party rule, 6,486 young people are registered for unemployment.

"Nicklin promised unlimited development of industry, but our natural resources have been grabbed by Monopoly interests while factory employment has declined.

"Today, it is becoming harder to get apprenticeships, and many talented young people are being forced into dead-end jobs, if they are lucky enough to escape from the unemployment office.

"We need homes, hospitals, schools, and sporting facilities, but always we hear the cry—no money. Nicklin and his friends in Canberra have been more interested in subsidising Mount Isa Mines to build a railway, and spending large amounts of money for communications bases which threaten Australian security.

"The Eureka Youth League supports trade union demands for a 35-hour week and increased annual leave. The Eureka Youth League calls for more apprenticeships, increased subsidies for education, provision of sporting facilities for youth.

"Nationalisation of the giant monopolies in the interests of the people could provide the money for all this.

"Most young people will not have a chance to choose their representatives on June 1st.

"Demand a vote at 18!

"If you have a vote, elect a Labour Government, together with some Communist M.L.A.'s.

"Put workers' representatives into Parliament to clean up the Liberal Monopoly mess.

"This is a Eureka Youth League publication: Authorised by B. Moynihan, 9 McConaghy St., Mitchelton."

**Mr. Aikens:** Did Bulcock associate himself with that?

**Mr. HOUGHTON:** He distributed these pamphlets around the city of Redcliffe. And members of the Opposition have the audacity to say that they have no affinity with the Comms. It is a regrettable state of affairs that a person of his character fraternises with these "nings." He associates with "nings" and then wonders why he is condemned. God forbid that these people who

masquerade as paragons should become associated with these Comms. That is one of the things that riddle the A.L.P. today, and they try to demonstrate that they have no affinity with the Comms.

**Mr. HANSON** (Port Curtis) (5.47 p.m.): As is customary in a debate of this nature, hon. members, with a sort of monotonous regularity, associate themselves with the message of loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen. This is my third participation in an Address-in-Reply debate. I have not always associated myself with this message of loyalty because I feel that the electors of Port Curtis have shown their loyalty to Her Majesty over the years and consequently it is not necessary to mention it.

**Mr. Walsh:** We take an oath of allegiance when we are sworn in.

**Mr. HANSON:** As the hon. member for Bundaberg just interjected, we take an oath of allegiance in this House when we are sworn in, which makes it unnecessary for me to refer to the message of loyalty.

I pay tribute to Sir Alan Mansfield for his many wonderful years of service in a judicial capacity and for the wonderful public service he has rendered to this State. He is a very fine man and one of whom all Queenslanders can be justifiably proud.

I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion. The hon. member for Mirani had not been very long in the House when he had to "grace the stage" and make his maiden speech. All hon. members realise what a difficult task that is; it does not come easily. I realise that he will not be with us very long as the election year looms on the horizon, and we will soon see Mirani represented by a first-class Labour candidate. While he is here, however, I hope he will be happy taking part in what is now known as the modern television drama of the age, "Three Corners."

To the seconder of the motion I say, in the twilight of his political life, that I wish him well when he retires from the political scene and the Legislative Assembly of this State. The electorate of Ithaca also will then once again be graced by a Labour representative, as it previously was for many years.

I think it is very sad at present to gaze upon the coalition parties, including the "three corners" to which I have already referred, and see the state in which the Country-Liberal Government has now got itself, and the exhibition that its members are making of themselves when they constantly rise in their places and become very critical of high-ranking members of Cabinet and former friends in the coalition.

**Government Members interjected.**

**Mr. HANSON:** Hon. members opposite who are interjecting have recently had to suffer the indignity of going in silent benediction before their masters on Wickham Terrace, genuflecting before them and actually begging forgiveness because they

sided with the Cabinet and were highly critical of the coalition. They were in trouble because they sided with those who were opposed to Porter and all the crazy gang that is running their affairs from Wickham Terrace today. What an atrocious state of affairs was shown to exist on the South Coast, where the Liberal Party convention was held—and held there only because there would be a considerable amount of political controversy over the two seats in that area at the next State election.

What happened at that Liberal Party convention? The Treasurer, in the evening of his political life and soon to leave his portfolio after giving many years of faithful service, had to suffer the indignity of being openly castigated by members of his own party, despite the fact that he had decided a few weeks previously to stick to his mates and had taken many of them on a grand tour of Central Queensland in an effort to soften them up. What happened? As Cain did to Abel, they turned their backs on him, and even a member of his own Cabinet stood at the convention and openly opposed him.

What else did we see? We saw the Treasurer willing to stick to the Premier and Cabinet, aided by the newly-created knight, Sir Alan Munro, the hon. member for Toowong, who came in and moved a motion to restore peace at any price. We saw a member of Cabinet come out openly and oppose these people. We also saw a former Deputy Premier and former leader of the Liberal Party in this House, at present a Senator in Canberra, who was supposed to come in behind the Treasurer and the newly-created knight and assist in restoring the situation, but what did he do? He did not come in behind them; instead he emptied the bucket right over them.

**Mr. Hughes interjected.**

**Mr. HANSON:** It is all very well for the hon. member to interject. I have a dossier on what he did at the convention, and I shall open it one day in this House. I have the lot; do not worry about that. One of the coalition parties is supposed to be lending support to the country people, yet through its ineptness and inefficiency primary producers are being allowed almost to starve. In the other party are representatives of monopolistic capitalism dictated to by the ferrets at the top, and by one in particular who hopes to enter this House and eventually become Premier. I have no truck with either of those parties, but at the same time, being a humane man, I like to see at least a little decency, something that does not exist at present in the coalition parties. They cannot tell me it does.

Why are hon. members opposite silent? They know I am telling the truth. Every one of them has gone back into his shell because he knows that what I am saying cannot be denied. What went on at Southport stunk to high heaven. The Treasurer of this

State, a respected Cabinet Minister, was subjected to the indignity of having whipper-snappers sniping at him and other members of Cabinet climbing ruthlessly over everyone to gain leadership of the Liberal Party and sabotage him in the dying stages of a grand political career and consign him to oblivion. It was absolutely disgraceful.

Does it augur well for the State of Queensland when the parties in a coalition Government are locked in a vicious quarrel and one hears members of those parties addressing one another in this House in terms that are malicious, wicked, and cruel? Mention was made earlier today of our desire to induce people to invest money in this State. Can hon. members opposite tell me how any industrialist would be encouraged to do so in the face of what has occurred here in the last few months, during which the Premier, who has carried the coalition on his back because of his public image as "Honest Frank", has been subjected to the indignity of attacks by ruthlessly ambitious people? I think it is a very sorry state of affairs.

Mention has been made in this debate of loan allocations for local authorities, and the allocation to the Gladstone area has been mentioned specifically.

**Mr. Camm:** You have not done too badly.

**Mr. HANSON:** On the face of it, it could be said that we have not done too badly in comparison with allocations made elsewhere. The first thing we wanted was sewerage, and I contend that a town is not progressive unless the major part of it is sewered. However, loan allocations were insufficient to enable sewerage to be provided. The figures now show that, for the first time in a long and chequered history, Gladstone has received a comparatively large allocation.

The works in Gladstone and in Townsville are highly specialised, and although the Government has not lived up to its responsibility and given us everything that we require, it is equally true that the Federal Government has not lived up to its responsibility to pass on to the State sufficient loan money to enable it to assist local authorities, thus keeping employment on an even keel. The work to be carried out in Gladstone has come upon us quite suddenly, and although, as I said, for the first time Gladstone enjoys pride of place in loan allocations by the Government—and it is appreciative of this—we believe that sufficient money should be allocated to each local authority to enable it to carry out essential works and works that are necessary for the future well-being of the community. I am sure that other local authorities that have not been treated as generously as we have will not be completely satisfied.

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

**Mr. HANSON:** Before the evening meal break I mentioned certain matters relative to loan allocations to various local authorities in the State. During the meal break we had a pleasant interlude in which the glories of the Barrier Reef were extolled on a film,

in the course of which we had a brief respite in the environment of a grand tourist resort in the Port Curtis electorate named Heron Island. After viewing that film I am sure hon. members are exuberant because what they saw is typical of which can be seen throughout the Port Curtis electorate, which has been beautifully endowed by nature. I trust that many hon. members will deem it worth while to visit the electorate on some future occasion and enjoy the tourist attractions abounding in the locality. I can assure them that the companionship, friendliness and amicability of the people of the area will be far different from what we have seen in the coalition parties over the past few weeks. Former friends are now virulent and violent enemies.

In this debate reference has been made to the housing situation that exists in the State today. Many speakers have deplored the impotence and inefficiency of the present administration in the carrying out of its functions in this regard. I join the long list of Opposition members who heartily endorse the statements that have been made. In my area a considerable number of Housing Commission homes have been built in the last 12 to 18 months, but notwithstanding this the stark reality of the situation is that the housing shortage in Gladstone today is possibly greater than that in any other town or locality in Queensland. The special allocation that has been made and the number of houses that are being built have been for a particular industry and, as I have stated in the past, and as I repeat tonight, every house, with the exception of about six, is offered to, and the rent is guaranteed by, a particular company. This company has come here with capital to invest and to start an industry in the area, but I firmly believe—and this is the policy of the very progressive party of which I am a member—that everybody in the community should be properly and decently housed. In spite of the number of houses being erected in Gladstone, there are hundreds of people within the Port Curtis electorate who today have not decent housing and it does not look as if they will be able to get it in the future. Rents are particularly high—£10 10s. a week, as was mentioned by the hon. member for Brisbane, who produced a certain recent Press statement indicating that such rents are commonplace. I know that an estate agent in the town approached a certain person about a very large home he owned. The man in question was willing to carry out repairs so that he could live in the house himself. The estate agent wanted the house for a large company that would use it to house its employees. He offered the owner £35 a week for it. Fortunately the owner was not like members of the Liberal Party; on the contrary, he was very much of the Labour vein. Being a very good type of man he refused the offer on moral grounds and also because he wanted the house for his personal use. That would be contrary to the grand-scale private enterprise espoused by our opponents opposite.

Since the advent of the Menzies administration in the Federal sphere in 1949, £200,000,000 to £250,000,000 has been spent on defence in this young country of ours. Why could there not have been a special allocation for housing because, after all, who will be called upon to defend this country other than people here who want houses? Who will defend this country other than the Australians that will be born and bred in houses? Everyone is entitled to food and shelter. Every single person in this country is entitled to proper and decent housing, but since this administration took office the housing position has become chaotic.

**Government Members** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. HANSON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but they do not worry me very much. I have been insulted by experts.

You can count on the fingers of one hand the number of Housing Commission homes allocated for rental purposes in the Port Curtis electorate since this administration assumed office in 1957. The hon. member for Salisbury could tell the same sort of story. If he were honest, each hon. member would say that the same state of affairs exists in his electorate. Is it not ludicrous, indeed, is it not totally dishonest on the part of the administration that it will not remedy the housing situation after making promise after promise on the hustings to provide adequate housing? No doubt the Premier, the Treasurer and the Minister for Housing will advance the argument that they did not get a sufficient allocation from the Commonwealth Government. Why are their political partners in crime denying them the opportunity to give the people of this State what is their just right—correct and decent housing?

It is ridiculous to think that those who would be called upon to defend this country against an aggressor will not be able to obtain in the foreseeable future decent shelter for themselves and their families. Is it any wonder in this modern day and age that in this young country the population is increasing at a very slow rate—an alarmingly slow rate—when we remember that we have people to the north who are not actually friends?

Is it any wonder that people who are unable to obtain decent shelter resort to birth control? Is it any wonder that young people who go to the altar to get married and are unable to obtain homes use some contraceptive device? It is simply because they cannot get decent shelter for their children. It all comes back to food and shelter.

Whilst on this matter I should like to refer to the high prices in this State. The low birth-rate in this country is governed by the economics of the individual and no-one can prove to the contrary to my

satisfaction. This is supposedly an age of prosperity, when the "quid" or the dollar is readily available, nevertheless to an Australian who is conscious of his country's future it is very alarming to think that we have such a low birth-rate. If we do not do something about it we will not hold this country very long.

Speaking about prices, one has only to turn to articles which appeared in the Press, either today or over the week-end, to see the high meat prices although admittedly they have been brought about by the exigencies of drought. Nevertheless, there has been a continuous, slow increase in prices, despite the assurances from the administration when coming to office that the scuttling of the Prices Branch would lead to fierce competition and thus keep prices at a low level. That has not been the case.

**Mr. Sullivan:** Did you reduce the price of spirits?

**Mr. HANSON:** In reply to the hon. member for Condamine, it is a pity Mrs. Horan is not here to listen to him postulate about bacon prices and put him in his place.

A number of hon. members mentioned price control and in doing so referred to the Government's approach with the employers to the Industrial Commission in opposition to granting the workers ordinary wage justice of a 6s. a week increase in the basic wage. What a terrible state of affairs in view of the price of meat and the prices of ordinary simple commodities, which are rising every day. Although prices have continued to rise, the Government denied the working people their just rights under the wage structure. It denied them moral and social justice.

I have referred to the astronomical rents charged by the Government, and the dreadful matters relating to the drought. These matters will be further discussed by my colleagues. It is a shame that the administration, which has a majority of Country Party adherents, is not concerned with the needs of country men and their pleas, and is not helping to overcome the drought problems. As a result, dissatisfaction and discontent have arisen in the ranks of the primary producers. Today, aluminium is in the minds of the people, particularly in the Gladstone area. It is very useful in the manufacture of irrigation piping, but the primary producer is charged 10s. and more a foot for aluminium piping. The aluminium producer would like to be getting that price. The inability of the primary producers to meet the terrible drought conditions today is brought about by the Government's not living up to its responsibilities to retain a form of price control to ensure that the primary producers get justice. One has only to investigate the price for cattle licks to discover the racket that exists between the wholesale price and the price the primary

producer has to pay. Broken Hill Proprietary Co. Ltd., made nearly £20,000,000 from selling steel at £70 a ton, yet when the primary producer needs it to construct a hayshed, he is charged £200 to £250 a ton. What a racket! What a shocking disgrace it is that this Government, which is supposed to be the friend of the primary producer, can deny him ordinary simple justice! His lack of capacity to meet the present situation is due to his being unable to get some form of justice from this administration.

The recent effort of the Government in providing £50,000 for drought relief has been criticised by its members. I concur in many of their remarks. It was purely a sop. It was only recently that the Premier went to Canberra to seek £1,500,000 for a drought-relief scheme. He should have been there months ago seeking special Federal assistance for the producer in the bad times that are now confronting him.

There are dairy farmers and other farmers in my area who have been suffering a drought for eight years, yet not one single ton of fodder under the drought-relief scheme went to the central district. I am certain of that. The area has been declared a drought area and the farmers can obtain the rebate that applies throughout the rest of the State.

There are fruit-growers in the Yarwun area. Even in times of plenty they are viciously attacked by the brigands at the C.O.D. In this time of drought what do we find? Growers who normally send 120 to 150 cases of fruit a week to the Sydney market are sending only 10. What special assistance has been given to them? Is there a fund at the C.O.D. to assist them in time of need? I say no. After all, those fruit-growers are helping to build up a good industry in Queensland. Their fruit is very much valued and prized for the manufacture of first-class fruit salad, for which Queensland is renowned. Even in times of plenty they are not able to get justice. The administration is adopting a poor attitude if it does not live up to its responsibilities in this regard.

I crave the indulgence of the House for a few moments to bring up a matter which has been exercising my mind for some time. The time is expedient and opportune to mention what I consider in this modern day and age is something deserving of the attention of legislators and other right-thinking people. One of the greatest scandals in the country is that numerous magazines and films pour forth smutty and rapacious filth before the eyes of our young people. It can be seen in barber shops, doctors' surgeries, and dentists' surgeries. In almost every magazine the barely-clad female form is exhibited before young and old. It is supposed to be something smart, something that this modern day and age likes, revels in, and accepts. I am no prude; I am an ordinary run-of-the-mill fellow. But as a father of five, a man deeply conscious of my family responsibilities, I echo the sentiments of people who believe that the world should strive for better morals.

I do not think it desirable that some people should make hundreds of thousands of pounds from the sale of filth through various agencies. I do not refer in any cruel way to the little bookseller at the corner stall; I refer to the monopolists in their boardrooms who decide to pour forth this filth in hundreds and thousands of magazines to capture the imagination of the young, thereby reaping large profits for themselves and helping to degrade the youth of the country.

I know that there are many leaders, particularly in religious organisations, who share these views, and I do not want on an occasion such as this to scout politically to try to obtain their support. I do think, however, that I am saying something with which every member of this House will agree when I say that something should be done to see that more wholesome activities are made available in the community and that book-stands everywhere receive some of the wholesome, decent type of literature that we remember and appreciate from the old days.

I have tried throughout my speech to demonstrate the inactivity and failure of the Government in the matter of housing and prices, and at the same time show its ineptitude in the administration of matters arising from the drought. This is affecting the price structure of the country very much, and the primary producer has become a pawn in the game played by the monopolists.

As I have already pointed out, the monopolistic faction of the Liberal Party and their avowed enemies, the Country Party representatives of the primary producers, are locked in great conflict and are exhibiting a form of belligerence that rarely touches political parties in this State. This is not desirable for good government and is to be abhorred, and I hope that at the State general election next year the people cast their votes for a sensible and sane party—the Australian Labour Party.

**Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE** (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (7.38 p.m.): All sorts of tirades are expected from speakers on the Opposition side of the House in the Address-in-Reply debate. On this occasion the debate does not lack anything in that regard. Hon. members have just had the undoubted pleasure of listening to the hon. member for Port Curtis regale the House with a mass of incorrect statements from all possible directions. He has not the slightest gratitude for the Government's action in bringing a great industry to his area. With the exception of the capital city, Gladstone has possibly received more housing than has any other part of the State. He did not mention the prices at his hotel which the Licensing Commission had to reduce.

**Mr. HANSON:** I rise to a point of order. The Licensing Commission has not recently made an order on Gladstone hotels, including the one in which I have an interest.

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** I accept the hon. member's apology. He spoke about housing and criticised the Government. He did not

tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in 1957 the Australian Labour Party was successful in building 7,000-odd houses, and that in the year of grace that ended on 30 June, 1965, over 14,000 houses were built in Queensland. He did not tell you of the great increase in spending in Gladstone, which no doubt has resulted in a very great increase in his own personal income. He shed crocodile tears about the people in Gladstone who could not get houses, but he did not make any suggestion that he was going to spend some of his hugely increased profits in building houses for some of them, either at £10 10s. a week or £35 a week.

**Mr. Lloyd:** What about the trouble in Collinsville? Have you got that fixed up?

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** I am glad the Deputy Leader of the Opposition raised that question.

**Mr. Lloyd:** I am glad, too, because you have a lot to clean up there.

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** If I had introduced the subject myself, I would have been accused of being parochial. Fortunately, I have some figures here.

I suppose the most significant effort on the part of any government is in the provision of communications within a country, and if this Government deserves praise for anything, it deserves it for the many thousands of miles of good roads that it has built to open up the country. That is particularly true in my own electorate, where £1,187,169 has been spent by the Main Roads Department in the past five years. In addition, £130,335 has been made available within my electorate from Commonwealth Aid allocations and Roads (Contribution to Maintenance) Tax. Thanks to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I have been able to make that information available to the House; I did not know how I was going to bring it in.

To take it a step further, I have even got the break-up on the figures. On the Proserpine Road, £111,000-odd has been spent; on the Bowen-Ayr section £502,499 has been spent. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked what is happening in Collinsville. On the Bowen-Collinsville Road, which is well up to the stage of bituminising, £430,340 has been spent by the Main Roads Department in the last five years, and I am sure that my Collinsville constituents will be more than happy to have that figure made available to them.

**Mr. Aikens:** Was that money spent as a result of your personal representations?

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** Absolutely. How else?

**Mr. Sherrington:** Johnny Gralton will still beat you next year.

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** That is wishful thinking. I have been connected personally with Collinsville since 1932. I had to wait

till this Government came to office—almost 30 years—to get one penny expended on the Bowen-Collinsville Road. Today, more than half of it is well on the way to being bituminised, and there are fine bridges over all the creeks.

**Mr. Campbell:** What a shocking road it was, too.

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** It used to take me 8½ hours to drive from Bowen to Collinsville.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! Hon. members on both sides of the House are engaging in disorderly crossfiring. I warn each hon. member that if it continues I shall have no hesitation in dealing with the person concerned under Standing Order 123A.

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** Not only has the Government spent this huge amount of money out of the Main Roads Fund as far as Collinsville but it has gone beyond there and, on the Collinsville-Mt. Douglas road has expended a total of £71,000. That is a major effort. That sort of spending has not been in just one electorate. There would not be one electorate in the whole of Queensland in respect of which a similar picture could not be painted.

As I said, much loose talk goes on in this Chamber on the Address in Reply, but I am more concerned with the sort of loose talk that also goes on outside. There are certain members of the community, including the member for Townsville North, who seem to go out of their way to do harm to the great sugar industry.

**Mr. TUCKER:** I rise to a point of order. The Minister's remark that I try to do harm to the sugar industry is offensive to me and I ask that he withdraw it.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The hon. member for Townsville North has indicated that the remarks of the Minister are offensive to him.

**Mr. Hanlon** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I need no help from the hon. member on my left.

**Mr. Hanlon:** I am replying to the Premier, who interjected on you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The hon. member for Barooka is going the right way to be sent out of the Chamber if he continues to interrupt.

**Mr. Aikens:** He is halfway there.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I advise every hon. member that if any member, irrespective of what side of the House he may be on, rises in his place and declares that a remark is offensive to him, whether that remark be true or false it is the bounden

duty of the member who made the remark, whether he be a Minister or otherwise, to withdraw it.

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** On your command, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the general statement that I made. I now propose to make particular statements to bear out what I said.

In this Chamber, at the end of last year, the hon. member for Townsville North produced a lump of clay which all hon. members will remember. He used that as a pedestal from which to attack the assignment of certain lands on the Ayr side of the Burdekin. He said that the four men concerned had been "sold a pup". He said they had been granted assignments on pieces of land that had been swamp, or were still swamp, and produced a lump of clay which he had taken from one of them. Unfortunately for him, some months later when the cane had been planted and had grown, there was a beautiful picture in "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" showing that the cane crop on that land was equal to anything on the Burdekin.

He has also recently, in Townsville, attacked the Government on the subject of the underground water supplies in the Burdekin area. I do not say he did it deliberately, but I do say he did it through lack of knowledge. As I am of a forgiving nature I can let that pass, but I think it only right that I should inform his mind on the facts.

In speaking about the diminution of the underground water supplies in the Burdekin Delta, he bemoaned the fact that there would be a great diminution in the production of cane as a result. Today I got figures from the Bureau of Sugar Experiment Stations to show just how uninformed he is on this matter. In 1962 the production in the Pioneer mill area, which is one of the leading mills on the Burdekin River, was 412,000 tons of cane, whereas the estimate, which is always a conservative figure, for this year's crop is 600,000 tons.

**Mr. Sherrington:** For what acreage?

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** It does not matter what the acreage is. We are talking about the water, not the land. I am showing how ill-informed the hon. member is about the water situation or, shall I say, about how he magnifies the position. In fact, from 1962 to this year there has been an increase in sugar-cane production in the Pioneer area from—in round figures—400,000 to 600,000 tons, a 50 per cent. increase. In the Kalamia mill area—another mill area on the Burdekin—production has increased from 463,000 tons in 1962 to 560,000 tons this year. In the Inkerman area, which is in my electorate—I do not take any credit for the increase in cane production, but I do boast about it—cane production has increased from 561,000 tons in 1962 to 743,000 tons this year.

For the benefit of the hon. member for Townsville North, I should like to point out what is going on in the Burdekin Delta with regard to the underground water supply. The Government became aware of, and concerned about, the falling level of the underground water several years ago. Such a fall was only to be expected because the underground water supply in that area is normally refilled by floods. As we have not had a big flood on the Burdekin since 1956 it was natural that the water level would drop. With the continued usage of the water, and the massive increase in usage that I have pointed out by quoting cane-production figures, any Government worth its salt would be concerned. Some four years ago the Department of Irrigation and Water Supply started a complete and thorough investigation of the underground water supplies. In June, 1964, it produced a report giving full details and making recommendations as to how supplementary additions could be made to the underground water supply. Besides issuing a report, the department propounded a solution which was to cost about £500,000. It would have cost a little over 5d. a ton of cane to carry out, of which the mill offered to pay one-third. There was a lot of argument about this, and in fact a very big public meeting was held in Home Hill in December, attended by the Minister for Irrigation, the Commissioner for Irrigation, the hon. member for Burdekin, and me. The farmers, in their wisdom, turned down the scheme, lock, stock and barrel. By April, the Department of Irrigation and Water Supply had prepared a detailed plan of the scheme. It pointed out that the way to implement the details was contained in the suggested plan of December. By April, those on the Inkerman side of the Burdekin decided to pull out of the committee that had been formed to negotiate with the Government. Straight away, the farmers and the mills on the north side of the Burdekin said, "We are going ahead to form a water board and get cracking," which they have done. In spite of the fact that those on the south side of the Burdekin pulled out of the scheme, only a few weeks ago a meeting of mill suppliers was held, and they have now voted in favour of a scheme of replenishment on the south side.

Those are the facts of the case and it would have been quite easy for the hon. member for Townsville North to get that information. I do not know if the hon. member made his statement in ignorance, or at the behest of his masters in Townsville. Those of us who live in the North, and those hon. members who have visited the North, know of the activities of the "Mackie-ites" and their supporters who were responsible for fomenting the trouble at Mt. Isa. I do not know if the hon. member for Townsville North knows what he is doing in acting as the mouthpiece of these people. However, I do know that on 4 March this year he said—and I quote from "Hansard" at page 2406—"I do not know Mackie. I have never met him." That was a definite statement and

those hon. members who were in the Chamber heard it. I ask hon. members to note that that was 4 March, 1965, yet on Thursday, 10 December, 1964, this item appeared in "The Townsville Daily Bulletin"—

"The State member for Townsville North (Mr. P. J. R. Tucker, M.L.A.) on Tuesday night addressed the final meeting of the Townsville Trades and Labour Council for the year . . .

"Mr. Pat Mackie, of Mt. Isa, also addressed this meeting."

**Mr. TUCKER:** I rise to a point of order. If the Minister does not accept my statement that I do not know Mr. Mackie, I repeat it at this moment. I did not meet Mr. Mackie that night. I left before he arrived. I repeat that I did not meet him.

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** This article was published in December, almost 10 months ago. If it is a false statement, is not the hon. member for Townsville North first of all dubbing the editor of "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" as a liar, and secondly, it does not explain why he has let nine months go by without informing the editor that he created a wrong impression.

As a matter of fact, I understand that the hon. member for Townsville North was amongst those present when Mackie was brought to the meeting by Fred Thompson, an organiser of the Amalgamated Engineering Union whom you all know.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** We don't all know.

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** You ought to, if you don't. The article was given to "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" by another notorious northern Communist named Gill.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** You seem to know them all.

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** I know them all. It is my job to know them all. Every good Queenslander should know them.

**Mr. TUCKER:** I rise to a point of order. I deny that I met Mackie that night. I have made that statement here and I ask the Minister to accept it.

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** In deference to the hon. member for Townsville North, I point out that I did not make the statement that he met him. If he has a tender conscience about it, that has nothing to do with me. I understood that he was amongst those present when Thompson arrived with Mackie.

**Mr. Tucker:** You are a rotten liar; I was not.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I realise that the hon. member for Townsville North may have been provoked, but it was entirely disorderly to use such a term and I ask the hon. member to withdraw it.

**Mr. Tucker:** I have the highest respect for you, Mr. Speaker, but I do not have any for the Minister. I am sorry, but I cannot withdraw it.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** If the hon. member declines to withdraw it I shall have no alternative but to name him for disobeying the Chair. I shall give the hon. member another opportunity to withdraw the statement. If he does, I shall not take the action I have indicated. I am warning him for the last time.

**Mr. Tucker:** It is only with due deference to you, Mr. Speaker, that I withdraw it.

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** I understand that the hon. member for Townsville North was amongst those who sat on the platform when Mackie came in.

**Mr. LLOYD:** I rise to a point of order. As Leader of the Labour Party in the House this evening I think these unnecessarily provocative statements which are being made are intended for one purpose only. I do not think they are necessary. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to request the Minister to restrain himself in some small way and refrain from saying things which obviously are untrue and are discordant.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister has heard the appeal by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to be a little less provocative. It is not my province to deny anyone the right to say anything in this Chamber, provided it is in keeping with the Standing Rules and Orders.

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** I thank you for that, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to provoke the Deputy Leader of the Opposition by asking that he withdraw his allegation that I have made untrue statements.

**Mr. Lloyd:** They are unnecessary.

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** I do not think that they are unnecessary. I am pointing out, and I believe that it is necessary to point out, that the hon. member for Townsville North is allowing himself to be used by the Communists in North Queensland.

**Mr. TUCKER:** I rise to a point of order. I resent the Minister's statement that I am being used by the Communists in North Queensland. That remark is offensive to me and I ask that he withdraw it.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** The statement made by the Minister was that the hon. member was allowing himself to be used. I do not know whether that is any more, or less, offensive but those were the words that the hon. gentleman used.

**Dr. DELAMOTHE:** Here is one last thing that shows I am making truthful statements, which is what I am here to do. I have in my hand the Communist guide to voting at the last Townsville City Council election in 1964. For aldermen, the first and second numbers

go to Communist candidates, and right at the top is Percy John Robert Tucker as the next candidate. Surely that bears out what I have said. The hon. member for Townsville North quite obviously aligned himself with the Left Wing at the recent convention at Townsville. As a reward, of course, he may replace the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, which is something that I would be very sorry to see.

However, I think I have said enough about this misguided interference with, and damage to, the sugar industry in my area. As I have now brought it to the attention of Parliament, I hope that the hon. member for Townsville North will better inform himself in future before he makes statements to the detriment of local industry.

**Mr. TUCKER:** I rise to a point of order. Last Thursday afternoon I denied that I had in fact had anything to do with any ticket issued without my authority, or that I had any knowledge of it. Is the Minister in order in making the statements that he has and in producing the card in the light of what I said last Thursday afternoon?

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The hon. member may take advantage of the Standing Orders of the House and make a personal explanation tomorrow morning if he so wishes.

**Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (8.7 p.m.):** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Aikens:** Don't you be thrown out.

**Mr. WALSH:** I have been here for 30 years and I think I have conducted myself fairly well. I have never been sent out.

Before I get on to the general theme of the Address-in-Reply debate, I want to say that I listened with a great deal of interest to the Minister who has just resumed his seat. I have known him for a long time, and I am very sorry that he sank to the depths of introducing what might be regarded as the personal side of a member's life in business. I do not think that the Minister in charge of the Licensing Commission should come into this House and refer to the personal business of another member who has addressed himself to questions affecting his electorate. As the hon. member concerned did not provoke the Minister, I cannot give any credit to the Minister for doing what he did.

**Mr. Smith** interjected.

**Mr. WALSH:** I hope, too, that there will be no going into the private affairs of the hon. member for Windsor.

If the Minister intends to convey to the House that the Licensing Commission has carried out its duties in respect of the recent increases in the prices of spirits, I say to him that I do not think it has. I want the Minister to ask the Licensing Commission what the price of a bottle of spirits was last November and what the price of a nip, or a half-nip, was in hotels, and then compare those prices with the prices today. If there has not been an increase of nearly 40 per cent. I do not

know anything about the business. However, I do not want to dwell on that point; I touched on it only because the Minister referred to it.

I wish to pay a tribute to the mover of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. Nobody else in this House has known the hon. member for Mirani as long as I have. I knew him when he was just starting school, a young boy of about eight years of age who had lost his father. His father sacrificed his life in an attempt to save a young woman who had got into difficulties while swimming at the seaside resort of Louisa Creek, outside Sarina. Although I disagree entirely with the hon. member's politics, I think that the manner in which he presented his case when moving the motion did him great credit. It indicated to all hon. members that he has a good grip of the industries in his electorate and of the problems confronting them, and I hope that, as time goes by, he will not be led astray by some of those who may want him to knuckle down to the orthodox method of presenting his case in this Assembly. Much as I would have liked to see my old friend Matt O'Neill elected to represent Mirani, I think the new hon. member for Mirani will make his mark here as the years go by.

Matt O'Neill would have filled a gap that is very evident in the ranks of the Australian Labour Party today. Apart from the hon. member for Mourilyan, it has no representative here who can speak with authority on the sugar industry and its problems. If for no reason other than that, had Matt O'Neill come to this House he would have been a very good acquisition to the ranks of the A.L.P. I think, too, that he would have lent a little bit of humour to the debates here with his natural wit. Those who know him will agree with me when I say that he has the capacity to make people feel a little bit happy and more pleasant when storms are on the horizon.

**Mr. Aikens:** Would he have been in the Egerton group or the Williams group of the A.L.P.?

**Mr. WALSH:** To this day, I have not been able to work out which group the hon. member for Townsville South belongs to.

**Mr. Aikens:** I belong to my group.

**Mr. WALSH:** I do not intend to devote any time in this debate to attempting to work that out. I wish to speak on matters that are of importance to my own electorate and the State generally.

I do not know whether I should blame the hon. member for Mirani for the somewhat heated atmosphere that has prevailed in this Assembly since he moved the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. He said that he was rather sorry to introduce what he called a discordant note into his speech, but he proceeded to refer to the disagreement that exists in the sugar industry today over the representation on the Queensland Cane Growers' Council. I have discussed this

problem with the hon. member, as I have discussed it with many other people. The hon. member for Mourilyan dealt with it in his speech this afternoon and expressed the wish that the present representation on the Council should continue. Anybody who stands for what might be called the democratic way of life could in no circumstances justify a continuance of the present set-up on the Queensland Cane Growers' Council. I cannot be accused of standing here and discussing this matter from a purely political angle. Whilst I did interject earlier today that there were no sugar mills or sugar farmers in my electorate, there is one mill, the Millaquin mill. But there are virtually no sugar farmers, and I do not have to toady, as it were, to the particular electoral group to win their votes because of this disagreement. However, I say with all the sincerity at my disposal that I would have had a longer experience of the sugar organisation in this State than anybody else here, and the Government cannot afford to allow the present position to continue.

I know that the Premier has endeavoured to meet the situation by encouraging the appointment of two independent committees to go into the matter and make recommendations. In the first case the inquiry was completed, but before the report was presented Mr. Foley passed away. I do not think there is a doubt in anybody's mind that the report would have recommended certain alterations in representation on the Cane Growers' Council. Mr. Foley had been a dedicated member of the Council, and also its chairman, for many years.

A later report that was presented made certain recommendations. The Cane Growers' Conference, which consists of equal representation from each of the 31 mill areas, has carried a resolution on several occasions, in each instance asking for a change in representation. When the matter comes along to the Cane Growers' Council which consists of 13 members, they flatly refuse to listen either to the recommendations of the independent committee or to the decisions of the conference itself. I think it is nearly time that the Cane Growers' Council was given to understand that it is working under statutory power conferred by this Parliament and that it should not continue to abuse its powers in the manner it has been doing, particularly over recent years.

I do not want to stress this matter any further for the moment. I might come back to it at a later date, but I remind members generally, and the Cabinet in particular, that many years ago when certain disagreements arose in North Queensland over the marketing of sugar, certain threats were made which fortunately were not proceeded with. Had they been proceeded with there is no question that it would have wrecked the whole foundation of the sugar organisation structure in this State.

I suggest to the Premier that before this matter gets out of hand, and having regard to the fact that Mackay, Bundaberg and Ayr produce approximately half the total amount

of sugar produced in Queensland and provide almost half the finance to carry on the organisation, the time has come for the Government to make it clear to the Cane Growers' Council that the Government expects a different attitude from it.

**Mr. Aikens:** How many representatives do those mill areas have?

**Mr. WALSH:** I do not want to go into that at present because it is a matter of quoting accurate figures. While I might trust my memory to quote them fairly accurately, I do not want to go into details at the moment. No matter what is quoted, whether it be from the point of view of the number of growers, the production of cane, or the finance made available, it favours the areas that have been agitating for a change in representation.

Housing has been discussed a good deal during this debate—as it should be. I have noticed during the debate that members of the Australian Labour Party have come to the point that I have been stressing for some time—last year and the year before—regarding the attitude of the Government in assisting with their housing problems the great international organisations who come here to establish industries. The duty of the State in the first place should be to those who have been here for the whole of their lives, to those who have come here and settled very many years ago and reared their families, and to those who at the moment have young families but no home. The Premier and his Cabinet would know that until recently Mount Isa Mines Limited, with all its capital assets and all the funds at its disposal, never came looking to the Government for any assistance to relieve the housing problem at Mt. Isa. During the continuance of the Labour Government Mount Isa Mines Limited went along with its own housing schemes, although at one stage it put up a proposal seeking some consideration in the provision of kerbing, channelling, electricity supply, water supply and so on in connection with 500 homes to be erected by it. Since this Government has decided to give first priority to Comalco and other international companies that come to dredge rutile and other minerals, it has forgotten its obligations to local communities.

Recently in the course of another debate the Treasurer treated the House to some very interesting statistics. He went into the number of marriages and births as evidence of what should be a guide to the demand for new homes. He could not make a case out on the basis that Queensland was rapidly developing because of the upsurge in migration, because all the figures prove the contrary. But he finally said, in effect, that after eight years as Treasurer he could not supply the answer to the housing problem. Although the Minister for Justice might get up, as he did tonight, and quote figures showing the difference between the number of houses built by the Labour Government in 1957 and the number built by this Government in 1963 or 1964, he did not go on

to explain that the construction of so many of these houses had been arranged through private finance in which the Government had no interest at all. The fact remains that the loan allocation this year from the Loan Council is approximately the same as it was last year, and is approximately the same as it was five or six years ago.

With ever-increasing costs because of increases in the basic wage and in margins and so on for tradesmen, how can it be suggested that the Government today is taking the same share of responsibility in the provision of these houses? Hon. members opposite can quote any figures they like but the fact remains that in most centres like Bundaberg, which has had industry established for many years, we still have young couples who have come all the way from the southern States because they thought Queensland was a better State and that the cost of living and the cost of rent was lower in this State, who are anxious to buy or rent homes, but they just cannot get them.

Recently a Bundaberg railway employee who was transferred to Gladstone from the Far West wrote to me asking if I would make some inquiries about his obtaining a Queensland Housing Commission rental home. I wrote to him telling him quite plainly that he had as much chance of getting one as he had of winning the New South Wales lottery. I suppose that the odds would be a couple of million to one, or even worse.

While I agree that there has been a certain amount of relief afforded through co-operative societies, I will not accept that the Government is shouldering its responsibility to provide homes. Lately, many young couples have come to me to outline their problems. I want the Housing Commission to take a more definite stand with contractors. Only this week a young couple approached me. They said that having arranged their finance through the Housing Commission, having deposited £691, having their own allotment of land, the tender having been accepted in March last, the contract was not even signed until early in August. The contractor is trying to evade his responsibilities yet the Housing Commission has done nothing to make him accept them and sign the contract within a specified period from the date of acceptance of the tender. Having signed the contract early in August, he now has 20 weeks from the date of signing to complete the dwelling, and remember that the tender was accepted in March last. I do not know how many similar cases there are, but one is sufficient for me to register my protest about the lax methods adopted.

I know that the Housing Commission will say, "We have to be careful in these competitive days. It is hard to get tradesmen and so on to fulfil these contracts." There is some truth in that, but if the department committed itself to a policy of a building contractor having to sign the contract within

a given date after acceptance of the tender, if he does not proceed with the contract by that date he should be called upon to forfeit his deposit. In this case I found that the builder was engaged in pulling down the hangars at the aerodrome in Bundaberg for removal to Cairns. In the meantime he was using his work force and his general organisation on that job and was neglecting his obligations under the Housing Commission contract. I should like the Government to investigate these matters and tidy them up a little.

I have found, too, that, through their own finance, many young people have purchased allotments. Then, proceeding to act through their solicitors or agents, the documents have to be forwarded to the Titles Office, particularly where there has been a subdivision. The complaints are too numerous to be ignored. Although I have stood on my feet for 25 years defending Government departments against many of these complaints I have reached a stage where, on the evidence before me, I feel that some complaint must be made about the departments concerned. I have said over and over in this Chamber, and only in recent years, what my experience has been in handling these matters on behalf of my constituents. Solicitors and other agents are very lax in lodging documents and, having lodged them, they do not always comply with the requirements of the Titles Office. The Titles Office, as the protector in this matter, has to send the documents back for a clearer outline of the details of the subdivision. This is going on backwards and forwards, and ultimately the prospective home-builder comes to me and complains about delays in Government departments. Until recently I have been able to show that in the main the negligence rested with the solicitors or agents; now, if I accept the details as presented to me by the solicitors, some of the blame must lie with the Government departments. That is not good enough.

I have had cases where documents were delayed for 2½ years. That is a long time. I have come onto the scene and made formal inquiries and the matter has been rectified in less than a fortnight. Why should the little people be humbugged like that? I am finding too much of it. Somebody will give the excuse that the Moonie oil leases and other matters that have to be dealt with urgently are piling up documents in Government offices. In these days we are supposed to have computers that can handle a good deal of the matter relating to subdivisions, so I do not know why there should be such extensive delays.

During the war the Titles Office was left with probably less than a skeleton staff and it took a good deal of time to work it up to a state of near efficiency again. Recently I was advised by the previous Registrar that since they were adopting the system of forwarding a good deal of this matter to Sydney to be dealt with by computers, there

should be a decision, or approval of registration of the survey plans, within a fortnight, and certainly in no longer than three weeks if the documents were lodged in order by the solicitors.

I hope that this will be brought to the notice of the particular Minister. I have already taken the opportunity of discussing it with one of the departmental heads because I am not inclined to make these complaints against a department with which I had long ministerial experience. But I have reached the stage where I feel I am justified in doing so in public.

**Mr. Lickiss:** If there are requisitions on the survey, that would be outside the scope of the Titles Office.

**Mr. WALSH:** If the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha had been listening to me he would have heard me say that if the documents have been lodged in the first place not completely in compliance with the requirements of the Titles Office they have to be returned to the solicitor.

I found a case where a surveyor had gone out to do some work at Moura on a private survey. He had had subdivisional plans forwarded to him through solicitors for correction as requested by the Titles Office. It was found that he was not even replying to the correspondence forwarded to him by the legal representatives. I thought the best thing to do, after I had made complete inquiries into the matter, was to lodge a complaint with the Chairman of the Surveyors Board, which is responsible for licensing these people to carry on their profession. If it is found that this person is negligent in his work he should be dealt with. It was not long before the documents turned up. But why should people be fooled about like that for such a long period? A solicitor gets a document into his office, and away it goes, and not much notice is taken until somebody like me starts to kick over the traces. I shall not say more on that matter now; I can elaborate on it further during the Budget debate.

Earlier tonight we heard the Minister for Justice giving an explanation of the Burdekin position. I assure him that unless some steps are taken to meet the position the problem at Bundaberg will become very serious. What I have to say is only my personal opinion, which at least I am entitled to express as other hon. members express theirs on problems in their electorates. There are too many statements being made. Experts are visiting the district; indeed, three went up recently, one from the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission, one from the University, and one from the State Electricity Commission. Why they went there I do not know, because engineers and experts galore have already been there. According to Press reports, they went up and sighted pumping stations and wells and so on, which information should be readily available from departmental files in Brisbane.

The stage has been reached at which council representatives are demanding the placing of pumping restrictions on farmers who are irrigating their cane in the Bundaberg district. These farmers are not in my district, but the industry in which they are engaged is very important to its economy. I cannot see how any demand to place restrictions on the irrigating of crops can overcome the problem of providing water for the residents of Bundaberg. It is not much good having regional directors travelling round and forming local development bureaus with the idea of encouraging industries to move to provincial cities if they are to be faced with a shortage of water. Who would establish a major industrial plant in Bundaberg or anywhere else where it had to depend on an underground water supply? The possibility is too silly even to suggest.

The sooner some specific move is made by the Bundaberg City Council and the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission to produce a plan for a water supply for Bundaberg, independent of any investigation carried out by officers of the Snowy Mountains Authority, the better it will be for the residents of Bundaberg. I do not think the negative attitude of preventing others from using water to irrigate crops simply because there is not enough to supply the city can be accepted. All it could provide is temporary relief. With the increasing number of wells being put down in the Bundaberg area, all with the object of maintaining production and employment, there must be an increasing drain on underground water supplies. Although the underground supply has been able to meet requirements over the years, no longer can we wait, because of the extra drain on supplies resulting from the large number of wells now operating, till the investigation by the officers of the Snowy Mountains Authority is completed. The sugar industry has contributed £10,000 towards that investigation, and I do not know of any other primary-producing district that has contributed in a similar way. Whilst I appreciate that gesture, I am old enough in the head to know that it will be a matter of five or 10 years before any real result will come from such an investigation. Therefore, I emphasise now that the department, instead of trotting its experts to and from Bundaberg in connection with this problem, should proceed to discuss it with the Bundaberg City Council on the basis of providing a separate water supply to meet the requirements of the local authority area. The rest can then follow.

I do not suppose anyone will object if I raise a few matters bearing on the political situation. As one who sits on the sidelines now, I am very interested in the battling that is going on on both sides of the House and outside it. As a matter of fact, I find myself coming to the conclusion that that section of the coalition which is seeking to gain control is adopting tactics exactly similar to those adopted by the Trades Hall group prior to the split in the Labour Party in 1957. Again I am only expressing my

opinion, but I do not think it can be said that I lack experience in these matters; I have had a good deal to do with them over the years. I know that the Liberal Party organisation has made it clear that it thinks the Liberals can do better than they have done in the past. Good luck to them if they can. I am not worried about their dog fights on the other side of the House. If they think they can tip their colleagues in the Country Party overboard, that is up to them. We will see later what happens.

When I first came into this House, the counterpart of the Liberal Party had three members in the Legislative Assembly. Three years later, in 1938, it still had three members. It then had the whole field of the metropolitan area to itself, and I am wondering whether the Liberal Party organisation today is as good as or better than it was then. That remains to be seen. Back in 1941 it had seven members, which was an improvement. Then, strangely enough, at the latter end of that year the image of Nicklin came into the picture, and from then on we find their numbers increasing. When the split in the Labour Party occurred in 1957, of the 21 seats lost by the former Government, 12 were won by the Liberal Party and nine by the Country Party.

It is interesting to be sitting on the sidelines watching these things. Of course, the Australian Labour Party is giving the coalition parties a little bit of advice on these matters, and members of that party are showing a great deal of interest in the fact that Mr. Charles Porter is likely to enter this House as the hon. member for Toowong. I do not know whether or not there is any truth in the suggestion—it has been bandied about—that Mr. Porter is likely to become leader of the A.L.P.

**Mr. Bennett:** It is fairly certain.

**Mr. WALSH:** I am glad to have that admission from the hon. member for South Brisbane. It would not surprise me at all when I remember that a former president of the Young Liberals in Western Australia became State Secretary of the A.L.P. Executive in Victoria. I remember just how much trouble Mr. Hartley caused in the ranks of the A.L.P. Irrespective of what members of the A.L.P. may be thinking about the coalition, let me convey this message to them: that the genuine, dinki-die Labour people outside this House are looking for better leadership of the Australian Labour Party, not only outside this House but also inside it. Never in my experience have I known an instance in which the leader of the State Parliamentary Labour Party in Queensland was not a delegate to the Federal Conference. It amazed me when I read that the Leader of the Opposition in this State declined nomination as a representative at the recent Federal Labour Party conference in Sydney. He may have his reasons for that, of course, but I am entitled to assume that he was shrewd enough to

anticipate that there would be some very controversial decisions and that he would rather be out of it than have to defend those controversial decisions, as was the case with the famous North-West Cape proposal in Western Australia.

Those are problems, of course, that I can only view from the sidelines with a great deal of interest. I hope that as time goes on, from leadership in the Labour Party in this State there will emerge a genuine Labour Party not directed by men like Chamberlain or the so-called Com. influence and so on, but a Labour Party that will be acceptable to the great majority of working-class people in this State. That will end the feud between the Liberal Party and coalition Government.

There are no doubt some interesting times to be looked forward to in the next Parliament if we are all here. I certainly will be looking forward with a great deal of interest to it. As a matter of fact, I thought the Liberal Party might make a gesture by nominating a woman to the House in the person of Gabby Horan. It is a possibility that Mrs. Jordan will be on the A.L.P. side in this Chamber; with Gabby Horan on the Liberal side we could be treated to some interesting debates.

I do not think that the Premier, as the Leader of the Government, likes to see the disintegration in the A.L.P. We do not want to get like Greece or France, but we are heading that way. No doubt the Liberal Party does not care two hoots so long as it gets the Treasurership, the Speakership and all the other plums of Government office. That is all its members are batting for. "Power at any price" is their slogan, but I warn them that the difficulties that presented themselves to the great A.L.P. in 1957 will no doubt arise again if this bickering continues in the coalition camp. However, that is the Premier's problem. I hope that while he is away representing Queensland at the sugar conference—good luck to him; I am glad to see him going because he will make a worthy representative for the industry—this coalition will not sabotage him as Jim Scullin was sabotaged when he was overseas during the depression years.

**Mr. LONERGAN (Flinders) (8.49 p.m.):** I join hon. members on both sides of the House in congratulating the newly elected member for Mirani, Mr. Newbery, on his able moving of this motion, and the seconder, Mr. Windsor, the hon. member for Ithaca. I feel sure that I would have the approval of every member of the House in saying that we were impressed by the speech delivered by the hon. member for Mirani in moving the motion. I feel equally sure that, as the years go by, the hon. member will prove his worth in this House. We are very fortunate indeed to have him take the place of another great fighter for Mirani in the late Ernie Evans. I wish him well

in his Parliamentary career and am sure he will be in this Parliament for a long time.

As we know, for the seconder of the motion, our friend Mr. Windsor, this will be his last term. I wish him well. In doing so I should like to express the thought that we are going to miss him not so much for what he said in the House but as a gentleman in action and manner and for the very high principles that he displayed at all times. It is unfortunate that we have not more like him. If we had, this Parliament would be a better place, and so would Queensland. I feel quite sure that if all of us were to pattern our way of life on what has been set by the hon. member for Ithaca we would do a much better job. He will take away from this House kindly thoughts of the many friendships he has made here. He will be cheered in the years to come by the knowledge that he had the honour to serve under the greatest Premier Queensland has ever known. I say that in all sincerity. Added to that is the fact that he has been a member of the most progressive Government that Queensland has been fortunate enough to have. Results prove that. It is proved by the very fact that this Government was returned at the last general election with substantial majorities.

I was very surprised at the remarks of the hon. member for Townsville North. Among other things, he said that this Government had made no real contribution to the advancement of the State. If that is so, why is it that Townsville is progressing faster than any other provincial city in Australia?

**Mr. Tucker:** Despite the Government.

**Mr. LONERGAN:** Despite the knockings of the hon. member for Townsville North. I am quite sure that if they had no member there—they might as well have none—Townsville would still prosper. How often is the hon. member seen? I have nothing against him personally, but just prior to the last general election the remark was made in Townsville that an election must be coming up because the hon. member for Townsville North had been seen in the street. How different he is from the hon. member for Townsville South, who gets around among his electors and is not too flash to talk to the worker. If any hon. member opposite has doubts as to whether the State has made any progress under this Government let him travel through the electorate of the hon. member for Gregory, or let him come into mine. Previously we were the backwoods of Queensland. Let anyone come through now and see what we have there today. We have first-class schools, accommodation second to none, roads where there were no roads at all before and contented public servants. In fact, they think of us as the best Labour Government they have ever had, and how right they are!

It has often been said, and rightly so, that the public has a short memory. From time to time we all hear some criticism

of the Government. When I do I always hasten to remind those who criticise to cast their minds back to 1957 and compare the conditions then with those of today. They readily admit that they are much better off. I then say, "Keep it that way. We have done more for you in eight years than the Labour Party did from 1932 to 1957. They are not concerned with the people in the bush. They look upon them as hillbillies." In fact, one very prominent Labour Minister said, "If they are silly enough to live in the country, let them put up with it." I will not mention names.

I give the Government credit for the many things it has done but it would be wrong for me to say that I am completely happy with some Government departments. Despite the good intentions of the Minister, it is only natural that somewhere along the line a man will fall down on the job a little. I am concerned mainly with a very important department, the Department of Transport. I have great admiration for the Minister for Transport. I think Queensland is very fortunate in having a man of his undoubted ability at the helm. However, I have received many complaints and this is the place to air them. I do not mind saying that in one instance a matter was brought to the attention of the Minister, and in other instances to the General Manager. I was rather surprised with the replies I received from both gentlemen. I hasten to add that I have great respect for the General Manager at Townsville, Mr. Hutchinson. He is a very able man. However, he is guided by the advice tendered to him by his engineers and other people holding a lesser rank. We have a small wagon repair shop in Charters Towers which was doing quite a good job, turning out work comparable with Townsville, but some months ago, suddenly and out of the blue, a memo. was received that the shop was to be closed and the employees transferred to Townsville. Some of the employees were very concerned, and rightly so, because they had their homes in Charters Towers. I made representations in various quarters and was able to have the move cancelled.

This was not so much a departmental decision but one which stemmed from personalities. I believe, and I am supported by every right-thinking person in Charters Towers, that for some reason the locomotive engineer in Townsville has taken an intense dislike to Charters Towers. It seems that he intends to do his best to withdraw as many railway men as possible from Charters Towers and thereby do the town some harm.

Recently I had occasion to bring to the notice of the Minister for Transport an incident concerning a derailment at Mingela, which is roughly 29 miles from Charters Towers.

In the reply to a letter that I wrote to the Minister, he said that the men employed at Charters Towers would be used in minor derailments in and around Charters Towers

and the depot. But what is the depot? Only recently there was a derailment within 12 miles of Charters Towers. Two of the breakdown gang were sent down to free the buffers, and the rest of the gang were brought from Townsville. Is it any wonder that the public ridicule the department? That is not the action of business men; it is the action of railway men steeped in the traditions of the railway.

The time has arrived when we should create a board to administer railway affairs. It is the largest industry in Queensland. One person does not control the affairs of a company in private enterprise, and we should create a similar board with business men on it to control the Railway Department. Business men would never agree to the present set-up.

I often wonder whether the administration has ever heard of the word "goodwill", despite the fact that we have goodwill officers who for a while did a good job. They were supported by the administration. But today that does not appear to be the position. Quite recently the mail train schedule from Townsville to Mt. Isa was altered. Imagine my surprise when I found that the mail for Maxwellton and Nelia was off-loaded at Hughenden and held for a later train. These trains frequently run late and consequently the mails had to wait until midday. How can the Commissioner or the General Manager hope to retain these customers—they send their wool by railway—when they do foolish things like that? In an effort to save a paltry few minutes they will get offside with the people who help to keep these things going.

**Mr. Tucker:** This won't get you the railway vote.

**Mr. LONERGAN:** I will get it, as I have done in the past.

There is another matter that I should mention that also reflects inefficiency in the Railway Department. There was at one time at Hughenden a diesel electrician whose job it was to service diesel locomotives. Some understrapper—perhaps an engineer—recommended a transfer to Cloncurry. What happened? Recently a diesel locomotive failed at Winton and had to be hauled all the way to Townsville for servicing. Things like that should never happen. If a man on the running staff was responsible for such a mistake, he would be fined a "fiver" and possibly reduced. These are things to which I hope the Minister will give some thought.

One of the greatest problems confronting those in the outback is water conservation. In my area there is a small drought every seven years and a major one, such as is being experienced now, every 20 years. I feel that where a watercourse or other feature lends itself to damming the Government, Federal or State, should make every effort to conserve water at that point. If no move is made in this direction, there

will be no development in Western Queensland towns; indeed, it is quite possible that the population in the West could decrease even further.

The Burdekin River is one of the largest in Queensland, and there is no need for me to stress what a wonderful boon it is to those fortunate enough to live close to it. It has many dam sites, and I hope that before long there will be dams on the upper reaches of the Burdekin above Charters Towers.

Recently I had the good fortune to visit an area north of Hughenden to view a potential dam site. It is one that I have heard of for many years, and I do not mind admitting that when I saw it for myself it really amazed me. If it was closer to the coast it would be a tourist attraction, and I venture to say that I have seen nothing in Queensland to equal it. I am referring to what is known at present as the Porcupine Gorge. It is roughly 60 miles north-north-east of Hughenden. The gorge itself is approximately 30 miles long, and its width varies. An interesting feature is that in some places the walls drop straight down for 600 feet, and I agree with the many people who say that this is an ideal site for a dam.

To illustrate the value of such a dam to the Outback, it would mean that all the fodder needed in Central and Western Queensland could be grown in the West, and I feel quite sure that the water would move by gravity and would not need pumping. Rainfall in the area is quite good. It is rather interesting to note that the average rainfall in Hughenden is only 17 inches a year, whereas 60 miles north at Mt. Emu, where records have been kept for the past 64 years, the average is 27 inches a year.

I realise that the scheme would cost a great deal of money and require a great deal of investigation. I understand that the Townsville Regional Electricity Board made preliminary investigations some years ago and was quite impressed with the site. It would be beyond the financial capacity of the people of the area that would be served by the dam to proceed with the project, but if this Government and the Federal Government are to do something for the people of the West, as they must, it warrants their support. Persons who are competent to express an opinion have informed me that 100,000 acres of land could be irrigated from the dam, and anyone who knows anything about fodder and grain-growing will have some idea of the amount that could be grown on that area. In my opinion, 100 farmers could be placed there, and they would employ workers on their farms. This would be quite a number of people in a small community, and it would make a considerable impact on the town of Hughenden. Projects such as this will induce people to go to Western Queensland, stay there, and create employment. What is more important, they will minimise recurring stock losses in dry years.

I believe that the project could pay for itself over the years. It was suggested to me in Hughenden last week-end that the Government does not do anything for the man on the land, and one does hear some criticism of this sort from ill-advised people. It is interesting to note that from 1958 to 1965 rebates allowed by the Railway Department in freight on fodder and starving stock amounted to £1,104,000 which is quite a lot of money. It is expected that rebates allowed in 1965-66 will be over £1,500,000. If this dam were built there would not be any calls on the Treasury for rebates of this kind, so the dam would, in effect, pay for itself. I know more about the West than most people.

**Mr. Bennett:** Frank Forde knew more about it than you do.

**Mr. LONERGAN:** I do not think that would be correct. He was a nice old chap, despite his politics.

I urge the Government very sincerely to keep this project in mind, because the people of Western Queensland must be given some relief. At present, dam projects worth £8,000,000 are under construction in Queensland, yet not one such project has even been investigated in the western part of the State. I suggest that an investigation should be carried out, and I am quite happy to issue an invitation to Mr. Haigh and the Minister for Conservation to come out and see for themselves. I am quite sure that they will be as surprised as I was.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH (Tablelands)** (9.15 p.m.): In rising to speak in the debate on the Address in Reply I should first of all like to express the loyalty of the constituents of the Tablelands electorate to the Crown. I do that because each year it is expected of the member and people sometimes get the wrong impression if one does not do it. Other members have different ideas, but that is my idea.

I also wish to pay tribute to and congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. The hon. member for Mirani, I think, delivered his address very well. It is worthy of note that the member who moved the motion was making his maiden speech, and the member who seconded it was delivering what might be called his swan song.

I also pay special tribute to the energy displayed by the new member for Cairns since he entered this Parliament, and also for the very fine address he gave in his maiden speech. I should say that "Watty" Wallace, who guided me in my early days in this Chamber, thereby making my task much easier, would be very gratified to know that his successor was a man of Ray Jones's calibre. He is just as interested in Cairns—and everyone in Cairns—as "Watty" Wallace, and whether there is a three-cornered, a four-cornered, or a five-cornered contest, Ray Jones will be here again next year.

Much has been said about the drought. It is rather a dry subject but the member who just resumed his seat spoke of water conservation. These two matters go together and I wondered why we do not compare farmers who are hard hit by other things than drought with the graziers and farmers who at the present time are suffering great hardship from this scourge. Can anyone tell me the difference between a tobacco farmer who goes out in the morning and finds every leaf stripped from his crop at a time when he is financially up to his eyes with the bank and a grazier who is hit by drought? These men are wondering what to do. They asked the Premier, or the Government, if they could get any assistance. I will give the Premier his due; he sent up someone to survey the damage, but the answer came back, "They can insure against it, you know."

**Mr. Bennett:** That is a big help.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** Yes.

**Mr. Sullivan:** That is what the farmers do in the wheat industry.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** There is a vast difference between the wheat grower and the tobacco farmer. Some of the tobacco farmers in my area were so hard hit that they resorted to very small acreages to keep themselves going. They cannot afford to plant any more, nor can they afford to insure because the premiums are exorbitant and the returns comparatively small.

At present we have, on the one hand, the whole Commonwealth raising funds for drought relief. I am not against that—I think it is very good—but the Government is differentiating between two groups of people who are on the same basis—they are both getting their living from the land—yet they are receiving different treatment from a Country Party Government.

Turning now to the subject of fodder, the hon. member for Flinders mentioned the possibility of growing all the fodder he needed if the dam he mentioned was available. On the Atherton Tableland we have ample water and very good fodder. On two occasions I made representations to try to get that fodder to starving stock but in each case I failed. It is an indictment of the department and the Government. When we were told that the fodder could be got rid of by contacting general managers of butter factories and the like I thought it was passing the buck to people who were not responsible to the same extent as departmental officers. This fodder was passed by a departmental officer, who said it was the best fodder he had seen. It was not 5 tons but over 200 tons. It was the type of fodder that the hon. member for Flinders said could be grown in his area. I agree that it could be, but would the same thing happen there as happened on the Atherton Tableland? Probably it would. I said to people at the time, "I do hope that in the event of a major disaster the same bungling methods will not be used." That man was prepared

to put it on trucks at Tolga and consign it wherever it was wanted. He did not even ask the price. When I rang Dr. Alexander all he said to me was, "Are you going to give it away?" I said, "No, he is a farmer. He grows this." He said, "There is no provision for it. I am only interested in grain from the Wheat Board and molasses from the various sugar mills."

There is an example of fodder going to waste while subscriptions are being taken up throughout the whole countryside and various loans are being made by State and Federal Governments to buy fodder from the Wheat Board and sugar mills. Although it may be said that such fodder would keep the cattle alive, if you continue to feed them on it you will have repercussions in the health of the stock. The natural fodder is green fodder or fodder which is dried by curing. If stock continue to feed on grain of high protein content there can be these repercussions. Before the next drought occurs, indeed, at the earliest opportunity, I hope that the Minister for Primary Industries will try to arrange some machinery in his department which can at once swing into action by saying, "We want all the fodder we can get. We will guarantee you get paid for it." This farmer was not worried about the price. He said, "I will put it on the trucks. Let me know where to consign it." He is quite interested in continuing. He is taken up with the fact that he can be a producer of life-saving fodder that is so necessary in this State in times of drought. One hon. member has mentioned how often we get droughts, although I think he might be a little bit out in his five or seven years.

Following representations made to me, I ask that a seed-testing branch be set up at the Kairi Experimental Farm. I am very pleased to see the Minister for Primary Industries in the Chamber. A seed-testing branch would be of great value for testing not only seed coming into the area but seed grown there as well. Andersons have taken over the old Walkamin area and are now growing crops for the production of seed.

I know that the tobacco industry is a hardy annual, but it is such an important annual in my area that I cannot say too much about it. If each and every one of us contributed a small portion of his time to the problems facing this very important industry it would be well worth while.

There was recently a headnote in the Press to an article written by a Mrs. Milson—the Minister for Conservation misquoted the name as "Mrs. Wilson"—who said that we may lose the value of the Tinaroo Dam. I do not think we will. When water is available in a dam it will remain there and it can be used at any time for any purpose. The important point is that at the present time the lifeblood of the tobacco industry is the quota system. I have made representations to various departments on behalf of farmers with inferior soil who wanted a little extra land, but I have always been confronted with the story, "This farmer has a living area."

Once a farmer has a living area it is the same as saying he has security, and that is what we want in life. If a farmer had a living area I would naturally say there was no point in going further and asking for more land. However, the whole picture has changed. The living area has been replaced by a living quota, which has been decided by the interim committee to be the quantity of tobacco a farmer will grow from now on.

I come now to the stabilisation plan, which I believe in. I think it will guarantee security. There has been much talk about the 26,000,000 lb. or 28,000,000 lb. we had to decide between. We have had a little Federal blackmail, as we were told that we had either to take the 26,000,000 lb. or do without the stabilisation plan.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** Following the example set by the Minister.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** Yes, the example set by the Minister for Primary Industries. If we had stuck out for the 28,000,000 lb. we would have been told it was impracticable and we either had to take or leave the 26,000,000 lb.

What does a quota mean? It means that if I had a farm with a 5-ton quota next to another farm with a 10-ton quota, and we both put them on the market, naturally the one with the 10-ton quota would sell more quickly. But how did my neighbour get the larger quota? For the last four years he grew more tobacco than I, because in all probability he did not pay heed to the recommendation of the Department of Primary Industry that tobacco growers should sacrifice quantity for quality. The farmers who complied with the rules and produced quality tobacco are now suffering with a smaller quota—because they did the right thing. That should be taken into consideration. A young farmer coming into the industry is usually given a 5-ton quota because he has no production for the four years. The farmer who was growing in the years when he was told to sacrifice quantity for quality and culled out the inferior leaf, or leaf of poorer quality, is now shown as growing only so much. We are told that they had to put the system on some formula, and the formula is the production for the four years. It seems altogether wrong to me that the farmer who carried out the instructions of the department should receive much less than one who failed to comply with the instructions.

We want an urgent, practical demonstration by the Federal Minister for Primary Industry. He must say to the banks, "I am going to see that you make finance available promptly to have the present crop planted properly." Only yesterday I was in the Chewko area. I saw four farms out of eight on which tobacco had been planted without fertiliser. That is disastrous and it will react later on. The reason the farmers planted without fertiliser was that the banks would not advance them any money. They grew 13 tons last year and got rid of 10 tons. Now that they are on a 5-ton quota it is

only natural to expect the banks to say that it is not a good proposition and that they will advance no more money. One farmer said he had his ground ready and would go ahead and not use fertiliser. While I was with one farmer a letter came from the bank to say that it had reconsidered the matter and that he could have £200. He will now plant half of his crop with fertiliser and half of it without.

Anybody who knows the tobacco industry knows that the plants must be kept growing. The soil in and around Mareeba has not the necessary natural elements for growing good tobacco. The field officers tell the farmers how much fertiliser to put in, when to put it in, and how much water to give it. That advice is followed by the tobacco farmers. It can readily be seen how far-reaching the quota system will be. I hope that the people who have been forced to plant without fertiliser get a favourable season which will give them a reasonable crop.

There is far too much element of luck. One dairy farmer said, "If you want to take the luck out of dairying, put all your money into irrigation." I think he was right. With the tobacco crop it is just as important to see that it grows at the right rate, and that the right nourishment is given from the time of planting to the time of harvesting. There will be a curtailment in many instances in the growing of tobacco. People will not take the risk. They are more inclined to sell or give their plants to somebody else and go share-farming.

That means that there could be a shortfall this year. Nobody wants to see that happen because it will embarrass the stabilisation scheme in its infancy and there will be complications when the buyers come to purchase the leaf. They have to use 41½ per cent. at present; 50 per cent is not effective until next year. If there is insufficient leaf they could use that as an excuse for reducing the percentage, which they want to do. I have been told by buyers and manufacturers that they are quite satisfied with a 5 per cent. increase each year. We had no increase for four or five years and then suddenly, with a stroke of the pen, the Federal Government said that the 41½ per cent. was to rise to 50 per cent. That is not a gradual increase, which is needed so that the industry can accommodate it. Therefore the industry is not in a healthy state.

At present a constant soil survey is going on, and it has been found that many farms are not suitable for growing the high-quality leaf that is required. I received an answer from the Minister for Local Government and Conservation this morning concerning the establishment of new farms. In the interests of the industry the farmers who have poor quality soil, or soils on the borderline, should be compensated to a degree by being given other soils on the expansion of the channel so that the area can be kept at its present level or slightly expanded.

I ask hon. members to bear with me while I explain briefly how much it costs for water to grow a crop of tobacco. The average price is £4 10s. an acre-foot, and it takes 2 acre-feet of water to irrigate 1 acre of tobacco for the season. The cost is therefore £9 an acre. It takes 2 acres of land to produce 1 ton of tobacco, which makes the cost £18 for water to produce a ton of tobacco. A farmer who has a quota of 6 tons has therefore to pay £108 for water for the crop. That would be so if the assessment was made on the quota, which it is not. The farmer may be paying anything up to £200 and £300 at present. The rate has not been altered, and I do not know whether it will be. I know that farmers are feeling that they are paying for water that they cannot use. Their production is being decreased, yet they are paying the same price for water.

To illustrate my point, I have a few newspaper headings taken at random. They read—

"Bank Finance for Leaf Growers  
Comments by Minister"

"Tobacco men desperate over crisis"

"Not happy with Tobacco Quota"

"Leaf Sales in Brisbane Further Sharp  
Deterioration"

Those were taken at random, and that is the story of the efforts of farmers in the tobacco industry.

I was not very highly impressed with some of the comments of previous speakers. Now that I have disposed of that part of my speech dealing with the very important tobacco industry, I intend to spend a few minutes referring to some aspects of contributions made by other members. It was unfortunate that the hon. member for Bundaberg used most of his time criticising the Labour Party. After all, he was one who played such an important role in destroying the Labour Government in 1957, and this is no time for him to set himself up as a revisionist of Labour policy. He said that whilst he was in the Chamber a lot of time was wasted by bickering, in which he himself engaged. I dispose of that matter with those few remarks.

The speech of the Minister for Justice was a quite shocking example of distortion from a Cabinet Minister who might be expected to speak on matters concerning his administration. There are at present quite a number of problems on which he could have enlightened the House in his speech.

**Mr. Bennett:** He has butchered his administration. He is the "Minister for Injustice".

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** That may be so, too. He did not use his full time, and all he did was criticise a member representing another electorate. The person whom he attacked is, I should say, one of the most highly regarded members north of Brisbane.

I have been in his electorate and have seen how he gets round and is known and respected by all.

It is well known that the Minister has sought the Communist vote in his electorate to keep his seat. He has relied on Communist preference votes for his own political purposes. We have heard of the pot calling the kettle black; in this case the kettle is shining and the pot is black. Those are things that I thought I should mention because it is so important for a younger member to find out when others are not speaking the truth. They will bend whichever way suits them best and use the time of the House in a debate as important as this one to continue their attacks.

I wish now to make a few comments about the main roads in my electorate and to mention particularly the Herberton-Irvinebank Road. If this is to be the pattern for the State as a whole, people in very large electorates such as Gregory and Flinders can expect sealed roads in about the year 2000 A.D. The Herberton-Irvinebank Road is 18 miles long. It has a 3-mile stretch of bitumen in it, and it takes a policeman on an urgent call one hour to travel the 18 miles. After being on the road and saying that there was going to be wonderful expansion, the Minister said, when replying to a question that I asked him, that in 1963-64 the Government spent £109,000 on the 3-mile section of bitumen and that will have to suffice for a long time. We cannot expect any more expenditure on that road; the other 15 miles will have to wait till the rest of the State catches up. As I said, if that is to be the pattern for the State, it is a poor lookout for big electorates such as Gregory and Flinders.

I should also like to mention in passing the problem of the poultry farmers on the Atherton Tableland. They are experiencing difficulties similar to those experienced by the tobacco farmers, but the plan for their industry is known as the C.E.M.A. plan. Because of the operations of Section 92 of the Constitution, it is very difficult to stabilise the industry. Freight is the main problem, and these items will be of particular interest to hon. members. The freight on a food mixer from Sydney to Kiari was £108; the freight on sorghum from Gladstone to Kiari was £12 17s. 6d. a ton; the freight on a 6-ton truck of bran and pollard from Brisbane to Kiari was £102; and the freight on meat-meal from Townsville to Kiari was £6 7s. 3d. per ton. That is over and above what would be paid in other areas, and it is one of the points that poultry farmers are raising at a Federal level in an endeavour to have a special investigation made. They are a wonderful body of people, and I am happy to say that their constant representations have led the Federal Minister for Primary Industry to promise them that a special investigational committee will visit the area in the middle of this

month. They hope that this will assist in solving their problems and enable them to carry on.

I have here a cutting from "The Cairns Post" of 7 August, 1965, calling for applications for tourist permits on the Atherton Tableland. It brought to my mind the days when I drove a rail-motor and as many as 50 passengers travelled from Cairns to Atherton and were met there by a service coach that took them back to Cairns on the Gillies Highway. In those days the Gillies Highway was open for one-way traffic, with a gate at the top and a gate at the bottom. It is now a two-lane highway and no delays occur. When tenders are received, I hope that the Minister will give favourable consideration to any person or company trying to revive the very good service that once existed. At present no-one can go down to Cairns in the afternoon, and under this system both the Railway Department and the Tourist Bureau would get their share of revenue. It would also give tourists an opportunity of seeing Tinaroo Lake and perhaps even having a short launch ride on it. I understand that a big tourist company now holds the permits. However, each and every one of them has been thrown open for tender, and any person who is prepared to provide tourist facilities between Cairns and the Atherton Tableland has an opportunity to tender for them.

Another very important matter I bring to the notice of the House deals with certain timbers which the mills in my electorate provide and which they are now finding it difficult to have accepted by the Queensland Housing Commission. I have here correspondence dating from 3 June until the last letter I received, dated 3 September, which states—

"Up to date we have heard nothing and we will be obliged if you would make further inquiries."

That letter was from the miller and it concerns an important milling family in Tolga who have installed very expensive machinery to deal with the sap of a certain type of oak. The timber has been tested by the various departments for strength, durability and every other quality that is needed in building, and yet it is not acceptable to the Housing Commission.

Although letters have gone backwards and forwards during the time from June to September, there is still no finality. This is the sort of thing that causes people who have spent thousands of pounds on costly machinery a sense of frustration which, in turn, results in population reduction in the Tablelands electorate. Some people will say that the North is going ahead. Parts of it are. There are pockets of Queensland that are jumping ahead whilst other parts are slowly receding. The Tablelands electorate is among the latter. It is not for want of representation, because it has been doing it for quite a number of years. The reason is that not sufficient interest is taken to realise

that a far-away place can be important to the capital and the provincial cities of Queensland. If one cuts the roots of a tree the tree will die. It is not similar to cutting the branches off a tree; it is like cutting the roots which give life to far-away places.

I hope that the Government and the various departments concerned will take more kindly notice of the Far North of Queensland and not think that Mackay is North Queensland. North Queensland extends as far as Bamaga and even further and that is the part for which I seek fair and just treatment.

**Mr. ANDERSON** (Toowoomba East) (9.48 p.m.): I wish to associate myself with the motion of loyalty so ably moved by the hon. member for Mirani and seconded by the hon. member for Ithaca. It is particularly significant today that I should recall the honour which I had in 1957 when this Government assumed office. On that occasion I was privileged to deliver the Address in Reply, in which the same loyalty and allegiance to Her Most Gracious Majesty was sworn.

As hon. members know, I have announced my intention of retiring from the parliamentary scene at the conclusion of this session. My decision to retire from Parliament was made after I had given due consideration to where I could better help the development of Queensland. In this regard, private enterprise has a very definite part to play in development and the industry of road transport cannot be divorced from the overall programme. In fact, I venture to say that Queensland will become more and more dependent on road transport as this great State advances. My service in the Parliament of Queensland since 1957 has been a very interesting experience. It will always be a matter of sincere appreciation to me to look back on the years in which I had the opportunity of contributing in some small measure to the spectacular progress and development that has taken place in Queensland under this Government.

It would be fitting on this occasion if I were to convey to hon. members of this House the appreciation of the electors of Toowoomba East, and Toowoomba in general, for the work that has been carried out in Toowoomba during the past eight years. What a splendid record of achievement unfolds as we look back on these accomplishments! The record is all the more meritorious because it reflects a pattern of interest that is evident all over the State, and not merely confined to the larger cities in Queensland. Toowoomba, despite all this expenditure and the spectacular development, is still the cheapest city in Queensland in which to live. In this connection I would quote from "The Toowoomba Chronicle" of Monday, 30 August, which states—

"Still cheapest to live in Toowoomba.

"Every year since 1960 Toowoomba has maintained its reputation as being the cheapest place in Queensland in which to live.

"Figures published in the Queensland Pocket Year Book, issued at the week-end, show that Toowoomba is well below other cities and towns . . ."

Various figures are then given. This alone should attract many prospective developers and investors. When I recall the present controversy and the difficulty being experienced by developers in getting planning permits in Brisbane I am more convinced than ever that Toowoomba has everything to offer. Therefore, I would urge the Minister for Industrial Development to send investors and developers to our city of Toowoomba where they will be accepted and encouraged to help us develop this State.

In regard to these planning difficulties, hon. members will recall that I have in the past advocated a State planning authority. Today I would again appeal to the Minister for Local Government to give this suggestion his mature thought.

Not only is Toowoomba the cheapest place to live, but statistics also reveal that it is the safest. In this regard, the good road manners and the low accident rate can be attributed in the main to the efforts of our local stipendiary magistrate, Mr. D. J. Kearney. Recently the Main Roads Department in conjunction with the Toowoomba City Council carried out a transportation study in Toowoomba, and it is estimated that this exercise will cost in the vicinity of £25,000. One hon. member this afternoon referred to the fact that the Government is paying 50 per cent. of the cost of the Wilbur Smith Report. In this connection the Government does help country areas. The whole cost of the transport study in Toowoomba will be approximately £25,000. The Toowoomba City Council will be required to pay only £5,000 of that total. The Government, through the Main Roads Department, is supplying the other £20,000. So the Government is playing its part in this. I have here a copy of the proposed plan. This is a wonderful book, and it will help the growth of our city. This is the first volume; there is another one to come.

At the present time Toowoomba has a population of 53,000 and by 1985 it is expected to grow to 78,000. I am sorry that time does not allow me to develop this matter. I have a lot of figures here to prove to the people of Toowoomba what a wonderful job has been done by the Government. I will have an opportunity to discuss these figures in the debate on the Estimates. Hon. members will be amazed to learn what has been done by the Government in Toowoomba.

Human nature being as it is we will always demand more. Nowadays we are inclined never to be satisfied. Certainly there is more to be done in Toowoomba and this, I am sure, will be done in its rightful order of priority. I believe it will always be a very healthy sign for a community to need more, as this need grows from development and expansion. It has never been the policy of

this Government to make promises, particularly at election time, but surely after these years in office we have gained the confidence of those whom we represent. Our reputation has been built on achievement and accomplishment, not on promises incapable of fulfilment. I am confident that this atmosphere will prevail, not only in Toowoomba, but throughout the length and breadth of Queensland, for many years to come under the present Government.

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

## SUPPLY

### CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEE

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

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

Motion agreed to.

## WAYS AND MEANS

### CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEE

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

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

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 9.56 p.m.