

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 25 AUGUST 1966

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 25 AUGUST, 1966

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

GOVERNMENT LOAN BILL

Assent reported by Mr. Speaker.

QUESTIONS

MIGRATION TO QUEENSLAND

Mr. Duggan, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Industrial Development,—

(1) How many persons migrated to Queensland during each of the years 1960, 1962, 1964 and 1966?

(2) Of the Commonwealth target of 148,000 migrants for 1966-67, how many are expected to come to Queensland?

Answers:—

(1) "The numbers of British migrants who migrated to Queensland under the Commonwealth of Australia/United Kingdom Assisted Passage Scheme during the following fiscal years are:—1960, 3,245; 1962, 3,161; 1964, 5,533; 1966, 5,841. These figures do not include British migrants who arrived without Government assistance or any non-British migrants, particulars of which are not held by the State Migration Office."

(2) "The Commonwealth target of 148,000 migrants for 1966-67 includes migrants of all nationalities. Of these about 56,000 settlers are expected to come without Government assistance. Naturally at this stage it is not possible to forecast the proportion of their settlement in each State. The target for assisted settlers is 92,000. These will come from the United Kingdom, Europe, and other countries. There is no official estimate as yet of the target for Assisted Passage migrants from the United Kingdom. It is expected, however, that the number of British migrants who will arrive in Queensland under the Commonwealth of Australia/United Kingdom Assisted Passage Scheme will approach 6,000."

PERMITS FOR FUND-RAISING VENTURES

Mr. Sherrington, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Justice,—

(1) What was the number of applications lodged in the year ended June 30, 1966, for permits to conduct fund-raising ventures by (a) parents and citizens associations and (b) approved sporting organisations?

(2) What were the total amounts respectively raised as a result of these ventures?

(3) What was the amount of revenue collected by the Government in connection with the applications?

Answers:—

(1) "As regards permits to conduct fund-raising ventures by the classes of associations named, the Department of Justice is concerned only with permits for the raising of moneys by art unions. Registration as an approved association also avoids the need of a permit for the conducting of art unions in accordance with certain statutory conditions. For the year in question, parents and citizens associations lodged 2,582 applications for these permits and 59 such associations applied for registration as an approved association. In the same period, sporting organizations lodged 1,360 applications for permits and 596 such organizations applied for registration as an approved association."

(2) "Returns are lodged either periodically, in the case of approved associations, or at the close of the period covered by the permit. Moreover, where permit fees are not involved, as in the case of small art unions, returns are not required. From those returns received during that period—the amount of \$246,409 was raised by parents and citizens associations; and the amount of \$841,728 was raised by sporting organizations, and by means of art unions."

(3) "The revenue collected was—\$5,431 from parents and citizens associations; and \$45,229 from sporting organizations."

BURDEKIN DAM SCHEME

Mr. Coburn, pursuant to notice, asked The Treasurer,—

(1) Was he correctly reported in the Press as saying, during his policy speech, that the State Government would seek the assistance of the Snowy Mountains Authority and the Commonwealth Bureau of Agricultural Economics to appraise the feasibility and economics of the Burdekin Dam scheme and the productive use of the storage provided? If so, what action, if any, has he taken in fulfilment of his promise?

(2) If no action has yet been taken, when is it anticipated that a request for the assistance of the aforementioned organisations will be submitted?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "The report is correct. A case is at present being prepared for presentation to the Commonwealth Government for participation by the Snowy Mountains Authority, Division of Northern Development, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

and other appropriate Commonwealth Departments in conjunction with Queensland State Departments, in a widespread investigation of water resources development in North Queensland. These include the Burdekin River catchment."

APPLICATION TO COMMONWEALTH FOR
SPECIAL FINANCIAL AID

Mr. Lloyd, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

(1) In view of the Treasurer's stated concern with the budgeting ability of the Government to provide the necessary level of the State's essential social services, why did he not join with the Premiers of New South Wales and Victoria in their approaches to the Commonwealth Government for special financial assistance this financial year?

(2) As an urgent personal meeting with the Prime Minister might effectively avoid the Government's obvious intention to raise the present high level of the State's taxation and service charges, will he take action to seek such an interview?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "Queensland's case has already been appropriately represented to the Right Honourable the Prime Minister by me both personally and officially, and I have reserved the right to make a further approach later in the year. As the Honourable Member well knows, there are recognised and effective methods of presenting a case to the Commonwealth, and these are the ones that I have followed. If the Premiers of New South Wales and Victoria care to adopt other methods, that is their business. However, the Honourable Member can rest assured that, as always, Queensland's interests will be carefully watched and fully protected by this Government."

OIL COMPANY CONTRIBUTIONS TO
DREDGING COSTS, PORT OF BRISBANE

Mr. Houston, pursuant to notice, asked The Treasurer,—

How much has (a) Ampol Petroleum Ltd. and (b) Amoco (Aust.) Pty. Ltd. contributed to the cost of dredging operations in the port of Brisbane for each of the financial years 1963-64, 1964-65 and 1965-66?

Answer:—

"By agreement with the Government, Ampol Petroleum Ltd. and Amoco (Aust.) Pty. Ltd. have made contributions towards the cost of dredging the bar cutting and swing basin at the mouth of the Brisbane River. In addition to those contributions, these companies have paid harbour dues along with other users of the Port of Brisbane. Those dues have been

used to meet the cost of port operation, including the cost of maintenance dredging of the port channels. The payments made by Ampol and Amoco for these two operations during the three years are set out in a statement which I now table."

Paper.—Whereupon, Mr. Chalk laid upon the Table of the House the statement referred to.

MOONIE OIL PROCESSED AT BRISBANE
REFINERIES

Mr. Houston, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Mines,—

(1) What quantity of oil has been delivered to Brisbane by the Moonie pipe line during the years 1964-65 and 1965-66?

(2) How much has been processed at the (a) Ampol and (b) Amoco refineries?

Answers:—

(1) "2,318,789 barrels and 2,967,044 barrels, respectively."

(2) "This information is not available. However, at present all this oil is being processed in Queensland by these two refineries."

REBUILDING OF BRISBANE ABATTOIR

Mr. Houston, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Primary Industries,—

Did the Government, as reported in *The Courier-Mail* of December 4, 1964, decide to rebuild the Brisbane Abattoir? If so, what progress has been made?

Answer:—

"The Government has taken a decision to build a works to replace the present public abattoir at Cannon Hill and the Metropolitan Public Abattoir Board has been requested to prepare design and cost estimates. These are now at the stage of being finalised and it is expected that they will be submitted to the Queensland Meat Industry Authority shortly."

PENSIONS OF PATIENTS IN SENILE ANNEXE
WARDS, CHERMSIDE HOSPITAL

Mr. Melloy, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health,—

(1) What is the disposition of pensions payments received by the hospitals board on behalf of patients in the geriatric section, Chermiside Hospital?

(2) What amount is placed to the credit of patients?

(3) How is the balance standing to his credit disposed of on the death of a patient?

(4) Are the relatives of a deceased patient given a detailed account of the disposal of moneys received on his behalf?

Answers:—

(1) "From the pensions received by the Hospitals Board from the Department of Social Services on behalf of patients in the senile annexe wards at Chermiside Hospital, an amount for accommodation and nursing attention for each patient, as authorised by regulations under the Hospitals Acts, is set aside for payment to the Board's funds, and an amount set aside for the patient. The amount set aside for the patient is \$8.40 per fortnight but where the pension is less than this figure, the total amount is set aside for the patient. In addition the patient retains whatever supplementary assistance is payable to him up to an amount of \$2 per fortnight."

(2) "The amount set aside for the pensioner is either handed to the patient or placed to his credit in the Patients' Trust Account, according to his wishes."

(3) "On the death of the patient the following procedures are carried out:— (a) If the affairs of the patient are under the control of the Public Curator both cash and property are forwarded to the Public Curator. (b) If written notice is received from a solicitor advising that he has been appointed to act for the administration of the estate the cash and property are forwarded to him. (c) If a Will is produced by a relative who is able to give evidence of identity the general practice adopted is to confer with the Public Curator's Office and with the concurrence of that office a cheque to the amount held in trust is drawn in favour of the executor of the estate. (d) In respect of all deceased patients amounts are paid to relatives to cover funeral costs paid by them. (e) Should none of the foregoing procedures apply, a sum not exceeding \$40 may be given to the next-of-kin being widow or widower, or son or daughter. Any residue is then transferred to the Public Curator. (f) In the case of no Will being produced, or letter received from a solicitor, the moneys and property held in trust on account of deceased patients are forwarded to the Public Curator after three months from date of death."

(4) "Detailed accounts of moneys held in trust for any patients are furnished on request from the legal representative of the deceased or from a relative."

PLAYSHED AT RAVENSHOE STATE SCHOOL

Mr. Wallis-Smith, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

Will he consider the construction of a playshed at the Ravenshoe State School because of the lack of sufficient shelter during the lengthy season of moist weather?

Answer:—

"No. The normal underschool shelter area is considered to be sufficient. While it is true that two temporary classrooms at present occupy part of this space, it has already been requested that plans and estimates of cost be prepared for the provision of two additional secondary classrooms. When these have been constructed the former protected playing area will be restored."

BUILDING OPERATIONS, MITCHELL RIVER AND EDWARD RIVER MISSIONS

Mr. Wallis-Smith, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Works,—

(1) Why was it necessary for the building contractors to return to Mitchell River Mission?

(2) Had the houses been passed by the works inspector prior to being occupied?

(3) Has the present work been passed by a departmental inspector and, if so, was it the same inspector?

(4) Will there be any need for extra work on the new houses built at Edward River Mission?

(5) Have these houses been passed by a departmental inspector and, if so, was it the same inspector who was employed on the Mitchell River building project?

Answers:—

(1) "It was necessary for the building contractors to return to Mitchell River Mission to complete the work covered by the contract."

(2) "The works inspector passed the houses for occupancy prior to being occupied and prior to completion of the work covered by the contract."

(3) "A certificate of completion has not yet been furnished by the departmental inspector."

(4) "The Department of Works has not been requested to carry out any extra work on the new houses built at Edward River Mission."

(5) "A certificate of completion has not yet been furnished by the departmental inspector."

RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF HOUSEHOLD ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES, NORMANTON

Mr. Wallis-Smith, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Industrial Development,—

Are there any restrictions pertaining to the use of certain household electrical appliances in Normanton? If so, will he consider necessary alterations in the power supply to overcome these restrictions?

Answer:—

“At present restrictions apply to the use of certain household appliances in Normanton. Appliances which are not permitted are stoves and other cooking appliances, radiators, wash boilers and washing machines with heating elements. A 100-kilowatt generating set is being installed at present, and when this is commissioned all restrictions will be lifted. The commissioning date will depend on the availability of certain components for the engine.”

TIN CONCENTRATES SHIPPED THROUGH CAIRNS

Mr. R. Jones, pursuant to notice, asked
The Minister for Mines,—

(1) What was the tonnage of tin concentrates shipped through the port of Cairns for the year 1965-66?

(2) From which fields was the tin mined?

(3) What was the value of the shipments?

(4) What percentage of Queensland's total shipment and output does this represent?

(5) What were the destination ports and their respective tonnages?

Answers:—

(1, 3, 4 and 5) “This information is not available at my Department. The Honourable Member might care to refer to the Cairns Harbour Board.”

(2) “Chillagoe, Cooktown, Herberton and Mareeba.”

SALE OF HOMESITES AT FERNY GROVE BY WILLMORE & RANDELL LTD.

Mr. Aikens, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Justice,—

(1) Has he been informed that a firm called Willmore & Randell, whose registered office is at 454 Queen Street, Brisbane, is writing letters to people throughout the State quite unknown to them, telling those people that they have been “selected” to receive a homesite at Ferny Grove, officially priced at £600, for £350?

(2) If so, will he have an investigation made to ascertain, (a) on what basis Willmore & Randell “selected” the people to whom this offer is made, (b) the *bona fides* of the offer, (c) how much these homesites are really worth and (d) if such letter and offer are a breach of “*The Auctioneers and Commission Agents Acts Amendment Act of 1953*,” or any other Act?

Answers:—

(1) “Until this matter was brought to my notice I was unaware that Messrs. Willmore & Randell (Qld.) Pty. Ltd., licensed real estate agents, approached members of the public by letter inviting them to purchase subdivisional land in particular areas.”

(2) “I am now informed that the licensees are selling agents for land development companies and that the information contained in the letter is in accordance with particulars supplied by one of their principals. In relation to the precise matters on which information is required—(a) The addresses are selected from names on the electoral rolls of particular districts; (b) The agent maintains that blocks can be purchased at the prices stated; (c) I am not in a position to supply this information which would necessarily have to be obtained; (d) The matter does not appear to constitute a breach of “*The Auctioneers, Real Estate Agents, Debt Collectors and Motor Dealers Acts, 1922 to 1961*,” or any other Act. A committee is presently considering the desirability of amending the above Act generally. If enquiries in relation to this particular matter reveal any need for action in this regard, this problem will be referred to that committee.”

FLUORIDATION OF MAREEBA TOWN WATER SUPPLY

Mr. Adair, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Local Government,—

As the Mareeba Shire Council has rejected a petition signed by over five hundred ratepayers in the Mareeba Shire, objecting to the proposed fluoridation of the town water supply and requesting that a poll be taken, has he been approached in regard to having it taken and, if so, what action does he propose to take?

Answer:—

“Yes. I have been approached. The circumstances of the case do not warrant any interference with the decision of the duly elected representatives of the electors of the particular area.”

HYGIENE IN MEAT DELIVERIES TO BRISBANE BUTCHERS' SHOPS

Mr. W. D. Hewitt for **Mr. Hughes**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Primary Industries,—

(1) Is he aware of the unhygienic method which continues in Brisbane of delivering meat for human consumption to city and suburban retail butchers' shops?

(2) Is he aware that meat delivery trucks, often double-parked, leave doors open while meat is delivered to shops and that uncovered, totally exposed carcasses of meat are carried on roads and across footpaths into retail butchers' shops?

(3) Is not this unhygienic practice a hazard to human health?

(4) Does he propose to take steps to correct this and protect the health of the community? If not, why not?

Answers:—

(1 and 2) "I am aware of the practices which operate in delivery of meat to butchers' shops."

(3) "I agree that there are some grounds for describing the present practice as not being fully hygienic, but I know of no reason to regard them as constituting any real hazard to public health."

(4) "Methods of delivering meat to butchers' shops have to be considered in relation to such factors as practicability and safety to the personnel carrying the meat. Slaughtering regulations under "The Meat Industry Act of 1965" are at present being revised by officers of my Department. Meat delivery under hygiene conditions is being given full consideration and whatever changes are considered reasonable and practicable will be made."

APPOINTMENT OF LABORATORY ASSISTANTS, STATE HIGH SCHOOLS

Mr. Tucker, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) What is the basis for appointing a laboratory assistant to a State high school?

(2) Where does the Townsville State High School stand in relation to schools where such appointments have been made?

Answers:—

(1) "Laboratory attendants have been appointed to high schools with an enrolment of 1,000 or more students."

(2) "The enrolment at Townsville State High School for August was 971."

FINANCING OF CONSTRUCTION OF NEW FISH MARKETS

Mr. Tucker, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Labour and Tourism,—

(1) How is it intended to finance the building of the projected new fish markets at Colmslie?

(2) Would the North Queensland Fish Board be able to adopt the same procedure in respect to additions or new premises at Townsville?

Answers:—

(1) "The securing of finance for this project is a matter for the Fish Board, which is a corporate body. Finance is being provided by the issue of debentures, a Treasury loan, compensation for the Stanley Street premises and from the Fish Supply Fund."

(2) "The North Queensland Fish Board is also a corporate body and this is entirely a matter for its consideration."

AMENITIES BLOCK, TOWNSVILLE RAILWAY WORKSHOPS

Mr. Tucker, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport,—

(1) If the new amenities block in the north yard of the Townsville Railway Workshops is in fact in use, what is the date of such handover?

(2) When were the automatic boiler and other kitchen appointments installed in the block?

Answers:—

(1) "The amenities block was brought into use on Monday, August 22, 1966."

(2) "One of the two automatic boilers required has been installed. It was necessary to return the second boiler for adjustment. New tables in the course of manufacture will be supplied at an early date. Meantime, temporary provision has been made."

ORDER IN CHAMBER DURING QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I point out to hon. members that there is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber during question time.

DIRECTING OF QUESTIONS

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask you to request the Premier or someone else to supply members with an up-to-date list of the various departments and the Ministers who control them, and thus assist us in directing questions to the correct Minister. The list we have is completely out of date and leads us astray.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that such a list is available.

Mr. AIKENS: But it is out of date.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Order in Council under the Industrial Development Acts, 1963 to 1964.

Regulation under the Fisheries Acts, 1957 to 1962.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—THIRD
ALLOTTED DAY

Debate resumed from 23 August (see p. 215) on Mr. E. G. W. Wood's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. LICKISS (Mt. Coot-tha) (11.29 a.m.): I again wish to associate the citizens of the electorate of Mt. Coot-tha with my expression of loyalty to the Throne, and in thanking His Excellency the Governor, Sir Alan Mansfield, for his untiring and devoted service to this State and this nation. I believe that we, as Queenslanders, can be justly proud that a Queenslander of the calibre of Sir Alan has been chosen by Her Majesty to represent the Throne in this State.

I should also like to congratulate the new hon. members, who are here as a result of the recent State elections. I wish them well.

Hon. members will know that I have addressed myself previously to matters relating to planning, and that over the years I have advocated the acceptance of the principle of town and regional planning in Queensland on a State-wide basis. So far, my pleas in this regard appear to have gone unheeded. Indeed, I know of no positive action yet taken by the Government to accept the principle, or to implement in any way such a system. It is therefore my endeavour to put forward what I trust will be a convincing argument to reinforce my plea to the Government for urgent implementation of such a scheme.

Let me make my proposal clear. I am advocating—

(1) A Cabinet portfolio of town and regional planning;

(2) A town and regional planning advisory commission with statutory authority;

(3) Comprehensive town and regional planning legislation covering the whole of the State to enable co-ordination of, and to assist in, the planning schemes for the State of Queensland; and

(4) The creation of a Land and Valuation Court—as recommended by the Committee of Inquiry (Land Valuations) to hear appeals dealing with—

(a) Planning;

(b) Valuations; and

(c) Compensation claims.

This court to have State-wide jurisdiction to provide equity of rights and justice for all citizens.

Any half-baked scheme for planning should be rejected. Surely it must be accepted that we cannot afford the luxury of meandering along in a haphazard manner in so far as planning is concerned. Development is costly in terms of our national resources. It is necessary to ensure that the best brains in the business are utilised to safeguard against the risk of errors in planning.

Where do we stand as a State in this vital aspect of Government? To answer this question, let us examine what is happening in other States of Australia. If we are not capable of original thought in this field, perhaps we might learn from the experience of others. Let us at least broaden our horizons; let us act as though Queensland is going places—and it will; let us think big in terms of planning; let us ensure that our limited financial resources are expended in such a way that this State will obtain the greatest value for that expenditure and that, through expert planning, the whole of the community will benefit.

In New South Wales the general legislation dealing with matters of planning is found in the Local Government Act, 1919 (as amended) and in the State Planning Authority Act, 1963. This legislation provides the means which enables local councils to prepare planning schemes. Provision is made also for promoting an interim development order to control development pending preparation and approval of a scheme by the Minister for Local Government. In New South Wales the State Planning Authority was set up by statute in 1963 to deal on a State-wide basis with matters of town and country planning. The more important functions of this authority are—

(a) It takes over the advisory and supervisory functions of the old Town and Country Planning Advisory Committee and the Department of Local Government. It may prepare planning schemes. It is responsible for advising the Minister on the approval of schemes prepared by local councils. It is responsible for ensuring that schemes are soundly based before they are made available for public objection and subsequent approval by the Minister. The authority also hears appeals arising from interim development control.

(b) The authority is required to promote regional planning by undertaking co-ordinated survey and research. (In particular it is this authority that is responsible for the regional planning of Greater Sydney—formerly the task of the Cumberland County Council.)

(c) The authority is required to undertake research and provide advice to local councils on planning and development techniques;

(d) The authority is empowered to undertake development (for example, to build new towns and/or industrial estates) for which purpose the authority has power to raise loans.

(e) This authority, having regard to its composition, provides a framework for co-ordination of and collaboration between Government departments responsible for the State's infra-structure.

The authority comprises a Chairman and a Deputy Chairman, who are fully employed in that capacity (the Chairman being a professional town planner), the Commissioners for Main Roads, Railways, Water and

Sewerage, and Ports and Harbours, representatives from local councils, and an independent university member.

The authority is also undertaking investigations and work relating to airport extension, transportation studies, and satellite towns.

The general legislation in Victoria is contained in the Town and Country Planning Act 1961, and regulations thereunder. This Act provides the basis for the preparation, by local councils, of statutory planning schemes. Provision is made for promoting interim development orders to control development pending preparation of schemes.

The general authority in Victoria is the Town and Country Planning Board, the Chairman of which is a professional town planner. The board is required to—

(a) advise the Minister on any matters relating to town and country planning;

(b) to advise the Minister or Ministers on matters and disputes arising out of planning legislation; and

(c) to prepare planning schemes and to advise the Minister on the approval of schemes prepared by local councils.

It is necessary also to mention the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works. This board was originally set up to deal with water and sewerage but is now also responsible for certain highway development and town planning in the region. It is not the sole planning authority, since local councils may prepare schemes, and this duality has, I believe, created some difficulties.

The board prepared a "master plan" for the Melbourne region. The board comprises a chairman and 51 commissioners who are local councillors representing local authorities.

In Western Australia, where town and regional planning has been accelerated in the last few years, the Town Planning and Development Act, 1928-62 (with subsequent individual amendments) provides the general powers under which local authorities may prepare planning schemes. Pending the preparation and approval of a scheme by the Minister for Town Planning, the local authority may promote an interim development order to provide planning control of development.

In relation to Perth, the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act, 1959-62, established a regional planning authority with the following objectives:—

(a) To prepare a regional planning scheme;

(b) To administer the interim Development Order; and

(c) To present the scheme to Parliament and, on approval, to implement and keep under review the scheme.

Five district planning committees representing all local authorities in the region are set up to assist and advise the regional authority.

Membership of the regional authority comprises a Chairman, Town Planning Commission (professional planner); Commissioner of Main Roads; Chief Engineer, Water and Sewerage Department; Surveyor-General; a representative of commercial and industrial organisations; and five local-authority representatives.

There is a professional staff under the control of a chief planner.

Now that the regional scheme is approved, the regional authority's powers of development control are delegated to local councils (subject to certain supervisory controls).

The regional authority provides a basis for co-ordinated survey and research, supervision of statutory town planning, and consultation and collaboration between those departments mainly concerned with development of regional infra-structure.

I now move to deal briefly with the position in South Australia. From my investigation, South Australia has a Planning and Development Bill (1966) which provides for the setting up of a State planning authority with the following functions:—

(1) Co-ordinate those authorities concerned with development of towns in the State and those bodies responsible for controlling private development.

(2) The Adelaide Metropolitan Advisory Plan becomes recognised as a development plan and will be administered by the State planning authority;

(3) To prepare development plans for any area in the State (at present the State prepares advisory plans for local authorities if they require them);

(4) To administer interim development control when appropriate;

(5) Joint control of land subdivision with local authorities;

(6) Acquire land and develop it in accordance with a development plan.

In general terms this planning system is not unlike the New South Wales system, with the exception that it will be more centralised in the State body, and it would appear that the development plan could become a more flexible instrument than the present statutory scheme.

I have briefly outlined the situation in other States to show how far we lag behind in this essential sector of sensible, useful planning so necessary if our major cities are to become benefits and not blights, and in preventing inter-related planning from becoming what one might deem a catastrophe.

Queensland does not have any unique situation which excuses us from the practical and widely accepted approach to such vital issues.

Everybody accepts that the successful private business is the one that carries out continuous study, survey and research in its field, for without this there cannot ever be any really effective forward planning.

But large-city management and development and State development are far bigger business enterprises than any private undertaking and so call for a still higher level of management skill, planning and technical expertise.

Planning must be looked upon as a positive concept to promote growth and efficiency and not just some kind of negative statutory-zoning exercise to stop private individuals doing what they wish to do, often contrary to the common good. Statutory planning schemes should be the blueprint for the provision of a beneficial and happy environment where business can grow and families can live and flourish. Planning schemes are only part of the total planning: an administrative tool. More important are the preliminary careful studies and surveys, the long chain of calculations and considerations, and the dynamic thinking and guidance in the whole planning process. The purpose of a planning authority is to provide the lead and to promote ideas.

We should heed what is happening around us in this small world. We should note the fantastic increase in world population and acceleration of technological developments in recent years. It took 5,000 years for the population of the world to reach one billion; it will take only about 40 years to double the world's present population of over three billion. This means that we live in a faster, ever-changing and increasingly competitive world. We cannot afford not to plan ahead for efficiency and growth. We owe this to our children and our children's children.

Because of this vital need and because of the responsibility vested in us, the need for positive planning has become an important issue, not only in under-developed countries but also in highly developed countries such as Britain (where machinery for regional planning was introduced by a Conservative Government) and European countries such as France and Germany.

Primary production is increasing by capital intensive and not labour intensive in an affluent society like that in Australia or Britain. Now, only about 5 per cent. to 10 per cent. of the working population is needed to produce food for all.

Hitherto, Queensland has grown by developing its natural resources, and its economy is still heavily dependent on primary and mineral production. But surely the State's future growth now largely depends on expansion of suitable secondary industry. Expansion of secondary industry is also necessary to produce a more varied economy in Queensland with employment stability. Primary production is much more related to export markets that are liable to considerable fluctuation—for example, the sugar industry at the moment—and thus cannot be relied upon in all circumstances for stable economic growth. Climatic variations and other imponderables add considerably to the risk.

Capital inflow for plant and other works enabling natural resources to be exploited in Queensland has helped the State's economy. But this is a short-term contribution. If Queensland is to benefit in a real sense from the exploitation of its natural assets, it has to endeavour to retain as much as possible of the subsequent processing and manufacturing of such resources within the State, because it is this that further assists to increase the local capital investment in terms of plant, machinery, power and water consumption, while at the same time facilitating an ever-increasing population because of increased employment opportunities. This, in turn, increases the demand for enlarged general services and provides a base market for consumer products.

This Government is endeavouring to come to grips with this matter. However, if we are not successful now in exploiting all the means available for industrial development, much of the economic growth and benefit over the next 50 years will go to other States and to other countries. Time is running out! We must mount an all-out effort to encourage, at every opportunity, secondary industry. Secondary industry, in turn, demands a reliable, efficient and economic infra-structure. This means, of course, amongst other things, water, power, communication, housing and education facilities.

To achieve this situation we must have co-ordinated and forward planning on a town, regional and State basis. This planning, in its turn, will encourage more people to join the work force and thus create an increasing local market.

It is also necessary to create the best possible communication system from producer to manufacturer within the State and with market areas outside of the State. I think it can be truly stated that this question of adequate communication was one of the prime motives for the creation of regional planning in some overseas countries, particularly Britain.

There has been some confusion in policies over the years regarding the proper place and purpose of town and regional planning. The positive function of town and regional planning is necessary for efficient growth, whether the emphasis be placed on private enterprise which enables private enterprise to grow within the limits set by the public provision of the infra-structure and insists on such growth, or whether emphasis is to be placed on a strong local government system, in which case local government can only plan its own development effectively against a sound regional background of development that has a ready availability of information, guidance and expert knowledge drawn from the central source.

I believe it can be said that the more one is inclined to rely on local authorities in Queensland—bearing in mind that most of

such authorities are fairly small in population resources—the more necessary becomes the creation of an adequate regional and town planning authority; in other words, a Commission for town and regional planning to supply the necessary expert knowledge to the local authorities.

As a free-enterprise Government it is necessary for us to critically examine those factors influencing the rate of private investment and development in an area or region. I think some of the reasons can be given as follows:—

(1) A knowledge of the natural resources and investment opportunities, and a comprehensive knowledge of the infra-structure and other relevant information dealing with the region.

This, in turn, requires a central and co-ordinated survey and research, carried out, I would suggest, in partnership with the local authorities and other interested parties in the region;

(2) The existence of sound social capital to enable resources to be exploited;

(3) The availability and the skills of a labour force, and this, in turn, in an expanding industry normally requires a steady population growth;

(4) The availability of finance to meet capital costs of development over and above that presently available to commence the development; and

(5) The size and availability of potential markets, which again depends largely on rapid local population growth and/or increasingly good accessibility to markets within and outside of the State; in other words, adequate communication at all levels.

Much has already been said about the tourist industry, and undoubtedly it is destined to become a major asset in the Queensland economy. I do not think we should overlook the fact that it could become a basis for major growth if the natural assets are to be carefully conserved and developed in relation to other aspects of orderly development. Here I refer again to communication services and, in fact, the ease of movement of the population generally. This again calls for town and regional planning of a very high level of skill.

Let me now turn briefly to Brisbane where, in spite of the fact that its boundary includes most of the present development, it cannot develop efficiently if not planned in conjunction and in co-ordination with neighbouring areas for its infra-structure. Hon. members have heard me discuss the problems associated with the South-east Queensland complex, of which I believe Brisbane is only one related portion.

The water supply for Brisbane—its source and subsequent use—is a striking example of the necessity for planning on a regional basis. Transportation is yet another problem; fringe development, yet another.

Reverting to the matter of water supply alone, one can only say that the present piecemeal approach to this very vital issue in connection with the south-east complex of Queensland is not only unsatisfactory and inefficient but, in terms of likely future requirements for industrial and domestic use, could present real problems. It certainly must be considered an obstacle to attracting significant industrial growth to this area at this point of time.

Access to and from Brisbane in highway design is a matter for regional planning closely associated with town planning, and here again we can only hope that the present system—the Wilbur Smith Report and various other planning schemes—will fit adequately into a town and regional planning system when all aspects of such plan are critically examined.

Our present approach to the Port of Brisbane has not impressed me at all. The future of the Port of Brisbane is a fundamental consideration which will govern Brisbane's future and the development of this port must surely be related to all other elements of communication, namely, road, rail and air, and particularly related to the location of a great deal of present and future industrial development.

All this, of course, points to the necessity to plan beyond the paper boundaries of Greater Brisbane. This, of course, means town and regional planning. Brisbane, at the moment, is faced with dying areas in its centre. The problems of redevelopment are highly complex and need very careful planning. I do not think that we should delude ourselves into thinking that the present old markets site and environs is a problem that will be faced in Brisbane in isolation. This type of problem could quite conceivably occur not only in other parts of Brisbane but in some of the other larger cities in Queensland.

This is merely history elsewhere in the world, and it is history plainly telling us that a proper approach to such problems is vital. This matter, I believe, could be adequately handled by a town and regional planning commission. The type of research required for these more difficult problems of planning could not be carried out by local authorities, and it is not always wise to rely heavily on imported experts. There is an old saying that a specialist is often merely a general practitioner in another man's country. We should create a commission; we should attract the calibre of person required to assist in this vital aspect of planning and we should, within the commission, then co-ordinate the planning that is progressing piecemeal in this State at the present moment.

Whilst I have the utmost respect for the Co-ordinator-General's Department, the Department of Works, the Department of Lands, the Main Roads Department, the

Department of Irrigation and Water Supply, the Harbours and Marine Department and other Government departments who participate in some form of planning, as well as local government authorities generally, in my humble opinion, unless the planning activities of all these can be truly co-ordinated in a statutory authority for planning on a town and regional basis, then I have not the confidence that one should have in the future planning of this great State.

Mr. Coburn: Do you think a town and regional planning organisation should be a sub-department of the Co-ordinator-General's Department?

Mr. LICKISS: As long as we have it as a town and regional planning authority to look after the whole of the State.

I should like to make it quite clear that a town and regional planning system, such as I have envisaged, should in no way act in competition with any of the instrumentalities presently undertaking planning schemes in Queensland. State planning should be complementary to, and not in conflict with, local planning. Naturally some matters must be planned on a regional basis; by the same token some planning of a purely local nature, while performed in concert with the over-all planning authority, would be done locally by the local authority. In general terms, I might sum up by saying that it is a question of getting the levels of responsibility correctly established.

I wish to thank hon. members for the attentive hearing they have given me in presenting this address. This matter of town and regional planning should not become a party-political issue. I have not presented it as such and I believe it would be unworthy of this House to consider that, in advocating such a system, I am merely playing with a political football. It is far too important a subject to be taken lightly.

The present Minister for Local Government and Conservation, whilst being the Minister responsible for the City of Brisbane Town Planning Act, and having a great deal of authority within the terms of that Act—as well as being the Minister who, under the Local Government Act, has the authority to approve of the some 23 town planning schemes mentioned by His Excellency in his address to this Parliament—has not, to the best of my knowledge, any qualified town planner within his department to advise him, let alone a competent team of experts to critically examine the plans in order to determine many of the matters that I have mentioned in my address here today, which, of course, are all vital considerations when we look to the future of this great State.

I suggest that this matter of town and regional planning cannot be postponed to some future date. We are telling the public generally, and rightly so, that Queensland

is experiencing an accelerated rate of development. Rapid growth can be either orderly or disorderly. It can be either beneficial or downright disastrous. After all, what is cancer but a rapid growth of body cells occurring in a hopelessly disordered manner? We are now on the threshold of great development and change. I make this earnest plea for an orderly town and regional development now for Queensland, in the interests of our State and our nation.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (12.3 p.m.): This debate last year was in the immediate pre-election session. I think I referred to it then as a kick-off for the big game—the election which was duly held this year. If I might expand the metaphor, now that the game is over it would be ungracious not to concede that the Government had a somewhat comfortable win, although not comfortable in the sense of any great overwhelming vote of confidence in the Government or preference for its policies. On the contrary, I think the public generally was extremely dissatisfied with the Government's performance. As the Leader of the Opposition conclusively indicated, percentage-wise there was virtually only a short half-head between the Government parties on the one hand and the A.L.P. on the other, in the opinion of the electors as a whole—something less than half of 1 per cent. But the Government's win was comfortable, I suppose, in that electorate-wise, on this occasion, the number of seats held when Parliament resumed was virtually the same as last year, and much the same as after the 1963 election, when the A.L.P. gained only one seat. That was in the electorate of Tablelands, in which the A.L.P. gained the acquisition—and a splendid acquisition it was—in the person of Mr. Wallis-Smith, who continues to enjoy the confidence of the people of his electorate, with an increased majority. In this instance our net gain in seats was nil; we left with 26 and came back with 26, which an Irishman, in his way—and quite soundly so—might regard as a win at the races. However, I do not think it can be regarded as a win by the Opposition, with 26 seats in a House of 78.

Certainly we would have shown a net gain of one seat in the last election by the outstanding, well-merited and popular victory of Mr. Peter Wood in Toowoomba East. All members will agree that he is an acquisition to this Parliament. We would have enjoyed a net gain of one seat with that win but for what might be described as the vexed situation that arose in Hawthorne. In this respect I make no judgment here other than to opine, as a political realist in summing up the result of this election, that the situation, as it evolved in that electorate, may well have had a broader effect in the over-all result than the loss of that particular seat by the A.L.P.

Be that as it may, the Government's win, whilst comfortable, was unexpectedly so at 47 to 26. It must be admitted it was unexpected by the A.L.P., by the political observers who had predicted, not that the Government would be defeated, but that it would suffer the loss of several seats, and not least of all by the Government itself, which, only a few months before the elections was in a state of near panic. We had only to look at the Premier when he appeared on television in the period leading up to the election and just preceding the election campaign itself and we would think we were watching the latest edition of "The Fugitive", because troubles were piling on troubles for the Government, in a shut-the-door-they-are-coming-through-the-window style.

We had the set-back in the sugar industry, the harsh cumulative effects of the drought, which undeniably the Government took too cheaply in the initial stages—it affected both the agricultural and the pastoral sectors of the State—and the uproar on prices that followed decimal currency, which focused attention on the erosion of values under this Government, and, blow of blows, we had "happy Jack" Pizzey's pride of the show, the education propaganda, which was starting to get more raspberries than hurrahs when people realised the truth of what the Leader of the Opposition pointed out in 1963, and again on this occasion, namely, that the alleged great leap forward in education, the propaganda used by the Government over the years since its advent to office in 1957, was largely nothing more than a hop, step and full half stop.

Taking all that into account, and giving the Premier his due—it has to be acknowledged that he is a cagey political war-horse, and his new deputy, the new Treasurer, is not far behind him—the Government sniffed a swing in the air and sensed its potential danger. Unlike its Federal colleagues in the Menzies Government in 1961 who, with supreme egotism and with an it-can't-happen-to-us approach, just sailed blissfully into a near-fatal hail of ballot-boxes in the election in 1961, the present Queensland Government began to puff up a sea-breeze before the election to try to counter the danger to its own interests.

We found that things that had been impractical the previous day became desirable and practical the next. King-size ladles of Labour thought and great hunks of Mr. Duggan's policy at the election were lifted holus-bolus and acclaimed as something that always was and always would be dear to the hearts of the Country-Liberal Government in this State.

All sectors, from the rural sector down to the wage-earner, got new consideration in the closing weeks of the life of the last term. The wage-earner who saw the Government, in the second half of 1965, send its advocate into the Industrial Commission to tell it that it should not even

hear an application for a basic wage adjustment, let alone consider it, before July 1966 saw the Government send its advocate back to reverse its attitude, which was tantamount to saying, "Yes, yes, we must have a wage rise." This was duly pondered by our Industrial Commission, and in a reserved decision it blossomed forth, from 23 May—election week no less—with a \$1.30 increase in the basic wage. It would have been long odds-on, to my mind, that had it not been election year, the unions and the workers of this State would have been whistling for a hearing, let alone a wage increase, before the predetermined July date this year. With consequent hearing delays and a reserved decision, the case would perhaps have taken even longer than the period leading up to the election, and the workers would only now be receiving the benefit that I think they obtained largely through the pressure applied on the Government early this year by trade unions and the Australian Labour Party.

One hesitates to suggest that the Industrial Commission gives undue weight to Government submissions or attitudes, although I do not suppose it would be the first time that that has been suggested under this or any other Government. It is not much use in the Chamber pussy-footing around things that concern us, and I am very concerned, as a Labour member and a citizen of the State, at the series of ominous clicks with which the arbitration machinery in this State has appeared to me to work in recent years under this Government.

I repeat, as I have said before, that it would be a sorry day for the great mass of workers if there is a continued erosion of confidence in our arbitration system, even among those with the greatest good-will towards it. The Australian Labour Party, as I think everybody knows, is pledged to a policy of conciliation, with arbitration as its backbone. I do not want to see arbitration discredited in this State, or anywhere else—and I have no doubt that there are people who have a vested interest in bringing that about. They always have wanted its destruction, and they always will, because they want to see, in their own interests, industrial relationships in a state of bitterness and confusion, and the Industrial Commission regarded with suspicion instead of the respect that is essential if it is to operate successfully. Those who would be pleased to see this happen are the members of the Communist Party.

Instead of engaging in cheap Red-baiting and slandering members of the Australian Labour Party who are outside the Parliament, the hon. member for Gregory would have been better occupied examining the assistance that his Government rendered to the Communist Party; that party's mischievous machinations in the industrial field by the Government's amendment of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act; and the way in which the Government has passed the

buck to the Industrial Commission on a number of matters of Government responsibility.

I was surprised at the hon. member's comments in this debate. Although I was not in the House when they were made, I took the opportunity to read them, just as I read all speeches that I am not present to hear. As I say, I was surprised to find the hon. member adopting the role that he did on this occasion. I have always admired his forthright approach to matters in this Chamber. He has at times launched attacks not only on the Opposition but on the Government. I think the Minister for Lands will agree that when the hon. member for Gregory has something to say, even against his Government, he says it without pulling any punches. That is fair enough. On this occasion, however, he did not do what he usually does; he launched a particularly vicious attack without backing it up in any way. I deplore the type of statement that he made in attacking non-parliamentary members of the party to which I belong. I shall always defend, in this Chamber of elsewhere, those who are members of the party to which I am proud to belong, and I would hope that there would be a similar mateship among all members.

The hon. member for Gregory said that certain people, members of the Australian Labour Party outside this Parliament, were Communists. That is a very difficult thing for any person to refute. It is a blank statement with obviously no foundation at all, yet the smear hangs in the air. It is unanswerable, because it is purely and simply a broad statement with no basis or justification put forward whatever. As I said, I was indeed disappointed by the hon. member's attitude. I should like him to pay more attention to the way in which the Government of which he is a member is assisting the Communist Party in Queensland by its legislation and by some of the submissions it makes before the Industrial Commission.

Today the Government seems to expect that the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in this State, because of its sense of the importance to the public of some matters that are brought before it, will exceed its function in an endeavour to correct the mess created by the Government's ineptitude or by hand-outs to its supporters. The Commission has already done that on several occasions. I again refer hon. members to the Mt. Isa industrial dispute, which arose, as you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, from the amendments of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act initiated in this Parliament by a former Minister for Labour and Industry, Mr. Morris. It seems to me that, if one believes in it, one does not chop off arbitration at the ankles as the Government of which the hon. member for Gregory is a member did when it introduced the infamous section 12 of the Arbitration Act relating to bonus payments. This undeniably

produced at Mt. Isa one of the bitterest and biggest industrial upheavals in memory, to the great delight of the Communist Party.

The hon. member for Gregory expressed concern for the Australian Workers' Union. I am sure that that union does not need either the hon. member for Gregory or anyone else to speak for it; it is more than capable of speaking for itself. But I will wager that the hon. member for Gregory will get little change from the A.W.U. if he cares to ask it for its opinion of the Government's performance in the industrial field. To the credit of the Australian Workers' Union, to my mind, it stuck to arbitration during the industrial dispute at Mt. Isa; not, I believe, because it was satisfied with the state to which it had been reduced by the Government's legislation, but because it realised, as a supporter of arbitration—incidentally, the Government is not—that an end to the dispute could come only when the matter was settled through the very avenue that the Government sought to close legislatively. I do not want to recanvass the matter, but thanks largely to the dedication and patience of the late Commissioner Harvey (no doubt his efforts took a heavy toll of his health) and the legal skill of Mr. Justice Hanger, a way was found to let arbitration function at least on a couple of cylinders.

So I say to the hon. member for Gregory, through you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that if he wants to see the people who are doing most to please and assist the Communist Party in Queensland at the moment, he should hang a mirror either in the Cabinet room or in the Legislative Council Chamber, in which the Government Caucus meets. He will then see reflected in it those who now are doing most to assist the Communists.

Surely those who believe in arbitration will make every effort to facilitate its functioning. That statement, of course, brings me back to the question that led me to discourse on arbitration. Last year the Government sent its advocate to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission and asked the Commission not to have a further basic-wage hearing until July 1966. Before the election, of course, the Government began to say, "This is not of our doing. Dear, dear, dear! We had nothing to do with it. This is a decision by the great Industrial Commission, and we must abide by it." That was quite true technically, because the decision was made by that body; but the advocate for the Crown—I do not think the Government can deny this—joined with advocates from private enterprise in putting that submission to the Commission. The Commission did not, of its own volition, decide to freeze the basic wage in Queensland over that period. It acted on submissions made last year to which the Government was a party.

If we have an Arbitration Act and we believe in arbitration, surely we should endeavour to facilitate its functioning, instead of amending the Act, as this Government did,

to exclude bonus payments from arbitration. But this Government went to the Commission and put this similar freeze-out submission to it.

I am not going to set myself up in any way to dispute legally the Commission's right to predetermine a period during which it will not hear submissions on a particular industrial matter, but I draw attention to section 11 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act as it remains since the Act was amended by this Government. That section still states that the Commission shall hear and determine all questions, whether of law or fact, which may be brought before it or which it may deem expedient to hear and determine, and so on. So I suggest that the intention of Parliament in this matter—certainly it would be the intention of the previous Labour Government in putting such wording into the Act, and, as I say, such wording continues to exist in the Act as amended by this Government—was to impose an obligation on the Commission to hear a matter brought before it. It might be argued that the words "or which it may deem expedient to hear" leave it as a matter for the Commission. I do not think that is so because I think those words should mean, and should be made to mean, that this allows the Commission of its own volition to call the parties before it to determine some matter if it considers it necessary in the public interest. When resentment was expressed by industrial unions in this State at the refusal of the Commission to have a hearing on the basic wage at that time, the Queensland Employers' Federation spokesman said that the Act was not being breached, that in the light of section 11 there was no anomaly in the action of the Commission, because he said that the section stated that the Commission shall hear and determine all questions. He said, "They are going to hear the basic-wage application in accordance with the section, but they are going to hear it next July." If that is to be put forward by the Queensland Employers' Federation as its interpretation of section 11, where are we to finish in industrial matters? Are we to have the employer saying to the employee, "Don't worry about this week's wages; you will get them but not until eight months' time." If that principle is to be put into the Arbitration Act, obviously we could continue it to the ridiculous point I just made.

The Government should take action to make it clear that we want arbitration to function in this State, not to be suspended. There may be an element of predetermination of a matter that comes before the Commission, but this matter was not allowed to come on for hearing; the Commission just wiped it aside. Surely that principle can not be allowed to apply. We could apply it to Parliament. We might as well say that Parliament is a waste of time, as this Government did in recent months, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Chatsworth. This Government

adopted the same attitude as the Industrial Commission. It said, "We do not want to be worried with the Opposition annoying us on these things. They have not the numbers so we will only call Parliament together for a few months of the year."

If that is the attitude, let us not think that it can be applied only to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission; it can be applied to Parliament or any other public body that should be functioning when it is required to function in the public interest.

All I can say relative to this matter of the basic-wage freeze that operated in this State for some time last year by order of the Commission is that even if it were valid for it to adopt that attitude—I respectfully feel that it was not although I would not deny that the Commission would have a greater knowledge in interpreting the Act than I have—on its own admission it displayed very poor judgment as a panel of expert Commissioners, because in September, 1965, it awarded a 5s. increase in the basic wage, which was the first increase since 29 March, 1965, and then it decided that it would not consider any basic-wage application whatever until July, 1966.

The Commission knew at that time that the introduction of decimal currency was pending; it knew at that stage, in September, 1965, that a number of avaricious merchandisers were altering the sizes of their containers and sneaking prices up ahead of decimal currency; it knew there would be at least some inevitable lift in prices—inevitable to a limited degree, but not inevitable to the extent which occurred had there been effective control and action by the Government of the day. It knew there would be these influences on prices in the period it nominated during which it would not hear any claim for a basic-wage adjustment. What happened? Early in 1966, when the Government started to feel the political winds of misfortune blowing towards it with an election coming on, it changed its attitude and said to the Industrial Commission, "Yes, we think there should be a hearing," and the Commission agreed.

By its decision at that time to have a hearing the Commission confirmed that it had misjudged the position in predetermining in September the previous year not to have a hearing. I think that sort of action by the Commission is to be deplored. It is comparable with a magistrate's suddenly saying, "The next person who comes before me for this particular offence I will go without the option." We have had some unfortunate occurrences of that type. I do not think it is a good idea for any magistrate to adopt that attitude, because he has no knowledge in advance of what the circumstances of the next case are likely to be. The Industrial Commission had no knowledge last September of what was going to happen other than what I have mentioned about decimal currency, which would have suggested that it should have left the way open for a hearing.

It may be argued by the Government, and perhaps by the Commission, that the way was still open for the unions to make applications if conditions did change, as they alleged they did. Of course, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out during the election campaign, the Government denied that there had been any undue increases in prices. The fact that the Commission did change its attitude indicates that it was rather at fault in its original judgment.

To my mind the Government places the Industrial Commission in a position where it has to accept the responsibility of making decisions which, as the Commissioners see them, are in the public interest, but which stink to high heaven. The one I have in mind certainly does. An application was made to the Commission that it should forbid unions to counsel or advise workers on the wages situation operating at a particular job relative to any other job opportunity in this State. I refer to the Collinsville power-house construction job.

I do not want to be misinterpreted, misquoted, or quoted out of context on this matter. I say that the failure of labour to offer at that point was definitely a very serious matter to the State, and to the responsible Authority whose task it was to get that job off the ground. I do not deny for one moment that the consequent delay because labour was not offering for the job was a serious matter. It certainly required the attention of the Government and those responsible for doing something about it. But I do not think that the Commission should have been approached in this way. I do not deny the right of the Authority to approach the Commission because it was endeavouring to get the job going; to get the job started was part of its responsibility. But I do say that this posed a problem to the Industrial Commission.

We are coming to a very peculiar stage in Queensland if it is not proper for someone to give advice to a worker before he takes employment. This could be expanded in a number of ways that hon. members opposite would not like. I believe that the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission exceeded its function when it forbade unions to counsel or advise workers on certain job opportunities that might offer one way or another in the State. I repeat that I am not for one moment denying the difficulties that this situation produced, nor am I arguing the rights or wrongs of the motives of the unions in the attitude they adopted to that project. I am simply saying that we cannot cope with a problem by doing something which, to my mind, is completely wrong, and that, I believe, was the result of the decision made by the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission.

This is in marked contrast with our experience of the administration of the Companies Act in this State. I ask the

Minister for Justice to nominate one significant person in Queensland who has been prosecuted, or to point to any action that has been initiated in this State by the Companies Office against people who have been peddling shares and so on (in a way about which we regularly get complaints) or in companies with wide activities in this State which have figured in some of the bigger losses in the commercial field of operations in recent years. Any such action seems to have been launched in other parts of the Commonwealth. I know that the Government will say that is done for convenience and that, on a legal basis, it is easier to deal with it under the one heading than under a number of headings in different States.

There are people resident in Queensland against whom a number of complaints have been made at all levels, but no action has been taken by the Companies Office against them to determine if there has been a breach of the Companies Act.

I repeat that this is in marked contrast with the Government's attitude to the Conciliation and Arbitration Act in relation to which the Government makes applications, brings in amendments, and twists, turns and bends the Act in any way at all to suit the people who support it. When amendments to the Companies Act have been before us and it has been put to the responsible Minister that further action should be taken to insert stiffer sections to narrow down the escape opportunities for people who are quite entitled to take advantage of weaknesses in the Act if they are left there by the Government, we have always been told, "Now, be careful; we must not go too far or breach a principle to try to deal with these people," although it is conceded, even by the Government, that they are acting not in a bona fide fashion so far as the Companies Act is concerned. However, that is not the attitude adopted to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act; any principle can be broken by the Government in amending that Act.

This brings me back to the point on which I commenced: the Government had quite a comfortable win in this State at the recent election, electoral-wise, but not percentage-wise, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out. I repeat that it was not because the people of the State were satisfied with the Government's policy or administration, nor was it because they rejected Labour's policy as delivered by Mr. Duggan on behalf of the A.L.P. which, I should say, is one of the best policies I can recall being delivered in this State in the light of the circumstances and needs of the time.

It would seem, as the Leader of the Opposition observed earlier in this debate, that people do not vote Oppositions in; they vote Governments out. On this occasion they did not vote the Government out. I add the observation that sometimes people tend to

keep Oppositions out. It must be conceded by the Australian Labour Party that in this instance that was a factor, whilst not in the failure of the Australian Labour Party to win the election, nevertheless a factor that negated to a great extent the prospects that appeared to exist of Labour's at least winning a number of additional seats at the last election. I observed to my friend the hon. member for Brisbane after the election that when we thought we were coming in from 3 to 1 to even money, we were in fact coming in from 100 to 1 to 33 to 1. That is how it turned out.

Undoubtedly there was a swing, and quite a large swing, towards the A.L.P. in this State in the early months of this year, and the Australian Labour Party, whilst realising that, in the absence of unusual economic stringency such as the credit squeeze in 1961, people do not tend to vote Governments out, no matter how well it might present itself as an alternative Government, depended on the failures of the Government, particularly at the time of the election, to win the election. We must face up to this fact that the swing did not reflect itself at the election.

I feel that much of the bitterness and conflict that is apparent in the Government ranks today, with the Liberal Party unashamedly endeavouring to outsmart and displace the Country Party as the senior coalition party in Government, is directed as much against the A.L.P., or perhaps more so, than it is against the Country Party, because, whilst the Country Party is a rugged party and has many features that resemble the rugged approach and Australianism of the A.L.P., it is, by its very nature and concept, a sectional party based on country interests. Therefore it is difficult for the Country Party to offer itself as every man's party. That is what the Australian Labour Party has been accepted as by Federal and State electors in this country for many years. It is a great privilege to the party to be accepted by the public in that way because it is the only party that has found it possible to govern in its own right in the Commonwealth and the States, with the possible exception of Victoria, where there have been some arrangements occasionally to retain one or other party in office because of the local circumstances at times in that State. The Liberal Party is making a strong attempt to replace the Labour Party as every man's party in the opinion of the electors generally.

I listened with interest to the speech of the hon. member for Chatsworth in this debate because, in presenting his personal philosophy, he, perhaps better than any other Liberal Party member, put the Liberal Party case in this regard. I do not deny his sincerity in that respect. But I do say to him that no matter how you dress a monkey, as has often been said about his party, you cannot hide its tail.

Whilst it has been presented under various names and guises over the years, the basic philosophy of the Liberal Party, is to my mind, alien to that presented in many respects by the hon. member for Chatsworth when he dealt with that matter in an interesting speech.

I feel that the Australian Labour Party has not only a vested interest in retaining its position as every man's party in this land, but an obligation to this country to do so. I should hate to see the day that the Liberal Party assumed that position and was able to brush aside the Country Party, which has some restraint on it in its administration in State and Federal fields. It would indeed, to my mind, be a very sorry day if the Liberal Party perchance ever came to be accepted as every man's party. Consequently, I think it behoves the Labour Party not to turn away from these challenges as they are issued but to look them fairly and squarely in the face and realise that we must retain the recognition of the people in that regard if we are to become the Government.

I conclude by referring briefly to a comment of the British Prime Minister, Mr. Harold Wilson, who referred to the fact that there were some people, dedicated Socialists themselves, within the Labour movement in that country who did not see the Labour Party as a party of power but more as a party of protest. He pointed out that it is very easy to act as only a protester and, in effect, an escapist, but that that is not a right that can be exercised by a Government elected to govern. I think that is the message, too, for the Australian Labour Party.

Mr. DIPLOCK (Aubigny) (12.42 p.m.): I join with previous speakers in expressing loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen, and in congratulating Sir Alan and Lady Mansfield on Sir Alan's appointment as Governor of this State.

Queensland has been blessed by a succession of good Governors, men differing in disposition but all respected because of their vital interest in the progress and development of our State and the happiness and welfare of its people. Sir Henry Abel Smith and Lady May were no exceptions, and they returned to their homeland carrying with them the love and good wishes of all sections of the community. They certainly did not spare themselves in carrying out the duties associated with their high office; they did not miss an opportunity of learning about the potential of our State and the problems associated with its development, and they proved themselves to be genuinely interested in the happiness and well-being of all sections of the people. They indeed set a very difficult pattern for Sir Alan and Lady Mansfield to follow. However, I feel sure that Queenslanders generally appreciate fully the past record of success and achievement of our present Governor and feel confident that when the time comes for him to relinquish office we will be able to say very proudly, "They did not fail us."

Although the election is now history, I should like at this juncture to say "Thank you" to the people of my electorate, who gave me my greatest political victory and, in particular, to thank my helpers who were prepared to travel so far and do so much to ensure my return.

A previous speaker mentioned the decrease in the percentage of votes gained by the Queensland Labour Party. Whilst this is correct, I say quite confidently—here I stress that I am not merely blowing bubbles—that the tide has finished running out and has already turned. For any political party to make headway there must be organisation, and organisation needs cash.

In the past we have not been able to spend on organisation because we have not been assisted by financial unions or wealthy business organisations or wealthy primary-producer organisations. Consequently, we have been able to organise in only a very few electorates. In these electorates we have done quite well, and, with the organisation which at last we have been able to get under way, I feel sure that our vote will increase very considerably and that this increase will be noticed in the next Federal election.

In my own electorate, where it has been possible to organise effectively, the percentage of Q.L.P. votes was increased to an all-time high of 56.3 per cent.; the Government vote was 31 per cent., and the A.L.P. vote fell to 12.6 per cent.

Whilst the actual election result was disappointing to the Q.L.P., we gained a deal of satisfaction from the fact that other political parties acknowledged sufficient merit in some of the principles embodied in our original policy to warrant their agreeing with these principles and competing with one another in their offers to the electors to gain votes. In fact, only yesterday I noticed that the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Representatives commented on social services and that his thoughts are in line with the principles and ideas enunciated in the original policy of the Q.L.P. I refer particularly to aid to private schools.

True, Q.L.P. supporters welcome this changed attitude, if it is sincere, because we believe, and have always believed, that such aid is the just due of these schools. I feel that I have to point out, however, that this was embodied in our original policy and left there, despite the cheap smears that the Q.L.P. was a party dedicated to further the interests of a particular religion (of which I am not a member), because we recognise the justice of such aid. If other parties considered that their previous smearing was justified and that we were the champions of a particular church, then I pose the question: what has caused them to change their minds now? I think there is one obvious answer: one party decided that State aid could be a worth-while expediency to be used as a vote-catcher, and then the race began to see who would offer most.

It must be remembered, however, that expediencies are weapons that can recoil against the users if promises are not carried out, and the people interested in this assistance, I feel sure, will be more concerned with what the Government does than with what the official A.L.P. has promised to do. If the A.L.P. were returned to office, I am sure these people would demand that they do what they promised to do.

During the election campaign all parties agreed that decentralisation was not only desirable but necessary for the progress and development of the State. I suggest that although much has been heard of decentralisation from time to time, nothing very much has been done to encourage secondary industry outside of the major coastal cities. Secondary industries must be established and developed in the country areas if decentralisation is ever to be accomplished.

The printing of attractive brochures is not going to achieve results nor is the pleading of any particular Minister going to do very much good. Something has to be done which is really going to assist those engaged in secondary industries in areas removed from the ports in order to place them on an equal footing with those established in centres on the coast. In stressing the necessity for practical aid I am not suggesting the impossible or the impractical, nor am I suggesting that the Government do something which Governments of other States are not already doing. In some States a subsidy is paid to those firms engaged in secondary industry whose premises are established in centres removed from the larger centres and who employ over a certain number of men, and these firms enjoy in their own States a preferential freight rate. This enables them to compete on as favourable a basis as manufacturers in the larger ports.

I am not suggesting that any subsidy be paid. I think an industry should be able to stand on its own feet, but I point out that in other States firms operating in centres removed from the coast enjoy, in their own States, a preferential freight rate. This enables them to compete on as favourable a basis as manufacturers in larger centres.

Mr. Aikens: The Chamber of Commerce would not allow this Government to do that.

Mr. DIPLOCK: I have to be honest; this Government has made certain concessions, but it has not made these concessions to those industries removed from the coastal towns because it has felt that if it extended them to those particular concerns it would also have to extend them to others engaged in the same industries. That is not the case in other States. I stress this point, because I am proud to be able to say that one particular concern last year was responsible for 23 per cent. of Australia's export trade in farm machinery. It started off this year getting very big orders and looked

like having those orders renewed until overseas firms discovered that our prices were more competitive than theirs. They then moved in and slightly shaded our prices.

If the Government valued this export trade it would say, "To enable you to compete with overseas countries we will allow a real concession on the freight rate from your place of manufacture to the port, for products that are for export markets." The Government would then be doing something really worth while to bring about decentralisation.

The Queensland railways in the early days were planned to aid in decentralisation, and they can only do this if freights are scaled to assist secondary industries established in the hinterland.

Having been associated with education in Queensland for a considerable time, I wish to offer a few comments about the present concern of the public towards our own system. At the outset, I wish to repeat what I said on many occasions at public meetings prior to the election, and to give the Government and the Department of Education full credit for what has been done to meet the demands of a public which at present is evincing more interest in the education of our children than it has done previously because, in my opinion, it at last is beginning to realise the real value of education in any community.

I would point out that the concern of the public and the problems of staffing, etc., in schools at all levels are not confined to Queensland. Last week I spent a good deal of time in New South Wales, where I spoke to many teachers. Schools in New South Wales were operating last week. Those teachers convinced me that the problems in that State are just as acute and just as real as our own.

The Government—give it its due—is spending as much as it can find funds for; it cannot spend more than the funds made available to it by the Federal Government. I believe that the administrative officers are conscientiously exploring every avenue whereby the system can be improved and the conditions of teachers bettered.

Speaking of the departmental officers, I should like to pay tribute to the late Sir Herbert Watkin for the wonderful work he did for education in Queensland. I knew him first as a teacher, then as an inspector of schools, and later as Director-General of Education when I was Minister for Education. He gave his all, all the time, in the interests of the profession to which he dedicated himself. I can, in all sincerity, pay that tribute to all of the present administrative heads with whom I have been associated, not only when I was Minister for Education but during my time as an officer in the Department of Education. One has to work in close association with these men to appreciate the conscientious effort they put into their duties, and to know of the amount of time outside of their regular hours—if it were added up it would certainly

amount to double the hours they are supposed to work—they devote to solving the problems of the department and endeavouring to administer fairly and in the interests of all associated with the teaching profession.

A great deal of concern about secondary education has been caused, in my opinion, by the Government's policy of ensuring that all Queensland children receive at least some secondary education. I have spoken on this matter on more than one previous occasion, and what I have said before I stand by today.

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

Mr. DIPLOCK: I firmly believe that all children should have the benefit of a secondary, or post-primary, education, but in my opinion the Government acted too hastily and decided to accomplish in one act what should have been spread over a period and introduced gradually, rather than making a splash, as it were, in education work.

I feel sure all will concede that some children have not the capacity to benefit by an academic secondary education. Consequently, at the present time the two years spent in the secondary department is a nightmare and a period of frustration to them, and the task set the teacher is almost impossible. These children could benefit by receiving tuition in specially selected courses which would fit them for the occupations they intend to follow after they reach the school-leaving age.

In my opinion—and I say this advisedly—many children are being done a disservice because sufficient time was not allowed for the provision of these special courses. In the business with which I am concerned we have a number of young lads eager to become apprentices but they are unable to carry on with the job because they do not understand the fundamentals of physics, science, etc. They have spent time learning French, and many other subjects which are entirely useless to them. We have tried to make it up to them by paying one of our employees to tutor them one night a week and try to help them in their courses.

The introduction of this policy, too, inevitably meant robbing the primary schools of many of their experienced teachers to help form the nucleus of a staff for the secondary schools, and often completing the staff with inexperienced and not fully trained teachers. I repeat, advisedly, that the mere possession of a B.A. degree does not of itself make a person a good teacher. He has to be trained, and he must have experience.

Mr. Aikens: It is not the knowledge you possess that matters; it is the knowledge you can impart.

Mr. DIPLOCK: What the hon. member for Townsville South has said is true.

The Vote for education can provide school buildings and equipment, but it cannot provide trained teachers. This position will, I feel sure, gradually correct itself, but it will take time. In the intervening period, teachers will be called upon to carry more than the desirable load. The position is worsened because many of our young teachers, as soon as they have met their obligations, decide to see the world by accepting positions overseas or in other States. I suppose this is their right in a free country, but I do think that the teacher who remains at his or her post here should receive priority of consideration over those people in the event of their rejoining the service. After all, we should not expect to have the best of both worlds.

While speaking on these lines, I believe that many young teenage ladies hesitate to join the service because they know that at any time they may be sent to any part of the State. I believe that these young people have every justification for feeling annoyed if they are transferred to make room for a married woman. Here I do not refer to the widow, to the wife whose husband has left her, or to the wife who has met with some disaster.

Being married is no qualification as far as the teaching profession is concerned, and in my opinion the married woman should enjoy no more privileges than the single woman. A single woman is expected to accept a position at the centre where she is required to serve and is subject to transfer. I quite understand her resentment if she has to disturb her domestic arrangements to make way for a married teacher who often is enjoying every comfort in life because of her husband's position and income.

I realise that the Minister and the officers of the department are faced with a staff shortage and that the only place in which they can employ a married woman is where her husband is living. But I still say that a young lady who is moved out has every justification for being worried about it.

I said earlier that I thought the Government was hastening too quickly with the introduction of secondary education. I shall issue another warning; probably it will not receive very much consideration, but I feel that I should issue it. I understand that the Cuisenaire system is to become universal next year. I have taken a great deal of interest in this system; I have made many inquiries about it and have read everything I can obtain on it. It has wonderful potential, but I think there is danger here again if the Government hastens too quickly.

After discussing with many teachers in the country centres, the introduction of the Cuisenaire system of teaching number in our schools, I suggest that here again the department might have to hasten slowly, and I advise that every effort should be taken to make teachers, particularly those in centres removed from Brisbane, more conversant with the method. Seminars have

been held in country towns but I feel sure that many country teachers feel that whilst these seminars have assisted them in some degree from a theoretical point of view, they are not fully equipped to proceed with the new method. If they are not fully equipped, there might be no progress at all.

If teachers simply get hold of a book and start using the different coloured rods as more or less counters and proceed on the old lines, this system will fall down, and that would be a great pity. Head teachers of city schools at which the system has been used during the past two or three years consider that the system is a meritorious one. They point out, however, that city teachers have had the opportunity of attending seminars and demonstrations and have been guided in their schools by a number of experienced teachers who have made a study of the method.

After going into it very thoroughly, I believe that the system is one that depends for its measure of success on the individuality of the teacher. It is a system under which each child has to be allowed to explore and to proceed at his or her own rate. If inspectors expect a certain level to be reached by each child in each school, the system will fall down.

Mr. Pizzey: They would put in the same type of report as you did when you went round.

Mr. DIPLOCK: I am quite prepared to have the Minister look at all the reports that I wrote.

Mr. Pizzey: That is what I am saying—quite good and understanding reports.

Mr. DIPLOCK: I should like the Minister to know the number of letters that I received from teachers whose classes I inspected thanking me for the assistance that I gave. I went to schools as an adviser, not an inspector, and I am quite proud to say that.

Mr. Pizzey: That is what I am saying.

Mr. DIPLOCK: A discussion on a book prepared by an inspector of schools left me with the impression that those who were discussing the work and who were well qualified to pass an opinion on its merit considered that, whilst it could be of assistance to the teacher who felt that he or she was not fully equipped to use the new method, it could well detract from the value of the method if inspectors generally considered this work as anything but an aid. If inspectors regard this book as virtually the beginning and end of things, as they did a book published a few years ago by two other inspectors, I think this one could do a lot of disservice to children.

On this occasion I have not very many complaints to make. I do wish, however, to bring to the notice of Mr. Speaker the very crowded conditions in the room in which six members are housed at the George Street entrance to Parliament House. I

can assure him that we are quite a happy band. We never have any arguments, and if things become a little difficult the hon. member for Townsville South entertains us with a song. We are not looking for the steel filing cabinets that there are in other rooms; we are not looking for the swing-back chairs enjoyed by other members; and we are not looking for carpets on the floor. But we do think that there should be room for us to have private discussions with our visitors, and at the moment that is absolutely impossible. I know that accommodation is limited, but I ask Mr. Speaker to give this matter his earnest consideration.

Mr. Dewar: There were 10 Liberals in that room from 1950 to 1956.

Mr. DIPLOCK: I assure the Minister that in that room are six members from important electorates. We are all returned with big majorities, and we will all be "bobbing up" again next time.

I conclude by thanking Ministers generally for the consideration given to requests submitted by me on behalf of my electorate during the past three years.

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) (2.30 p.m.): Everybody who knows me takes my loyalty to the Queen for granted, so I never find it necessary to preface any speech I make in the House with an oral profession of it. I will therefore get right down to the business that I propose discussing.

First of all, I want to place something on record in the pages of "Hansard" so that the many people who come to this House from time to time can read it there as a factual statement and so that, if necessary, generations yet unborn can read what actually happened in the Parliamentary Labour Party in this year of grace 1966 in relation to the deposing and humiliation of its former Deputy Leader, the hon. member for Kedron, Mr. Lloyd. It is a matter of complete indifference to me—I want to make this perfectly clear—who is the Leader, titular or otherwise, of the Parliamentary Labour Party or who is the Deputy Leader. My sole purpose in dealing with this matter is, I repeat, to place the matter on record so that its veracity will be beyond doubt and so that students of political science coming here from the university—many of them come to my home in Townsville and look at the bound copies of "Hansard" going back over several years—will know just what happened.

Mr. Mann interjected.

Mr. AIKENS: You know, of course, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that after the last election the Labour Party held its usual Caucus meeting, which it is entitled to do, and it was moved, I think by the hon. member for Brisbane, who has just interjected vociferously, that the Leader and the Deputy Leader, Mr. Duggan and Mr. Lloyd, be reappointed without a ballot.

Mr. Mann: That is not right.

Mr. AIKENS: I am not concerned with the hon. member's remarks; I am concerned only with the truth, and I propose to place the truth on record.

The hon. member for Sandgate disagreed with that motion. A motion was carried re-electing the Leader, Mr. Duggan, unopposed, and then the hon. member for Townsville North, Mr. Tucker, called for a ballot for the election of the Deputy Leader.

It may be thought, of course, that there is such a thing as party loyalty and conscience within the ranks of the Labour Party. But the people who think that do not know the members of the Labour Party as well as I do. In order to make the position abundantly clear, I should like the people to know, and I should like those who read "Hansard" in the future to know, that at present there are three separate factions or groups within the Parliamentary Labour Party. There is the Trades Hall faction, or the "Moscow Mob", as they are contemptuously called; there is the A.W.U. faction; and there is the little group that are gathered around the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Duggan.

In order to make the matter very clear, I seek your permission, Mr. Deputy Speaker,—it will save the "Hansard" reporters from getting writer's cramp and save me from getting clergyman's throat—not to refer to these hon. members by the names of their electorates, as is required under the Standing Orders, but merely to list their names. I do not want to impose too much on your tolerance, but the A.W.U. group is as follows: Messrs. Mann, Dufficy, Lloyd, Byrne, Bennett, Graham, Hanlon, Hanson, Wood, and Harris. The Trades Hall group, or the "Moscow Mob", is: Messrs. Houston, Jones, Melloy, Newton, Sherrington, Tucker, Wallis-Smith, Bromley, Dean, Inch, and Mrs. Jordan. The little group gathered round the Leader of the Opposition is: Messrs. Duggan, O'Donnell, Davies, Donald, and Thackeray.

At the fateful Caucus meeting that dumped and humiliated Mr. Lloyd, it was naturally thought that the A.W.U. faction would vote for Lloyd and that the Trades Hall faction would vote against Lloyd, with the Duggan faction holding the balance of power. Of the 26 members of the Parliamentary Labour Party, only 25 were present. One was absent—Mr. Inch, who represents Burke—and he sent his proxy down to Mr. Newton—but he made sure that Mr. Newton did not receive it until after the vote was taken. That was the best example of political fence-sitting in the British Empire since the days of the Vicar of Bray.

Mr. NEWTON: I rise to a point of order. The remark passed by the hon. member in relation to Mr. Inch's proxy is not correct, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Hooper): Order! The hon. member for Belmont has said that the statement made by the hon. member for Townsville South is not true and he asks for a withdrawal.

Mr. AIKENS: According to the Standing Orders and your ruling, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will withdraw it.

In the ballot demanded by the hon. member for Townsville North, the 10 members I read out as belonging to the A.W.U. faction voted for Mr. Lloyd; the 11, less Mr. Inch, that I read out as belonging to the Trades Hall faction voted against Mr. Lloyd; and the Duggan faction—of course, Mr. Duggan only had to lift his finger and those other four men would have voted with him for Mr. Lloyd—but Duggan decided not to lift his finger. Duggan, on the other hand, gave the nod to his four and the group, with himself, went across and voted with the 10 "Moscow mob", which made 15 votes to 10 in favour of Mr. Houston, who replaced Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. Coburn: Now Lloyd sits up here with us.

Mr. AIKENS: We would rather have him; he is a very intelligent man and I am quite sure we will reform him.

The dumping and humiliation of Mr. Lloyd can be placed fairly and squarely on the shoulders of none other than Mr. Duggan. As a result, in the trade union and Labour movements in Queensland he is known today, and will be known henceforth, as "Dumper" Duggan.

The hon. member for Bulimba has been elected Deputy Leader of the Parliamentary Labour Party, and there he will remain. He will not go any higher than that. Like Mr. Frank Forde, who was the permanent Deputy Leader of the Federal Parliamentary Labour Party, he will remain Deputy Leader of the Parliamentary Labour Party in this Parliament. He will for ever be the bridesmaid, never the bride.

Mr. Murray: Was not Forde Leader for a day?

Mr. AIKENS: Seven days, but that was only until the Caucus held a ballot and dumped him in favour of Chifley, after the death of Curtin, just as Mr. Lloyd was Deputy Leader here from the election date until Duggan dumped him.

The hon. member for Bulimba was quite happy to accept this invidious position in which he now finds himself, because he is certain that when the Trades Hall boys get round to dumping Duggan, or when Duggan dumps himself or takes a job with the oil companies or something else, the hon. member for Bulimba will not jump to the leadership, nor will the hon. member for Townsville North, who it was hinted in the Press would be the Leader of the Labour Party. We all know who will get the backing of the boys at the Trades Hall; it is none other than the shrinking, retiring violet, the hon. member for Belmont. He will be the Leader of the Labour Party, don't kid yourselves about that.

Now, let me get into this a bit closer. Mr. Lloyd was dumped because he took a stand in favour of State aid for independent schools. He made some statements in the Press about it just prior to the election and he then became non persona grata with Egerton and the real rulers of the Labour Party at the Trades Hall. But the main point is that since the dumping and humiliation of the hon. member for Kedron, the Labour Party has turned one of its typical somersaults and is now in favour of State aid for independent schools. So that the sacrificial dumping of Mr. Lloyd was of no avail. The Labour Party has swung right around and the Trades Hall boys are proclaiming that they are in favour of State aid for independent schools.

Hon. members may want to know why the Labour Party turned this somersault. They somersaulted because they were tipped off by Mr. Calwell, the Federal Labour Leader, that the Communist Party is considering establishing primary and secondary schools. (Laughter.) These people can laugh, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but do you notice what a sickly grin it is? They are grinning to hide their mortification and the fact that I am telling the truth. Mr. Calwell told them, and they know, that under the Federal Constitution if State aid is granted to independent schools the Communist Party, or any other organisation that sets up an independent school, cannot be denied the same ratio of State aid as is granted to any other independent school.

I will say this for the hon. member for Belmont—our shrinking violet, the perfumed pansy who denied my statement a few moments ago: at least he had some doubt. He is a man with a little bit of political nous; he possesses some political perspicacity. When he and the others of the "Moscow mob" in the Parliamentary Labour Party received their instructions from the Trades Hall to dump Lloyd, he approached Mr. Egerton and said, "I doubt the wisdom of dumping Lloyd. Personally, I think we should not go on with it—not at this stage, anyway." Mr. Egerton said to him, "You choose between Lloyd and your endorsement for Belmont at the next State election."

Mr. NEWTON: I rise to a point of order. Again I ask that the remarks of the hon. member for Townsville South be withdrawn. They are offensive and are not correct. Mr. Egerton was overseas at the time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Hooper): Order! I ask the hon. member for Townsville South to withdraw the remarks.

Mr. AIKENS: I will withdraw them.

We have an amusing position with regard to the hon. member for Barcoo, now known as "the Bolshe from Barcoo". Since he came into this Parliament, and before then, Edgar Williams, the State secretary of the A.W.U., referred to him as "Fido"—the little lap-dog who was always running around at his heels, so much so that he

frequently embarrassed Edgar Williams when in company. He even went to the extent of actually putting milk and sugar into Mr. William's tea. I am sure Mr. Williams would now like to put some thallium in the hon. member's tea.

As I said before, I merely want to put these facts on record. I am not going to enter into the argument between the hon. member for Gregory and the Australian Labour Party or the mob at the Trades Hall as to whether any of those at the Trades Hall are Communists. However, I do say that the mere signing of a non-Communist pledge, as is required of all members of the A.L.P., proves nothing as far as I am concerned. For a man to say, "I am not a Communist because I have signed the A.L.P. non-Communist pledge" is about as stupid and as silly as a witness getting down from the witness box in a court and saying, "Everything I said in the witness box was the truth and the whole truth because I took an oath to tell only the truth and the whole truth." The very basis of the Communist philosophy is duplicity. Communists are trained in the art of leading people up the garden path. Anyone who cares to read Communist works on this subject would know that members of the Labour Party who are tinged with Communism, although they may not belong to the Communist Party, were described by Lenin himself as "useful idiots."

When we talk about the duplicity of the Communist Party and how Communists can lead people up the garden path, just let us remember what a first-class galah Sir Leon Trout made of himself in an article in "The Courier-Mail" quite recently when he extolled the Communists of Russia as being in favour of culture, advancement and all this other sort of tommy-rot. A Presbyterian minister had to expose him for the gullible and credulous fool that he really is.

The hon. member for Aubigny pointed out that when State aid was first put forward by the Democratic Labour Party it raised a lot of sectarian bigotry. There was no more vigorous, vociferous and vicious sectarian bigotry in the fight against State aid than Senator Keeffe, the President of the Federal Executive of the A.L.P. We remember his statement at the executive meetings—people may wonder where I get these statements from, but I get them—when he said, "The Labour Party must oppose State aid at all costs because State aid will mean the resurgence of the Roman Catholic faith in Australia." He now believes in State aid in order to carry out the principles of democracy, which he claims operates throughout the Labour Party today. Yet this man, who professed to detest, despise and loathe the Roman Catholic faith, was married quite recently in the Roman Catholic Church of St. Margaret Mary's, in Hyde Park, Townsville. Of course, he swallowed the wafer and drank the wine—the body and the blood.

We have, too, the Labour Party in this House today. When I look at the members on the front bench, with perhaps the exception of the hon. member for Baroona, they remind me of the saluting base in the Red Square at Moscow during the Russian May Day celebration and procession.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: Have you been there?

Mr. AIKENS: No, I have not been there either as a dishonoured or an honoured guest, but many A.L.P. men have been there and they will go there again. Many of them are members of the Soviet Friendship League. Many of them are well-known members of Communist-front organisations. If the hon. member for Tablelands does not keep his big "trap" shut, I will tell the story of the cheque he donated to the Cairns Aerial Ambulance just prior to the last election.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: I would like you to tell it.

Mr. AIKENS: I will tell it, now that the hon. member has invited me to. He thought he was going to be beaten so, complete with Press photographers and reporters, he presented to the Cairns Aerial Ambulance a cheque for what was supposed to represent the difference between the money he was going to get and the money he thought he was worth. But he did not point out that the cheque was post-dated to 2 June so that he could cancel it if he did not win the election on 28 May.

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH: I rise to a point of order. That remark is completely untrue and is offensive to me. I ask for it to be withdrawn.

Mr. AIKENS: I will withdraw it, but I wonder what the hon. member will say one of these days when I produce a photostat copy of the cheque.

I merely made those remarks to place the history of this shocking incident about Lloyd and State aid in the pages of "Hansard" for the benefit of those who, later on, may feel disposed to read about it.

I now appeal to the Government to do something that, in the nine years it has been in office, it has not had the guts to do. I want the Government to place every citizen living outside the area of Greater Brisbane in the category of a first-class citizen instead of keeping them all relegated to the second-class-citizen category that they are in at present. It is useless for Government members to say that this was done by the Labour Party; it was, and I do not deny it. It was done by the Labour Party when it was anxious to establish the Greater Brisbane area and to throw some sops to the representatives of the various local authorities which were to constitute the Greater Brisbane area. The Labour Party passed an Act of Parliament known as the City of Brisbane Act, and local authority affairs of Brisbane and the people of Brisbane are covered by that Act. All

the other local authorities, the other rate-payers, land-holders and other citizens of Queensland, for local authority purposes, are bound by the Local Government Act, which gives only second-class-citizenship status to those who live outside Brisbane. I do not intend to discuss all the arguments that have been, and could be, advanced to prove that. I could if I cared to recapitulate what has been said over a number of years. I stressed this subject in a letter that I wrote to the Minister for Local Government. I regret that he is not in the Chamber, because I intend to deal extensively with him.

In order to prove this point, I shall deal with one of the many cases that were submitted to me and which I could have brought down with me. I decided to bring this case down as it is perhaps the most outrageous of all.

Quite recently the Townsville City Council decided to have a town plan. It employed a town planner. Like most town planners, he was a faddist. These people get all sorts of fads and fancies when they have no sound basis to work on. He drew up a town plan for Townsville which, if it is adopted in toto by the Minister for Local Government, will make Townsville the laughing stock of the Commonwealth. A person driving into Townsville along the main arterial highway sees four or five shops, two houses, two vacant allotments, four more shops, a garage, two houses, a club, another vacant allotment, and then two more shops. I have never seen such a shocking hotch-potch arrangement in all my life. It is like a pakapu ticket drawn by a drunken Chinaman.

These town planners simply sit down with a plan and a whole basketful of coloured pencils in front of them, and they mark the plan according to their little whims and idiosyncrasies. The council accepted the plan in its entirety even though it is a monstrous and shocking thing. Naturally, many landholders in Townsville decided to object to the town plan. They lodged objections in accordance with the Local Government Act.

Here we have a most amazing case. There is also a town plan for Brisbane. If a landholder in Brisbane objects to the Brisbane town plan, under an Act passed in the last session of the last Parliament he can go before a court presided over by a District Court Judge, with legal representation, and have his case heard in public with the Press and the public present. His case is judged on the evidence submitted to the court and the decision is given by an impartial District Court Judge, who is president of the court. No-one can cavil at that, because that is democracy and freedom as we know it.

On the other hand, a person who objects to the Townsville town plan, or any other town plan in any other local authority area in Queensland, must send his objection—

Mr. Coburn: To the Minister.

Mr. AIKENS: No, it is worse than that; not to the Minister, but to the council, which will emasculate it, distort it, and probably tear half of it away, and make any remarks it likes on it. The council then sends it to the Minister who, if he deals with it at all, which is doubtful, will deal with it in secret, make his decision in secret, and I doubt if he even has to transmit his decision to the objector or to the council. All I ask for is the same rights of appeal, that is, an open hearing according to freedom and democracy, for the people who live outside Brisbane as are enjoyed by those at present residing in the Greater Brisbane area.

In case there is any doubt about what must be done, I wrote to the Minister for Local Government on the subject. I have a large file on the matter. I have brought up aspects of the Townsville town plan in this Chamber and I have produced photographs and coloured plans, and in my opinion I have made out a particularly good case for amendments to the Townsville City Council town plan. I gave all of that to the Minister and he accepted it.

When it was announced by the Minister that the Director of Local Government, Mr. McNamara, would go to Townsville to investigate the town plan, being a simple country lad I naturally thought Mr. McNamara would see the objectors and would see me as the representative of a little over half of the people of Townsville. I wrote to the Minister.

With all the enthusiasm of my youthful inexperience in these matters, I got this reply from him, dated 18 March, 1966—

"Dear Mr. Aikens,

"I am in receipt of your letter of the 13th instant relative to the Townsville Town Plan and in reply thereto must repeat that I am obliged in law to consider all objections to the plan lodged with the Council within the statutory period. The Plan has been advertised in accordance with law and persons concerned have had the right to object to the Council. You will appreciate that the time for lodgment of objections has expired and accordingly there can be no further objection in law. To state the case otherwise would be absurd. All objections lodged with the Council have been forwarded to me and I am unable to find any objection by you and accordingly I am unable to find that you are an objector in law to the plan. The purpose of Mr. McNamara's visit to Townsville is to give consideration to the objections which have been duly lodged in accordance with the law and report to me thereon."

To use a vulgar expression, I was wiped.

I then wrote to the Hon. H. Richter, on 21 March, in these terms—

"Dear Mr. Richter,

"Thank you for your letter of 18th March, in connection with the Townsville Town Plan. It is very illuminating.

"It now appears that, according to a strict technical interpretation of the word 'objector', as contained in the "LAW", I am forbidden to see your Mr. McNamara on his proposed visit to Townsville. So be it.

"It also appears inevitable that my considered speech in Parliament, buttressed by photos and plans, on this subject, is to be contemptuously disregarded, presumably in accordance with the same majestic "LAW".

"As a simple country bumpkin, might I again risk pontifical rebuke, by drawing your attention to the fact that your Government, which has been in power for nearly nine years, could have afforded the second-class citizens of this State the same measure of justice as was recently afforded the favoured citizens of Brisbane, by the establishment of a Civic Court of Appeal in these matters.

"But your Government did not either amend or repeal the "LAW" as it applies to the second-class citizen, yet you now use it as a weapon to deny me, a representative of these people of Townsville, the right to attempt to secure them justice, because I, individually, have no cause to "OBJECT" to a Town Plan. Notwithstanding my considered opinion that the Town Plan reeks to high heaven with injustice, and, if implemented, will make Townsville the laughing stock of Australia.

"Would you consider it redundant if I meekly mentioned that I shall deal with this matter at another time and place?"

I now propose to deal with it.

Mr. Walsh: What else did you say that you did not commit to writing?

Mr. AIKENS: I know that the hon. member for Bundaberg is still staggering under the disclosures that I made about the Australian Labour Party. If he will take the time to draw two or three deep breaths and then make a relevant interjection, I shall be happy to reply to him.

I have brought down with me the particulars of a case that probably is the most astonishing of all. It shows what goes on in Townsville, and how the person concerned is to be treated. It is the case of a man named W. de Courcey. Here in my hand is a plan of the city of Townsville, which I invite every hon. member to peruse. It will be noted that the subject land covers 47 acres or approximately that area, on the very edge of the city. It is a triangular piece of land. For one boundary it has the Aboriginal Reserve at Aitkenvale. Another is the boundary of the Thuringowa Shire Council, and the third is Ross River Road. It has no communal boundary with any other zoned land.

That land, in addition to other land in bits and pieces in other parts of that area, has been zoned as future urban land, which means that it is frozen till it can be incorporated with other land in the area to make an area of about 250 acres. It can then be used only for recreation areas, shopping centres, school blocks, residential areas, and so on. The whole "future urban" area must be re-zoned as a complete urban area, and there must be, according to the draft of the town plan, at least 250 acres to do it. How de Courcey is going to do it when the land has no common boundary with any other land that has been declared "future urban" land, I do not know.

I point out to hon. members, too, that the plan shows that already several allotments on what was originally de Courcey's land fronting Ross River Road have been cut up and subdivided, with the council's acquiescence, and are now residential allotments.

Mr. de Courcey then wrote to the Council and said, "I would like to make an application to you to cut off my own home and the area of land that contains the well which serves my property. I am also prepared to give you a couple of allotments alongside. Then, of course, I can argue the point in relation to the rest in connection with my objection to the Town Plan."

The Townsville City Council wrote to him on 7 January this year—this is sheer, unadulterated blackmail—and said—

"Dear Sir,

"I refer to your application for a permit under the Interim Development By-law in respect of the above. I have to inform you of the Council's decision in this matter as follows:—

(1) A permit is hereby granted: To the proposal to subdivide two allotments as indicated on Plan T.P.S. 94. Allotment 1 will contain an existing dwelling house, and the Council accepts your offer to transfer to the Council a fee simple title to Allotment 2.

"NOTE: In conveying this decision the Council further points out that the permit is granted on the understanding that you will withdraw your objection to the Town Planning Scheme and that the transfer of allotment 2 will have no bearing on the determination of park contribution when the balance area is subdivided."

In other words, the council said to de Courcey, "We will let you take your house and your other allotments out of this area that has been shown as "future urban" if you withdraw your objection to the town plan." If that is not blackmail, then I do not know the meaning of blackmail.

The most amazing thing then happened. Three days later, on 10 January, the council wrote to Mr. de Courcey, and I think this is perhaps the most fortuitous blunder that the Townsville City Council has ever made. It said—

“Dear Sir,

“Proposed subdivision of land—Allotments 1 & 2 of Sub. 4 of Resub. 3 of Sub. 3 of Resub. 2 of Sub. 1 of Portion 38, Ross River Road, Aitkenvale

“Please find enclosed copy of Plan T.P.S. 94 in respect of the above subdivision. I regret that this plan was omitted from your reply from the Council dated 7th January, 1966.

Yours faithfully,
C. B. Campbell,
Town Clerk.
(John Manton)

per J. J. Manton,
Acting City Planner.”

I have here the plan the council sent de Courcey of his land. He did not ask for it; he did not know it was in existence. You will notice, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it is a plan of the complete subdivision of the whole of the de Courcey land into residential building sites, despite the fact that under the town plan it is supposed to be “future urban”.

When I questioned de Courcey about it, I said, “Has anybody tried to buy your land from you?” He said, “Yes. Bartlett has been out, and some other fellows have been out, and they have been trying to buy my land from me.” I said, “Do they know of the existence of this plan?”—it was sent to him, I am sure, by mistake by the council—and he said, “I don’t know.” This was the same Bartlett who owned the Monastery Gardens Estate and who sold it to a company composed of four aldermen that has already made a small fortune out of it. Would we be doing an injustice in saying that Bartlett was sent out to try to buy this future urban land from de Courcey, and that if de Courcey had sold it to Bartlett, Bartlett would have sold it to some of the aldermen? There was a plan already drawn—drawn by the council, not by de Courcey; he knew nothing about it—to cut up de Courcey’s 47 acres into residential blocks.

Mr. Coburn interjected.

Mr. AIKENS: I really believe it was all cooked up in the council and was sent to him by mistake. He did not know anything about it, and it was a complete surprise to him when he received the plan. All he wanted was his own home cut off, and he was going to give the council two allotments next door for park purposes.

Then he wrote to the Council—or his solicitors did—as follows—

“The Town Clerk,
Townsville City Council,
TOWNSVILLE.

“Dear Sir,

“We act for Mr. de Courcey, who has referred to us your letter to him of 7th January, 1966, reference T.P.S. 16/86 C.M.W. 16-12-1965.

“Our client has instructed us to advise that he is not prepared to accept the permit on the conditions under which it is granted, namely that he withdraw his objection to the Town Planning Scheme, and that the transfer of allotment 2 will have no bearing on the determination of park contribution when the balance area is subdivided.”

On 19 April, the Council wrote to Messrs. Wilson, Ryan & Grose, solicitors, telling them what de Courcey had to do and the fees he had to pay and so forth. I will not read the preamble, but in the third last paragraph they say—

“If, however, you wish to have approval only of the general principle of residential subdivision of this land (without specific approval of the layout or determination of the precise subdivisional conditions) the submitted application is satisfactory.

“Could you please advise in what manner this is to be treated?”

“This information is required under Clause 7 of the Interim Development By-law.

Yours faithfully,
John Manton,
Acting City Planner.”

They wrote and asked him, “What do you want? Tell us and we will give it to you.” Then, when they stumble and send him a plan that should not have been sent to him, when they find he will not submit to their blackmail and withdraw his objection to the town plan, they write him on 2 June and say—

“A permit is hereby refused for the following reasons:—

(a) The proposed development will prejudice the orderly and proper growth of the locality.

(b) In the Council’s opinion, essential public utility services are not available to serve the proposed development.

(c) There is no adequate drainage for the proposed development.”

What in heck are they talking about? It is not his plan; it is their plan that they sent to him. When he would not submit to their blackmail, when he would not play ball with them, even after they wrote to him and asked him what he wanted, they refused his permit.

I now read a letter from his solicitors to the council, dated 22 April—

“We refer to your letter of the 19th April. We are instructed to advise that our client desires the approval only of the general principle of residential subdivision

of this land, and on this basis we note your advice that the application submitted is satisfactory."

After they sent him a letter asking him what he wanted and telling him they would give it to him, he wrote this letter, on 22 April, through his solicitors, telling them what he wanted, and when they found that he would not play ball and sell his land, they wrote to him, as I have already read, on 2 June and told him that the plan they had drawn up and sent him would not be approved.

So that de Courcey, at his own expense and at his own inconvenience, could not see McNamara in Townsville; McNamara refused to see him or to inspect his land. Everyone in Townsville except the aldermen were kept right away from McNamara.

Mr. Richter: That is not right.

Mr. AIKENS: The Minister can get up and tell us where it is wrong.

At his own expense and inconvenience de Courcey came to Brisbane with all these plans and documents and tried to see the Minister. He also tried to see McNamara here, but he could see neither of them. He was sent along to a junior officer named Jacobs—a very courteous officer, by the way—and he was all de Courcey could see. By the time he saw Mr. Jacobs—

Mr. Low: He is not very junior.

Mr. AIKENS: Whether he is junior or not, he is neither McNamara nor Richter.

(Time expired.)

Mr. MILLER (Ithaca) (3.10 p.m.): I wish to join with other hon. members in expressing, on behalf of the electors of Ithaca and myself, our loyalty and affection to Our Most Gracious Sovereign, and to extend to Sir Alan and Lady Mansfield our best wishes in the task that lies ahead.

I should also like to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to my predecessor in Ithaca, Bob Windsor. Mr. Windsor came to Ithaca as a man unknown, and with the task of taking the Ithaca seat for the Liberal Party. We all know the results of the splendid job he did during his six years in office. When Bob retired from politics and Ithaca he left as a man respected and loved by all.

I should also like to record my appreciation of the work done in the Ithaca electorate by the late Alderman Norm Buchan. He was a man respected by all for the untiring effort he put into council affairs in Ithaca.

The largest and most important investment the average Australian will ever make is the purchase of a home. We, as Liberals, believe that family life is fundamental to the well-being of society, in which every family has not only the right but must also have the opportunity of owning a comfortable home at a reasonable cost. It is because of this belief that I wish to speak on housing.

At the present moment, because of lack of adequate finance, people are being forced

into buying Queensland Housing Commission homes in areas where they would not normally prefer to live. I believe it is our duty to see that these people are able to buy or build homes of their choice where they would wish to live.

Queensland like most other States, has many problems affecting the housing industry. At a time when all departments are seeking extra finance—especially the Department of Education—it is vital that we look closely at these problems and find the answers. We are all aware of the shortage of finance and how it came about. Surely it is the job of this Government to encourage and facilitate rather than to provide. We have in Queensland building societies capable of handling all the housing demands of this State, if finance were available. I believe the Government could overcome this problem if it were prepared, firstly, to make the climate more favourable for private investment in housing societies by educating the public on the necessity for and safety of, these investments; secondly, by asking the Commonwealth Government to extend to the investors in housing societies a tax concession similar to that which exists for mining and insurance. This would immediately make finance available to the societies and relieve one of the most pressing problems affecting the building industry. This finance would also eliminate the stop-go conditions that affect the industry each year.

Housing, like any other industry, must have constant production to keep costs at a minimum. Too often are employers forced to dismiss staff only to have the problem a few months later of finding suitable tradesmen. In many cases this seriously affects the long service leave of the employee in the industry. I suggest that there are fewer tradesmen receiving long service leave than any other sector of the community.

Another problem that faces the home buyer is what is commonly called the deposit gap. Although this Government is to be commended for its encouragement of the housing societies, and also the raising of the home loan by \$1,000, I feel that the problem for the people on low salaries is still one of saving enough money for a deposit. The housing loan insurance scheme is of considerable benefit to these people but, once again, finance is the bugbear. If we assume that an adult can save 20 per cent. of his income towards the purchase of a home, then, in 1946, with an average wage of \$13 a week, it would have taken 97 weeks to save the deposit. Today, with an average wage of \$50 it now takes 240 weeks to save the necessary deposit. The biggest reason for the variation is the Brisbane City Council's attitude of demanding that the subdivider shall pay for all the services connected with an estate. In effect, the council has only passed on to the worker added costs, which are a real problem. Twenty years ago land represented 9 per cent. of the total cost of a house but today it is at least 25 per cent.

Another reason is the uncontrolled sprawling development of urban areas that has taken place in Brisbane. This development has not only added costs to the subdivision of land but also has been responsible for heavy public transport costs being placed on the shoulders of the people of Brisbane. I hope that under our town plan Brisbane will expand in a more orderly fashion resulting in reduced costs for land and transport.

To enable people to save so that they may buy a home of their choice, the Government should make flats available at a reasonable rental. I believe the Government can provide at least 50 per cent. more accommodation, at no extra cost to it, by building flats. They should be built close to the inner city, which would relieve the congestion on our suburban roads. I do not believe that flats are the answer to the housing problem, but they are the answer for young couples who require a breathing space in which to save their deposit. Many young couples do not realise the implications of married life until after they are married. It is then that they realise they want a home of their own, and the problems attached to getting one. I am sure that every hon. member in the House has had many calls from young people about accommodation. These flats should be small and built in areas such as Spring Hill or other near centres.

It is pleasing to know that the Government may now build higher than three storeys without the approval of the Commonwealth Government as I should like to see the land used to the best advantage with the building of multi-storey flats.

Briefly, housing demands may be channelled into four categories. First, there are the young couples without families, on whom I have lightly touched. Secondly, for the older families I believe it is our duty to make homes available on terms similar to those being offered by the War Service Homes Division. If the terms were extended to 45 years to purchase a home, this would reduce the deposit and make for easier weekly repayments. If these people do not complete the purchase of a home in their lifetime through some unforeseen circumstances, then at least the family would have a good start, and I believe this is necessary.

I believe it is the duty of this Government to build suitable accommodation for our senior citizens who, because of their age, should not have the problems of housing to contend with. These flats should be built to accommodate senior citizens only, on lines similar to the Darby and Joan units in Victoria. The rental should be a nominal 5 per cent. of their income. Although this may prove a burden, I feel it is the least we can do for our senior citizens.

This investment by the Government in flats could well improve the flow of migrants into Queensland. We cannot expect migrants to come to Queensland if we have no accommodation at least equal to that being offered by other States. It is essential that Queensland should absorb as many migrants

as possible during the next few years, both from an economic and a defence point of view. If we look at the population increase for the first half of this year we see that Queensland's population increased by only 703, as against 4,390 in South Australia. It has been said that immigration is so interwoven into the pattern of our development that if the migrant thread breaks the fabric of our economy will fall apart. In Queensland we have good working conditions, good climate, and many opportunities for advancement. But in the field of housing we lag far behind some of the other States.

The exciting history of the U.S.A. could be duplicated here if we could promise the home-starved people of the world an opportunity to own a piece of land whose wealth they will help to produce. America has been populated by people who were denied this right. So I believe that we in Queensland must encourage migrants to settle here by offering suitable accommodation in the way of flats to enable them to decide where they wish to settle. The shape of our future development will to a large degree be determined by the number of migrants we can induce to settle here.

Another problem affecting both the home-buyer and the home-owner is the number of unqualified tradesmen presenting themselves to the public. There has been a good deal of talk on this matter, and, believe me, the time has come when we will have to take a stand on it. Too many people are being fleeced by unscrupulous tradesmen. Both the master builders' and master painters' associations have been inundated with complaints that they are unable to solve. There are two courses open to us; namely, registration and bondage. Registration will eventually solve this problem by these unscrupulous tradesmen losing their licences and the fact that they are unable to carry on their particular trade. But the problem is to protect the people today, and that is where I believe the posting of a bond could be the answer. When a bond is posted, the public at least knows that the tradesman has collateral should court action be necessary. In many cases in the past, proceedings have been dropped because the contractor concerned did not have sufficient collateral.

I think it is scandalous that the public can be robbed by these people who are allowed to roam the streets looking for easy prey on which to fall. In my electorate I know of at least three cases, and there are doubtless many more of which we are not aware. Hon. members will probably recall the first case, because it was publicised by "Sunday Truth". A painter contracted with a widow to paint her house, and after the first day's work he asked for a progress payment to enable him to buy paint. Unfortunately she paid the full amount and has not seen him again to this day. Here was a woman who did not have money to call in another painter, and who had no redress at law.

In another case a war widow borrowed money from the Commonwealth Bank to have her home repaired and repainted. Three months after the job was completed, the paint fell off. When she inquired about the tradesman, she was told that he had returned to cane-cutting. It took her two years to pay for something that she did not in fact have. This type of thing should not be allowed to continue. In many cases it is our senior citizens who fall prey to snide contractors.

Another case involved \$2,800 for repainting a large house at Toowong. Once again the owner was taken in by a painting contractor who presented himself as a qualified tradesman. He contracted to burn off and repaint the house, but in actual fact he repainted it only. More will be heard of this case, as it will come before the court in the near future. Fortunately the owner is a barrister and is in a position to have it dealt with in court, but how many people are able to do that? I am of the opinion that the time is now opportune to legislate for the protection of the people of Queensland.

Mr. R. JONES (Cairns) (3.28 p.m.): I wish to join with my Leader and other members of this Assembly in renewing our expressions of loyalty to Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. I also express on behalf of the people of the Cairns electorate their devotion and loyalty to the Crown.

First of all, I wish to congratulate the new members of this Parliament, particularly the hon. member for Ipswich West, Mrs. Jordan. Her speech, which I read in "Hansard", was one of the best that I have heard from a new member. I offer similar congratulations to Mr. Ted Harris and Mr. Peter Wood, the hon. members for Wynnum and Toowoomba East; I am sure that they will be great assets to the Parliamentary Labour Party.

Whilst I am in a congratulatory mood, I congratulate also the mover and the seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and the other new members on the other side of the House, namely, the hon. members for Toowong, South Coast, Logan, Chatsworth, Ithaca and Hawthorne.

To you, Mr. Speaker, I offer my congratulations on being re-elected to your office.

As I am the elected representative not only of the people of Cairns but also of the Australian Labour Party, I must record my appreciation of the work of all members of the Australian Labour Party—the branches, the unions, the Young Labour association, and the Parliamentary Labour Party—who assisted me in my campaign. Members of the Australian Labour Party are notorious for giving their time voluntarily and unstintingly and working very hard to return their representatives, and as all members of the party believe in its platform and principles,

it behoves a member elected to this august Assembly to propound that platform and those principles at every opportunity.

I cannot allow the occasion to pass without paying special tribute to my campaign director and the committee that guided the conduct of my campaign at the last election. I pay tribute also to the late Alderman George Peterson, who conducted my campaign for the by-election in 1965 and has since passed away.

I now have the honour of representing Queensland's northernmost city. As this elected representative of the people of Cairns, I shall advocate, as I did in the 15 months before the recent election, the development of the Far North. Because of its geographical position, I will endeavour to promote increased production in primary industries and the advancement of secondary industries in conjunction with the natural growth in demand in the area. The people of the North will continue to press the Government to take more progressive steps that will allow provincial centres to become even more important and create a balance where imbalance now exists in the development that is proceeding in this State.

Before leaving the elections, I wish to comment on some things that occurred in the Cairns electorate and which I believe should be aired in this Chamber. One of the worst incidents occurred at the hospital polling booth, where over 240 votes were ruled out because the poll clerk had initialled the ballot paper when the presiding officer should have done so. After having been notified of this, I sought some explanation from the returning officer. He referred the matter to the Department of Justice, which ruled out the votes under section 74 (1) of the Elections Act, 1915 to 1965.

Mr. Walsh: The presiding officer had not initialled them—is that it?

Mr. R. JONES: The presiding officer had not initialled them; the poll clerk had. They were ruled out of order.

I draw the attention of the House to section 86, which says—

"Election not be questioned. *Ib.* s. 114. No election shall be liable to be questioned by reason of any defect in the title, or any want of title, of any person by or before whom such election is held, if such person really acted at such election, nor by reason of any formal error or defect in any declaration or other instrument, or in any publication made under this Act or intended to be so made, nor by reason of any such publication being out of time."

That mumbo-jumbo, under my interpretation, means that if a person acted in good faith, either as presiding officer or poll clerk, in initialling a ballot paper, the vote should be regarded as a valid vote. On this occasion it did not make one speck of difference to the result. I think there may have been a difference of four votes recorded. The

Labour vote was 140 and the anti-Labour vote 136, or something to that effect, but I draw attention to the fact that this could cause a miscarriage of justice in an instance where a particular polling booth polled heavily in favour of one party. Somebody whose interests lay against that party could purposely initial ballot papers incorrectly. So long as they are initialled by the officer and the officer initialling them has been duly appointed by the returning officer, I feel that those votes should be counted as valid under section 86 of the Act. I cannot see why these votes should have been ruled out.

I should like to express my thanks to the many candidates who came forward in great numbers to oppose me. I wish them all the best in future elections. I like competition. There was quite an assortment of them—Liberal, Country Party, Independent and Democratic Labour Party.

Mr. Thackeray: You slaughtered them.

Mr. JONES: Yes. By comparison, my vote remained the same and they split the anti-Labour vote up amongst them. The Country Party vote, I am sorry to say, fell from 5,120 to 1,700 or 1,800.

Before going further, I should like to congratulate His Excellency Sir Alan Mansfield on his appointment as Governor of this State, and I take the opportunity to wish both him and his good wife, Lady Mansfield, every success in the future. I do that on behalf of the electors of Cairns because Sir Alan had a brother who was a doctor in Cairns and who was very well known and well respected in the area for very many years.

In his Opening Speech, at page 2, Sir Alan said—

“An important contributing factor to this achievement has been the application of a modernisation programme highlighted by the progressive substitution of diesel-electric for steam locomotives.”

That is something that is very dear and near to our hearts in Cairns, because we again are the first “bunnies” to be affected by dieselisation. It has affected both our township and our area.

Within the last two years we suffered the partial closure of the railway workshops. It was only as a result of the activity of the citizens of Cairns that the workshops were not closed completely. The Combined Railway Unions in Cairns have been in consultation, and they are trying to soften the blow or cushion the effect that will be felt in the area, not only by the 64 employees who will be involved but by the community generally.

I have used the pronoun “we”. I certainly mean “we”, because I feel very deeply for these men who are directly affected. I have just come from their ranks, and proud I was to be a member of their ranks. Proud I am also that the Australian Railways Union saw fit to grant me a life membership on being elected to this Assembly.

What we are concerned about is the fact that although the Minister and the administrative officers of the department can tell us that 64 members are going to be affected, the proposed new time-tables to the areas in question have not yet been promulgated. We feel that these time-tables should be made available to the unions to give them an opportunity to offer a suggestion so that what is proposed may not have to be carried out in its entirety. If it has to be carried out at all, perhaps it could be done in gradual stages so that the adverse effect will not be too great.

In order to obtain some sort of formula to convince the railway administration and Cabinet, the men themselves are drawing up a questionnaire which will be distributed in an endeavour to obtain information to prove how they will be affected by the varying values of their own home and those in the areas to which they may have to go. Differing home and land valuations are greatly concerning these men. If they are transferred to Townsville they realise that the valuation of land in Cairns is entirely different from that in Townsville; the same considerations would apply if they were transferred to Brisbane.

The men are also disturbed with the thought that if they are transferred to other centres they will have no assurance that they will not become involved in further reorganisation plans of this type in the future.

Mr. Pizzey: You are aware that public servants have always faced that problem?

Mr. R. JONES: That is perhaps true, but in one respect only. When these men were appointed to their jobs they were appointed after long service in western areas. They joined the railways, as I did some 23 years ago, with the idea that this would be a permanent job. That has not proved so in my case but they cannot all become members of Parliament, as much as they would probably like to. When they joined the railway service they felt that the permanency of employment behoved them to devote themselves entirely to their industry, an industry which is peculiar in that—

Mr. Pizzey: They are still permanent employees.

Mr. R. JONES: They are still permanently employed, but if I could get a guarantee from the Minister that they would be permanently employed in their classifications until they retire at the age of 65 I should be quite happy. But I do not think the Minister can give me that assurance. Men trained in jobs such as locomotive engine-driver, guard and shunter are proficient in jobs which are peculiar to the industry in which they serve. Once cast from the industry they become no more skilled or semi-skilled than the ordinary labourer on the street, after devoting 20, 30, or even 40 years to the industry.

That is where the Government has failed the men in the industry. These facts must have become well known since the introduction of the diesel loco in 1955, but they have not been planned for. The Government's attitude has been negative in every instance. This is demonstrated wherever we turn. Be it in housing, hospitals, education, the mining industry or railways, there is no planning. Everything just happens. Like Macawber, the Government is hoping that something will turn up. Unless the Government plans its activities it will be confronted with this situation not only in the railways but in every other facet of its administration.

There is another matter in my area about which I recently questioned the Minister, namely, the rationalisation of the beef ports. I am reliably informed that beef in Queensland is to be sent to three ports, namely, Townsville, Rockhampton, and Brisbane. They are the three biggest ports, and the three biggest cities. Imbalance in development is again displayed with the centralisation of beef at those three ports. It seems that the idea is to run the beef to the Queerah meatworks and then rail it to Townsville for shipping. To my mind, that is ridiculous. If I were a grazier north of Cairns and had to send my beef on the hoof to the Queerah meatworks for slaughter and then pay 2 cents a lb. extra to send it to Townsville for shipment, would it not be proper for me to take it on the hoof, or by rail, to Townsville for slaughter? I ask hon. members what they would do. Would they bypass the Queerah meatworks and those at Gladstone and Mackay?

Mr. Sullivan: What would it cost, in comparison, to take it by hoof?

Mr. R. JONES: I do not know. I am not a grazing man. However, I have been told by the people in the area who know that it is much cheaper to take cattle the extra 210 miles on the hoof, or by rail, than to the Queerah meatworks, have them slaughtered, and then rail the frozen beef to Townsville for an extra 2 cents a lb. I am informed that it will cost an extra 2 cents a lb. to have it railed from Queerah to Townsville.

Mr. Sullivan: I only asked as a matter of interest. I thought you would get it down cheaper than travelling the stock by road.

Mr. R. JONES: These questions could well be answered by the Minister for Primary Industries. I do not claim to be an expert. I am only pointing out what the people in the North are feeling. It is a psychological feeling.

Many railway lines have been closed since the advent of this Government. The Mt. Mulligan and Mt. Garnet lines have gone. The Millaa Millaa and Mt. Melloy lines have been torn up. Now the meatworks will be by-passed because of the action of this Government. A study of a road plan will show that Cairns and this area of Far North Queensland are being bypassed in

the road programme, and again centralisation is taking place with the beef roads going to Townsville, Rockhampton, and Brisbane.

In the 1965 by-election I advocated secondary industries for Cairns. I was scoffed at and told that Cairns was to be simply a tourist centre. Tourism is only the cream on the cake. To counteract the imbalance in our State today those areas of North Queensland need industry to develop the area in which that production takes place. Since the 1965 by-election I have made speeches in the House. They were used by my opposition at the last election. But when they were speaking, people interjected and said, "You must have read some of Jones's speeches in the House, because you are advocating exactly what he advocated." At no time had those candidates ever advocated, on behalf of their parties or themselves individually, what was needed for Cairns. Now they are jumping on the bandwagon. I am glad they are because we need every voice in North Queensland to draw attention to what is happening there. Recently we had in the North a Minister of the Commonwealth, a brewery baron, and, as a paradox, Archbishop O'Donnell, who told the citizens of Cairns at a civic reception that what was sadly needed in our area was secondary industries.

Mr. Pizzey: Are you happy having a Victorian Senator as chairman of the Northern Development Committee?

Mr. R. JONES: Although that remark is irrelevant, I shall answer it. The Minister is turning the old sod over again, or stirring the bottom of the bucket after a little bit of mud. The chairman of the Northern Development Committee is the secretary of the A.L.P. in Victoria. But the chairman of the Parliamentary Northern Development Committee for the Commonwealth is Dr. Rex Patterson. I think it is ideal that we have as chairman a Victorian who has interested himself in northern development, and who was recently in Northern Queensland and got a good deal of Press publicity. He got much more than I shall get on my advocacy for North Queensland on any occasion. I say that his appointment is a good thing, because we of the Australian Labour Party believe in the development of Australia not only in North Queensland but the entire continent, and the more people that become aware of this, the better it will be.

If anyone wants to participate in the work of the Northern Development Committee, I shall certainly be the first to help him and show him the way. Does anyone disagree with the holding of the Third National Conference on Balanced Development at the Loxton Hotel, Loxton, in South Australia? Is that wrong? Are discussions on development ineffective because they take place in South Australia? Would anyone say, when the Senior Project Officer of the Northern

Division, Department of National Development, Mr. D. J. Gates, who is domiciled in Canberra, states in a paper on mineral development in Northern Australia now and in the coming decade—

Mr. Pizzey: That is national development.

Mr. R. JONES: Yes, and North Queensland is part of it.

Mr. Pizzey: So is Tasmania.

Mr. R. JONES: I agree, but this is the Government of Queensland, and it should be more conscious of its own area, as I certainly am.

Mr. Pizzey: The Victorian is chairman of the Northern Development Committee.

Mr. R. JONES: What is the difference? I think the Minister is fumbling.

Mr. Gates said (and this is relevant to North Queensland)—

"Continuing north to the Atherton plateau, there has recently been a revival in the search for tin in the Irvinebank area. Australia is deficient in tin but it is expected that within a few years the country will become self-sufficient in this metal."

That is my point. I believe that we should be developing mining and primary industries in these areas. I advocated in my maiden speech the establishment of a tin-processing works and refinery at Cairns, which is the port from which tin is shipped.

Mr. Duggan: The Minister has engaged Americans to develop the North.

Mr. R. JONES: That is right. As long as it is not the Australian Labour Party that advocates anything, it is all right.

In Cairns very shortly we are going to reform the Northern Development Bureau, which will make constructive submissions on behalf of development in the North. I say "re-form", because it was established before and I believe that it fell by the wayside because the Government's ear was deaf to the overtures and submissions made to it. We believe in the spread of industry, and the work of such a bureau needs widespread support. I am seeking the support of Cabinet and all other members of this Assembly.

Mr. Walsh: I think the Minister is a bit jealous because Mr. Hartley was president of the Young Liberals.

Mr. R. JONES: I do not know about that; I think the hon. member for Bundaberg is getting his Hartleys mixed up.

Mr. Walsh: No; that is quite true. You cannot deny that one.

Mr. R. JONES: He is certainly well informed now and no doubt that indicates that quite a number of other Liberals will be converted to our way of thinking in the future. That is exactly what I am trying

to do at the moment. I am endeavouring to convince Cabinet members, of both the Liberal and Country parties, that northern development is something not peculiarly within the province of the Federal Government. Northern development is important to the development of Queensland. It is practicable, and the Government will receive an assured return for any money that it invests in such a rich area.

I have here a pamphlet issued by the Country Party candidate for Cairns at the recent election. In it he supports what I have said. He says that he advocates the erection and completion of the Cairns Cultural Centre and a boat harbour and launching ramps, early completion of Highway 1, the formation and support of a Cairns industrial development league, the stimulation of the tourist industry, and the elimination of water restrictions.

The Government believes that the Flaggy Creek scheme is premature. The Premier indicated this when replying to a question that I asked in this House on 26 March 1965. During the election campaign the Country Party candidate for Tablelands began supporting this scheme, but when I supported it I was told by the Country Party candidate for Cairns that I was irresponsible. That is another instance of conflict between the two candidates.

I shall give the House some facts and ask hon. members to judge whether my support of the Flaggy Creek dam scheme was incorrect and whether the A.L.P. was irresponsible or whether the Government was irresponsible. In 1963, an election year, the Minister for Lands announced that surveys of the Flaggy Creek scheme were expected to commence. The people from Mona Mona Mission were shifted from their tribal grounds over two years ago because they were going to be flooded out. Now they have not even an adequate water supply. Two years later, in 1965, the Premier said there was no need at that juncture to incur expenditure on this scheme. However, in 1966 the Kareeya Power Station is on reduced generation and only holding, and Koombaloo water storage for power is at constant level, with only a fluctuating slight increase because of the recent rain. This available water storage for power is less than half the amount available at this time last year. Is it not logical to assume that, with another year like this one, a crisis will develop in water storage for power?

What other water storage is there in North Queensland? The level of the Tinaroo Falls Dam is dropping by 1 foot every two or three weeks. This time last year the water was spilling; it is now down at least 14 feet, perhaps more, below the spillway. The Barron Gorge hydro electric scheme is relying almost entirely on the release of water from Tinaroo Falls Dam and is drawing on the reduced storage. At the moment it

is able to generate only one-third of its maximum capacity because of the poor flow of water. Surely this is a poor return for a \$12,000,000 scheme.

As I said earlier, the position in which we now find ourselves is typical of Government planning. It has failed to go ahead with the Flaggy Creek scheme. As the drier period of the year approaches and there is an increase in the call on water, system loading and system peaks will further burden the supply.

The Barron Gorge is relying on releases from Tinaroo Dam. Fundamentally, Tinaroo Dam water is conserved for irrigation. Irrigation for what? For tobacco-growing areas, so is it not logical to assume that if the dry persists more water will be required for irrigation in the tobacco areas? Which will be given priority—the survival of a \$2,000,000 tobacco industry, or will electricity supplies, already extended to their fullest capacity, be curtailed further, with resultant black-outs in Far North Queensland?

The Barron Gorge constitutes one-third of the present generating capacity of the northern grid system and hydro power represents more than two-thirds, and up to 90 per cent. of the output capacity of generated electricity. There is no doubt, when we are depending on hydro power for from two-thirds to 90 per cent. of our electricity supply, that power black-outs will be experienced in the grid system in Far North Queensland.

Mr. Newbery: We depended on water for 95 per cent. last year.

Mr. R. JONES: That is correct. It is no good saying that the Collinsville power-house will alleviate this situation. If we all, as the Treasurer says, hope for rain, and get it, we will get through, but if we do not get it and with the power-house at Collinsville not likely to be completed before 1969, we will be in dire straits in Far North Queensland in the supply of electric power. It is therefore my duty, as a member of this Assembly and as a responsible member of the Opposition, to warn the Government of what might happen. I hope it does rain. I hope the Minister's prayers will be answered because, if they are not, we in North Queensland are certainly going to suffer black-outs. Because of Government misplanning they will be inevitable.

Had the Labour Party been in office this dam would now be a reality. I reiterate that the Flaggy Creek scheme would ensure ample water storage for hydro power.

(Time expired.)

Mr. CORY (Warwick) (4.8 p.m.): Let me first of all take this opportunity of thanking the electors of Warwick for again placing their confidence in me as their representative in this Assembly for the ensuing three years. Because of this it is my privilege on their behalf to express their loyalty to Her Majesty and also to congratulate His Excellency Sir Alan Mansfield and Lady

Mansfield on Sir Alan's appointment as Governor of Queensland. We sincerely congratulate both on this appointment and thank Sir Alan for the manner in which he was pleased to open this session of Parliament.

I should also like to congratulate the hon. member for Logan and the hon. member for Hawthorne, who moved and seconded the Address in Reply to the Governor's Opening Speech. I congratulate them particularly for the knowledge they displayed when speaking about matters that they obviously knew thoroughly and understood fully. They not only made a very worth-while contribution to the debates in this Parliament but also indicated their sincerity in their representation of the people who elected them.

I congratulate all the other hon. members who are in this Chamber for the first time. Although I have not been privileged to hear them all speak as yet, I look forward to very worth-while contributions from them. I am pleased to extend to them the personal hand of friendship, regardless of their political background.

I should like to refer to the dairy subsidy which this Government is providing to assist in extension of pasture species. I congratulate the Premier and the responsible Minister for the scheme that has been evolved. The principle is a very good one, and is one which I feel can have very real application over a large area of Queensland where varying conditions apply. At first there was a doubt in my mind as to what extent different species would be allowed. I found out very quickly, of course, that a great variety of species are eligible for the subsidy. In my area, of course, lucerne is the most important one, and it has been the backbone of any pasture stand in the area for many years. We are very thankful that it is included. We feel sure that a lot of use will be made of this subsidy.

Mr. Sullivan interjected.

Mr. CORY: There has been a lot of collaboration with, and co-operation and guidance given by, the leaders of the industry in formulating this scheme.

It is good to see that in the administration of this scheme a wide discretionary power is given to the local committees to vary their recommendations according to the needs of the district. With the differing climates and soil types in different areas it leads to a great variety of species.

We appreciate the fact that the subsidy is available as from 9 May. It will be available for work done from that date. However, I sound a note of warning. Whether we are dealing with human beings, animals, or machinery, very often the best material is wasted because of lack of opportunity. I mention that, because if the administration breaks down all the good thoughts, good intentions, and good ideas will fall down. The scheme must be applied in a practical manner.

Mr. Sullivan: You will agree that this Government has indicated that it is prepared to help those dairymen who are prepared to help themselves?

Mr. CORY: Yes. That is an indication of the sincerity of this Government in doing everything possible to help an industry that has been the backbone of large areas of this State for many years. It is also earning a great deal of export income, from which every Australian and every Queenslander benefits.

I have a word of warning for the Minister and his officers. I sincerely hope that their administration of this scheme will be such that the good intentions are not frustrated by clumsy administration and application. In a scheme of such magnitude there must be safeguards, considering the amount of money involved. In the public interest with the expenditure of public money there must be safeguards. The smooth running of the administration, taking into account the safeguards, will have a big bearing on the eventual success of what appears to be a very good scheme and I cannot see why it should not be.

I should like to mention the "shemozzle" that is going on between butter and margarine.

An Opposition Member: Which side are you on?

Mr. CORY: If the hon. member will wait a minute, I will tell him.

No industry is afraid to stand up to fair competition, but I do not think the margarine competition is fair.

Mr. Davies: Who do you think is supporting Marrickville? Support is coming from the Liberal Party in Sydney and Melbourne.

Mr. CORY: Well, we will deal with that if it becomes necessary.

The competition from margarine could not technically be termed fair. It is based on expecting the butter industry to hold out and do a magnificent job in supporting the export earnings of Australia at a reduced price level overseas. The butter industry is expected to continue to do this and at the same time share the premium home market with margarine. The margarine manufacturers are trying to take away the premium market from the butter industry, without doing anything to increase our export earnings.

We realise that there is an equalisation scheme for the dairying industry. The equalisation of income for the producer is roughly the average of what he gets, percentage-wise, for export and home-consumption butter. We are exporting about 43 per cent. of the butter produced, and home consumption takes about 57 per cent. Hon. members will see that the equalisation is roughly 50 per cent. going each way, so that the producer gets a gross return of only

75 per cent. for his commodity. Yet everything the table margarine manufacturer sells brings the home-consumption price and he wants more and more, without accepting any responsibility for the privilege of sharing the market.

Mr. Thackeray: May I ask a question? Do you think the dairy farmers should get cost of production?

Mr. CORY: I think everybody should get cost of production.

Mr. Thackeray: They are not getting it at the present time.

Mr. CORY: That is all right—

Mr. Bromley: It is not all right.

Mr. CORY: It is not all right, but it is happening everywhere. That is one of the problems.

We must also realise that this is a period of transition for the dairying industry. There is more and more bulk handling. We have newer equipment. These things cost a good deal of money and throughout this transition period the entire industry is confronted with these costs. At the same time the producers have to maintain quality and production. The industry realises that it must diversify its operations as much as possible. We have had a milk economy and a butter economy; they are still with us, and I think they will be with us for a considerable time. The industry must diversify and produce powders and casein, and get a bigger share of their market. That would have a great bearing. Because of the service this industry has given to Queensland and Australia over a long period, it is only right that it should be given some consideration. The manufacturing side of the industry employs 11,000 Australians, over 6,500 on the butter side alone, whereas the table margarine industry employs only 1,400.

Mr. Davies: Do you think the Commonwealth Government is doing everything possible to help the dairying industry?

Mr. CORY: I am sure it is, but we must have greater recognition of these problems to see if we can do a little better.

There is no suggestion of squeezing out the margarine industry or denying it its rightful place in the Australian market. That industry might be manufacturing over its quota, but there is no suggestion of a reduction in its quota. Nobody suggests that every Australian has not the right to buy margarine whenever he wants it. There are few places where margarine cannot be bought.

Table margarine is only a small part of the Australian vegetable oil industry. Therefore it is only a small part of the Australian market. For this reason, marketing guidance from our leaders during this transition period would be welcomed by both industries because that would consolidate the industries and protect those in them and make

their capital secure. If there is no guidance we could have extremes. There could be a boom period. If there was, there could be a marketing upset, followed by a slump. A little guidance could be of assistance in this regard, and then we could look forward to gradual expansion of both industries.

Mr. Davies: Do you think we should support the man on the land by wearing woollen jackets rather than linen jackets as depicted in this newspaper?

Mr. CORY: Yes, I think we should, especially in this cold weather.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Hon. members are out of order if they are reading newspapers in the Chamber.

Mr. CORY: There is no suggestion of denying any Australian the right to have margarine. But table margarine production used only a small percentage of Australian produced vegetable oils last year—it was in the vicinity of 6,300 tons. In comparison, the total vegetable oil used in Australia was 32,000 tons or a little more, which means that approximately 80 per cent. of the vegetable oil used in Australia was imported.

I say, in complete fairness to the safflower and peanut industries, that within this 80 per cent. there is ample room even for any possible expansion. If markets can be obtained and consolidated, this industry will benefit, because more and more will be sold for a fair and reasonable return and prices will not fluctuate at the hands of manufacturers who could (and I think would if there was no restriction) become ruthless and possibly unethical.

Eighty per cent. of vegetable oils have to be imported, and this allows room for expansion in the vegetable oil industries in the foreseeable future. If everything required in the manufacture of margarine were produced in Australia, the proposition would be quite different. That stage, however, has not yet been reached, so I do not think the time is opportune to ease margarine quotas, especially when the margarine industry is not prepared to accept its responsibility to share in export earning at the lower price levels under which the dairying industry has to survive.

I should now like to refer briefly to the Leslie Dam, near Warwick. I expressed in this Chamber on various occasions my hope that the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission would complete stage 2 of the dam whilst construction workers were on the site. This did not come about. However, I felt that as soon as it was found that landholders below the dam had use for the water and were taking it, stage 2 would have been shown to be justified and would have been completed.

The dam is not yet filled—it will be this summer—and even now there are more applications for water than there is water available. I know the feelings of the Minister in this matter, and he has given much co-operation and help. I do consider, however, that the decision not to proceed immediately with stage 2 could almost be termed an error in judging the enthusiasm of the landholders to use this water. I do not think the Commission realised that the landholders would take it as quickly as they did. I know what happened in other places, which no doubt is why there was some conservatism in this project.

I should like to stress that landholders are ready to take the water as soon as they can get it, and that anything the Minister and the Commission can do to expedite the completion of stage 2 will be very much appreciated.

Mr. Sherrington: The Minister has not been very helpful.

Mr. CORY: The hon. member has no idea.

I shall now say a word or two about the Department of Primary Industries. Although other hon. members no doubt will have more to say about this department, I point out that its revenue from stock return assessments, and so on, will be reduced greatly as a result of the effects of the drought. On the other hand, it has never been more necessary that the advisory services and assistance that the department provides should be kept alive and active and made available in as many places as possible. One wonders what will happen if funds are not available to keep these services working to maximum capacity. They are of vital importance to the rehabilitation of many industries, particularly the stock industry, which have been hit so badly by the drought, and action must be taken to see that the advisory services get more than the 16s. in the £1 that they now receive from Consolidated Revenue as the over-all revenue of the department.

The matter that I wish to deal with finally is one that I think should be publicised as widely as possible. It is of concern to the people of Queensland, although not strictly a matter for the Queensland Government. I refer to the activities of door-to-door salesmen and the pitfalls that have become evident. I do not criticise a man simply because he is a door-to-door salesman; but I do criticise a door-to-door salesman who uses high-pressure sales tactics on a wife when her husband is absent. The article that he sells her may be a good article and may not be very dear. The point is that the person may not really want it and may not be in a position to pay for it. When it is suggested to the wife that it is only necessary to put down a deposit and then pay the balance over a considerable number of weeks, it sounds very attractive; but in fact, because of what I would describe as an unethical practice on

the part of an astute professional salesman, she buys something that the family is not in a position to buy.

As I said earlier, this should be publicised as widely as possible and people should be warned not to sign contracts unless they are sure what they are committing themselves to. A close watch must be kept on the general procedure, because a contract is legally binding once it is signed.

The ethical and moral side must be considered, too. I have experience of several cases in which the families were definitely not in a position to spend the extra amount of money but were bound by law to honour these payments over a period of time. That is neither honourable nor ethical.

Debate, on motion of Mr. Newbery, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 4.36 p.m.