

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 30 AUGUST 1966

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 30 AUGUST, 1966

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

QUESTIONS

DRIVERS' LICENCE FEES

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

How much money was received to June 30, 1966, due to the increase of 5s. in driving fees?

Answer:—
“\$247,075.”

POLICE TRAFFIC PATROLS

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

How many extra police for traffic patrols have been provided due to the increase of 5s. in the annual driving fee?

Answer:—
“Thirty-eight.”

WHEAT PURCHASES, THE COURIER-MAIL DROUGHT RELIEF FUND

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

(1) How many tons of wheat were bought from the State Wheat Board from money received by *The Courier-Mail* Drought Relief Fund?

(2) What price per ton was paid and what was the total amount spent on wheat from the Board?

Answers:—

(1) “A total of 2,816 tons were bought from the State Wheat Board under the Drought Relief Appeal Fund sponsored by *The Courier-Mail*.”

(2) “This wheat was purchased at a quoted price of approximately \$52 per ton. The total amount spent on such wheat purchases was \$144,036.08. The wheat was purchased from the silo nearest to the point of distribution.”

CREATION OF MINISTRY OF SPORT AND RECREATION

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

In view of a statement in *The Courier-Mail* of August 25 in which the Minister for Labour and Tourism is reported as having disclosed a twenty per centum increase in juvenile delinquency in the past twelve months and because of the urgent need for positive action to combat this ever-increasing problem, will he seriously consider the possibility of creating a portfolio of sport and recreation, with sufficient funds as would enable it to further promote and assist approved youth clubs, national fitness organizations, police and citizens' clubs, sporting bodies and all other approved recreational organizations, which have as their objective the promotion of better citizenship?

Answer:—

“Juvenile delinquency is a problem of international concern and covers a vastly greater field than sport and recreation. The Queensland Government has given tangible support over the years to National Fitness and Youth Welfare Organizations. The Government's programme is to be expanded and its intentions in this connection will be made known at the appropriate time. The creation of a Ministry of Sport and Recreation, as proposed by the Opposition, would be a costly venture. The Government is firmly of the opinion that equally as effective results can be achieved at much less cost, under its policy of assistance and encouragement to those engaged in the training and education of our young people for citizenship responsibility.”

ADDITIONAL NATIONAL PARKS

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

(1) Has he received a report prepared by the C.S.I.R.O. Plant Industry Division and the Queensland University Zoology Department, with the backing of the Australian Conservation Foundation, concerning the desirability of creating twenty national parks totalling 100,000 acres between Ingham and Mossman, North Queensland?

(2) If so, does the report draw attention to the fact that less than one per centum of the State is set aside for national parks and that this figure should be increased to five per centum, and does it also draw attention to the need for sizeable areas in the brigalow country and the Far West being set aside as national parks?

(3) What action, if any, is to be taken to implement these recommendations?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "No."

(3) "The report furnished is being investigated. The question of reservation of additional areas throughout Queensland as National Parks is continuously under investigation. Since the present Government came into power the total area reserved as National Parks in Queensland has been increased from 836,472 acres to 1,054,101 acres."

MINIMUM CHARGE FOR GAS, TOWNSVILLE

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

(1) Is he aware that the Townsville Gas Co. recently increased the price of gas to consumers and fixed a new minimum rate of \$1.50 per month?

(2) In view of the hardship caused to pensioners and others in indigent circumstances by the new minimum rate, will he take any action possible to have it abolished or considerably reduced?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "The minimum charge was raised from 60 cents, which was set 50 years ago, to \$1.50. This \$1.50 does not even cover the actual overhead of establishing and maintaining a service. The cost of gas is only a small proportion of the actual tariff. Nevertheless a change from 60 cents to \$1.50 is proportionately large and this was pointed out to the company by the gas referee some three weeks ago. As a result the company then agreed to meet any case of genuine hardship brought to its attention. This will cover pensioners and others in special circumstances. Direct approach should be made to the local manager. It is considered therefore that this situation is well met."

FINANCIAL DIFFICULTIES OF SUGAR INDUSTRY

Mr. R. Jones, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

In view of the reports in the Press on August 25 concerning the world sugar price slump—

(1) Is this price expected to have reached bedrock or are even lower prices anticipated?

(2) Has he or his advisers sought or arranged for any further negotiations in this regard?

(3) Has the Government any immediate plans to relieve the plight of the hard-hit sugar farmers?

(4) What remedial measures will be taken to bolster the State's economy to offset the effect of the world sugar price slump, which is the lowest price reached in twenty years?

Answer:—

(1 to 4) "I refer the Honourable Member to the Answer I gave to the Honourable Member for Mulgrave in response to a similar Question on August 9 last, and to the Prime Minister's statement in this morning's *The Courier-Mail*."

CATTLE RAILINGS, MUNGANA-ALMADEN- FORSAYTH LINE

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

How many cattle have been railed from Forsayth, Einasleigh, Mt. Surprise, Mungana and Almaden for the years 1963-64, 1964-65 and 1965-66?

Answer:—

| " | Financial Year | | |
|-----------------|---------------------------|---------|---------|
| | 1963-64 | 1964-65 | 1965-66 |
| | Numbers of Head of Cattle | | |
| Forsayth .. | 12,919 | 10,936 | 11,278 |
| Einasleigh .. | 2,219 | 2,636 | 3,473 |
| Mt. Surprise .. | 4,057 | 4,581 | 7,295 |
| Mungana .. | 18,256 | 15,022 | 17,064 |
| Almaden .. | 440 | 408 | 625 " |

SALT CONTENT, NORMANTON WATER SUPPLY

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the salt content in the Normanton water supply?

(2) Will he have an early investigation made with a view to the prevention of any inflow of salt water?

Answers:—

- (1) "No."
- (2) "See Answer to (1)."

WATER CONSERVATION SCHEMES,
HERBERT RIVER AND TUMOULIN

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

In view of the Treasurer's Answer to a Question on August 25, 1966, relative to water conservation in North Queensland, will the Herbert River scheme and the Tumoulin scheme on the Millstream be given favourable consideration?

Answer:—

"The Treasurer indicated that a case was being prepared requesting assistance by Commonwealth Departments in wide-spread investigation of water resources development in North Queensland. As far as the Herbert River scheme is concerned this has already been investigated in some detail and no further work is proposed at this stage except for agricultural investigations at the Walkamin and Parada Research Stations where work is considered applicable to a large area of the soils available in the Herbert River scheme. With regard to the Tumoulin scheme this is a relatively small proposal and a good deal of investigation has already been carried out. This will be completed jointly by the Department of Primary Industries and the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission when other commitments, now on hand, have been dealt with."

PUBLIC TRAFFIC LECTURES

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

(1) Has the system of traffic lectures for educating the public in traffic matters been abandoned? If not, how many have been held during the years 1964-65 and 1965-66?

(2) What has been the (a) average attendance and (b) total attendances?

Answers:—

- (1) "Yes."
- (2) "See Answer to (1)."

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

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

What was the Governmental work-force in each of the years 1960-61 to 1965-66?

Answer:—

"If the Honourable Member cares to study the annual reports of the Public Service Commissioner for the years in question, he will find the information he is seeking."

DREDGING OF MANLY FORESHORES

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

In addition to the original plan to establish a channel at the site of the public ramp at the Queensland Yacht Club, Manly, will the Government consider the dredging of the foreshores at Manly to a depth of two feet at low water?

Answer:—

"I presume the Honourable Member refers to the foreshores within the Manly Boat Harbour. The plan is to dredge the harbour to depths varying from two to six feet at low water and pump the spoil to reclamation on the present harbour foreshore. The land so reclaimed will be used for car parking, boating clubs purposes and recreation parks."

WARNING SIGNS, RECLAIMED LAND,
MANLY

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

As three children were nearly suffocated on August 21, 1966, as a result of falling into silt in the reclaimed area at Manly, will he cause warning signs to be erected there immediately?

Answer:—

"Warning signs have been erected and the construction area fenced."

LIQUOR PRICES IN TOWNSVILLE

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

(1) Is he aware that the Townsville Hotels Association did not take advantage of the recent liquor price increase, but has stated that any move to increase liquor license fees must cause a review of its policy?

(2) What steps are being or might be taken to assist the Townsville Hotels Association to continue its present policy and also protect the consuming public?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "I have not seen the statement to which the Honourable Member refers. There are numerous factors, of which liquor license fees are one, involved in the cost structure of this commodity and there is ample power in the Liquor Acts for the protection of the consuming public whenever this is necessary."

BOAT HARBOUR DEVELOPMENT,
CABBAGE TREE CREEK

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

In view of his statement in *The Courier-Mail* of June 1, 1966, that State Cabinet had approved the second \$164,300 stage of the Cabbage Tree Creek boat harbour development at Sandgate, has this work commenced and, if so, how much has been completed and how much of the approved allocation has been expended?

Answer:—

“Work on the second stage of the Cabbage Tree Creek boat harbour development commenced on June 9, 1966. Work authorizations amounting to \$33,740 have been issued for 20,000 cubic yards of ash fill and 6,000 cubic yards of revetment rock to be placed between Palm Avenue and the Yacht Club. Expenditure to date on ash fill has amounted to \$3,500.”

FORM OF QUESTION

Mr. CHINCHEN (Mt. Gravatt) having given notice of a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! If the hon. member is asking whether a statement in a newspaper is true, his question is not in order under the Standing Orders. I shall have a look at it later.

ORDER IN CHAMBER DURING
QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There appears to be quite a deal of long-range conversation going on in the Chamber during question time; I ask that it cease.

There is plenty of room for the hon. member for Maryborough to sit beside the hon. member to whom he is speaking.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

The Water Acts, 1926 to 1964.

The River Improvement Trust Acts, 1940 to 1965.

Regulations under—

The Burials Assistance Act of 1965.

The Health Acts, 1937 to 1964.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—FOURTH AND FIFTH
ALLOTTED DAYS

Debate resumed from 25 August (see p. 293) on Mr. E. G. W. Wood's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. NEWBERY (Mirani) (11.19 a.m.): I wish first of all to express my loyalty to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth, and secondly

to congratulate His Excellency Sir Alan Mansfield and Lady Mansfield on Sir Alan's appointment to the high and important office of Governor of this State. I join with other hon. members in applauding the appointment of such a learned and respected Queenslander to that position. I have no doubt that both Sir Alan and Lady Mansfield will discharge their many and varied duties with credit not only to themselves but also to our State.

I also extend my congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, on your re-election to your high office.

My congratulations are extended also to the mover and the seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. They have both made useful contributions to this debate and, I believe, will continue to serve their electorates and the people of Queensland in a manner worthy of the trust imposed in them by their electors.

Twelve months ago I was privileged to move the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and I take this opportunity to thank many hon. members for the help and courtesy extended to me during my first year as the representative of the important electorate of Mirani. I also extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to my electors, and assure them that I will do my utmost to serve them in a manner fitting the confidence they have shown in me. I am deeply grateful to all those people who so freely assisted me during my election campaign and on election day. To them I say “Thank you”.

The first subject I should like to discuss this morning is education. I commend the Minister for Education on the advances made in education generally, particularly in my electorate of Mirani. I trust that there will be no relaxation in the progress which has been noticeable in that electorate over recent years. In secondary education, the development in my electorate has been dramatic. With the establishment of complete high schools at Sarina and Mirani, and feeder-bus services from nearby centres to those schools, more than 500 students are now receiving secondary education in the Mirani electorate, whereas only a few years ago no children at all were attending high school in my electorate. In fact, the only high school in the whole of the Mackay region was in Mackay, and I understand that in those days 16 children from my electorate were attending that school, which was established many years ago by a non-Labour Government. This is a service this Government is giving to country areas—a real service and something that, as we all know, was lacking for far too many years. Most of our youth were deprived of the opportunity of securing a higher education, which is so essential today in primary and secondary industries and also in commerce.

However, the job is not yet complete in my electorate. I must again mention, as I did in the House last year, the urgent need

to provide a high-school top for the Eungella Range area. Eungella, as all hon. members know, is principally a dairying district, with the Eungella Dam under construction only a few miles away. Timber and forestry development and the tourist and pastoral industries supplement dairying in the area. Sooner or later, of course, the traffic west of the Eungella area will pass through the Eungella area to the coast at Mackay.

A tutor to assist students taking secondary education by correspondence was appointed to the Eungella State School from the commencement of the 1966 school year. Unfortunately the appointment came too late, and most of the students whose parents could afford to send them to boarding school had either left for boarding school or had been booked in. The Minister allowed the tutor to remain at Eungella so that the system could be put on trial. Initially it was welcomed, but with some reservations. The reservations, of course, were associated with the late appointment.

Apparently the system has not proved successful, as my last advice is that the Eungella Secondary Department Sub-committee has applied for the establishment of a secondary-department school bus service for the Eungella area, starting from Dalrymple Heights, going through the Eungella township and being met there by a private bus from the Crediton area. It is estimated that 26 children from this area could be involved.

I understand that in the first place a minimum enrolment of 21 students was necessary for the establishment of a high-school-top facility. The Sarina school, which obtained a high-school top eight years ago, finished its first year with a much smaller number; I understand it was in the vicinity of 14. Later, a minimum number of 24 was quoted but now 26 students are not sufficient. Sarina commenced with 21 students and now has an enrolment of 250. Later, Mirani commenced with a small enrolment but it now has an enrolment of 260.

Of course, Eungella has not the immediate potential that these two areas had, but it has the potential to warrant a high-school-top facility. It should not be deprived of it because of its isolation; its isolation should be a factor in favour of a high-school top. It appears that the Eungella people are grasping at the last straw in asking for a transport service. I will support the establishment of this service as it has been stated that the scheme could benefit the greatest number in the shortest time. I am afraid that if this bus service is provided to the secondary school it will become permanent and that Eungella will never get a high-school top.

The transport service would travel over 80 miles for some students in that area and the Eungella Range would have to be negotiated twice daily. The Government has spent about \$200,000 on the Eungella section and it has an excellent surface, but I do not relish

the idea of school children having to traverse this very steep range twice a day. In fact, I myself do not feel very comfortable when I am driving up and down it.

I realise that my remarks may be used to prevent the establishment of the bus service—if they are, I believe that the Government is duty bound to give Eungella adequate secondary-school facilities whatever the cost, and I ask for it from the commencement of the 1967 school year. A decision on this matter has been held in suspense for many years and the proposed bus service is the last straw. We have no right to drive the people of the area to take this action, but that is just what is being done. The Minister is well aware of the position. He has been to Eungella and he knows the range. He has spoken to the Eungella people; he knows that Eungella is in a growing area and is not a dead end.

I applauded the Minister's action in appointing a tutor to the Eungella area on trial, but apparently this scheme has failed. I now appeal to him to establish high-school-top facilities, at least to the Junior standard. As I have said, the cost would be considerable but we must bear in mind that the cost for the Eungella people is considerable. As we all know, the Eungella people who wish to give their children a secondary-school education, even to the Junior standard, have to send them away from home. I believe that, given adequate secondary education facilities for their children, country people will remain in the country. Surely that is what we need.

The only other urgent need in secondary education in my electorate is final approval to proceed with the second wing of the high school at Sarina. It is only two or three years since the new high school was built and already so many people are taking advantage of this benefit that a second wing is needed. Unless something is done immediately in this regard the classrooms will be overcrowded and there will be complete chaos in this school.

Really good progress is being made in the Mirani electorate in the provision of primary education, and the backlog of years ago is gradually being overtaken. We are getting new schools, as well as new residences and new flats for teaching staffs.

I have received complaints from the parents and citizens' associations about staff living conditions. Firstly, I refer to the supply of water. The department supplies tanks, but in the last two years tanks have been of little use as there has been insufficient rain to get water into them. Bores are needed in this area so that there can be an adequate supply of water, not only for school needs, but also for septic systems, hot-water systems, and even gardening. A hot-water system is of no use to people who have only a tank, and country teachers deserve a hot-water service and septic facilities.

In this area tanks quite often cost more than bores and supply less water. Bores have been installed at some schools. Some of them were put down under a subsidy scheme more than 20 years ago. After being used for that length of time they need replacing, but there would be difficulty getting the subsidy paid by the department. The bores should be renewed without cost to the parents and citizens' association. A good water supply is essential in school areas. I know of no school in my electorate that could not be supplied by a bore. I ask the Minister for Works and Housing to give sympathetic consideration to the several proposals I have previously submitted to him along these lines.

There should be a continuance of and progressive increase in State aid to private schools. In my electorate there are many small communities and one cannot help being impressed by the service that these schools, all of them primary, by the way, give to so many of our young people whose parents wish to have their children educated in a private school. These people pay for the right to send their children to private schools, but we must keep in mind that they also share the cost of financing our State educational system even though they do not use the primary section of it. Therefore, it seems only right that the State should assist the private schools more. If the students in the private schools were sent to State schools, many millions of dollars would be needed to provide the educational facilities and staff for them.

Financial assistance given to private schools is simply a case of helping others to help themselves. I ask the Minister to consider extending this help and the possibility of granting subsidies to private schools for the establishment of school libraries and the provision of sporting equipment. These are important aspects of education, which is the stepping stone to citizenship. The cost of this has been the responsibility of parents and other citizens.

To assist private schools in meeting their administration costs, I suggest that the urgent need is for more forms of financial aid for the provision of lay teachers and school furnishings. These at present are not subsidised by the Government. I have no doubt whatever that those responsible for providing private schools appreciate the progressive increase in the help that the Government has given to them, and I should like the Minister to give every consideration to their immediate needs.

I should now like to deal briefly but not from a critical angle, with the sugar industry.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I should like to advise the House that on two previous occasions during this session when hon. members have referred to the sugar industry I have warned them not to make their discussions too wide. I have since given this matter further thought. Past experience has shown

that private members' motions well down on the Business Paper are seldom debated, but while they remain there other debates are necessarily restricted. As it appears that there is only a remote possibility that the motion submitted by the hon. member for Mourilyan will be debated, I propose to allow discussion on the all-important subject of the sugar industry rather than find later that the opportunity for open debate has been lost to the House. The hon. member for Mourilyan has not yet spoken in the Address-in-Reply debate, and I mention this matter now so that he will have his opportunity to speak on this subject later.

Mr. NEWBERY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Although the sugar industry is often discussed in this House, I have begun to wonder how many hon. members and citizens, particularly those not directly connected with the industry, realise its importance to Queensland, and indeed to Australia, and the precarious position in which it finds itself today. Far too many people are ignorant of just how bad is the financial position of the sugar industry today.

How important is this industry? Probably its greatest value to Australia is, firstly, its tremendous contribution to our national income and, secondly, the way in which it is developing the north of Australia in general, and Queensland in particular. It is a large employer of labour, to the extent that total employment in the industry today is in excess of 22,000 people. These include 8,000 mill workers; 4,644 manual field cane-cutters; 2,810 harvester operators and labourers; 3,000 full-time field workers; plus permanent workers for the season totalling approximately 4,000.

Many people say that the industry has had good years and, because of that, why cannot millers and growers carry themselves through this financial slump? I am setting out to tell the people of this State, and hon. members in this Chamber, what the cost to the sugar industry has been. It has been phenomenal. What our critics fail to realise is that the industry was requested to almost double its output in a matter of three years. The industry has fulfilled its obligation to produce and treat the crop of cane, but at tremendous cost to both millers and growers. This, together with falling world prices, drought in the southern areas, on the one hand, and wet conditions in the northern areas, has brought extremely excessive and embarrassing burdens to all sections of the industry.

What does the sugar industry do financially for this State and for Australia? I have taken out some figures from the last Year Book, which was issued in September, 1965. Of course, we all agree that Australia's greatest need is increased exports, and I think we all agree, too, that it is far better to gain overseas balances from exports rather than from loans. For the financial

year ended 30 June, 1964, the total exports of Queensland primary products were valued at £272,500,000. Of this, £77,300,000 was from sugar, compared with £73,900,000 from wool. The gross revenue from the 1,600,000 tons of cane produced in 1963 was £105,600,000.

Following the adoption of the Gibbs Report by the Queensland Government late in 1963, expansion unparalleled in the history of the sugar industry took place. Peaks were increased by 1,000,000 tons of 94 n.t. sugar. I might mention in passing that this is estimated to return \$79.6 million this year on peaks. The expansion enabled 27 of the 31 mills to increase their crushing rate from 164 tons an hour in 1963 to 168 tons an hour in 1965. I am sure there will be further big increases in the crushing rates when the expansion of some mills is completed. One single-train mill that I know of has already exceeded 300 tons an hour, and a number of others are getting close to that rate.

The financial expenditure incurred to treat the increased tonnage of cane reached very high proportions. From information available from 29 mills up to the end of 1965, it is clear that they were committed to spend, or already had spent, capital in excess of \$92,000,000, and, before the expansion is consolidated, the expenditure on the milling side will be more than \$100,000,000. This will mean that, on an average, each mill will be undertaking capital expenditure of about \$3,000,000 to increase its crushing rate to the stage at which it will be able to crush the greatly increased quantity of cane supplied to it.

The sugar industry undertook this expansion programme during a period of prosperity. Financial commitments related to the expansion were entered into in the expectation that the following years would be at least moderately prosperous. Thus, if that had been the case, much of the expansion would have been paid for by the ploughing back of profits. It was not expected for one moment, of course, that the world sugar price would remain at the 1963 level; on the other hand, it was not expected that it would fall to the current level of about £16 (stg.) a ton. As a result of the sharp fall in the world market prices of sugar, the profitability of sugar milling has been reduced sharply. Some mills have had losses, and repayment of loans necessary to finance the expansion has proved to be difficult, especially where the expansion was financed by short-term loans. The situation of low returns from sales on the world free market has been worsened in 1964 and 1965, and again this year, by heavy increases in costs, wages, and materials, as well as on reduced through-put of cane, and a consequent increase in costs of production caused by the unseasonal wet weather in the far northern districts of Queensland and the drought in Southern Queensland.

I should like to deal now with the significance of the sugar mills as an economic unit in the manufacture of raw sugar. A sugar mill occupies a far more significant position in the sugar industry than does any comparable factory in any other primary industry—for example, a butter factory in the dairying industry, or a cotton ginny in the cotton industry.

A sugar mill has a large, complex and extremely expensive manufacturing unit and, at today's prices, it would not be possible to build a new mill of average size, with its associated transport system, for less than \$12,000,000. During an average crushing season the average mill crushes 500,000 tons of cane, which would produce somewhere in the vicinity of 60,000 tons of raw sugar with a gross value, on last year's low price, of \$5,000,000.

Another significant point is that sugar mills maintain their own private railways. That is a very important point, and I should like hon. members to take particular note of it.

Mr. Walsh: You mean some of them do.

Mr. NEWBERY: No. All mills control their own private tramlines, as we call them, or railways, for the benefit of hon. members here. On those tramlines they carried last year in excess of 12,500,000 tons loading of cane. According to the 1964 Commonwealth Year Book, during 1962-63 the Queensland Government Railways carried a total of 8.7 million tons of goods and livestock, or only two thirds of the loading that the sugar mill tramlines in the State are carrying today. I point out, too, that we have a length of tramline equal to the distance from Brisbane to Cairns or from Brisbane to Melbourne.

These are simply some features showing the importance of the sugar industry to this State. They are features, of course, that are not appreciated by the critics whom I mentioned earlier in my speech.

All proprietary mills have had sharp falls in their profits. Some have sustained losses, although others, because of their other interests, have managed to scrape through. Co-operative mills, of course, have also been severely affected and some mills have suffered losses. I should mention that one has lost \$170,000 and another \$250,000. I can assure hon. members that the debts of these mills, brought about by the expansion of the industry, are tremendous. Some have reached, I understand, \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000.

Mr. Walsh: You are talking about co-operative mills now, I take it?

Mr. NEWBERY: No, not necessarily co-operative mills.

Of course, the mills have not been the only ones to suffer from the effects of this expansion, the low world market prices and the drought. The growers have been in the

thick of it; they are up to their necks in it and they are really embarrassed with the troubles they are experiencing today.

The price for No. 1 Pool 1965 raw sugar was \$86.58 per ton and the over-all average for Queensland was \$84.58. These prices are the lowest since 1951, with one exception—the 1954 season—while in the meantime the basic wage has risen 69.7 per cent. since 1951. The estimated return for 1966 is in the vicinity of \$78 a ton. The way prices are going today, the probability is that it could be lower. The 1961 acreage of cane harvested totalled 372,000 acres for a gross revenue of £63.1 million, whereas this year it is estimated that 548,000 acres will be harvested for a sugar revenue of only £79.6 million. That is an increase of 176,000 acres, or a 50 per cent. increase in acreage, for a return that is increased by only 25 per cent.

As a result of the increase in mill peaks from 1.22 million tons of 94 net titre sugar in 1961 to 2.16 million tons in 1966, approximately 49 per cent.—a very large proportion—of Queensland sugar is now disposed of on the world's free market, compared with approximately 25 per cent. previously. At £16 sterling a ton for free market sugar this falls far short of cost of production for both miller and grower. I estimate that the loss this crushing year, based on the figure of £16 (stg) a ton, would be tens of millions of dollars. I estimate that the loss to the industry would be within the vicinity of at least \$30,000,000.

The gross assignment at 30 June, 1966, was 749,345 acres, an increase of 158,694 acres over the previous figure, made up of 85,405 acres given to the old growers and 73,289 acres to the new growers. The clearing and preparation of the land, the planting, the purchase of equipment and fertiliser, and many other cost factors associated with the growing and harvesting of the crop, have reduced many in the industry to the bread-line. I estimate conservatively that \$100,000,000 has been spent by the cane-farmers—that includes the old growers and the new growers—on the expansion of the industry. The new grower, of course, has had a tremendous expenditure. In his case I estimate that \$40,000 would be close to the mark for his expenditure in establishing a new farm. The 8,048 old growers have had to meet considerably increased costs to clear their new assignments and get the land into production. Of course, clearing costs have not been their only expenditure; they have had to introduce irrigation and mechanical harvesting. I have here some very interesting figures about irrigation.

Prior to 1963, 75,000 acres of cane were irrigated throughout Queensland. That figure has risen by 100 per cent., because today the sugar industry has 150,000 acres under irrigation. Of course, the big increase in irrigation was in the Mackay and Bundaberg areas. Today in the Burdekin area there are 75,000 acres under irrigation,

25,000 acres in the Mackay area, which had very little irrigation prior to 1963, and 50,000 acres in the Bundaberg area. This all costs money. I should say that to establish a new irrigation plant on a farm would cost something like \$200 an acre. Today 25 per cent. of the sugar-cane in the State is irrigated and 50 per cent. of the irrigated land in Queensland is growing sugar-cane.

Another very interesting item is the cost of installation, which has been a big embarrassment to the industry. With the 100 per cent. increase in irrigation over the last three years, \$15,000,000 has been spent on the installation of new irrigation plants in the Queensland industry. Most of that expenditure, of course, has been in the Bundaberg and Mackay areas. On the mechanical side, we have had the introduction of mechanical harvesting. It has been said, of course, that the introduction of mechanical harvesting is depriving men of work, but had it not been for the very large introduction of mechanical harvesting we could not possibly have hoped to harvest today's crop. To harvest today's estimated crop of 15,300,000 tons we would have needed 12,500 cane-cutters to cut and shoulder load. Today, with the introduction of cane harvesters, we have 4,800 cutters who are cutting and loading with mechanical loaders. The introduction of mechanical harvesters by the growers has cost them \$11-1/3rd million. That is a tremendous sum, and for the Queensland growers the total cost adds up to well over \$100,000,000.

A very important requirement for the sugar industry today is that it be established as a stable and reliable exporter so as to secure a substantial quota if and when a new International Sugar Agreement is framed. To do this we must produce and sell to world buyers irrespective of the prevailing prices. We must continue to produce to the limit and establish in the eyes of the world sugar consumers our ability to do so, and also to prove beyond doubt to the delegates at the next International Sugar Conference that we can, and will, honour our agreement to supply.

The industry is now fulfilling these requirements and has established these facts but, of course, the industry cannot continue producing this free market sugar to the extent of 1,000,000 tons, at a loss of tens of millions of dollars, for the sake of establishing a quota for export for national income. This will benefit the whole Commonwealth and I therefore claim that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to finance the loss on the world free market export sugar. It should not be financed by the people in the industry, which is on the verge of bankruptcy and desperately needs immediate assistance on the 1,000,000 tons of free market sugar. I urge the Federal Government to release its proposals for relief at the earliest possible opportunity.

I now wish to refer to another matter concerning cane-growers' representation. In this House last year I urged the Government to

adopt the recommendations of the committee of inquiry which was established to examine the constitution of the Queensland Cane Growers' Council so far as it related to cane-growers' representatives from the various mill areas. Other persons and cane-grower organisations also made similar approaches to the Government. Subsequently approval of the recommendations was given, but so far they have not been implemented. I urge the Minister for Primary Industries to give urgent attention to this matter and thus enable more equitable grower-representation, as recommended to operate.

Finally, I wish to mention motor vehicle drivers' licences and relate them especially to the sugar industry. There exists today a very annoying and, at times, a very damaging aspect of administration as it relates to the issue of licences for drivers of motor vehicles. Let us consider a farmer who, in the course of his business, runs a private car, a motor truck, a tractor, and a motor utility. He is required to secure four separate certificates of vehicle registration and pays four separate fees for drivers' licences, yet he is issued with only one driver's licence. He must carry this document with him wherever he goes in the course of his work.

This is not as simple as it sounds. It may be simple for many hon. members here, but for the man in the country it is very difficult. When driving a tractor which has to proceed along or cross a road, or a truck loaded with cane or other produce, a farmer is not usually dressed in a way that allows him to preserve documents on his person. The work is such that he just cannot keep a document in reasonable order on his person. I left Mackay only yesterday, and any document carried by a farm worker or farmer in the field yesterday would have been unreadable by midday.

(Time expired.)

Mr. NEWTON (Belmont) (12 noon): As this is the first session of the Thirty-eighth Parliament, I extend to the electors of Belmont my sincere thanks for the vote of confidence they have again extended to me for the work that has been done on their behalf in the past six years. They have my assurance that their personal problems and the problems affecting the Belmont electorate will at all times receive the same attention as has been given to them in the past six years.

I thank my campaign director, Mr. Fabian, the Australian Labour Party branches and branch members, and members of the affiliated unions who assisted me during my campaign. As Assistant State Campaign Director for the A.L.P., I thank those people who studied the policy of the Australian Labour Party which was brought down in the interests of the people of Queensland and Queensland itself, and gave us a very good vote on this occasion.

The new members of this Assembly who have spoken have mentioned many interesting topics. No doubt during the term of

this session many controversial issues and issues with which the Opposition does not entirely agree will be referred to. I congratulate particularly the new Opposition members, namely, Mrs. Jordan from Ipswich West, Mr. P. Wood from Toowoomba East, and Mr. Harris from Wynnum. The contribution made by those new Opposition members indicated the great deal of work they put into preparing their speeches, and also that they have already taken steps to do what is required of members of Parliament, that is, to get to know their electorates and the various problems associated with them.

I was very interested in the contribution of the mover of this motion, the hon. member for Logan, and particularly in what he had to say about the Tingalpa Creek bridge, which we have been seeking for some time, to link the Logan and Belmont electorates. It was only on 27 April this year that I again raised this matter with the Premier in an effort to ascertain what progress was being made. Unfortunately, owing to the heavy commitments of the Loan Council, the reply was not as favourable as I had hoped. Because of the water supply scheme in the Logan electorate, the Co-ordinator-General is of the opinion that he will not be able to undertake this work in the 1966-67 programme. It is to be hoped that this project will be given early consideration, because it is vitally needed to compensate in some way for the closure of the railway branch line.

The hon. member for Wynnum, Mr. Harris, whose electorate also adjoins mine, has my wholehearted support in continuing the agitation of the previous member for Wynnum, Mr. Bill Gunn, for a hospital to cater for the needs of Wynnum and the surrounding district. I have spoken about this project on many occasions, because a large portion of my electorate adjoins the Wynnum electorate.

The hon. member for Wynnum also has my full support in endeavouring to avert the closure of the passenger rail service from South Brisbane to Wynnum. This form of transport means a lot to the people of Lota West, Wynnum West and Manly West in my electorate.

I am sorry that Mr. Speaker is not in the chair, because I should like to express my appreciation of his assistance and words of wisdom during the time that I was a member of the Parliamentary Buildings Committee.

Mr. Davies: I cannot understand why the Liberals want to toss him out.

Mr. NEWTON: That is so.

I want to say quite openly that, irrespective of what might happen inside this Chamber, at all meetings of the Parliamentary Buildings Committee that I attended, Mr. Speaker, as chairman, at all times, and in all matters administered by that committee, had the welfare of hon. members at heart.

I have not ceased to be a member of that committee because possibly the foundations of the building are at present a little shaky, but because I feel that other hon. members should have the opportunity to learn what takes place in the workings of this committee.

Great words of advice have been given over a period of time by Mr. Speaker on what may and may not take place in this Chamber. If members ask provocative questions, of course they must expect to receive provocative answers. The same applies to debates. Some debates proceed quite happily, whilst others become controversial and some even of a very fiery nature. When this atmosphere is introduced and the Opposition is affected, it has always been our policy to meet fire with fire. It is for this reason that the first subject on which I intend to speak in this debate is the scandalous and scurrilous attack recently made on members of the Australian Labour Party by the hon. member for Gregory.

Mr. Bromley: They tell me men drink with him in hotels but won't go home with him.

Mr. NEWTON: That is rumoured; I do not know whether it is correct. As a member of the Parliamentary Labour Party, and one who has been on the Queensland Central Executive, the governing body of the party, since 1955, I cannot allow the hon. member's statements to go unchallenged. I have listened during numerous debates in the House to similar slanderous Red-baiting, but there is no doubt in my mind that if the hon. member for Gregory had been confronted by any of those whom he named in the House the other day, or if they had come to see him personally, he would not even have known who they were. There is no doubt in my mind that he received a brief either of a personal nature or as the result of a meeting that took place in the bar at Parliament House before he spoke in the Chamber that evening.

If that is not so, there can be only one other explanation: that he had a brief. It is well known on this side of the House—it has been indicated to us, strangely enough—that whenever back-bench members of the Government parties want information on persons in their electorates with whom they wish to deal, briefs are available to them. However, I say on behalf of the Opposition that on this occasion the hon. member for Gregory did not avail himself of that opportunity, because if he had had information from the security police in this State, he could have elaborated on the charges that he made against the gentlemen on the Queensland Central Executive of the Australian Labour Party to whom he referred as Communists.

Mr. Walsh: You won't deny that Vickers stood as a Communist?

Mr. NEWTON: I do not deny that. I think my colleague the hon. member for Ipswich East made that position quite clear in this House on an earlier occasion when an attack of this type was made on Mr. Vickers, so I do not intend to cover that ground again.

Let me repeat the note of warning that was sounded by the hon. member for Baroona. Continual attacks on decent members of the Australian Labour Party only assist the Communist Party in Queensland. It has always been the policy of the Australian Labour Party to encourage its members in the trade union movement to take an active part in the affairs of their unions. By continually smearing members of the Australian Labour Party who want to do something for the particular union to which they belong, hon. members opposite are chasing them out of union affairs. The stage is being reached when they will not accept positions in the trade union movement because of this smearing and the slanderous and scurrilous attacks that are made on them under the privilege extended to hon. members in this House.

Mr. Bromley: The hon. member for Gregory did not say anything about Charles Porter being in the Communist Party at one time, did he?

Mr. NEWTON: No! that is true. Something may be said about that at a later date.

Now let me take the matter a little further. If hon. members opposite intend to make a practice in this House of attempting to put Red smears on the Australian Labour Party, I think it is high time that members of the Opposition put before the House something that the parties in the coalition Government of the State might well consider in relation to their own actions.

It is somewhat peculiar that on a number of occasions words have been thrown round very loosely in this House about the coalition being a marriage of convenience and references made to "bedmates." Let us look at what happened in the Warwick by-election in 1963 and in the Albert electorate in the recent elections. On the question of "bedmates" and who is who in the coalition parties, what did Mr. Harley, who in the recent election contested the Albert seat for the Liberal Party, say? During the Warwick by-election campaign he had quite a bit to say about the Country Party. Instead of debating the Red issue or attempting to exercise his lungs on this subject, the hon. member for Gregory could have used his time much better by supporting his colleague Mr. Cory in the Warwick by-election and supporting Mr. Carey in the seat of Albert in the recent election. I have here a letter published in the "Warwick Daily News" during the by-election campaign, and it was published again during the recent election campaign for the seat of Albert.

This is what it says—

"Sir, The nominations for the seat of Warwick have produced quite a number of candidates who have the respect of the people of the electorate and this, in itself, is a good thing. Many people refrain from nominating for public office because of the unsavoury tactics used by party machines to discredit the candidate personally in the eyes of the electors.

"This is happening at this very moment in Warwick to one of its most respected citizens, who has seen fit to nominate in a democratic manner, and it is common knowledge in the South East of Queensland that the Country Party is by innuendo and whispering campaigns hoping to discredit Mr. Bob Simpson, Independent, in the eyes of the electors, to such an extent that it hopes to secure his defeat.

"The present control of the Country Party is in the hands of men who know not the words 'respect', 'decency', 'fair play' or 'principle' —"

Mr. Davies: Who said this?

Mr. NEWTON: Mr. Harley. This is in a letter he wrote to the "Warwick Daily News" during the Warwick by-election.

To quote further from the letter, he said—

"The present control of the Country Party is in the hands of men who know not the words 'respect', 'decency', 'fair play' or 'principle', but who operate in a manner that leaves the Communists with a lot to learn in the art of the opposite to democracy."

That is the very point that we on this side of the House have been stressing in connection with the recent outburst made by the hon. member for Gregory. After all, if we believe in democracy—and as members of this Chamber we say we do—we must strongly resent these things being used by a particular party as this one has recently been. If Country Party members want to debate the Red issue, let them also defend themselves against this smear by Mr. Harley.

Mr. Carey: That is a frightful accusation.

Mr. NEWTON: Of course it is. It nearly brought about the hon. member's defeat, together with the fact that this same person would not allow the hon. member to go to the depots down there because he believed what he said in this letter. If the hon. member's colleague, the hon. member for Gregory, was concerned about these things and wanted to get rid of some of his spleen, why did he not take action in the Warwick by-election or assist in the hon. member's election in Albert?

Turning now to the other section of the coalition, I have here a report in one of the local newspapers of a meeting of a branch of the Young Liberal Party. This again is very interesting because it seems that these people can associate with anybody yet no Red smear is placed on them.

Mr. Bromley: Do the Young Liberals associate with young Fascists?

Mr. NEWTON: I would not be surprised whom they associated with, particularly when one reads this article, which appeared in the suburban newspaper, "The Times", on 16 March, 1966—

"Comms. and Libs. in Wavell tug-o-war!"

"For two hours, Wavell Young Liberals fired searching questions at the guest speaker at their monthly meeting last week.

"The speaker was Acting State President of the Communist Party of Australia, Mr. Charles Gifford."

That was a meeting of the Young Liberal Branch of the Liberal Party.

Mr. R. Jones: What would happen if the Young Labour Association asked a Communist to speak?

Mr. NEWTON: A smear would be bandied around this Chamber.

To read on—

"At the meeting on March 8, Mr. Gifford told 63 Young Liberals of his association with the Communist Party."

Following the article through we find something of further interest. One of the best-Red-baiters in the House, a member of the Cabinet, was present. The meeting was attended by the Minister for Industrial Development.

Mr. Houston: The Young Liberals!

Mr. NEWTON: Oh, no; he is a seasoned one. He is seasoned in these Red-baiting tactics. Again it is quite O.K. if he appears at a meeting. Do not tell me that a platform is any different from a meeting; it is the same thing as far as we are concerned. They say it is for us, and if it fits us it must fit them on that side.

Mr. Houston: Didn't he move a vote of thanks?

Mr. NEWTON: In fairness to Mr. Dewar, the article reads—

"He described it as the greatest lot of nonsense he had ever heard and said Australia would never accept Communism because it left out the most important fact inherent in all energetic men—the desire of people to better themselves."

That is what Mr. Dewar said. Let us see what Mr. Duus, the chairman, said, according to the report—

"Chairman of Wavell Young Liberals, Mr. Ross Duus, said later he was pleased with the interest aroused among the members of his branch by the discussion.

"He said: 'Mr. Gifford was called upon to answer a barrage of questions relating to everything from trade union ballots to the Berlin Wall question. Some very searching questions were asked and both Mr. Gifford and Mr. Dewar answered.'"

So it was a decent sort of unity job, wasn't it? Apparently at question time someone put a question to Mr. Gifford and then someone else addressed one to Mr. Dewar. Yet we hear all this ballyhoo and tommy-rot about unity, Red smears and all that sort of thing.

The article continues—

"At a meeting late last year, there was a representative of the Waterside Workers' Federation.

"Mr. Duus said: 'I don't believe there is any danger in introducing these people and it stimulates thought among the Young Liberals.'

"Mr. Duus plans to introduce another controversial speaker at the next meeting in April."

We find that there was a decent sort of "barney" with Mr. James who is well-known to us on this side of the House as the representative of the Queensland Employers' Federation. The newspaper report states—

"Mr. James said on Tuesday that a small but influential group inside the Liberal Party was preaching the latest shade of socialism—'anaemic blue.' He said the group comprised mainly political opportunists in the Young Liberal Party and professional politicians in the Parliamentary branch."

What has been our experience with these three-cornered contests and the battle that is going on at the present time in this State between the Liberal Party and the Country Party? Let us bring the position right out in the open. It is a well-known fact that we have the Tory "blues", and we have the anaemic "blues" up in the back-benches on the Government side. There is no doubt about what would have happened if they had gone ahead with what they intended to do in the Albert electorate. They were going to call for a recount, but somewhere along the line somebody inside the Liberal Party, either the Tory "blues" or the anaemic "blues", got to work because of the embarrassment that it could cause. The recount was not held.

Mr. Carey: They knew they could not win.

Mr. NEWTON: That remains to be seen.

It is no wonder that the Premier of the State—the Leader of the coalition Government—takes things quietly. We have heard the Treasurer saying that he also intends to take things quietly and not disturb anything along the line. It is a well-known fact that the anaemic "blues" in the Liberal Party, if they are ever pressed, will seek political asylum in the Country Party. I have put before the House clearly what is taking place in the Government parties relative to the Red-smear tactics they have waged against the A.L.P. over a period in this House. Let us see if Government members can rise to defend themselves on some of these matters that have been happening

within their own parties; let us see if they have the ability to come back with the same slanderous and scurrilous attack on those who are charging them with doing the very things that they have charged the people in the A.L.P. with doing.

I now intend to deal with a number of problems affecting my electorate. On the eve of the election, before the House rose in December last year, the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt asked questions concerning the proposed take-over of portion of a bus run in the Holland Park West area, in the Belmont electorate, and an extension of the service to other portions of the Belmont electorate. I am not at all happy about this matter. The hon. member for Mt. Gravatt quite rightly raised the matter because it would have affected some bus routes in his electorate if the take-over had taken place and the new routes had applied. When he asked the questions I quickly got busy because the matter affected my electorate, in Mt. Gravatt East, Mt. Gravatt South, Upper Mt. Gravatt, Mt. Petrie, the school bus from Mt. Gravatt South to the convent school at Upper Mt. Gravatt, and also buses to the Cavendish Road State High School. After I made strong objections in representations to the Commissioner for Transport, stating that I was very concerned about the attitude adopted, I eventually received a letter, on 6 December, setting out what was happening.

Much has been said about the Wilbur Smith Report in this debate. As it has taken the Department of Transport so long to give consideration to this request, which was brought to our attention first by the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt and then by me in December—and we have not yet had a decision from the department—I can only say, "God help the metropolitan area if the Wilbur Smith Report, so far as it affects the transport system in the metropolitan area, is implemented."

Mr. Hughes: Do you favour the retention of trams?

Mr. NEWTON: In the Kurilpa electorate people matters I raised was the provision of bus transport. But in my electorate buses are the main form of transport provided by either the Brisbane City Council or a private company. On numerous occasions in the House I have pointed out that transport would have to be provided in the newly opened areas in my electorate.

After being elected in 1960, one of the first matters I raised was the provision of bus transport in the Mt. Gravatt South portion of my electorate. I got a quicker result on that occasion, even though all the spade work had to be done. Within 12 months approval was given to the Mt. Gravatt Bus Service to go into that area and provide a feeder bus service to the Mt. Gravatt tram terminus so that working people and their families, and school children, would not have to walk a great distance to transport in either Logan Road or Broadwater Road.

Many endeavours have been made to ensure that a reasonable service is provided in Mt. Gravatt East and Upper Mt. Gravatt. Efforts were made to get either the local bus company, the Mt. Gravatt Bus Service, to provide a feeder bus service into this area, or the Brisbane City Council to extend its Cavendish Road trolley bus service. We have there at present the same position as that which existed in Mt. Gravatt South in 1960, when people had to walk up to two miles to the trolley bus terminus at Elgar Street, Holland Park, or to the Mt. Gravatt tram terminus.

When the Mt. Gravatt South State School was opened, the private bus company was approached to provide a school bus service. In fairness to the manager of the company, who is well known to me and well respected by me, he intimated to me that he could not provide the service because he did not have a bus to put on that run.

The proposed new service, which is required in that area, has been held up for eight months to our knowledge, and possibly longer, since the applications were lodged by interested parties. An extra bus service, apart from the service in the Holland Park West area for which the Brisbane City Council is willing to pay £16,000 to Mt. Gravatt Bus Service, should be provided in this area. There is no reason why both bus services should not operate in my electorate. Transport is extremely important. I hope that a quick decision will be made on this matter so that people in my electorate can enjoy an amenity that is long overdue.

I shall now deal with a matter raised by the hon. members for Salisbury and Baroona. Since Parliament resumed we have heard a very sorry tale from the Treasurer, supported by the Premier, in a number of articles that have appeared in the Press. Two weeks before the Brisbane Exhibition we heard a number of sob stories about the finances of the State. During Exhibition Week, page after page appeared in the "Telegraph" stressing the great advance that has taken place in Queensland and the huge amount made available by the Government for development. In one long article by the Premier there is a very small reference to the wage position in Queensland. He said—

"On 18 May the State Industrial Commission increased the Queensland basic wage by \$1.30 for men and \$1.00 for women. About 240,000 men and 82,000 women benefited from the rises. The State basic wage now stands at \$32.70 for men and \$24.45 for women."

The Premier made a great song and dance about this increase.

Let us now examine the Government's attitude to wage increases. As a respondent to the unions' claims for an increase of 6s. in the basic wage, the Government, through the State Public Service Commissioner, replied in these words—

"With reference to the application filed on the Twenty-first day of July, 1965, the Respondent will oppose at this juncture the claims of the applicant Unions for a Declaration of a Basic Wage for the State of Queensland, and will again submit that adjustments in this wage should be considered and determined annually."

That was signed by D. W. Fraser, Public Service Commissioner.

Here again is an example of the Government's endeavouring to prevent the working people from obtaining wage increases due to them. Again the Government can be attacked as a sectional Government. The only people asked to make sacrifices to meet the problems confronting the State are the men on the land who are directly affected by the drought, and the wage-earners. No-one else has been asked to contribute anything.

Let us take another look at the measly increase of \$1.30 granted for election purposes, before the election. The adjustment for the September quarter was announced as 5s., and the figure for the December quarter was 6s. The workers were therefore already entitled to 11s. When the decision was given on 20 September their entitlement was 12s., that is, if the 1s. to which they were entitled under the prescribed formula, and which they did not receive in the September decision, had been added. But what did they get? Following the introduction of decimal currency, they received 1s. to cover increased costs brought about by the introduction of decimal currency. That is all the Government gave them to cover price increases. Of course, hon. members opposite claim that prices have not risen. As a family man who does the shopping for his family, let me tell them that if they endeavour to pull the wool over our eyes in this manner, we will be able to give them a number of answers.

It is interesting to note that the Premier referred to the fare increases imposed by the Brisbane City Council. I am pleased that the Minister for Education is present. Children's fares in the metropolitan area have been increased to the extent that they are now 5s. a week, and the Minister must realise fully what it means to his department if they go any higher, as far as bus services in the metropolitan areas are concerned.

(Time expired.)

Mr. CAMPBELL (Aspley) (12.40 p.m.): I join with other hon. members in extending my congratulations to hon. members who have been elected to this Assembly for the first time. Each has made a very significant contribution to the debate on this motion and has indicated that he or she possesses creative thoughts that will be of assistance to the House. I believe that, in some measure or other in the future, those hon. members will make their mark, and I hope they will be able to maintain the high resolve that they have displayed already.

It is very pleasing to see, once again, a woman representative in this House in the person of the hon. member for Ipswich West. Her election is very fitting, too, because today members of the fair sex display a much greater political awareness than they have previously. I regret that the Liberal Party did not see fit to take advantage of the opportunity presented to it in the recent election and have at least one woman member of the party elected to the Parliament of Queensland.

Mr. Houston: You can have one in Aspley next election.

Mr. CAMPBELL: She is welcome.

I congratulate the Leaders of the Government parties, Mr. Nicklin and Mr. Chalk, on their successful leadership in the recent election campaign, which resulted in a vote of confidence in the Government by the people of Queensland. I suppose I should commiserate with the Leader of the Opposition. He seemed to skirt round the election results in his remarks in this debate. That was understandable, of course, because he must have been very disappointed at being rejected again by the people.

Mr. Davies: Doesn't it embarrass you to know that you are a minority Government, a Government appointed by the minority of the people?

Mr. CAMPBELL: If the hon. member will be patient, some figures that I shall quote later will give a striking commentary on his interjection.

I cannot recall an election campaign that was so devoid of real political issues as was the recent one, and the people left no doubt that they were quite content with the performance of the Government and that they were content to entrust the reins of government to it for another term. Perhaps they were less distrustful of us than they were of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition made some very interesting comments on that point.

The Australian Labour Party endeavoured to make a major issue of prices in the election campaign and had high hopes that the public would regard it as a major issue. Indeed, in opening his campaign the Leader of the Opposition gave prices very high priority on the list of issues that he put forward. He came down strongly in favour of price control. Reference to past experience will show that this advocacy was purely a political fraud, because the Leader of the Opposition knows full well that price control does not prevent price rises. The hon. gentleman was a senior Minister when a very rigid system of price control was in operation, and he knows that it did not prevent the alarming rises in prices that occurred at that time.

Admittedly, last year was a bad year. The index rose by 6.5 points (the greatest increase since the Government took office in 1957), but there were valid reasons for that. Hon.

members are well aware of these reasons because they are still fresh in our minds. They were valid just as there were valid reasons why the price index in 1949-50 jumped five points, in the next year a further eight points, and in 1951-52 a massive 16.7 points. I point out that the five-points advance in 1950, from 62 to 67 points, is in far greater proportion than the movement of 6.5 points, from 133.9 to 140.4 points, which occurred last year. If we were to equate the rise that occurred in 1950 to that which occurred last year, we would find that the latter figure possessed only half the value of the former.

Again relating the 16.7 points rise in the index figure in 1952—a period when the Labour Government maintained a very rigid system of price control—to the current index, it shows that prices in that year rose by 22 per cent. as against 4.7 per cent. this year. I repeat that there were valid reasons for the massive price rises in the early 1950's. Members will recall that there were influences such as the Korean War boom and the inflationary trend of that period. I am surprised that somebody did not mention the Menzies Government, because the figures show that even in 1948-49, during the period of the Chifley Government, there was a rise of 5 points, from 62.1 to 67.1 points.

I did not set out to compare price movements which occurred under this Government with similar experiences when our predecessors were in office, even though the comparison is in our favour, but to point out that reference to past experience shows clearly and distinctly that a system of price control under the jurisdiction of a public official cannot keep prices in check.

The Leader of the Opposition and the Labour Party seek to deceive the public when they prattle all this nonsense about price control. The hon. member for Salisbury is also a keen advocate of price control, but he can be excused because of his limited experience in this matter. The Leader of the Opposition, who was, as I said, a Minister when the Government of the day maintained a rigid system of price control, should know better, because he knows that this advocacy is false.

The Leader of the Opposition, further on in his speech, made reference to redistribution and had this to say on the revision of electoral boundaries—

“I know that all parties are accused of some degree of gerrymandering, but it is commonly accepted by political commentators and observers that the Queensland gerrymander is the worst in the Commonwealth, and worst of all when it comes to redistribution.”

I interposed and asked if he was serious—I really doubted his seriousness—and he replied, “I am very serious about that.”

If the Leader of the Opposition is serious in his allegation that this is the worst gerrymander, let us have a look at the record. Let us compare enrolments in 1956 with those at the last election because, in each case, a redistribution occurred some six years earlier. The charge of the Leader of the Opposition concerning gerrymandering was tied in with the results of the recent election. In 1956 the electorate with the greatest number of electors was Mt. Gravatt; it had 26,307 voters on the roll at the time of the election. The lowest enrolment was for Charters Towers, with 4,367 electors. Therefore, one vote in Charters Towers was the equivalent of six votes in Mt. Gravatt. At the time of the election in May this year the highest enrolment was 18,334, for Salisbury, and the lowest was 7,092, for Mulgrave, which shows that one vote in Mulgrave equalled fewer than three in Salisbury.

Those figures are revealing enough in their import, but when we compare the number of votes cast with the number of seats won we see that a similar consistent position emerges. In 1932, in respect of which the Leader of the Opposition quoted figures the other day, the then Labour Government secured 49.99 per cent. of the votes—a minority vote—and, with 33 seats, secured 53.2 per cent. of the seats. In 1935 it secured 52.49 per cent. of the votes and, with 46 seats, obtained 74.2 per cent. of the seats. In 1938, with 46.55 per cent. of the votes—another minority vote—the Labour Government obtained 45, or 72.8 per cent., of the seats. Hon. members opposite talk about gerrymandering—

Mr. Bennett: You are going back to ancient history.

Mr. CAMPBELL: When we refer to ancient history we find that the Labour Party was a past master in the art of gerrymandering. In 1941 the Labour Government secured 50.48 per cent. of the votes, and with 41 seats won 66.1 per cent. of the seats; in 1944, with 43.85 per cent. of the votes—another minority vote—with 37 seats it secured 59.7 per cent. of the seats; in 1947, with 42.99 per cent. of the votes—another minority vote—with 35 seats it won 56.4 per cent. of the seats.

In 1950, by gaining 46.35 per cent. of the votes, Labour won 43 seats, representing 57.3 per cent. of the seats. In 1953, with 52.52 per cent. of the votes, Labour won 50 seats, representing 66.3 per cent. of the seats. In 1956, with 50.12 per cent. of the votes, Labour won 49 seats, representing 65.3 per cent. of the seats. In 1957 the figure was somewhat reduced because of the intrusion, or the advent, of the D.L.P. and it is difficult to give a comparison.

When we compare the experience of the former Government with that of the present Government, the claims made by the Leader of the Opposition are shown to be completely fallacious. At the 1960 election,

with 42.96 per cent. of the vote the Government won 46 seats, which gave it 61.3 per cent. of the seats. If we take into account that the Q.L.P. gained 12.01 per cent. of the votes cast at that election and that a great proportion of them invariably flowed in the Government's direction, it makes a difference to the comparison. In 1963 the Government gained 43.40 per cent. of the votes, and won 45 seats, representing 60 per cent. of the seats. On that occasion the Q.L.P. gained 7.11 per cent. of the votes, which would make a variation, but one that is not so marked. At the recent election, with 43.73 per cent. of the votes the Government gained 46 seats, representing 61.3 per cent. of the seats, and on this occasion the Q.L.P. received 6.17 per cent. of the votes.

Mr. Bennett: All this does not clear your conscience.

Mr. CAMPBELL: My conscience is perfectly clear. I wonder how the hon. member's is.

Mr. Bennett: I can only say that mine is better than yours.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The figures I have quoted have no doubt worried some hon. members, but they are very revealing to others and demonstrate the nonsense of the claims made by the Leader of the Opposition about gerrymandering. I repeat my earlier comment that past history reveals that when it comes to gerrymandering the members of the Labour Party were past masters in the art.

We of the Liberal Party believe in the principle of one vote, one value, with a tolerance of 20 per cent. either way. Personally, I have yet to discover how this principle may be implemented in a State like Queensland and yet give equality of representation. I represent one of the larger metropolitan electorates, yet it contains only 13 square miles. I can drive across it in half an hour. When we compare it with the vast distances of the western areas of the State we realise how difficult is the task of implementing this principle, to which I think all hon. members on this side of the House subscribe.

(Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.)

Mr. CAMPBELL: I wish to reply to some of the remarks made by the hon. member for Townsville North. He seldom says anything of note but on this occasion he was unkind enough to say, relative to the election campaign in Townsville North—

"Of course, I know the Liberal Party now owes a substantial amount of money in respect to the last election campaign and has had to make arrangements to repay it bit by bit."

For the information of the hon. member, the accounts of the Townsville North Campaign Committee of the Liberal Party were paid with the customary promptness.

The hon. member criticised claims made by our candidate, Mr. Bonnett, who increased his vote from 3,639 in 1963 to 4,919 in the last election, an increase of 7.5 per cent. I commented during the hon. member's speech that he must have spent some sleepless nights before the count was completed, and he bridled somewhat. Apparently he is sensitive about the fact that at one stage he was close to being defeated. As the count progressed his majority was gradually reduced towards break-even point. However, he was fortunate enough to stave off the drift against him and retain his seat, and I say good luck to him. However, if during this troublesome time he was not worried, as he tries to imply, he was either indifferent to his return or was unaware of the consequences of the Q.L.P. preferences.

I wish to comment and elaborate on some points made by the hon. member for Ipswich West in her maiden speech. The hon. member urged that the Government could do something to provide an emergency housekeeper service and gave an analysis of what is required in such circumstances. For her benefit, and the benefit of other hon. members, I inform the House that there is in existence such a body which is rendering a tremendous service to the community. Perhaps I should indicate just how it came into being.

The Hon. J. D. Herbert, Minister for Labour and Tourism, took the initiative last year and called a public meeting which was held at the Y.M.C.A. It was attended by 70 or 80 people representing virtually every major organisation in Brisbane with "community activity" as one of its aims. Arising from the discussion at that meeting a decision was made to institute this type of service, and the title "Queensland Home Help Service" was adopted.

A management committee was formed and was empowered to draw up a constitution and apply for registration under the Charitable Collections Act, which has since been done.

Mrs. Jordan: So far this operates only in Brisbane, doesn't it?

Mr. CAMPBELL: No. So far it operates in 11 branches in Brisbane and one in Gatton. I speak as president of the association. We have embarked upon a gradual development of the service and have not yielded to requests from some suburbs to include them in our organisation simply because, being a new venture and having few guidelines to assist us, we prefer to learn from experience in a small way. We do not want to build up a mushroom organisation on an imperfect base. For that reason, although the service has been functioning now for some 18 months, we still have only 12 branches. We have discovered weaknesses in some of the branches, and I think that our being prudent in developing is justified.

Most branches of the Queensland Home Help Service are functioning very satisfactorily and are providing a very good community service. I am very pleased that some members of this House have seen fit to associate themselves with this cause and have taken leading parts in the operations of their local branches. The Minister for Labour and Tourism and the hon. members for Greenslopes, Sandgate and Yeronga are all very active in the branches in their electorates. The hon. members for Kurilpa and Mount Coot-tha have rendered service from time to time, and one or two aldermen of the Brisbane City Council, whose names I cannot recall, have also been associated with this service.

The management committee of the Queensland Home Help Service looks forward to the time when it will have a branch established in every suburb of Brisbane and other branches throughout the State. This service works in a complementary manner to the Blue Nursing Service, which, I might add, began in the same humble way as the Queensland Home Help Service is now operating.

The object of this body is to provide a service to families who, through illness or other adversity, are in need of help in the home. Always we emphasise that it is purely an emergency service to fill the gap till the householder is able to make more permanent arrangements. It is certainly not an employment service. We offer a service for the payment of a fee of 60 cents an hour. Alternatively, if the householder is not in a position to make a contribution, some branches are able to offer voluntary help as well. The service also gives to those in the community well enough to perform these tasks an opportunity to supplement their incomes by providing this assistance.

Mr. Davies: Is there any Government grant?

Mr. CAMPBELL: It is too soon to make any approach for a grant. I feel sure that the Government would not entertain any thought of supporting an organisation which had not demonstrated that it had a degree of permanency. I do not believe that the service has yet demonstrated that. We are still working out our destiny, and we believe that any application at this time would be premature. However, as time goes by and the organisation demonstrates that it has attained a degree of permanency, I do not think any organisation would be better qualified than this one to receive a subsidy as a service organisation.

The number of cases of hardship resulting from illness or other adversity that one comes across is amazing. In many cases the breadwinner is required to remain at home when his wife becomes ill; this not only causes him to lose his wages but also interferes with the production machinery of the community. That is one type of service that we seek to provide. We endeavour,

too, to help aged people who, for example, may not be able to cope with their housework. The position is met quite satisfactorily by someone going in for a couple or hours one or two days a week. There is a very wide range of hardship in the community and the Queensland Home Help Service is providing this service to meet it.

So far, the branches have practised self-help and, by their own efforts, have been able to raise funds to assist people who are not in a position to pay the fees that the service recommends. I might mention that there are branches in the following places: Sandgate, Gap-Ashgrove, Sherwood, Gordon Park-Stafford, Kurilpa-West End, Yeronga-Moorooka, Gatton, Ascot-Hamilton-Hendra, Coorparoo, Bardon, Redcliffe, Wynnum-Manly. Some months ago the Coorparoo branch, in conjunction with the local Rotary Club, organised a door-knock appeal from which \$1,000 was raised. There was a good response because people in that area recognised that the service was filling a need in the community.

The organisation has the complete support of all the churches and of organisations such as the Queensland Country Women's Association, and doctors, chemists and clergymen are completely in accord with its aims. Indeed, the local committees are usually composed of a doctor, a chemist, a clergyman, a bank manager and other people of that type.

One of the problems that local committees have to meet is the determining of the bona fides of those who are seeking assistance. On rare occasions—I am happy to say they are rare—some people in the community do seek to take advantage of services such as this, but the majority of those who seek assistance are thoroughly deserving. The secret of success of the service at branch level is the diligence of the person who supervises it, who is given the title of supervisor. She is the person who receives the requests for help, which are usually channelled to her through a doctor, chemist, clergyman, or some other responsible person. From the list of people who wish to serve, she then selects the person whom she thinks would be most suitable to meet the particular request. The requests may vary from help for an hour or so a day to work in the home on three or four consecutive days until, as I said previously, the householder is able to make more permanent arrangements.

I commend this service to hon. members. It is something that fills a long-felt want in the community. However, this type of activity can only function and flourish so long as there are in the community people who are prepared to give of their time in assisting their fellow-men. I repeat, I earnestly commend this service to members of the House.

Mr. MURRAY (Clayfield) (2.31 p.m.): As this is the first occasion on which I have been privileged to address the Thirty-eighth

Parliament of Queensland, I take this opportunity of expressing my thanks to those electors of Clayfield who showed their confidence in me in returning me again as their representative. I undertake to serve them and the State as well as I possibly can in this Parliament in the coming three years.

I am particularly interested in a question asked of the Premier by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. He gave notice of his question last Thursday and it was answered today. I think it was a particularly good question, asking that consideration be given to establishing a portfolio of sport and recreation, either within the Department of Education, or related to it. It is along these lines that I wish to address a few remarks, and I sincerely hope that the hon. member for Bulimba will agree with me in the line that I take.

The hon. member's question, of course, was related to a statement made by the Hon. J. D. Herbert, Minister for Labour and Tourism—

Mr. Houston: I think I had better put you right; the hon. member for Salisbury asked that question. You should have been in the Chamber.

Mr. MURRAY: Anyway, a question was asked. It was a very good question, even though I may have the name of the questioner wrong. In any case, I am sure the hon. member for Bulimba is interested in this subject. As I was saying, it refers to a statement by the Minister for Labour and Tourism in "The Courier-Mail" of last Thursday in which he drew attention very forcibly to an increase of some 20 per cent. in juvenile delinquency. I am sure that all hon. members of this House would have been very concerned at the release of that information by the Minister. We have had warnings and figures of this type presented to us on many occasions, and here it is again.

Amongst other things, the Minister mentioned a recent rise in social instability. This has been reflected in an increase in the number of broken homes, which is closely related to delinquency. I stress the phrase "social instability". No-one need believe that we are doing nothing about that; we are doing a great deal about it but, of course, most of it is curative rather than preventive.

Nevertheless, we have one particular body of people doing much about this matter; it is the Juvenile Aid Bureau, on which a splendid article was written in last week's "Sunday Truth". I think most hon. members would have noticed it. This bureau has been set up in the last few years by the Minister in charge of police and education, Mr. Pizzey, and the Government is to be commended to a degree on this. Of some 700 cases that the members of the bureau have handled, they believe they have achieved somewhere round 90 per cent. of success. That is exciting, and is extraordinarily good. The bureau operates in the metropolitan area only. There are only seven personnel on

the bureau—or squad, if you like. They are in plain clothes and comprise four male officers and three female officers.

I am so attracted by the work that this bureau is doing that I believe all of us will agree that we should ask the Minister, and the Government, to do whatever is possible to increase its strength if the type of people are available to be attracted to it and be employed within it.

This is wonderful work. The figures given by the Minister for Labour and Tourism indicate that there are far more reports of delinquency from outside the metropolitan area than from within it. This would suggest that the work being done by the bureau is keeping the metropolitan figures down to a relatively low level. I think we are all hoping that the Minister will take whatever steps are necessary to increase the strength of the bureau. As I said, what is being done is curative rather than preventive. It is interesting to me that one of the principal sources of reference coming to the bureau is school principals. I want to deal further with this matter in a moment.

In the last few weeks each of us has received a letter from the Secondary Schools Branch of the Queensland Teachers' Union in which these people point out a number of deficiencies, as they call them, in the education system. There has been unprecedented unrest and agitation among the teachers of the State—some of them talking strike action. This is unprecedented and must cause very great concern. They point out that most secondary schools in Queensland are understaffed. I know that the Minister realises this; I understand that all teachers employable in secondary schools are in fact employed. So we have a problem here, and the Minister is well aware of it. They point out also that there is no relieving staff, that there is need for more ancillary staff—clerical staff, library staff and so on. We know all these things because they have been raised before.

The Minister knows of these things, and responsible people in the department are drawing them forcibly to our attention. The teachers point out the great need for improved conditions in a number of ways. They go on to talk about pre-service and in-service training for secondary-school teachers. They talk about the need for buildings and equipment. They say that despite the big improvement in both quantity and quality of secondary-school buildings over the last few years most high schools are lacking in adequate staff accommodation, specialist rooms, libraries, assembly halls and proper maintenance of buildings and fittings already provided.

We all recognise these things and give credit where it is due, nevertheless there are still considerable deficiencies. They point out, of course, that the remedy for these deficiencies will require the channelling of more money into education.

So it revolves around money. Of course it does. The Minister knows this as well. Problems have occurred over the availability of teachers in the various population surges that we have had. They cause great difficulty for the Minister and his department in securing the number and type of teachers required. But it does come down to money in the long run. This again is something we have to look at very closely indeed.

The secondary teachers want a modification of regulation 73, and also the discrimination against female teachers removed. I sincerely hope that our new and very welcome hon. member from Ipswich West succeeds in moving the motion standing in her name on the Business Paper. The party I belong to is dedicated to the principle that she outlines. Discrimination against female teachers under the Public Service Regulations is outdated and outmoded; in fact, it is quite crazy.

Mr. Houston: Do you say that the Country Party is responsible for it?

Mr. Murray: No, not at all.

It is all a matter of time. We want to press for these things. I believe that the Minister knows where he is going in these matters but it is a question of finance. I have had many discussions with him on these matters, and I am very heartened by his approach. Rome was not built in a day, and in our education system we have a great legacy that was built up over many years. It is indeed difficult to break it down overnight. All hon. members will agree with that.

I am confident that discrimination against females generally, as outlined in the motion of the hon. member for Ipswich West, will be eliminated. Schools need ancillary staffing—clerical staff—so that teachers may get on with teaching. It is ridiculous that a school principal should be tied down by clerical work.

Our Directors of Education are dedicated men, as also are so many of our principals and others right throughout the Department of Education. The directors particularly are extremely hard worked and do a wonderful job. I ask the Minister if it does not seem odd that any one of us can pick up a telephone receiver and dial straight through to one of the Directors of Education. I ask him to investigate this. I am sure I could not ring a fashion director at McWhirters, for example, who would not be cushioned by a secretary somewhere along the line. Although in theory being able to ring straight through to a director may seem admirable, the number of people who ring and ask, "When does school start again?", or, "Why didn't Mary Jones pass her examination?", must be a drain on his time and ability.

Mr. O'Donnell: I said all this two years ago.

Mr. MURRAY: The fact that the hon. member said it two years ago does not mean that it should not be repeated.

The Q.C.E. has said that education deserves No. 1 priority. Who would disagree with that? If we were able to wave a magic wand and do all these things immediately it would be wonderful, but the State has the level and the type of education it deserves. The matters that I have raised are indictments not of our education authorities but of the electors at large and of us who represent them here. That is where the indictment lies, not with the education authorities. If we were to raise all our facilities to the desired level and eliminate the deficiencies pointed out by the Secondary Schools Branch of the Queensland Teachers' Union, if we could get the money we require—and most of these matters are governed by finance—and if through our normal State aid channels we could make sure that our private and denominational schools were raised to the desirable level, would all this be enough? Are we likely to be satisfied that we have inquired sufficiently into the true ends of education so that we can do what the secondary-school teachers point out in their letter? I will quote part of it—

“These deficiencies are causing students in our secondary schools to be denied what is accepted as their birthright in all enlightened countries, the right to a full and liberal education suited to the needs and abilities of each student, taking due cognisance of the differing capacities, home background and personal characteristics of each student.”

Those are well-chosen words and we should ponder them. If we could raise the facilities, would that satisfy this particular requirement without again looking at the aims of education? Do we really know why we are supplying all these improved facilities, or has education just become a social habit?

We know perfectly well that secondary-school teachers are obviously aware that education in a democracy is not nearly as simple as it is, for instance, in a totalitarian State because it is essential that democracy should recognise—and the secondary-school teachers have clearly recognised it in their letter—that in our way of life the individual should preserve his individuality. This they clearly point out. They also imply that the citizen has an existence apart from the community in which he lives because he is free to do what he likes and think what he likes, subject to certain restraints within society and certain duties to the State. Therefore, I believe that what we have to look at is the purpose of education.

I think the purpose of education is twofold: firstly, to equip the child to become a “full” citizen, and, secondly, to equip the child to make his own inner life. The secondary-school teachers imply that if democracy under our way of life is to survive, both those purposes are vitally important. At times we are failing because we forget this dual purpose and tend to stress minor aims and goals in education, and there are many of them, such as to equip for work, to train thinkers, and to preserve culture. But when

we read through the crop of annual reports given by school principals each year we must be disturbed by seeming a lack of unanimity concerning the aims of education.

Far too often is it stressed that the object of schooling is to equip a child for the calling by which he is to live. A high percentage of our children leave school at Junior year to enter occupations which do not require a good deal of academic knowledge, and up to that stage I believe they should at least have been taught the importance of physical well-being, the art of living in the community, and the acceptance of leisure. The only calling which should be taught in fact is the state of manhood to which we are all called, and up to the minimum leaving age the essential thing to do is not prepare a child for his occupation but to prepare a child against his occupation, because the aim should be to educate a child, not train a hand. The child will leave school and become a hand soon enough and the school process should not be allowed to hasten it.

Above all, education should not be accepted as just a social habit, and these reports from school principals give so many warnings of the trends our children are tending to follow—clearly very often unhealthy trends in social behaviour—so closely related to the statement made by the Minister for Labour and Tourism last Thursday that we may well wonder whether we should pause and think again and reset our aim in education. The warnings by inference from school principals, statements by so many well-informed people outside, and this Press statement must surely stir our own conscience and show us clearly that in this day and age, with all the improved facilities, we should not be too complacent and self-satisfied with what is coming out at the other end of the education machine. The product of organised education, integrated education, which is what we want, is a man or woman who has to exercise the privileges and bear the responsibilities of citizenship.

This morning, in reply to a question, the Premier rightly mentioned citizenship. We know full well that the pattern of our so-called civilised life today has changed drastically. Even as adults we are having problems of adaptation. I wonder and ask: have we failed sufficiently to adjust the syllabus for our children to help them through the transition from child to man. I personally think we have. Should we not have a much greater concentration in our syllabus on civics, the type of civics that will penetrate the home as well as the classroom? If the home influence is declining and if moral standards are being eroded—and it seems clear that we agree they are—how else do we stop this drift but through education based on Christian concepts? Do not let us be so naive as to believe that we can make any great impact on the adult population. We could perhaps through adult education, but we will not.

We can make any impact we want through our education system by the type of syllabus that we set, the facilities that we supply and—not the least by any means—the type of trained teachers whom we employ. I stress again first and foremost that it is citizens that we want. We must aim to produce citizens rather than little compendia of knowledge. This is essential if democracy is to survive, and surely that is the great moral issue and challenge of our times.

Democracy is a way of life, not merely a form of government to which we adhere, and the inner life which democracy allows the individual, as pointed out by the secondary-school teachers, is as essential to the community as is his public life. Therefore I say that the secret of good citizenship lies less in knowing how to vote, for instance, than in how to behave to one's next-door neighbour or how to occupy one's leisure.

Mr. Davies: The Minister knows all this.

Mr. MURRAY: Yes, and I am pleased indeed at his understanding of this subject.

Mr. Davies: You are dodging the issue.

Mr. MURRAY: Therefore school, like democracy, must become a way of life which the child prefers, and which sets an example from which he will deviate only reluctantly. It will not preserve democracy to turn children out as well-informed little voters. We want to turn out many kinds of people, not just one kind. We even hear a clamour for some kind of political instruction in schools. God forbid! Some people still assume that the chief contribution that a citizen can make is to be politically aware. Preoccupation with politics is good for those who want to be preoccupied with it, but I shall never believe that it is an essential sign of a good citizen. To confuse citizenship with these things is dangerous and wrong. Most children cannot grasp this sort of stuff. They will passively absorb it and obediently pass examinations, but that will not make them vote more intelligently or serve their country with more understanding.

Our country needs more than voters and deputations, and people who write letters to newspapers on defence policy in Vietnam and national service. Good for those who want to do that, but our country needs more than that. We need men and women with enthusiasm and skill who are ready and prepared to devote themselves to the community in return for the free life, and who can occupy their leisure with their hands and minds without need for the modern palliatives, which are all around us, against boredom. We need men and women who realise that the chief responsibility of the individual is to live in co-operation with his neighbour and in harmony with the community. One good carpenter in the community surely is worth ten political-study groups.

It is not of supreme importance that everyone should "know" something, but it is of supreme importance (again, the secondary-school teachers realise this) that everyone should "be" something. Citizenship training therefore is not concerned with what a man does but with his attitude towards the occupation that he follows. There is all the difference in the world between the attitude of Bill Smith, who drives a tram merely to get his pay, and that of Bob Brown, who drives a tram in the knowledge that transport is essential to society and that he is taking a hand in it. I am quite sure that we can turn the Bill Smiths into Bob Browns by convincing them that they drive trams not merely for their pay but to provide transport for society, for Australia, and for our way of life.

The way to teach this at school is not so much to tell Bill Smith the place of Australia in the Pacific, but his place in the school. This is the way to teach it, and this is the value of citizenship training. This is not, of course, the complete answer to helping him during the transition from teenage to manhood. There are 168 hours in a week. It is likely that he will not work for more than 40 hours, which means that for 128 hours a week he is very much a citizen.

I am not ignoring the value of parental influence and home environment. We have clung desperately to the hope that this would, and should, be the solid base on which we could build. Thank heaven, it mostly is. But again we cannot ignore reports from school principals which point out very clearly that the base is not nearly as solid as it should be.

Nor am I ignoring the Church. Here, too, I believe we need a revival—an absolute crusade, if I may say so, but certainly a very sincere and practical effort to integrate more closely the Church and the State, each of which is indispensable to the other in the field of education if we are to preserve democracy based on Christian concepts. It is not so long ago—we all know this—that the only education available was supplied by the Church. I think, perhaps, we have taken this process much too far in reverse. Some people who remember their history may recall that Napoleon made this statement, when addressing one of the sessions of the Councils of State—

"Up to the present the only good education we have met with is that of the ecclesiastical bodies."

He later said—

"I would rather see the children of the village in the hands of a man who only knows his catechism but whose principles are known to me than a half-baked man of learning who has no foundation for his morality and no fixed ideas. If you take faith away from the people you will end by producing nothing but highway robbers."

We should ponder these words and ask ourselves whether in fact we are setting our aims in the correct way for the education of our

children in this State and whether their education is based on ideals and concepts that will endure and will help them to stand against the stresses and strains of life that they will meet when they leave school.

We pay little more than lip service to religious instruction in State schools, and I think that somehow we must restore it to an accepted part of the school syllabus. In this regard, I am particularly attracted to the Victorian system. It seems that Victoria, as has Queensland, had established a secular state. However, it has obviously been realised in Victoria that that is not good enough, and since 1950 religious instruction has formed part of the curriculum, although it may not be given by departmental teachers. It seems that the system there retains the class basis for instruction, given by visiting teachers who use what is known as an "agreed syllabus" to make this possible. The syllabus is the responsibility of the Council for Christian Education in Schools, which represents seven constituent churches whose heads approve the syllabus before it is issued. From convenors appointed for each school, primary or secondary, nominations are received by the council, which then submits them to the Minister for Education for accreditation as instructors. No-one, clerical or lay, may give religious instruction in Victorian State schools without first being accredited.

Mr. O'Donnell: How long would the instruction be?

Mr. MURRAY: I will come to that. It is all set out in a splendid article in the "Anglican" of 28 July of this year.

One interesting feature—indeed, a significant development—is the growing system of Government school chaplains on a full-time basis. Over 20 high schools in Victoria now have full-time chaplains, and some girls' secondary schools have full-time deaconesses. They are there full time, as I said, giving a Christian education on a class basis, usually about 25 periods each a week, but in fact they enter into the full life of the school—sports supervision, social activities, acting as form masters, and so on—and enjoy the same facilities as other members of the staff. I believe that we should investigate this exciting development—I think it is exciting—and take whatever steps are necessary to implement a parallel system so that religious instruction will again become a vital part of our educational responsibility.

Mr. O'Donnell: I do not think that answers my question. I want to know how much religious education each child will get in a week.

Mr. MURRAY: Each class, it seems, gets at least one period; but there is an agreed syllabus, which I believe is the important thing.

In my opinion, the whole examination system in Queensland should be put in the dock and thoroughly investigated. I noticed an article in today's "Telegraph" by the Director of Secondary Schools in New South Wales in which he criticised the examination system as one of the chief threats to liberalism in education in Australia. Of course, examinations are necessarily an essential part of education and cannot be abolished. Primary school is still an adventure, but when our child goes off to secondary school both teacher and child are driven to put aside the adventure of living and concentrate on a formal syllabus. Life becomes separated into subjects and the teacher has to push in, and the child has to absorb, a great variety of inert facts without protest. With large classes and the constant drive to stay with the time-table and syllabus, a child who displays the sins of originality, resource, scepticism, critical judgment, non-conformity, lack of deference to those in authority, and of wanting to know more than is in the syllabus, must be subdued to bring him back to the mean of the class. And yet these are the qualities on which our civilisation was built.

The secondary school has little option but to suppress the eager child from the primary school, and must concentrate on launching him into the world nervously clutching a certificate. What he probably does not realise is that he probably has exchanged it for the intellectual adventure of living. So many employers demand a certificate and look upon it as the exit from education and the entrance to employment that after the primary stage teacher and pupil are bound by the demands of an external public examination. In fact, the teacher's future, and very often the chance of a boy or girl getting a job, depend more upon the possession of a certificate and less upon the possession of enthusiasm and interest. The fact that teachers, as well as the pupil, are inspected, is a principal reason to drive the teacher to satisfy the inspector rather than the particular needs of the pupil. Under this system we cannot possibly satisfy the suggestions of the secondary-school teachers in their letter of a full and liberal education suited to the needs and abilities of each student with his different background, capacities, and personal characteristics.

Mr. Houston: There has been a big difference in the attitude of inspectors.

Mr. MURRAY: So I believe.

I think, as others have advocated over the years, that at least the Junior examination should be conducted by the school—internally and inconspicuously—on the school's own syllabus. The inspector could then inspect the curriculum and the pupil, not the teachers, so that the standard on which the certificate is awarded does not vary unnecessarily between schools. The certificate would be awarded on more than the base examination; the pupil's school record would

also be taken into account. The school could therefore undertake the responsibility of examining and the Department of Education the responsibility of issuing a certificate.

By this means the examination would become part of the ordinary school procedure and would not be attended by all the fear that affects timid pupils under our present system. The examination held by the school would be so much part of the inner life of the school that the issue of a certificate would not call for public advertisement of results. I wonder what sort of a public outcry we would receive if our children at school were submitted to a detailed physical examination and the results published in the Press?

Under the present system, if the candidate reaches a prescribed and purely arbitrary level of mediocrity in the prescribed number of subjects he is given a certificate. It is issued, it seems, on the assumption that it is better to know six subjects badly than three subjects very well. Bill Smith can be a dull plodder and pass, whereas Bob Brown may be a gifted mathematician and fail. The effect of this on employment opportunity for Bob Brown may well be disastrous.

And now a word or two on the teachers. The truth of the matter is that we have not raised the status of the profession to the level of nobility that it deserves. If our child is sick we take him to a doctor who has had six or seven years of rigorous and intensive training, and the public pays him two or three times the amount paid to a teacher; but we trust our child's mind, and to a large extent his character, to a teacher who has spent two years in a training college and whose comparative monetary value to the community by way of fees, is certainly less than 50 per cent. of the local doctor's.

Let us face it. The inner life of our children, and with it the prospects of civilisation for the next generation, are entrusted to men and women, most of whom have supreme unselfishness and great nobility of character, but whom we neither respect nor pay adequately. We must raise this profession to the highest status we can because we look to it to such a tremendous extent to guide our future way of life. Education should be removed from politics; it should be lifted right out of the push-and-pull of party politics. I believe that it is a shameful stain on our sense of State and national responsibility and values to allow our children to be the innocent victims of political argument and petty party gain. Their future and that of the State deserves a great deal more than this.

With the settlement of the differences in the broad argument surrounding State aid to independent schools—and it has been settled—with the four political parties which influence our Governments now firmly committed to this politically, and with a State election just behind us, now surely is the

heaven-sent opportunity—the golden opportunity—to get together with sincerity, determination and courage to investigate, plan and determine our educational needs, our aims and the course we should steer in the future—a bi-partisan course, free of petty political recriminations and accusations.

Is this too much to ask or too much to hope for? Surely not. I believe that the Leader of the Opposition would welcome this but, more importantly, I believe the electorate at large, the people of the State—and we are here merely to serve them—would breathe a sigh of relief and satisfaction that would be heard well beyond the borders of this State. Let me therefore suggest and advocate that the Premier establish a committee—a standing committee—representative of both sides of the House and including the Minister for Education, the Leader of the Opposition and his shadow Minister for Education so that it would be representative of both sides of politics, to which should be added from outside some of our leading educationists, and one or two leading citizens to represent the citizens' point of view. Let us establish such a committee and get it working, and, realising and acknowledging the fallibility of mere politicians, the representation of outside educationists and leading citizens is essential, just as it is essential when setting up committees from outside to advise Governments that they should contain one or two politicians if we want the reports of these committees to avoid being wrecked on the hard, cold rocks of political reality, where so many of them founder or disappear.

Education should be the No. 1 priority in State financial allocation, and financial allocations to education should be made on a non-party basis. Whatever money is considered necessary to satisfy the requirements of education should be decided upon in the spirit I have asked for and by the type of people I have mentioned, and that amount of money should be made available. What is left afterwards should be the financial cake that the other departments carve up. I do not believe that this is too much to ask, and I commend those thoughts to the House.

Mr. HANSON (Port Curtis) (3.9 p.m.): In participating in this debate I once again desire to express the loyalty of the electors of Port Curtis to the Throne. On the day that we, as members of the Legislative Assembly, were sworn in we took an oath of office. I certainly do not regard that oath as something to be taken lightly, but as a matter of great seriousness. In recent years it has been recognised that people apart from the conservative element in the community can be loyal. Many years ago loyalty was somewhat sacrosanct, and it was held that one must follow the strict conservative line in the political or commercial field to be a loyal citizen of the Throne. Nevertheless, people in many different occupations, in many forms of activity and in many fields of employment have demonstrated that they

can be very loyal, and possibly more sincere than those who gained recognition in the past.

I should like to express my delight in seeing a fellow Australian appointed to the premier position of Governor of this State. Since assuming office Sir Alan Mansfield and his good lady have visited my area. They graciously opened the show at Gladstone and during their visit proved that they were universally popular with the people. I wish them many happy years at Government House and I am sure that they will effectively discharge their duties.

Years ago it was absolutely abhorrent to any conservative administration to recognise great Australians and great Queenslanders by allowing them to occupy the position of Governor in the State. Once again it has been proved that the Labour Party's view is not fallacious and that the Labour Party is well ahead—some 20 years ahead in this instance—in seeing that due recognition is given to these people and recognising that fellow Australians and Queenslanders can occupy this position with distinction. I hope that one day we may be so advanced in thought that many Queenslanders and Australians will be given a chance to occupy similar positions in Commonwealth countries beyond the seas.

I sincerely thank the electors of Port Curtis who gave me a vote of confidence at the election on 28 May. Many of them worked assiduously for the Labour Party in my electorate and I sincerely appreciate their efforts.

Mr. Davies: Did one of the Government Party candidates lose his deposit?

Mr. HANSON: In reply to the hon. member for Maryborough, that is quite so.

Mr. Davies: Country Party or Liberal Party?

Mr. HANSON: It happened to be the Liberal Party candidate.

I am particularly grateful for the fact that confidence in me was sufficiently strong to allow me to be returned. Like the hon. member for Belmont, I promise my electors that I will give them the same faithful support that I have given them in the last three years.

I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment. I fully appreciate the efforts made to unseat you in your electorate, especially by the ultra-conservative forces of the coalition. I congratulate you on your re-appointment to your high and honourable office.

I congratulate the hon. members in this Assembly upon their contributions to this debate. There have indeed been some excellent speeches. I specifically congratulate the new members in my party on their well-delivered addresses in this debate. Judged on their efforts, I should say that they have

a great future in the political sphere, and I wish them well. In making my humble contribution, I admit frankly that I am somewhat over-awed by the excellent speeches made from our side of the Chamber.

As a member of the A.L.P., I am naturally disappointed that the electors of the State did not see fit to put us into office, but in a democracy we accept the vote of the people in good faith, remembering that there will be another day when we will be at the barrier and that the electors will not be duped by many of the policies inflicted upon them by this administration; in other words, they will suddenly wake up and put the Labour Party on the Treasury benches.

It is disturbing to me, as a Queenslander, to know that we are governed by an administration or coalition in which there is considerable discord. This was evidenced not only in the post-election period but also in the pre-election period. The A.L.P. is 70 years of age, and, although there have been troubles within the party, it has 70 years of rich history behind it and has had a pronounced and desirable effect on the political life of this country. The appointment of a Queenslander to the high and important office of the Governor of this State is sufficient proof that this coalition, when it wants to, can come around to Labour's way of thinking.

Despite the effervescence of the Government parties during the election campaign—they were bubbling over like champagne—what has happened since we have assembled in this Chamber? A financial gloom has been cast over us by the words of the Treasurer. He set out to get Opposition support in this great moment of crisis, during which the huge undertakings in this State will be somewhat retarded because he has no money. Were we told in the pre-election period about this great gloom that would be cast over us because of the ineptitude of the Government's financial relations with its counterpart in Canberra? Certainly not. We were told that there was great harmony between the Federal and State Governments, and that only the present coalition could keep Queensland swimming on the crest of prosperity. What utter rot! What utter nonsense! That was nothing but political hypocrisy.

As the hon. member for Baroona mentioned in a previous debate, many of the difficulties of this administration are the result of its own misgivings and its own mis-spending. Why the present Treasurer cast his spear at post-war Labour Governments and claimed that they did not use their allocations I do not know, because he knows full well that unscrupulous forces in the South withheld materials and other supplies from Queensland. Someone had to pay for the war. There were constant shortages. In those days when the present Government members were in Opposition they got up in this chamber, and in loud terms, claimed that the Budget of the Labour Government was

pure window-dressing. This occurred frequently. In "Hansard" there is clear-cut evidence of their statements. The Treasurer is not fooling anybody, certainly not me, by making such irresponsible statements as appeared in "The Courier-Mail" last week.

In debates of this kind there are certain local matters which, as a member, one has the privilege of bringing to the notice of the Chamber. So numerous are the complaints that one could make against the coalition Government that I could not deal with them all even if I received three or four extensions of time.

Although one is somewhat restricted in the scope of subjects by reason of the many fine contributions by members on this side of the House, I should like to support the remarks made by the hon. member for Cairns last week when he spoke of the very great crisis brought about in the shipping and maritime industries by the threat of rationalisation. This is something that concerns the Government because, after all, the Treasurer has a very great interest in the harbour boards and harbour authorities of the State. I should like to tell the House what is happening at present.

For their own pecuniary benefit, the shipping combines, the monopolists who have been bloodsucking the country for many years, are harassing various ports in the State in the hope that those ports will be so badly injured financially that they will have to be closed. At present, as the hon. member mentioned, there are four ports in the State, namely, Cairns, Bowen, Mackay, and Gladstone, that will most certainly suffer seriously from the intentions of the foreign shipping combines. I refer to recent negotiations that have been inflicted on the Australian community by a shipping line known as the Columbus Line, backed by many large monopolistic lines that operate between the United Kingdom, America, and Australia.

I remember quite well when I was a lad reading of the sale of the Bay Line in this country. That was a shipping line that was established by a Commonwealth Labour Government. As a result of machinations, intrigue, and corrupt business practices, the people of Australia, who were the owners of the Bay Line, suffered financially as a result of the sale. In the United Kingdom a member of the aristocracy was taken to court and gaoled over the manipulation of funds surrounding this transaction. The Bay liners were taken from the people of Australia and were eventually operated in the ownership of a large shipping combine in the United Kingdom. For many years their new owners brought them to the coast of this country, picking up cargoes from Australian shores. They came here and absolutely thumbed their noses at the Australian people. The sale of those ships did not return to the Australian people one brass razoo compared with the huge capital outlay involved in establishing the line.

There is at present within the shipping industry a marked trend towards containerisation and rationalisation. It is, in other words, a scheme devised by shipping interests to obtain more profits for themselves at the expense of the Australian public.

I ask the House to excuse me if I speak on local matters; I think I am fully entitled to do so in this debate. The Gladstone Harbour Board has a capital interest in cold stores at their wharf of some \$200,000, and the Port Curtis Co-operative Dairy Association, which is the largest dairy association in the State, has an interest of some \$25,000. These cold stores can store 1,000 tons of cartoned meat. At the Port Curtis Dairy Association's stores within the town limits there is a storage capacity of 3,000 tons. Meat from Amagraz and butter from the many factories operated by the co-operative are stored in these cold stores.

An instruction has come, apparently backed by the Australian Government, certainly backed by the Australian Meat Board, and certainly backed by the Federated Meat Exporters' Committee, that it is not desired to call at the port any more for small parcels of meat and that there should be only one port of call in the Central Queensland area. This would certainly be a disadvantage to the meatworks at Biloela, 80 miles inland; it would certainly endanger the Port Curtis Co-operative Dairy Association's headquarters in Gladstone. If the Federal Government decides to hand over to foreign shipping combines the right to deny any company the opportunity to export through the port of its choice, it will be a very sad day for the people of this country. After all, what right have shipping combines to say, "We do not wish to visit this particular port. You can close it."? I maintain that they have no right to do that. They say that, from the point of view of economy, it is very necessary—in fact, vital. I can tell you quite frankly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that is a lot of hooey.

At present there is a ship in the port of Gladstone under the flag of the Israeli Line, which is trying to break up the combine to which I referred earlier. It has gone to Gladstone to pick up a parcel of meat—something that the Columbus Line and other foreign lines would not do—and is due in the port of Brisbane tomorrow to load a parcel of 160 tons of meat, which will take one day. It is all very well for small countries and small shipping lines to engage in this business. However, I believe that the Federal Government should not acquiesce in the action of shipping combines that for years have reaped rich profits from this country and which are now attempting to close ports and throw down the drain the livelihood of decent citizens living in them. For example, the port of Bowen and the port of Cairns rely fairly heavily on meat shipments. Since the installation for bulk handling of sugar has been operating at Cairns, watersiders who live in the Cairns

area find that meat exports during the year enable them to augment their income and to remain there and rear their families. As I said, I think it will be a very sorry day when one of the foreign companies whose ships come to our shores can dictate to the Federal Government what ports they will go to.

I mention these matters, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because the State Treasury is very interested in many ports. It has a considerable sum of money invested in them by way of Government loans and debenture loans guaranteed by the Government. These matters are very vital to the economy of our State and I think it ill-behoves any company to come here and think it can blantly say, "This port will not operate; we shall operate at this particular port to pick up this particular commodity."

I draw the attention of this House to the reply received by Amagraze Limited, Biloela, when they made representations to this company and told it they would be financially embarrassed and very inconvenienced if the company adopted its proposed course of rationalisation. In reply, the company said—

" . . . while appreciating Amagraze's efforts in Gladstone to increase the labour force and obtain priority for refrigerated vessels . . . the Federal Government had made it quite clear to its principals that they favoured both rationalisation and a reduction in the number of loading ports and it was their impression that both the AMB (Australian Meat Board) and the AMEFC (Australian Meat Exporters Federal Council) were of the same opinion. The company's principals were very much in favour of both rationalisation and centralisation and felt that centralisation between the two ports should be an object of primary importance."

That is a very serious matter. Many companies operate within this country and they have received quite considerable concessions—far more than many of them deserve—and it ill-behoves any that is carrying on a successful financial venture in this country to try to bloodsuck from Australian communities further moneys so that it may be able to show its shareholders and directors richer profits. It is high time that we in this country shaped up to our responsibilities and that the Federal Government once again instituted a shipping line of its own so that we can compete on the oceans of the world. I am sure that an Australian-established shipping line that was run efficiently—as it would be—would be something of which we could be justifiably proud. T.A.A. has proved itself worth while.

Mr. Ramsden interjected.

Mr. HANSON: In reply to the hon. member for Merthyr, the Federal shipping line suffered because of the nefarious practices of the shipping companies in England. When a Federal Labour Government is returned to office I sincerely hope that it has the

common sense to institute a Commonwealth line of which Australia will be proud and from which we will reap much benefit. We will then cease throwing money down the drain, as it has been thrown for years in order to afford rich profits to overseas companies, much to the detriment of Australian communities.

Certain members of the Government in a snide way implied in this debate that the Australian Labour Party has done very little for dairymen, was not concerned about their future and never did anything for them. If one believed the forces of the coalition, the No. 1 enemy of the dairymen in the State and nation is the Labour Party. Far be that from the truth. We heard one reference from the other side of the Chamber to dairy subsidies. Some members of the coalition Government are in the dairying industry and really know the story. Men like the hon. member for Fassfern know full well that the Australian Labour Party was responsible for subsidies to the dairying industry in this country and certainly put the scheme of paying subsidies on a very sound footing, with great benefit to those in the industry; in fact the 1949 demise of the Chifley Government was a sorry blow to dairymen. If that Government had been returned, the dairymen in this country today would have a return based on the cost of production, something they have never enjoyed in the history of their industry. I have made the point before that no industry has opened up more of this wonderful country than the dairying industry, and no industry, either directly or indirectly, has provided greater employment than the dairying industry.

Believing as I do that the hon. members for Mulgrave and Condamine have a sincere interest in dairymen, I cannot understand why they should join forces in coalition with a party that is the avowed enemy of the man on the land. I cannot understand how they can link themselves with the forces of monopolistic capitalism just for the sake of political expediency. It is very strange, indeed, abhorrent, to me.

Let me put on record a little of the history of the subsidy paid to the dairying industry. In 1942 the Curtin Government in the Federal sphere, in an attempt to stimulate production in the dairying industry, and at the same time to avoid any undue increase in price to the consumer, granted £2,000,000 by way of subsidy to the dairying industry. That was the first time such a subsidy had been given. At the same time the Government of the day appointed a committee to inquire into the industry generally.

Following the report of that committee the Government decided to increase the subsidy to a figure which would lift the average return to the dairymen to 1s. 6d. per lb. of butter. This meant increasing the subsidy to £6,500,000. That was not a bad effort at all for the first 18 months of subsidy. From 1 April, 1944, the Labour

Government in the Federal sphere altered the basis of subsidy somewhat so that a higher rate could be paid during the months of lower production. This resulted in 1944-45 in a return to the farmers by way of subsidy of £5,700,000. The figure for 1945-46 was £5,200,000 and for 1946-47 £4,813,000.

In 1947 the Chifley administration announced a new five-year plan. Five years from 1947 brings us to 1952. It will be realised that on 10 December, 1949, the Menzies Government took office. Under this plan which was introduced in 1947 the dairymen of this country were to receive 2s. per lb. of commercial butter, and there was to be an annual review of this price, up or down, in accordance with any movement in cost factors. It is particularly important to note that the scheme covered all butter and cheese produced for sale, either locally or overseas, and also covered all other milk products such as condensed milk. With the yearly reviews, the price received by the farmers rose steadily during those five years, and in the last of the five years it was 3s. 6d. per lb. of commercial butter.

In 1947-48 this scheme cost the Commonwealth Government in subsidy £6,375,000 and the figure rose to £17,234,000 in the year 1951-52. That was the last year of the Chifley agreement—the agreement that was negotiated by the Labour Party. Despite the fact that the Menzies Government was in office the subsidy was paid because of the formula laid down in the agreement of 1947. A total of £17,234,000 was not a bad job of subsidising compared with the statutory £13,000,000 paid by the Menzies-Holt administration last financial year. And in comparing the two figures we must bear in mind the decrease in the value of money.

It can safely be said that if the Chifley administration had remained in office dairymen today would be enjoying cost of production. They are not likely now to enjoy it, and their future is far from bright. In 1952, to rub the heel of the old boot fair in the face of the dairy-farmer, the Menzies Government instituted a new plan—a real top flight one—with several conditions of which I will cite a few for the benefit of the House. They are—

1. The guaranteed price was not extended to any dairy products other than butter and cheese;

2. The total amount payable by the Commonwealth was fixed at a specific amount determined by the Treasurer being a figure not exceeding the amount appropriated by Parliament.

As I said earlier, £13,000,000 is the amount appropriated by Parliament and that sum has been appropriated for a number of years.

The next conditions were—

3. Provision was made for the suspension of the bounty if at any time the maximum price for sales other than by a factory were not based on a price

determined by the Minister for Commerce and Agriculture as the appropriate price for local sale by factories;

4. The guaranteed price was limited to butter and cheese consumed in Australia plus an amount of butter and cheese exported equivalent to not more than one-fifth of the butter and cheese consumed in Australia.

Those figures are particularly important; the dairymen are certainly not getting very lush treatment there.

Other conditions were—

5. The guaranteed price was to be based upon the cost of efficient production as estimated by an authority (the Dairy Industry Investigation Committee) established by the Commonwealth for that purpose.

6. The State Government agreed that to ensure the guaranteed return, the maximum prices fixed by the States for sales other than by the factories would be based on the price determined by the Minister for Commerce and Agriculture.

We see that in 1952-53 a price of 4s. 1-29d. a lb. for commercial butter was determined, but the actual return to the producer fell short of this figure because no bounty was payable in respect of any butter or cheese exported in excess of an amount equivalent to one-fifth of local sales.

I leave those thoughts with hon. members, and before concluding I should like to inform hon. members about two agreements entered into by the Labour Government in its lifetime. As I said earlier, the original subsidies were negotiated, or provided for, in the Dairy Industry Assistance Act of 1943. This Act had no fixed duration, but the agreement of 1947 had a fixed period of five years. Two long-term contracts were negotiated with the British Ministry of Food, in this era, for the disposal of exportable surpluses of butter and cheese. The first was for four years, from 1 July, 1944, and the second for seven years, from 1 July, 1948. The latter provided for an annual review of valuations, with variations up or down, not exceeding 7½ per cent., according to the movement in the cost factors.

I admit that in the process of government considerable argument is advanced by certain parties about particular industries, but no-one can state that the A.L.P. in any way refused to give a subsidy to the dairy industry. We were the first political party, the first administration in this country, to recognise the dairymen's position and ensure that they got something approaching a decent standard of living. Well might the Leader of the Opposition in the State sphere go to the hustings at the last State election and tell the people of this State that there are 5,000 fewer dairymen now than there were when this Government took office in 1957. What a discreditable performance! Can new members of the Country Party be proud of this

attempt to destroy one of the most important sections of primary industry. It is certainly not something to be proud of!

New agreements have been negotiated by the regional electricity boards throughout the State for the supply of electricity to rural areas. These should be looked at. I was not a member of this House long before I asked the Minister for Industrial Development (now Sir Alan Munro) about the guarantees demanded by the regional electricity boards. I asked if he knew that the guarantees were not based on a percentage of the actual cost, and if he was aware that consumers wanted to know and had been refused details of the calculations of those costs. The Minister informed me that the general practice was to assess guarantees on the estimated capital cost and that the consumers were not normally supplied with that information, although they desired it. A few people wanted to know the capital cost of installing electricity on their properties, but they were denied that information. That is not right. After all, if a person is asked to pay a guarantee of 10 per cent.—by legislation the boards are entitled to charge 15 per cent.—surely the boards should know what the capital cost is and should not have to open, say, the Sydney telephone directory and pick out a number. That is ridiculous. Even a racecourse tout would not give that type of treatment. It is very distressing to these people that the regional electricity boards adopt this high-handed and arrogant attitude.

I feel sorry for the boards throughout the State because they will fall far short in their loan requirements. The Capricornia board will have a shortage of \$2,800,000. This does not augur well for the area it serves. When the gigantic alumina plant comes on stream in March next year and the board has to meet other commitments, it will not have much up its sleeve. If it does not watch out it will fall far short. The same applies to the Department of Local Government. It will have a £50,000,000 plant and will not be able to supply it with one drop of water because it has not shaped up to its responsibility, and this administration has not ensured that there has been an efficient organisation at work to supply this particular industry.

These matters are exercising people's minds and they should be told these things. I know that the provision of these two facilities will be accelerated as a result of my mentioning them in the House. I notice the Treasurer is smiling, but every time I bring up matters of this nature he gets the pen to work and decides to do something about them, because I speak a good deal of common sense and a good deal of truth.

(Time expired).

Mr. CAREY (Albert) (3.49 p.m.): With the world in the turmoil it is, with revolts, uprisings, and cold wars in many of the countries of the world, and with the hot war, where our boys are involved, going on very

close to our shores, it is imperative that we in this House, as we do in every Address-in-Reply speech should affirm our loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen. On behalf of the people in the electorate of Albert, and on my own behalf, I do this very sincerely.

I wish to extend my thanks also to His Excellency the Governor, Sir Alan Mansfield, and Lady Mansfield, for accepting the responsibilities of office and the very strenuous duties that they will be called upon to undertake on behalf of the State. I know it is usual to congratulate the Governor on his elevation to this office, and I think it appropriate that we be thankful to have been given the services of such a wonderful person, a good Queenslander, and a man of high integrity who has the interests of Queensland at heart. I thank him myself, and on behalf of the people of my electorate, for accepting these responsibilities.

Many of the older residents of the town of Southport, which is part of the electorate of Albert, feel they have a personal interest in the appointment of Sir Alan Mansfield as Governor, because for many years Lady Mansfield was a resident of our town.

I should like to join with other speakers, particularly those on this side of the House, in congratulating the Premier on again leading the coalition team to victory. To my mind, this was never in doubt. The Premier was the figurehead who carried Country Party and Liberal Party members to victory.

I add my congratulations to those already extended to the mover and the seconder of the motion before the House, namely, Mr. Dick Wood, the newly-elected member for Logan, and Mr. Bill Kaus, the new member for Hawthorne. I want to be generous again today, as I have been in previous Address-in-Reply debates, and congratulate all members who won at the election and are now sitting in this House. I extend a special welcome to the hon. member for Ipswich West, Mrs. Vi Jordan, and say it is very pleasant to see a lady sitting in our midst. At least she will have some influence on keeping members of the Labour Party in order. I congratulate her and know that some very fine contributions will be made in this Chamber as a result of her knowledge.

I give special congratulations to my friend and colleague the hon. member for South Coast, Mr. Russell Hinze, who had a difficult seat to win. For him the election was a tough, hard fight. He had to defeat elements within and outside the party—elements he should not have had to contend with—and he came through it with great achievement and much credit to himself. I know he will do a good job for the people of his electorate.

I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on again being elected to your very important office. You know, of course, that you always have

my loyalty and that I shall always be obedient to your rulings, even though at times we may differ in our opinions.

Finally, I sincerely thank the chairman of my electoral council, Mr. Reg. Hughes, and the members of the council for the sterling job they did in working to have me returned. I thank particularly my scrutineer, Mr. Bill Rickard, who did a wonderful job during the "49 blitz." I call it that because I won by 49 votes. (Opposition laughter.) Hon. members on this side of the House, particularly Country Party members, have no worries about what hon. members opposite might be thinking, because we know what we did and we know it was all fair and above-board.

Mr. Hanson: Did you have any spies on Harley's committee?

Mr. CAREY: We had no spies on his committee, but I think he had a few spies at our meetings. No matter what I said, whether at Canungra, Cedar Creek, or Southport, the next morning Alderman Harley was able to tell the Press what I had said before I had an opportunity of telling them myself.

I was rather surprised to hear the hon. member for Port Curtis say there is considerable discord between the two Government parties in this House. He said, "It is a shame that we are governed by a Government in which such discord exists." I assure the hon. member that the majority of the members of the coalition are friends—very good friends—who work together for the benefit of the State. They have no idea of personal aggrandisement; they work together as a team to assist the development of Queensland.

Having dealt with the nicer things—I think it is important that every now and then men should exchange pleasantries—I turn to the things that are required in the Albert electorate.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I address my remarks first to the Minister for Lands, and perhaps to the Minister for Primary Industries. I believe that South Stradbroke Island, which contains about 5,000 acres of land—a little more, or a little less—should be retained in its present state as a recreation reserve. About 1,100 acres are under lease—31 permanent tenures, 15 special leases and one informal lease—which leaves about 3,900 acres. Of course, this area has a few mining leases on it, but the land not already under lease should be put aside by the Government so that our children's children can enjoy on Stradbroke Island the things we are enjoying there today. As Australia is developed, and particularly as Queensland is developed, it is becoming more difficult to find places where one can get close to nature. Stradbroke Island has many natural attractions and one can relax completely there in the sunshine, the sea air, and the pleasant climate. Every effort should be made, too, to retain some of the flora and fauna. Various species of wildflowers grow on South Stradbroke Island, and there are

many wild animals there, although not as many as there were before the Labour Party allowed the indiscriminate shooting of them.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: Any dingoes?

Mr. CAREY: There are wallabies, goannas and other species of lizards, as well as colourful birds, which the hon. member for Tablelands would not know anything about because the area he represents has been denuded of wild life. He has allowed indiscriminate shooting in his area and no longer has it the beautiful wild life that previously roamed there.

I believe this land should be retained and I suggest to the Government that it set aside the remainder as a permanent recreation reserve.

Mr. Bromley: They could call it "Carey's Park".

Mr. CAREY: It would be all right to name it "Carey Park". It would be the only thing in Queensland named after Carey, and I have been here longer than the hon. member has.

I intend to deal with the very important tourist industry. The setting up of South Stradbroke Island as a recreation reserve would play a tremendous part in improving tourist facilities on our coast. I am very glad to see in the Chamber the Treasurer, who administers harbours and marine affairs. I ask him to dredge the channel from Brisbane to Southport because it is essential to have a channel 6 feet deep at low tide from the capital city to Southport. It may not be generally known, but 317 rather large yachts and power boats are registered with the Queensland Yacht Club. There are approximately 182 registered with the Southport Yacht Club, and, in addition, there are many yachts not registered with either club. Numerous boats use this channel and I think it is important that we should have the waterway cleared so that anyone can ply between Brisbane and Southport without being stuck on a sandbank.

During the time at my disposal I should like to deal also with main roads, but I am hoping the Main Roads Department Estimates will come up for discussion, when I will be able to deal with the subject more fully. Yesterday two very reputable people told me that the volume of traffic on the South Coast Highway, including the four-lane sections, was so congested that vehicles were virtually brought to a halt. Anything that will relieve the traffic congestion on this road, even temporarily, should be done. By the time we complete the four-lane highway to the Gold Coast, the area and the volume of traffic will have grown to such an extent that it will be necessary for the Government to start immediately building a six-lane highway.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. CAREY: The Minister for Main Roads is always in my good books because he spends an enormous amount of money in my area, but he will

have to spend much more. However, I will deal with that point more fully if the Estimates for the Main Roads Department are debated. Some relief of traffic congestion on this road, even of a temporary nature, should be undertaken. This article appeared in "The Sunday Mail" of 14 August—

"Nearly Mile a Minute Boat Race

"In just 178 minutes yesterday Brisbane speedboat owner-driver Jim Rice won the 164 mile Surfers' Paradise-Brisbane and back powerboat race.

"Shattering all those old illusions about 'pottering around the Bay,' Rice pushed his 17 ft. cruiser over the course at an average speed of more than 55 miles an hour."

If it was possible for that boat to travel at 55 miles an hour over the water in its present condition—with sandbanks at Jacob's Well and Macleay Island, and another close to the Grand Hotel—what would prevent our having a very fast boat service between Brisbane and Southport if adequate dredging were carried out? As a matter of fact, I am looking forward to the time when we have a hydrofoil operating two or three services daily. I am not being very visionary here, because recently I had a visit from a member of a Japanese firm that builds hydrofoils. He would have been prepared to establish this service had the channels been deep enough to carry traffic permanently. At very little outlay the Government could dredge the channels, and at the same time reclaim land with the sand and silt. The reclaimed land could then be sold.

Housing, of course, has always been one of my pet subjects. I agree fully with what is said in this newspaper article—

**"Housing 'May be Crux'
"View on Migration**

"Housing could be the crux of migration, the Queensland Agent-General, Dr. W. A. T. Summerville, said in his annual report tabled in State Parliament today."

That is a very important statement by Dr. Summerville. If this country is to develop and grow, it is imperative that we have migrants coming here in sufficient numbers to take up the slack when labour is short. It is right that migrants should be adequately housed, but it is also very important that we should adequately house our own Australian-born citizens who have lived here all their lives.

The Minister for Works and Housing is a very sympathetic gentleman and I again appeal to him to build more houses in Southport. I also want a few at Canungra, but it is particularly important that we have them at Southport because of the tremendous development that is going on there. During the last financial year \$20,000,000 worth of building permits were issued by the Gold Coast City Council.

Mr. Davies: Is not Canungra more important?

Mr. CAREY: No, Southport is more important because of the number of people who reside there. We need more houses to house the workmen who are employed on the construction of the buildings for which those permits were issued. Already 50 acres of Housing Commission land have been taken up at Roryville, which is about 1½ miles from the post office. I believe it is the intention of the Queensland Housing Commission to develop it gradually. We do need approximately 20 houses for rental purposes. I am sure it would not be long before they were taken up and bought if they were available.

I am now going to turn to something that I know hon. members opposite have been dying for me to deal with. I intend to read a prepared statement. Although I do not like reading statements, I intend to read this one. I wish to devote some of the time at my disposal to placing in the records of "Hansard" a few pertinent points on three-cornered contests as they apply in Queensland; not that it greatly worries me now but I will admit that I was concerned whilst waiting for the final count.

Mr. Bromley: Did you read the Liberal journal?

Mr. CAREY: I will come to that in a minute.

I am quite certain that any other hon. member would also be concerned if he had to wait 14 days for a decision on his election. I won the seat of Albert against terrific odds. The Country Party had a meritorious win in my electorate, and it can take pride in the organisation which assisted me and the confidence shown in good government by the great majority of the electors of Albert.

It was not my Liberal opponents who nearly defeated me. I should like hon. members to listen to this. As a matter of fact, when my opponent stood in 1963 as an Independent he received 34.1 per cent. of the valid primary votes cast, whereas in the 1966 election, as a Liberal, his share of the primary votes dropped to 33.2 per cent. It was the concerted effort of the Labour Party to unseat a sitting Government member which counted most. The Labour preferences accounted for most of the trouble. I quite agree with the hon. member for Belmont. Certainly it was the preferential vote that caught up with me. I am against it; I always have been, and I always will be.

Mr. Tucker: You were almost hoist with your own petard, and now you are crying.

Mr. CAREY: I am not crying about anything. I can take my medicine, and I hope the hon. member can.

I was opposed to preferential voting, I am still opposed to it, and I always will be. The Labour Party in the Albert electorate directed its preferences to the Liberal Party candidate and was successful in steering 70.8 per cent. of the Labour votes to my opponent, whereas in 1963, when the Labour Party

directed its preferences to me, it could influence only 53.8 per cent. to follow its card.

Now, this is past history but what concerns me most today is, "What of the future?" Will common sense prevail in Queensland, as mentioned by my colleague, Mr. Russ Hinze, the hon. member for South Coast, in his maiden speech.

Mr. Newton: How could the Liberals do that when they had your opponent elected in their journal?

Mr. CAREY: I have it here. I thank the hon. member. I will raise that point in a minute.

The majority of the people of Queensland recognise this Government as a good Government. They have shown their faith in us by re-electing us at the last poll. But our supporters are concerned and many strongly disagree with a section of the Liberal Party's organisation in opposing sitting members of their coalition Country Party partners.

I do not believe that anyone associated with these two major political parties can register a very strong protest against open competition between Country Party and Liberal Party candidates when a seat becomes vacant by resignation, retirement or death. But to oppose one another, when a safe seat is held by a Government member, appears to the thinking person as ridiculous and verging on political suicide which, if continued, could bring down the best Government this State has enjoyed for many years. The man in the street is worried about this situation and I am confident that the majority of members in this Chamber will work for a better understanding between their organisations.

While I was having recorded in "Hansard" my opinion of three-cornered contests, the hon. member for Belmont interjected and asked if I had seen "The Queensland Liberal".

Mr. Walsh: It is published by Coronation Press.

Mr. CAREY: I do not know who Coronation Press is. I know it is certainly not published by my Press. Apparently it is the Liberal Party's journal and Bible. This copy is dated June, 1966, Volume 7, No. 80. It contains a page with the heading—

"New Liberal Faces for State
Parliament
Likely Winners"

Five very good-looking gentlemen are depicted in the photograph on this page.

Mr. Bromley: They were not new; they were "old".

Mr. CAREY: I thought they were all new; we are all getting old, and old wine is very good. I am concerned mainly about the photograph of my Liberal opponent for the seat of Albert. This article reads—

"E. O. Harley (Albert) is Mayor of Gold Coast, and previously stood for this seat

as an Independent before Liberal organisation was established on the Gold Coast. He is an energetic and dedicated spokesman for the tourist industry."

He is at liberty to have his own thoughts on whether he is a dedicated spokesman for the tourist industry. He has done a bit of touring himself recently and I am sure he enjoyed it. But this very important paper continues—

"Alderman E. O. Harley won a close victory in Albert, which balanced the narrow loss in the 'sister' seat of South Coast. It is interesting to note that in the whole of Gold Coast area the Liberal Party received a clear majority of support as compared with any other party."

This was before the decision by the returning officer on who had won the seat.

Mr. Bromley: It makes you sick.

Mr. CAREY: It certainly does.

Mr. Davies: Who is responsible for that?

Mr. CAREY: I can only answer the hon. member for Maryborough by saying that I presume it was the officers of the Liberal Party's organisation.

Mr. Walsh: Who are they?

Mr. CAREY: The hon. member for Bundaberg knows them as well as I do. There is no doubt that the president of the day, the secretary of the day, and the editor of this journal were responsible for electing a man before he was elected. I felt very sorry for my opponent, Mr. Harley, having his photograph blazed in this paper as a winner when in fact he was a loser. It is a little like Napoleon, Hitler, and Mussolini, who struck victory medals before they had achieved victory. But poor old Mr. Harley did not have to strike a medal. All he got was his photograph in the Liberal journal.

I also wish to have recorded in "Hansard" a letter which has just come into my possession from a highly reputable and distinguished gentleman of Brisbane. I want to read it as I wish to have it placed on record. It was sent to the headquarters of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Bromley: By registered mail, too?

Mr. CAREY: It might have been. All I know is that I have the letter here.

Mr. Walsh: Did Jack Egerton write it?

Mr. CAREY: I am not divulging the name of the gentleman who wrote it. It reads—

"The General Secretary,
Liberal Party of Australia,
Queensland Division,
Box 1045N, G.P.O.
Brisbane.

Dear Sir,

"I read with great surprise the paragraph on Page 12 of the June issue of 'The Queensland Liberal' that Alderman Harley had won a close victory in Albert.

"It seems most extraordinary that an organisation such as the Liberal Party should be so foolish as to count their chickens before they are hatched in making a statement of this nature.

"In the business and Board Room circles in which I move there has been most unfavourable reaction from solid Liberal supporters at the lack of common sense displayed by a responsible body in making a specific statement of this nature when the issue was so uncertain.

"This completely inaccurate statement leaves the Party open to ridicule and has not enhanced its status and prestige in the eyes of its supporters."

That is the sort of thing that went on in my electorate. I do not believe it was quite as vicious in other electorates.

In the few minutes still available to me, I should like to take this matter a little further. I was rather interested to hear the comments of the hon. member for Belmont when he was endeavouring to convey to the House certain views about the Country Party. Of course, I know he does not really believe there is any connection between the Country Party and Communism. I wish to refer to some of the things that the hon. member for Belmont said were in a letter written to the "Warwick Daily News" during the by-election at which the present member for Warwick stood and won the seat. Of course, there was an Independent in the field against him. It is well known that at that time Mr. Harley was an Independent. I wish to read this passage so that it will be incorporated in my speech—

"Many people refrain from nominating for public office because of the unsavoury tactics used by party machines to discredit the candidate personally in the eyes of the electors."

No doubt that could have been a reference to the Labour Party, the Liberal Party, or the Country Party. This was said by the then Mayor of the Gold Coast in an article written to the "Warwick Daily News". I am quite prepared to accept that this would be possible because then his mind, ideas and ideals were purely independent. Of course, every man can have a change of heart and mind, and after he wrote that he possibly had such a change and joined the Liberal Party.

I cannot accept, without some defence of my leaders in the Country Party, the passage that is also referred to in "Hansard" in the speech of the hon. member for Belmont. I do not believe that strong men need to be defended. Although men such as the Premier, the Minister for Education, other Cabinet Ministers, and back-benchers for that matter, who take part in the running of the affairs of the Country Party, do not need

much defending, I think it desirable to have this recorded for posterity. This is what Mr. Harley said—

"The present control of the Country Party is in the hands of men who know not the words 'respect', 'decency', 'fair play', or 'principle . . .'"

I draw special attention to the last few words.

Mr. Sullivan: He stands condemned for that.

Mr. CAREY: I think I would stand condemned if I made a statement like that about the Labour Party.

Mr. Bromley: A scurrilous statement.

Mr. CAREY: That is the word I want. I thank the hon. member.

Mr. Harley then said—

" . . . but who operates in a manner that leaves the Communists with a lot to learn in the art of upsetting democracy."

It is rather veiled, but he is telling the world, through the country Press, what he thinks of the leaders of the Country Party. I ask hon. members, through you, Mr. Speaker, whether they can accept an attack of that type from a man who has been disappointed in his political ambitions. Everyone knows that the leaders of the Country Party are as well respected as the leaders of other political parties. In my opinion they are better respected. The Country Party covers a wider field of operations than other parties.

Mr. Sullivan: This would never have been tried even by our worst political opponent. It is shocking.

Mr. CAREY: I am greatly shocked to think that it ever found its way into the Press. I am firmly convinced that the coalition Government, led by the Hon. Frank Nicklin, backed by the Deputy Premier, Hon. Gordon Chalk, and with the support of the men who believe in their policy and are prepared to get behind them, will retain the Treasury benches for as long as the Labour Party did.

In conclusion, let me say that I am very pleased indeed to be here.

Mr. Aikens: Didn't the Labour Party give its preferences to the Liberal candidate in your electorate?

Mr. CAREY: Yes, it certainly did. That shocked me, too.

It is a great pleasure for me to be here. It was a tough, hard fight. If it can be shown in any way that it was not a clean fight on my side, I am prepared to apologise, because I did not make any statement unless I was satisfied that it was completely accurate.

I say this to the leaders of the Liberal Party: do not come into my electorate again and say, "Of course, you are all right, but the Premier thinks more of the North Coast than he does of the Gold Coast." What a downright ridiculous statement that

is! I have been in the Premier's electorate recently, and he has nothing in it to be compared with what we have on the South Coast. Facts and figures will prove that the South Coast, because of the way it is growing, is certain to receive further funds from the Government.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Mulgrave) (4.29 p.m.): I join with the mover and the seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply in affirming my personal loyalty and the loyalty of the people of the Mulgrave electorate, whom I have the honour to represent, to Her Majesty the Queen. I also join with them in offering my congratulations to Sir Alan Mansfield on his appointment to the very high and important office of Governor of Queensland. I have no doubt that he and Lady Mansfield will discharge their duties with satisfaction to themselves and benefit to the State. We all realise that the example set by his predecessor showed a very high standard of service to the State, but I feel that this distinguished Queenslander will at least measure up to that standard and, if possible, surpass it.

I should also like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your re-election as Speaker of this House. I have no doubt that you will discharge your duties, as you have since you attained that high office, with dignity to yourself and impartiality to members of the House. I should like to thank you also for the many courtesies you have shown to me, and indeed to other members of this Chamber, on the occasions when we have approached you and it has been within your jurisdiction to do something for us.

Mr. Walsh: You reckon he is a pretty good bloke?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: He is not a bad fellow, and a very able officer of this Parliament.

I should like to congratulate, too, all the new members who have graced this Chamber with their presence since the last election. I mention particularly Mrs. Jordan who is, I think, only the second woman to enjoy that privilege. I hope the stay in Parliament of all those hon. members will be beneficial to their electors and a satisfaction to themselves.

I intend today to devote most of my time to some of the industries in my electorate, the problems associated with them, and the manner in which they concern people not only involved in them but associated with them. I do not think there is any need for me to tell hon. members again, but in case some have forgotten I will recount some of the main industries in my electorate. They are, in the main, sugar, timber, dairying and mixed agriculture.

As the representative of the people engaged in these industries and those associated with them, I regard this occasion as an important opportunity to record their trials and their hopes for inclusion by the

Government as units in the over-all appreciation of the economy of this State. I am well aware that the people in these industries are not the only people I represent, but it is inescapable that the over-all prosperity and well-being of all of my electors must primarily depend on the industries I have mentioned as the basis of community wealth and existence. All sections of the community must appreciate that their existence depends upon the prosperity of those industries, and, to ensure that the over-all community does not suffer, these industries must be kept dynamic and in sound economic health.

It is a matter of great dissatisfaction to me on this occasion to record that in my electorate at least one of the major industries has not maintained anything like the standard necessary for its own or the community's economic welfare. I appreciate that the Mulgrave electorate is only a part of the whole State but it is for the representatives of other electorates to speak for themselves. For my part I would feel I was neglecting my responsibilities to my electors if their position was not clearly expressed and recorded for consideration by the Government at this time of depressed prices, particularly in the sugar industry. As their representative—and living in the area in constant communication with them, I must be aware of their problems much more than people who perhaps are not so closely associated with them—I feel it is my duty to bring their problems before this House as forcibly as I can.

At the present time the sugar industry is suffering to a far greater extent, I should say, than any other industry that I know or am associated with in this State. This is a result of the very low world free market price, and also because a very large percentage of our production now has to be sold on that market at a price which is considerably under the cost of production. It is the lowest price for many years, even without taking into consideration the increased costs that this industry has had to bear. This means in cold, hard fact that the people in the sugar industry are not getting sufficient to maintain production and to pay their way. This situation in such an important industry, one of the main industries along the eastern coast of Australia, must have some effects on the other industries that live alongside it. This, to some extent, is the position that exists in the part of the State that I live in.

Since the end of the last financial year I have made it my business to have a look at a few of the fairly progressive farms in the area with a view to ascertaining, if possible, what was necessary to bring this industry back to something like the financial stability it enjoyed previously. I think we all appreciate that in any industry there are the top performers, some who are average, some a little under average, and some who would not do very well under any circumstances. I have taken what might be considered the

better-than-average farms, where the production has been better than the average of the mill area in which they are operated. I find from delving into their costs that at the present time we need something of the order of \$2 per ton of cane over the whole of our production on the present acreage to make it something like a modest working business investment. I point out that the average production was 36 per cent. higher than the average of the mill areas—

Mr. Aikens: Is that average per acre?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: It was 36 per cent. higher than the mill average per acre. I feel that that should convey to hon. members, and others who are perhaps not as well informed on the sugar industry as some of us, the severity with which the smaller man in the industry has been hit, whether he be a new grower who has come into the industry or an old grower who is endeavouring to increase his production. There is no doubt in my mind, or in the mind of anyone else who has gone to the trouble to inform himself factually, that unless substantial cash gains are provided for the cane-growers in my electorate—and no doubt in many other electorates throughout the State—the year 1967 will probably see reduced production. Indeed, I feel that some of the farmers will use their farms more or less as a means of accommodation, seeking work where they can get it and growing their acreage on a volunteer basis for whatever it might be worth.

No industry, particularly one like the sugar industry with its unusual tie-up with the market system, can afford to let this happen. As hon. members know, it is the hope and desire of everyone associated with the industry, including those negotiating for it and managing it that before too long an International Sugar Agreement may again come into being. I think all hon. members realise how important it is for us to supply adequately and well the markets we now hold, and indeed, to extend them a little, if possible, so that when this day comes we may support with performances our claim for securing markets at what we hope will be reasonable prices.

Mr. Sullivan: Is it necessary to maintain production?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Very much so.

Mr. Sullivan: In order to enhance the world prices?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: It is not so much to enhance the world price. When an international agreement comes into being we want to hold the markets we have established so that we can retain our equity. If we slip it will be very hard for us, as the hon. member would know from his association with marketing, to get something we cannot justify.

It is of paramount importance that production should not slip. I feel that in the few minutes I have devoted to this subject I have established that we must receive at least \$2 a ton more than we did for the last crop. If we do not, production must slip. If this condition continues throughout 1967, by 1968 a significant number of cane-growers will be either destitute or forced to leave the industry.

Mr. Aikens: What would you regard as the valid cost of production per ton of cane to let the farmer just break "even steven?"

Mr. ARMSTRONG: That is very hard to say, because costs vary. There are high-cost farms and low-cost farms, and sweet farms and farms that are not so sweet. We can only work more or less on an average basis in our industry.

Mr. Aikens: Would you say they would want £4 for a ton of cane?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: They would want a lot more than the equivalent of £4, I should say, to get them back onto a reasonable economic basis.

Mr. Lickiss: What are you basing your estimate on, a c.c.s. of 14?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: No, I would not be basing it on 14. I think that is too high.

These problems must be ventilated so that we may do something about them. I am not suggesting that the Government has been found wanting, and I should not like anyone to get that idea. As hon. members know, the Government has not the necessary resources to assist the industry, as the figure I have in mind is about \$30,000,000.

Mr. NEWBERRY: That would be \$4 a ton on free market sugar.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Yes, equivalent to \$4 a ton of cane on what we are now selling at world free market price.

I do not think anyone would suggest that this Government could find the resources to cover such a large sum. I place on record the industry's appreciation of what the Government has done. We ran into trouble last year and the Government did its best to assist those mills that got into financial difficulties—particularly the co-operative mills. The Government has also tried to assist cane-growers in the drought-stricken areas as well as growers who have found difficulty in paying some of the levies imposed on the industry to help the mills that got into financial difficulties. The Government has been very sympathetic in every way; indeed, I think we all know it is still playing a very active part at present, in conjunction with the industry and the Federal Government, in endeavouring to solve the problems I have cited. I hope it is not too long before the solution is found. The farmers are at present preparing for next year's crop and if

sufficient money is not found for them to adequately cultivate and fertilise, production will slip. Then, if and when an international sugar agreement is formulated, instead of our expansion scheme doing what it was designed to do, it will achieve nothing.

Mr. Aikens: Don't you think that if they were South-east Asians they would get a better deal from the Federal Government?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: No, I would not say that. I know the problems associated with this industry. The industry itself has discussed these problems for some time with the Premier and some of his colleagues and there has been a good deal of discussion between those gentlemen and the Federal Government. It is not an easy problem to solve, but it must be solved as soon as possible so that confidence is instilled in these people to go on and perform their tasks in this important field.

In addition to the problems confronting the cane-growers and the mills, there has been an adverse effect on many business people in small towns and provincial cities in sugar areas. Storekeepers, hotelkeepers, garage proprietors, and people in engineering works and the like are experiencing great difficulty. They cannot carry the farmers for ever, particularly in the system under which we live. Many of these people are not newcomers to the area. They have spent most of their lives building up their businesses. None of us want to see them get into financial difficulties or have to dispense with the services of some of their skilled staff.

Anybody who has followed the trends in the sugar world knows there is little chance that the situation will correct itself in the near future. If sugar is being sold at the equivalent of \$30, or a little more, on the world market they cannot grow cane for very long and will drop out of the industry. In due course, when the surplus sugar has gone, the industry will right itself. But we want to keep the industry intact so that it can play its full part in the economy of this State and of Australia. The depressed state of the industry and of the business people in sugar towns must have an effect on the economy of the State and of the Commonwealth. These people will not pay very much tax, which is not good. None of us enjoy paying tax but we know what happens if we do not pay it, so I hope the solution to these problems is found quickly.

It was to some extent heartening to read in "The Courier-Mail" this morning that the Prime Minister, Mr. Holt, said that the Federal Government was considering means of helping the sugar industry as a matter of grave urgency. Before he left for overseas he said, "In co-operation with the Queensland Government, our efforts will be continued until a solution is found." Mr. Holt also said that the Queensland Premier had made strong representations to him concerning the difficult

position facing the sugar industry in Queensland and New South Wales. He went on to add a little more about the world situation.

There is plenty of evidence that the Premier and his Cabinet colleagues have been doing what they think should be done in an endeavour to overcome the present difficult situation. If this is not done the sugar industry must slip even further, because cane-growers are not receiving sufficient money to pay their way and maintain production. There will be greater deterioration if assistance is not made available quickly.

Many people seem to think that the sugar industry should be able to live through this period on the savings that they say should have been accumulated during the years when the industry was on something like an even keel. I have heard that opinion expressed many times, and I suppose others have heard it, too. I want to point out clearly that the capital cost that the industry was called on to bear in a very short time, in both the growing and the milling fields, was so heavy that savings were very quickly eaten up and the industry had to borrow from wherever finance was available. When they are not receiving cost of production it is not possible for them to plough anything back, and that is briefly where the trouble lies.

Mr. Hanlon: Do you accept the criticism of the former Treasurer of the conduct of mill managements?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: No, not exactly. The expansion of this industry throughout the State cost something of the order of \$200,000,000, which gives some indication of the amount of capital required in a very short time. Now it has to be paid back.

In the area that I represent, and no doubt in others also, there is every indication that the sugar content of the cane this year will not be as high as it was last year, and this will aggravate the position still further.

The sugar industry is very important not only to Queensland but to the whole of Australia. For a number of years it has been a good export earner, and I feel that Australia as a whole—and this includes the southern States—has enjoyed some of the prosperity that it has brought to the country. Many people believe that the price of sugar is subsidised, and it is not generally recognised that the sugar industry assists other industries. It should be remembered at all times that very high tariffs are imposed in Australia to allow of the establishment of secondary industries. Generally speaking, I think we can agree with that practice. I also feel, however, that those who enjoy that protection must always remember that the sugar industry, along with the wool, wheat, meat, dairying and other industries, has made it possible for them to become established.

The sugar industry is a large purchaser of, for example, farm machinery, and in this way has materially assisted those in industries that enjoy protection. It therefore behoves those

people at least to try to understand the problems that the sugar industry is facing and assist it back onto an even keel so that it, in turn, can continue to assist other industries in the future. As an export earner it is a very important industry. It must be remembered that the expansion was embarked upon mainly to develop the country but specifically to earn overseas credits, and I believe that Australia as a whole has some responsibility in this field.

I remind hon. members that in Australia sugar has remained at the same price since about 1960, although the industry has been called upon to absorb many increases in wages, fertiliser prices, and the prices of farming equipment and other things associated with it. It is not possible for the sugar industry, or any other primary industry, to go on absorbing costs indefinitely.

Mr. Adair: Raise the home-consumption price.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I see no reason why that should not be done.

Mr. Adair: Neither do I.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: That is the point I am making. Many people seem to have it stuck in their minds that the sugar industry should go on absorbing costs that are really being forced upon it because of the policy of the Federal Government.

I do not want anyone to get the idea that I am suggesting that there should be low wages and a low standard of living. That is not my idea. I have said before—and I say it again—that we must pay the best wages we can and raise the standard of living as high as we can because this is our best market. Almost from the beginning of self-government primary industries have been earning the overseas credits that have made it possible to lift the standard of living and wages to their present level. I do not think it is necessary for me to indicate in this House that if primary industries are not prosperous the standard of living now enjoyed by people in all walks of life must decline, and I do not think anyone wants to see that.

Mr. Hanlon: To what extent would the home-consumption price have to be increased to be of any significance to the industry in its present state?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I do not think it would be fair to ask the Australian consumer to pay the price for home-consumption sugar that would be required to make up the leeway. In my opinion, a subsidy, a grant, or something of that sort, is the correct approach, together with an increased home-consumption price to absorb some of the costs that have been loaded onto the industry as a result of Government policy.

Mr. Tucker: Don't you think that lifting the home-consumption price would have the effect of making people buy less sugar.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: One hears that argument used time and time again. I think this is one of the best illustrations I can give. In many countries the manufacturers of cigarettes have been forced to include on their packages warnings about injury to health, and so on, and newspaper articles indicate that smoking is one of the causes of lung cancer. But I notice that this does not stop the producers of cigarettes from increasing prices if they think it is necessary to do so. They are not concerned with that problem.

I do not think any fair-minded Australian believes that wages can be increased continually with industry absorbing the increases. One cannot expect a man drawing so much a week to go on absorbing increased costs, either. There has to be a balance somewhere along the line, and I think the ordinary Australian expects that.

Mr. Tucker: To put the same argument, why was not relief given to our consumers when the price was £100 a ton overseas?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The consumers in Australia were not affected when the price was £100 a ton overseas.

Mr. Tucker: Somebody must have got it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: It was absorbed in the general economy of the State at that time. I did not think I would have to remind the hon. member of this, but he should remember that all the people who were working in the industry received a prosperity loading of £2 a week, which took quite a large share of the money.

Mr. Low: And they are still getting it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Yes: It is now part and parcel of the wage structure.

We have never heard anybody saying too much on behalf of the new grower. He was given a cane assignment and asked to get into production quickly so that he might assist the industry to fill market opportunities. Much has been said about mills and other farmers but let me give hon. members some indication of what some of these new growers have been called upon to find, by various means, in establishing themselves. Many of them are not yet fully established, which makes their chance of survival much slimmer.

I do not know too much about growers in the southern part of the State—they may be able to operate more cheaply than we can in the North—but it is reasonable to assume that it will cost a new grower in the North anything from \$43,000 to \$45,000 to establish himself. Clearing rain forest in these areas, when it has to be done quickly, is not a cheap operation. It costs anything from \$200 to \$240 an acre to get rid of standing scrub, push it into heaps and perhaps have the roots ripped out. From then on it is the farmer's responsibility and he has to spend more money.

These men were unlucky to hit the reduced world price with the first crop they produced. To illustrate my point further, I point out

that many of the mills in the northern part of the State have an initial price over the weighbridge of something of the order of \$5 a ton. Many of the new growers, particularly those dealing with the Agricultural Bank—I suppose it could be worse with other banks—are being asked for a repayment of \$2 a ton from their initial crop. I think all hon. members will realise that it costs in excess of \$2 a ton to cut cane, to say nothing of transport costs.

Many growers in the North, in order to get their cane to the mill tramline, would be faced with a cutting and hauling rate of something of the order of \$3. If they have to pay \$3 to get the cane as far as that and \$2 to the bank and they average \$5 a ton—in addition, new land quite often produces less sugar content than old land—one can see what chance they have of surviving. They would not earn enough to feed themselves, unless of course they eat cane tops.

I sincerely hope that the people in the industry, with the Premier and those who are now examining this position closely, will come up with a solution very quickly, because it is urgently required. The industry appreciated what the Federal Government did recently in offering a subsidy on nitrogenous fertiliser. That is something which I am sure every cane-grower will appreciate; the industry has been asking for it for many years. But here again, when this is related to the price of cane, depending on how much of this commodity one uses, it might mean something of the order of nine or 10 cents a ton. Although it may be a fair amount of money spread over the whole, it is when related to cane price, perhaps not as much as one might think. However, I am sure that the industry is very happy about it.

Mr. Adair: Some cannot afford to buy fertiliser.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: That is the point. Along with other commodities, fertiliser has increased in cost.

Another important industry about which I should like to say a few words is the timber industry. I feel that we should examine this industry very closely in order to get it onto a stable basis. I was closely associated with this industry for many years. It seems always to be up and down like a yo-yo. This is brought about as the result of several problems, mainly in the marketing field. As the building industry fluctuates, we can expect trouble in the timber industry.

I strongly urge that the Government have a look at the volume of products imported from overseas. I cannot see any sense in importing products if we can produce them here. I am reliably informed that at the present time about 20,000,000 super feet of rough sawn timber from New Guinea and Brazil is annually finding its way onto the Queensland market. That does not include log timber, ply timber and many other forestry products that we get from overseas. This is a matter that this Government, and

indeed the Federal Government, should look at to ensure that we import only sufficient timber to make up the difference between the demand and what we can grow and process at home. I remind the House that the cost of timber and forestry products imported into Australia is close to \$200,000,000 a year, second only to the bill for the importation of oils and the like.

I feel that we should approach the Tariff Board on this problem. Perhaps an even better suggestion might be to seek the assistance of the Australian Forestry Council—a body set up only recently—and get it to join with us in our efforts to narrow down the gap.

Mr. Murray: The answer would be more plantings.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Ultimately we will achieve that.

If we must import, for heaven's sake let us import logs and process them in Queensland or Australia so that our own people will get the benefit of it. We admit that we have to import to a certain extent because we have not the quantity of timber that we need. My friend from Clayfield has suggested that plantings are the answer. Since the setting up of the Australian Forestry Council we are getting results in this direction. I do hope that my area, which has a number of sawmills, will not be forgotten.

Mr. Davies: It is rather late—

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I suggest that the hon. member should not get me in on this question. His Government must accept much of the responsibility for the present position, but I will let that wait until another day. I want to talk not about what has happened, but what may happen in the future. I am suggesting that certain matters require the urgent and earnest attention of this Government and this Parliament in order to get the timber industry onto a proper footing. One of those matters is the security of raw materials. I think it is reasonable to assume that no-one can be expected to put a lot of money into an industry when he does not know how long his raw materials will last, or what price he will receive for his product. At the present time costs are on the up-and-up. I am led to believe that sawmillers north of Townsville draw approximately 60 per cent. of their logs from State forests.

(Time expired.)

Mr. MULLER (Fassifern) (5.10 p.m.): I preface my remarks by joining with other hon. members in offering sincere congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the motion. After being in Parliament for about 30 years, I can say that it is rare that we get men coming into this Chamber with the degree of genuine knowledge and common sense displayed by the two hon. members entrusted with the moving and seconding of this motion. I am sure that both of them will make their way in this Parliament.

I join with other hon. members also in expressing my deep appreciation of the Opening Speech of His Excellency the Governor in this, the first session since being appointed to his high and honoured position. I offer him my sincere congratulations. I know of no-one who could more capably represent Queensland than Sir Alan Mansfield, and, with him, Lady Mansfield. No-one is more deserving of the honour that has been conferred upon him. Through him, I should like to assure Her Majesty of the utmost loyalty of my constituents.

This afternoon I propose to address my remarks chiefly to the plight of our primary industries. I am not implying that there has been any maladministration. They have simply drifted into their position as a result of the present inflationary trends. Before doing so I should like to mention one matter that has been raised here, although it does not concern my electorate.

There is an old saying that the Address-in-Reply debate gives hon. members an opportunity to work the parish pump. This concerns a matter outside my parish but it has some bearing on it. I refer to a decision of the Department of Transport relative to the Ellenborough Street bridge at Ipswich. The railway line divides Ipswich into two parts, north and south, and there has been a bridge at Ellenborough Street for as long as I can remember, and probably a lot longer. We have no definite information that the Railway Department intends to allow this bridge to go by the board when the present structure has outlived its usefulness, but we can only gather from a recent statement by the Minister in reply to a question from the Opposition that nothing will be done about it.

It will be a great pity if the Railway Department, as a means of balancing its budget, penalises the city of Ipswich as is proposed in this matter. The bridge has served the people of Ipswich for a long time. They did not ask for it; it was built for the convenience of the Railway Department. The railway line split the town in two and it was then found necessary to build the bridge.

It is most unfair to tell the people of Ipswich that the bridge is no longer required. I ask the Minister to talk to the Commissioner for Railways to ensure that justice is done for Ipswich. The amount of money involved is not great but if the bridge is not rebuilt the people will be put to the inconvenience of using either the Burnett Street bridge or the under-and-over bridge near the river, which will be very unfair. When the bridge was first constructed the population of Ipswich was much smaller than it is today, and it would be a great pity if the people were now told, "You have to go round about." I hope this matter will be further investigated before a final decision is made.

I now wish to discuss some matters of tremendous importance to our primary industries. I want hon. members to realise that the product of our primary industries is the lifeblood of the nation and that, if we allow the primary industries to starve, the whole country will starve with them. I am pleased that the Government has decided to do something for the sugar industry as, over the years, it has played the game. It has had an agreement to supply the people of Australia with sugar at a reasonable price and has been prepared to export at the world export price. This position prevailed, to the benefit of the people of Australia and the industry, for a number of years. That being so, I feel it is the Government's responsibility to assist the industry in times of stress. I do not know the extent of the trouble, and I am not suggesting that the Government should carry the whole of the burden, but the industry is in a very extraordinary position through no fault of its own. The growers and the organisation have played their part. It is now the Government's duty to ensure that the sugar industry is protected at this time.

I do not know a great deal about the sugar industry and its organisation, but I do know a great deal about the organisation of the dairying industry. My chief purpose in speaking this afternoon is to deal with the plight of the dairying industry and the unfair and vicious propaganda distributed by some of the margarine interests. Members of this Parliament should know the truth and the whole story. I have never seen the equal of this propaganda. These people must have a tremendous amount of money to be able to spend as much as they do in advertising. The booklet that I have here is not advertising, really; it is a scandal. It is untrue and unfair, and it is the Government's duty to intervene. These interests have even used a photograph of the Federal Minister for Primary Industry in one of their booklets, and have misconstrued something that he said. Almost all of this propaganda is a misconception or is untrue. The dairying industry has been worth a lot to Queensland. This Parliament should play the game with it, just as it did with the sugar industry. Nearly all the towns in the area from Rockhampton to Coolangatta, and from the coast to a point 200 miles inland, and some on the Atherton Tableland, owe their existence to the dairying industry. Take the dairying industry out of those areas and the towns go with it. If we are sincere about decentralisation we must stand by the dairying industry in this time of crisis, which is due largely to what has been done by those who manufacture butter substitutes.

We must be fair in trade and commerce, and fair competition is acceptable. If the margarine manufacturers were using ingredients produced under Australian conditions I would have no complaint. But they are not. They complain that the subsidy is a bounty to the dairying industry and its

inefficiency. The subsidy was introduced to help the dairying industry in a special set of circumstances. I am one of the few living original members of the Commonwealth Equalisation Committee. There are not too many left. It was established in 1935, not to give the dairying industry a leg up but to help it under the existing circumstances, and our organisation was established on the same lines as that in the sugar industry, and much the same as that in the wheat industry. The policy was that if we took a share of the local market we took a share of the export market. We were prepared to make a sacrifice by taking a share of the export market. I shall explain what that means.

Almost without exception the overseas market prices for wheat, sugar, and dairy produce are lower than the Australian prices. Over the years the ratio of butter exported to butter consumed locally has been about 50-50. It could perhaps change to 55-45 or 45-55, but I shall use 50-50 for the purpose of illustration. If I work on a 50-50 system, I shall not be far out.

After deducting transport charges, adding exchange, and taking off commission and other selling charges, the overseas selling price will net about 3s. 6d. a lb. I use sterling currency for the purpose of giving a simple illustration. The local price would net about 5s. a lb. On an average of 50-50, the return to the farmer would be about 4s. 3d. a lb.

I do not claim credit for launching the Commonwealth equalisation scheme. I was one of a committee who devised it, and it took quite a lot of working out. We did not have power, under section 92, to operate under statute, and we had to launch equalisation on a voluntary basis. Whatever was done with dairy produce was purely voluntary. All dairy factories in Australia are parties to this voluntary agreement. Anyone can retire from it if the required six months' notice is given, and that would be the end of it. Nobody is game to do that, however, because all know that it would react against them.

Then the subsidy came into the picture. The Commonwealth Government was prepared to play the game with us to the extent that they said, "We feel that this is so sound that we are prepared to give you all the proceeds of the subsidy and you can distribute them." They decided to do that, and they still do it. The money is not handled by the Commonwealth Government; for the purpose of distribution, it is handled by the Commonwealth Equalisation Committee who see that it is distributed on this basis throughout Australia.

We saw at that time that if we created a price and somebody else got in under our necks, as it were, he could capture the entire local market. I am not going to use this House for the purpose of blackguarding margarine. Do not forget, however, that good margarine is sold at about 5s.

a lb., or approximately the same price as butter. I appreciate what has been said already by hon. members who have spoken on this subject, and I do not want to repeat all their arguments. I endorse what they said. The point that has not been made, and which to my mind is a vital one, is that margarine manufacturers are taking advantage of the whole of the local market. They do not, and cannot, export even 1 lb. If a Commonwealth equalisation scheme applied to their industry, they could not live.

This is the type of material that they publish, and which I resent—

"Dairying . . . is notoriously inefficient.

"Most Australian industries that have been artificially protected against competition have developed an efficiency that stands comparison with the rest of the world. Steel and sugar come readily to mind.

"Not so the Australian dairying industry, which is notoriously inefficient; so inefficient, in fact, that it costs the taxpayers more than \$30 million a year to keep it going; so inefficient in New South Wales that the housewife pays exorbitantly for her milk."

I say that that is a deliberate lie; there is not a word of truth in it. I know of no section of the community, in secondary industry or anywhere else, in which people work harder and longer for the few pounds they receive than those engaged in dairying. I think that will be endorsed by any hon. member who knows rural districts. I feel that what the margarine industry is doing should not be allowed to continue.

The dairying industry was successful in having a quota placed on the production of margarine. We appealed to Governments for some protection, because the competition was so unfair. The quota was granted, but over the years it has been argued that it was illegal to enforce it. Recently the Privy Council ruled that the legislation is sound and that the Government is entitled to enforce the quota.

The complaint I make this afternoon—I hope the State Government will act on it—is that manufacturers of margarine have ignored the quota. New South Wales has a quota of about 4,000 tons; about 14,000 tons have been manufactured. In Queensland the quota is 2,400 tons; over 4,000 tons have been manufactured. Victoria has similar legislation and has enforced it right to the hilt. If Victoria can enforce it, why cannot Queensland and New South Wales? In Queensland, of course, the difference is comparatively small. The chief offender is Marrickville Holdings in Sydney, which is flouting the legislation by manufacturing large quantities of margarine.

I have here a booklet—what is contained in it is really scandalous—in which the manufacturers of margarine claim that they have not affected the dairying industry. I draw attention of hon. members to a graph

in the booklet. It shows that in 1955-56 the total consumption of butter and margarine was 32 lb. a head—29 lb. of butter and 3 lb. of margarine. In 1964-65—10 years later—it shows that the consumption was 22.6 lb. of butter and 4.5 lb. of margarine. The total consumption is 27 lb. against 32 lb. a head. In 10 years 5 lb. has gone somewhere. No-one is silly enough to believe that the people of Australia have so changed their eating habits that they are eating 5 lb. less of either butter or margarine than they were 10 years ago. It is obvious that the figures given by the manufacturers of margarine are not correct. It is not known how much they are manufacturing; the fact is that they are manufacturing considerably more than they have revealed to the people of this country.

Of course, the question has been considered very fully. I realise that if it is possible to make margarine out of safflower seed and other seeds grown in Queensland, we cannot close our eyes to that. The manufacturers have a perfect right to produce and sell margarine as long as the competition is clean and fair. However, if they are to get the butter price for it at the expense of butter producers, something should be done to protect the butter producers. Hon. members should remember that every pound of margarine eaten in Australia means that the dairying industry has to export another pound of butter and lose about 18d. a pound on it. The nation is meeting that expense, and a great deal of the propaganda is accepted because people do not know the full story.

Mr. O'Donnell: Don't you think there has been a good deal of propaganda against butter by dietitians and people of that sort?

Mr. MULLER: The propaganda is inspired by people who have a vested interest; much of it is vicious. They try to tell people, "From a health point of view, you should not have butter." They have no evidence to support that contention. The incidence of cancer is one of the things they work on; they also work on heart disease. The incidence of heart disease in the United States of America is very much higher than it is in Australia, but the consumption of butter in America is very low. New Zealanders consume about 33 lb. of butter per capita, and the incidence of heart disease there is very low. On that basis, the argument falls to the ground. Medical opinion has been used by vested interests to support their argument, but no-one is really in a position to challenge it. We know that when a sick person is recuperating the first thing a doctor puts him onto is milk food. It is a well-known fact that milk is the only food that people can use from birth to old age. Anything else has to be varied. It is also well known that a human being can be carried right through life on milk or milk foods. That cannot be done with anything else, and there cannot be very much wrong with it if that is so.

The time has arrived for us to do something about controlling the margarine manufacturers. Otherwise they will control us. We have to get right down to the fundamental principle in this matter. Unless the dairying industry is protected in some way against this unfair competition it will have to go out. Never in my life have I seen so many people in the Fassifern electorate leaving the dairying industry. One may ask, "To whom are they selling?" In some cases they are selling to people from the cities who have a bit of money and do not know what they are buying into. Other people are buying up dairying properties and using them for something else.

In addition to the margarine problem we have to consider changed conditions. The smaller men are entitled to some help. Today we are living in a mechanical age. The days of the horse are gone; mechanical farming is not cheap, and unless a farmer is in a fairly big way he has no hope of competing. These days one simply has to use machines.

One of the reasons for the industry's receiving a subsidy is that the machinery people are protected. Those who manufacture the machines and those who sell them add on all their costs, and by the time the article reaches the farmer he has to carry the lot. The cost is passed right down the line until it reaches him and he has to carry it all. This, of course, does not apply only to mechanical farming but to everything used in connection with the working of a property. It applies equally to transport, spare parts and everything the farmer uses. He just has to take it.

Any wage-earner who has a grudge goes to the court and gets an increase. It is then passed down the line until it is finally paid by primary industry. Secondary industry does not pay these costs; it passes on additional costs, which go down the line until they get to the farmer, who has to carry them. This position cannot be allowed to continue; there has to be a stop somewhere. In days gone by the position was never so pronounced as it is at the moment. Extra costs were encountered but the farmer could recoup his costs somewhere; at the present time he cannot.

The position that I am speaking about exists not only in the dairying industry but in all primary industries. If one looks at the position squarely it will be seen that the solvency of this country is based on the solvency of our primary industries. Eighty per cent. of our revenue comes from export industries. What will happen—what can happen—in a set of circumstances such as these? If our exports fall our revenue falls too, and that means that the solvency of the nation falls with it. Therefore, I say that something has to be done.

There are a few other matters in connection with the dairying industry—apart altogether from unfair competition from

margarine—that need mentioning. Costs have been increasing in every way. I noticed the other day that chemists are talking about increases; doctors have asked for an increase; stores have applied extra handling costs and these costs are passed on. In its recent Budget the Commonwealth Government decided that taxation disbursements to the States would be kept to a minimum and that the States must find additional finance in the best way they can. As a result, the Treasurer said last week that during this session he would introduce measures which, in effect, would provide for additional new taxation. Whichever way one looks at it, whether it is to be sales tax, pay-roll tax—call it what you like—in every case it will be passed on and will go right down the line until it hits the farmer, who will have to carry it. In my opinion, that is why all these people are leaving their farms.

I do not know how we can afford to do without our primary producers. I do not know how we can afford to have the community misled as the margarine people are misleading them. I think that is wicked. We have to find some means of relief.

I get many people asking me for different things. I know they ask for things that are impossible, but they are really concerned about the present position. We hear a lot about decentralisation of industry, but where is secondary industry being established? I am in full support of secondary industry. It helped us out of a very difficult situation during the drought. It has done a mighty job. What I am concerned about is that secondary industries are set up around the cities.

People come to me with the suggestion, "Can't you get this Government to subsidise secondary industry in areas away from the city?" My reply is that it is economically impossible, that the Government would need the Bank of England behind it. Industries will become established only where they can compete. If an industry became established at Rocklea and a similar industry became established 60 miles out, the difference in freight would be enough to show a profit for the industry at Rocklea.

I think we have to make another approach. We have to do something about transport. I am not trying to escape my responsibility in that I may have thought something different a few years ago. It is only a fool who never changes his mind; wise people change their minds in exceptional circumstances. I think this is an exceptional circumstance.

This is a matter for co-operation between the State and Commonwealth Governments. I suggest that the present idea of transport tax is all wrong. It penalises country people; it means increased charges to people outside the cities. I realise that this money is used to build roads to serve the needs of country people, but we are never going to get decentralisation in this way. Instead of a transport tax I should like to see a tax on

fuel, sufficient to cover the whole of the cost of road construction. I do not mean a tax imposed by the Commonwealth authorities for the purpose of obtaining revenue, but a tax the whole proceeds from which should be diverted to the State. In that way we could cover the whole of our road-construction costs. This has just got to come, whether it is now or a little later. Until it is done everyone will remain in the cities. It is the only way we can ever get people out into the country areas.

I should like to give another illustration of what happens. Section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution permits those who are operating beyond our borders to bring their goods into Queensland and, at the same time, to avoid certain transport charges. In this way they compete with our people, whom they leave in a hopeless position. While we have section 92 operating as it does we can do nothing about this interstate competition. If the Commonwealth Government is not prepared to co-operate with the State so that we are in a position to finance road construction, it should accept the responsibility for building our roads. I realise that what I am suggesting is a tall order and that it may take a while to get people to see eye to eye with it, but I believe that what I suggest must be done.

I realise that we will have an opportunity to discuss finance in the Budget debate, but I wish to refer to one matter that forcibly impressed me in the Federal Budget debate when it was disclosed that \$1,000,000,000 was provided for defence. I know that, in the circumstances, that is absolutely necessary, but, I am very mindful of Hitler's statement before the last war—"Guns and butter." The way we are going we will have plenty of guns but not much butter. The first line of defence for any nation is its food supply, but at our present pace I can visualise the food supply diminishing rather rapidly. These matters can be overcome in many ways if we are prepared to adjust our plans in keeping with present-day needs. When such a situation arises we must take the necessary precautions to cope with it.

A few weeks ago I listened with interest to the speech delivered by the Governor-General, Lord Casey, in opening the Brisbane Exhibition. Part of his speech was devoted to the ravages of the cattle tick. It might be thought by some that the cattle tick affects only the owners of cattle, but in reality it affects everyone. No-one has been game to estimate the ravages caused by the cattle tick. While certain research work has continued, no practical findings have been reached. I believe that a good deal more should be done.

The Governor-General referred to the benefits to be gained from tick-resistant stock. I listened to that part of his speech with a great deal of interest. I should say that hybrid stock have some resistance to the tick, but not a great deal. It depends how far cross-breeding is carried. The zebu,

which is the basis for all the cross-breeds and hybrids, is not completely tick-resistant. I have seen newly imported zebu cattle at Waverley. When Mr. Wright was alive he asked me to inspect some newly imported cattle at St. Lawrence, and they were covered with ticks. They will carry ticks, although they are not affected by them in the same way as other breeds. I saw a zebu bull being vaccinated at Yeerongpilly to prevent redwater. I said to the officer-in-charge, "I thought these cattle did not get redwater." He said, "Who told you that?" It will be seen that even pure zebus do not have complete immunity. If they are imported and are in tick country, and then go to clean country, it is only a matter of time before they lose immunity. To my mind, they are not the complete answer.

I have told the House on two or three occasions about what happens on our own property. I will keep hammering at this despite the fact that I have been unable to convince the officers of the C.S.I.R.O. about it. The cattle on one property, drinking from a certain bore, will not carry ticks. If we keep the cattle on the water for a few weeks they are free of ticks. In an adjoining property, which was my father's selection—I have it now; my son owns the other property and we work them together—the cattle are tick-free while they drink this water.

The C.S.I.R.O. officers and our own State officers investigated this matter. After years of investigation they came back to us and said the ants were eating the ticks. I cannot remain silent about this; it is too absurd. The country is just the same. There is a three-strand barbed-wire fence between the two properties. The cattle on one have ticks, yet those on the other have not. I told the officers who made the investigation, "If you are right you have discovered something I never knew before, that is, that a barbed-wire fence will stop ants." They refused to take our advice and brought their own cattle in to prove their case. They put some of the cattle in tick-free country and some in the other country. When there were no ticks on the cattle in the clean country they put ticks onto the beasts and left the beasts on the property. In six weeks' time they were clean again.

I do not say that the ticks do not breed on that property but there are so few of them that a person would have to scratch the beast to find them, and instead of being mature ticks they are not even half-grown and are sovereign-coloured. The officers of the C.S.I.R.O. took water from the bore on the property and gave it to stock on their research stations. They said it was not effective. I claim they did not have enough of it because if cattle are kept on that water long enough the ticks go. We did another test. We allowed the cattle to drink from a dam on the same property and shut them off from the bore water. In a month or two they had ticks. That proves conclusively that it is the water.

I do not suggest that people on every property should bore until they find similar water. But it occurred to me that it should be a lead to scientists that there is something from the bore water in the blood of the beast. Therefore it should be possible to inject something into the blood to destroy the ticks and make the country tick-free. So far we do not seem to be getting anywhere with it. I am not being critical of the department. I have the greatest regard in the world for the officers of the Department of Primary Industries, particularly Mr. Newton and Mr. Mulhern. They are very capable men.

Another matter I should like to deal with is the declared quarantine area at Piarra, in the Toogoolawah district, which is supposed to be infected with dip-resistant ticks.

I know the Minister for Local Government and Conservation realises that the tick is a bit of a headache in that country. It is coming through into my territory and the people there are howling about it, and so would I. A number of farms are in quarantine. The owners can sell cattle only for slaughter. The idea is to capture all the ticks. The cattle were dipped every 14 days and are now dipped every 10 days.

I was here before the ticks. I remember when they came here and I know what harm they have done. If immunity has been built up by the ticks it has been brought about by people not keeping the dip strength up to standard, and using water that was so hard it would not penetrate through the hair onto the skin of the beast. Within a year or two the tick became immune.

(Time expired.)

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (5.50 p.m.): I do not desire to be tedious, but I do wish to express the appreciation of the electors whom I am honoured to represent of the services of Her Majesty the Queen and His Excellency the Governor. Without going into all the details, I suppose it is well known that the people of West End and South Brisbane are noted for their outstanding citizenship, and there is no need for me to stress that fact; it is manifest.

I, too, have been pleased to note the standard set by many of the new members on both sides of the House in their contributions to this debate. I give them my congratulations. At the same time, I suppose it would be fair to say that they have already been sadly disillusioned by the standard set by the Government and the contribution of certain members on the opposite side who seem to believe that their main avenue to the Press is castigation of Opposition members for certain directions that they claim are received from outside the House.

Mr. Graham: They indulge in character assassination.

Mr. BENNETT: That is so. I was rather surprised to see that the hon. member for Gregory, who frankly I believed was a man

of open mind, a big-hearted bushman, was apparently obsessed with the standard set by the Liberal Party in this House and anxious to follow its members. Previously the man who played that role was the hon. member for Ashgrove, now the Minister for Health, who, by following the standard set by his Government and the line of thinking on that side of the House, he obtained a seat in Cabinet.

Following in his footsteps came the hon. member for Nundah, now the Minister for Transport. Unfortunately he is ill at the moment, although I noticed in the Press this afternoon that he is well on the road to recovery. He also adopted that role. In the speeches that they made as back-benchers during my term in this House, I can find nothing but slanderous attacks on the Opposition on the basis of directions it received from bodies outside Parliament. I do not recall their making contributions on any matters affecting the welfare of this State.

Of course, the hon. member for Ashgrove found his way into Cabinet, and it seems that the hon. member for Gregory, frustrated over a period of time because the Premier has overlooked what he considers is his right to a seat in Cabinet, has decided to adopt this technique, believing that it pays off in receiving consideration for Cabinet appointment. I think that it is a sad reflection on the standards of the Government when this type of technique is encouraged.

Mr. Sullivan: There could have been other things said when you were away. You are not here very often.

Mr. BENNETT: Perhaps it might be true to say that I am not here as often as are some other members of the Opposition who are very loyal to their duties. In reply to the interjector, however, I may say that even if I were here for only a quarter of the time that he spends in the House my contribution would be ten times as great as his.

I then had to listen to the painful details given this afternoon by the hon. member for Aspley when he dealt with the electoral redistributions that have been made from the early days of this State. It was quite apparent that he had a troubled conscience and that he was embarrassed by what the Government has been doing, in a dishonest fashion, in the gerrymandering of boundaries, and he sought to remove the cloud in his conscience by saying that this had been done before. Even if that was so, it would not justify the nefarious practices of the Governments in by-gone years.

As a matter of fact, it is true to say that during the time of the Labour Government a Country-Liberal Party Opposition severely castigated the Government for what it termed gerrymandering and questionable practices on the part of the Labour Government in relation to liquor, racing and betting, and hotel interests. But, my goodness, this

Government has far excelled the efforts of the Labour Party in matters on which its members previously chastised the Labour Government! They are making a great deal of money for the Government by enticing people to bet more frequently than they did previously and to drink more.

It is no excuse for the Government to say, "Well, in bygone years other Governments engaged in gerrymandering; therefore we are entitled to do it." In effect, the Government is saying, "We are going to engage in the malpractices of which we accused Labour Governments that were in office in Queensland for 30 years." Even if their allegations about former Governments are true, that does not justify their present activities. Admittedly, in relation to boundaries, there is a tendency for Governments to distribute to some extent to suit their own political purposes. That is to be conceded, and any genuine Parliamentarian will agree that that is so. But it is making it rather blatant—a real political plum—to obviously promise a commissioner who is called upon to carry out the redistribution a high office in this State in a field of which he had no knowledge and for which he was ill-equipped when he was a junior barrister at the bar, and then to raise him over the heads of all his seniors of the day. It was obviously awarded to him as a reward for the job he had done in the redistribution, and I have no hesitation in saying that that practice should be frowned upon. As I said, I am prepared to concede that any Government is inclined to redistribute to safeguard its own political hide; but it is making it really hot to promise a commissioner a reward of elevation to a position that is equal to that of a Supreme Court judge and carries the same emolument.

I have good reason for saying that, because, first of all, the man concerned was a solicitor after the Country-Liberal Government came into office. Prior to accepting appointment as a commissioner for the electoral redistribution, he applied for admission to the bar, to become a practising barrister, and thereby became the junior barrister in Queensland. Immediately after his appointment, he was made president of the Land Court in this State. So far as I know, he had no particular qualifications in land matters. He had less experience than I did at the bar; he was many years my junior, and many years the junior of most members at the bar at the time. As I said, he was elevated to that high office, obviously as a reward for the job that he had done; yet the Government will say that if any other officer of the Crown, public servant or otherwise, is bribed in the performance of his duties, he should be prosecuted in the Criminal Court. That is the standard that the Government set in redistribution.

I did not propose to advert to this subject during this debate, but I was sickened by the claims of the hon. member for Aspley in going back over the years. He cannot

go back to any former Labour Government and show that it rewarded an electoral commissioner within such a short time and in such a handsome fashion.

The time for a further redistribution is approaching, and I sincerely hope that the man who is appointed to perform this task will at least be noted for his integrity, will not have any political affiliations, and will not have any expectation of appointment to a high office by this Government. If the redistribution favours the Government, I say quite frankly that is to be understood; but I sincerely hope that the reputation of this Parliament is not further damaged and tarnished by the Government's offering a plum position in the Public Service to the person appointed to carry out the task.

I know that the Liberal Party and the Country Party are both considering the question of redistribution at present. At the moment, as you well understand, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party is trying not only to "do for" the genuine and decent Australian Labour Party but also to unseat many decent and genuine members of the Country Party. Therefore, it will be doing its level best to secure a commissioner for the electoral redistribution who is hostile to the A.L.P. and who also will have a strong inclination in favour of back-bench members of the Liberal Party who are endeavouring to unseat Country Party members.

(Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.15 p.m.)

Mr. BENNETT: The next aspect of governmental administration with which I would like to deal —

Mr. Bromley: Maladministration.

Mr. BENNETT: That is what it is with this Government. As a matter of fact they never raise themselves to a statesmanlike level; they must always play politics and that is why I wish to refer to legal aid.

With other members on this side of the House I have, over the years, advocated a proper and full system of legal aid. It was written into our policy speech in the 1963 State elections and the opportunity for its introduction was not availed of by the Government in the next three years. But the force of our arguments became so powerful that at a late stage the Government did decide, obviously for political purposes, to implement some scheme of legal aid. In the last session prior to the election, legislation to enable the introduction of this scheme was put through Parliament—with a certain amount of indecent haste, because the scheme had not been properly conceived or suitably worked out.

Then, for further political purposes, the Minister for Justice, instead of giving due credit to those who were responsible for advocating legal aid, gave the complete credit for it to the hon. member for Windsor. Obviously he is not on side with the hon. member for Windsor because they

are in different factions of the Liberal Party. Neither of them is powerful in the Porter faction but, nevertheless, for electioneering purposes, they got on side.

The hon. member for Windsor was prepared to accept the acclaim and commendation knowing full well that I and others on this side of the House had been advocating it for years.

Mr. Ramsden: You do not know where you are.

Mr. BENNETT: The interjections of the hon. member for Merthyr are like those of the hon. member for Condamine. He wants to know where I am from time to time. The reason for a certain number of absences on my part is that for a number of years I have been the only fair-dinkum, legal-aid machine in this State—and I venture to say that I still am.

It is claimed now by the hon. member for Windsor that a permanent law-reform committee should be set up in this State to improve upon our system of legislation and our laws. With that I entirely agree but again, of course, he is only 12 months behind me. His statements, of course, were put in the Press. Apparently it is so long since I made my demand for a permanent law-reform committee that the Government—and even the Press—have forgotten about it. In "Hansard" of 7 September last year—just almost 12 months ago—at page 307, I said amongst other things—

"If we wish to preserve our concept of British justice by the passage of correct legislation, there should be a permanent law reform commission of at least three members, and possibly five, presided over by a judge of the Supreme Court who will be free from political interference."

Similarly the commissioner for electoral boundaries redistribution should be a judge of the Supreme Court who will be free from political interference, not a member of the Bar who is an aspirant for judicial honours. I went on to say, on the same page—

"If we had a permanent law reform commission, I believe the Government would pay greater heed to its decisions and recommendations. As I understand it, several hon. members including myself, have individually made recommendations to the Government from time to time about a system of legal aid in this State, but those recommendations appear to have been completely ignored. It is true that the Government did say, through the columns of the Press, prior to the commencement of this session that it did intend to introduce legislation relative to legal aid . . ."

and so on.

This system of legal aid is one that causes me a great deal of concern because I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members opposite that the system of legal aid in this

State is presently bogged down. That could be so for several reasons, of course, not the least of which lies in the fact that many unfortunate people have been awaiting the introduction of such a scheme for a number of years, and they have already flooded the market with their applications. We find now that in one field alone—the field of divorce—the committee that handles this scheme of legal aid has decided to defer all applications indefinitely. Obviously the Government now finds that the scheme it rushed through the House with indecent haste in the pre-election period, is not meeting the demand. Unless the Government does something in a practical fashion to supplement these funds, at least temporarily, the scheme will fall flat on its face. As a matter of fact, instead of assisting the administration of justice, the scheme at the present time is inclined to impede and defeat the ends of justice because judges and magistrates, when told that certain litigants are being considered for legal aid, in fairness to those litigants, adjourn the proceedings to await the decision of the committee on legal aid. When hearings are resumed on the adjourned date litigants produce correspondence from the committee saying that again their applications have had to be deferred. The letters do not say so but the actual reason for deferment of applications is insufficient funds, although the scheme has been in operation for only a few short months.

If the Government wanted efficiency in the scheme perhaps it should have waited until adequate funds were available to meet the applications, although the better alternative would have been to subsidise the scheme, because if it operates successfully the time will come when litigants who are assisted will be awarded costs, and a certain proportion of the funds will be returned to the scheme. I say that it is rather shocking for applicants, who otherwise are eligible for assistance, to have their applications deferred indefinitely because there is just no money available.

I thought it was not without significance that, at the last call-over held in the Supreme Court last week, no divorce actions were called on at all. I do not know the real reason why no divorce actions were set down, but it seems patently obvious to me by way of logical inference that the real reason is that the courts know that they are being cluttered up with applications for adjournment after cases have been set down because the applications of litigants for legal aid have been deferred and not finally dealt with. So we have the Government introducing a scheme that is going to increase the lag in the court list unless something practical is done about it. If the Government were fair dinkum about the scheme it would have subsidised the funds so that the initial rush it should have expected could have been dealt with and the scheme properly floated.

Mr. Newton: It is bankrupt.

Mr. BENNETT: As the hon. member for Belmont points out, the Government is bankrupt. It is not prepared to go to the Federal Government and insist on its just share, but it is prepared at this stage immediately after the election to increase all forms of taxation, which no doubt it intends to do very shortly.

In considering legal aid we should be fully conscious of the fact that in the criminal field there is still no full form of legal aid except on a means test.

In making submissions about a permanent law reform committee, I said, and I think it is worthy of repetition, that the right of appeal to the Privy Council should be abolished. Since making those submissions events have made me even more convinced that this country and this State should long ago have advocated the abolition of appeals to the Privy Council. The existence of this right has been an embarrassment to the Government. The ordinary person or private individual, with few exceptions, has very little opportunity, if any, to avail himself of the right of appeal. Only the big business combines and vested interests enjoy that right and it has become a right in terrorem rather than the provision of natural justice. As a matter of fact, in one of the latest editions of the A.L.J. printed this year one of the learned authors says—

“In April, 1963, we commented that the great majority of persons having an informed opinion on the matter favoured the abolition of appeals to the Privy Council from Australia. The continuing truth of this assertion as regards the opinion of the legal profession was demonstrated last year during discussion of the proposal for a Commonwealth Court of Appeal at the Law Conference. And published opinion on the question has been overwhelmingly in favour of abolition.”

I know that the Minister for Justice attended that conference—and rightly so. But it is little use, or it serves small purpose, his putting the taxpayers to the expense of his attending, with his assistants, unless he is prepared (together with the other Attorneys-General in the States and the Commonwealth) to listen to the worth-while suggestions emanating therefrom.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: The Law Conference was not enthusiastic about that suggestion concerning the Commonwealth Appeal Court.

Mr. BENNETT: As I say there are many who were not but the overwhelming majority was undoubtedly enthusiastic.

Without going into the legal intricacies, I point out that some cases are not dealt with by the Privy Council. Even after a case is taken all the way to the Privy Council, that body may decide, without stating whether the barrister is right or wrong in law, that the case is not a suitable one for appeal. It is a most unsatisfactory venue and I think we

show little respect for the calibre of our own courts, including the High Court, when we say that in certain instances we can by-pass the High Court and go direct to the Privy Council.

It is rather unfortunate that the Minister for Justice, skilled doctor though he might be, was appointed Minister for Justice, because he endeavours to administer that office in a political fashion.

A Government Member: You have never had a better one.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not know. What about the hon. member for Windsor? He has even grown a moustache to make himself sufficiently dignified to hold that portfolio.

In his political engineering the Minister even promised the people of Queensland, and the legal fraternity, a new District Court this year. With that in view big bulldozers, on contract work, worked over the Christmas holidays. They even worked on Christmas Day at penalty rates, digging a big cavernous hole outside the Supreme Court so that the whole community in Brisbane and many others from country areas would be convinced that, at long last, Queensland was getting a new court. That was done of course because the elections were coming up early in the New Year.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr. BENNETT: The hole was completed in February. The only work done since is by men who go there from time to time to pump out the rain water that accumulates. If that was not done, it would end up like the pond in the Botanic Gardens. It is unfortunate that the gardens and the aspect of the Supreme Court were despoiled for political purposes, simply because it was an election year, when it seems that there is no immediate possibility of the commencement of construction of the courts. In any case, this will only be the District Court building. It will be another decade at least before the Supreme Court is replaced and all practising barristers say that they will never live to see the magistrates courts replaced; and that is a crying urgency.

The Government is building magistrates courts in the suburbs. Those courts have not relieved the pressure in the inner city because they are manned by Brisbane magistrates. Inner-city courts are idle while the magistrates go to the suburbs. The procedure they follow is to take a day or half a day off in every five because they are considered to be out of town when they go to the suburbs, and their staff does likewise, or alternatively goes onto overtime.

The Minister discussed very enthusiastically the implementation of assistance to reporting by way of tape recorders. I think there are about 40 courts in the city and the suburbs—I am being conservative—only six of which are equipped for tape recording.

We have been two years getting as far as that. I argued at the time that the depositions clerks, although necessarily slow because of the old machinery they were using, were accurate and performed a worth-while task, and that if they were to be replaced they should be replaced by shorthand writers. However, the Minister thought otherwise and introduced this expensive system of tape recording. I understand that the equipment in one court is worth approximately £3,000. It has to be maintained regularly by a technician. In addition a technician is in court while it is operating, and there must still be a depositions clerk. In a back room a staff of five stenographers type from the tape. Whereas two years ago we had a magistrate and a depositions clerk, we now have a magistrate, a depositions clerk, the technician who repairs or maintains the equipment, the technician who operates the equipment and five girls in the back room.

Mr. Lloyd: That was Ray Smith's baby.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes. The hon. member for Windsor convinced the Minister for Justice that that was necessary. I still believe that a first-class shorthand writer is just as efficient as, if not more efficient than, a tape recorder. When a tape recorder is being used a barrister cannot make asides in court or speak to his colleague; otherwise it would go onto the tape, and it would be difficult for the girls to know what was evidence and what was said as an aside.

Mr. Ramsden: What you say to the stenographer still confuses us.

Mr. BENNETT: I may confuse the hon. member for Merthyr but I find him difficult to understand.

The hon. member for Windsor also got on the jury band wagon. Unfortunately, in England, our time-honoured jury system has been eaten into by legislation which allows the returning of a majority verdict. The jury system has operated successfully in the British administration of justice over the centuries, and always there had to be not a majority verdict but a unanimous verdict one way or the other.

In particular, this has operated perfectly successfully in Queensland. Although I have not taken out statistics, I suggest that the Minister do so, lest he be again trapped by the submissions of the hon. member for Windsor. He will find that jury disagreements in Queensland have been relatively few. If the Government is to allow jurymen to hide behind majority verdicts so that the public will not know how each voted, it will be inviting and enticing men to be weak and not to face up to their responsibilities. Furthermore, they will not consider their verdicts as carefully as they did previously, nor will they shoulder the responsibility that they should.

Admittedly the reason for the introduction of majority verdicts in England is the strong suspicion that bribery and corruption have to some extent entered the jury system.

Fortunately in Queensland there has never been such a suggestion at any time over the many years in which justice has been dispensed here. It will be sad if the hon. member for Windsor, who in this matter is merely aping English legislation as he so often does, is able to convince the medico Attorney-General that this is necessary.

The Minister intends not only to give women the opportunity to serve on juries; according to what he says, he is also going to place an obligation on them to perform jury service. I say without hesitation, and without engaging in any controversy on women's rights, that it is perfectly obvious, with due respect to our latest acquisition, the hon. member for Ipswich West, that women do not want to serve on juries. For many years now our legislation has given to women the right to apply for jury service. No doubt the Minister knows the number who have exercised this right. I do not think I would be exaggerating by saying that fewer than 20 have volunteered in the last few years for jury service. They just do not want to serve on juries. When considering women's rights, we have also to consider whether we are trespassing on women's privacy and feminine dignity. The Minister should take into consideration the obvious evidential fact that women do not want to serve on juries.

If he does place women under the obligation to serve, he will certainly have to provide in the legislation easy ways for women to be excused without attending court. At the beginning of a sittings at least eight or 10 of the panel of 72 jurors make applications to the judge to be excused, and dealing with those applications very often takes an hour to an hour and a-half. During this time counsel have no right to make any submissions, and no work is done on the actual trial, yet counsel's client has to pay for that time. If there were, as one could expect, approximately 36 women in a panel of 72, many would attend with small children and could have other household obligations that would entitle them to be excused. I certainly do not think that they should be required to attend the court, with their children, to ask to be excused. They should have the opportunity merely to register their applications to be excused without attending.

Mr. Murray: I certainly do not want my wife included in that lot.

Mr. BENNETT: No, I agree. There are certain distasteful cases—I will not go into the merits of them—now before the courts. I should hate my wife or daughter to sit on the jury that will hear the evidence in the Innes case, for example. It is absolutely revolting, and I would do anything I could to prevent my wife from hearing it. If a woman wishes to sit on a jury, all very well; but I do not think we should drag women in involuntarily.

If jury service is made compulsory for women, there will be many more applications to be excused. Instead of taking an hour or

an hour and a-half, they will take two-thirds of the day, and the client who stands in the dock will be paying fees to his counsel for sitting at the Bar table saying nothing, doing nothing, and performing no fruitful function for him.

As a matter of fact, the woman juror who did serve in Victoria made a very favourable impression on the judge and the court. An article appeared in "The Australian Law Journal" about her efforts and about women jurors. Samuel Johnson once said, "Nature has given women so much power that the law has very wisely given them little". The article said that the woman had performed very well, and then said—

"So we have it, as it were, on judicial authority, that no analogy can be drawn from another comment of Johnson's that 'A woman's preaching is like a dog's walking on his hinder legs; it is not done well, but you are surprised to find it done at all'."

That was, of course, a reference to the woman juror. As I said earlier, I concede that those who wish to serve should be given the opportunity of serving, but there should not be any compulsion about it.

I have some submissions to make about sentences. With due respect, Mr. Speaker, I think that, as a lawyer, I have certain obligations to acquaint this House with the difficulties that judges and magistrates have relative to sentences. It is easy, within the confines of Parliament House, to castigate severely the judiciary and the magistracy for their failure to impose what we consider are harsh and severe penalties. In imposing sentences, courts have to take into consideration certain principles. Firstly, they have to take into consideration the statute that limits the maximum penalty that can be applied; secondly, they have to take into consideration the fundamental principles of the imposition of a sentence, that is, mercy, the desire to reform a character, if he can be reformed, and the clear intention to avoid his rubbing shoulders with undesirables who are incurable. That is one of the greatest difficulties that magistrates and members of the judiciary have. They know that, if they send to gaol a young fellow who has otherwise led a decent life, there is every opportunity for him to become tarnished permanently by the persons with whom he rubs shoulders in prison—sex perverts and others. Prison warders will tell one that perversion is rampant in the gaol.

(Time expired.)

Mr. HUGHES (Kurilpa) (7.44 p.m.): At the outset, I express appreciation to those who, by their franchise and their efforts, have put me in this place as their spokesman. I have heard other hon. members express similar appreciation, and it is the normal and correct thing to do. Membership of this Assembly carries with it an obligation to serve the community and also an obligation to arrive impartially at decisions that will

benefit society and assist the further development of the State. I express my thanks to all those people in Kurilpa who voted for me as their spokesman and to the many people who helped me in my campaign.

Speaking on behalf of the people of Kurilpa, we enjoy rights and privileges of a democracy, and as members of the British Commonwealth we owe and swear our allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen.

I must also extend my congratulations to His Excellency Sir Alan Mansfield and Lady Mansfield on Sir Alan's appointment as the representative of the Crown in this State. He has a task of no small magnitude ahead of him because of the size of the State, the tremendous pulsating development that is taking place within it and the problems of the people, who are wedded to the purposeful future of increasing the standard of living and the development of the State. Furthermore, emulating his predecessor, Sir Henry Abel Smith, will in itself be a task of no small magnitude. If Sir Alan, in the task ahead of him, is able to measure up to the timbre and diligence displayed by his predecessor, in the years to come we will have reason to shower upon him laurels and congratulations as we did upon Sir Henry Abel Smith.

We have seen, since the last election, a number of new members enter this House. My mind goes back to the days, a few years ago, when I first came into this Chamber and found that I was just a little fish in a big pool. I am still a little bit that way because there is such a tremendous amount to learn. One can gain much knowledge simply by listening and, once having gained it, can then make a creditable contribution to the debate. I congratulate the new members for the manner in which the Address in Reply has been moved and seconded, and supported. The speeches involved have added lustre to the debate and show the addition of a degree of qualifications to this House which, in the forthcoming years, will greatly assist this Parliament in framing legislation.

Mr. Walsh: Why don't you display some fire; the "Hansard" reporters can't hear you.

Mr. HUGHES: I acknowledge the advice of the hon. member, but that is a matter for Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I did not quite catch what the hon. member said but I cannot help him raise his voice. I am finding it most difficult to hear him, even when the House is quiet.

Mr. HUGHES: That is possibly because, unlike a number of others I could name, I am not gifted with Herculean lungs which may be able to shout at functions, circuses, shows and other places.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member could come closer to the microphone. He is not compelled to speak where he is standing. I am trying to give him some advice and I have consideration for the "Hansard" reporters, who have to record the speeches.

Mr. HUGHES: I think we have overcome the problem; the microphone has been moved closer to me.

In congratulating the new members of this House, I believe they will make valuable contributions to the debates. I believe that the speeches already made, particularly those of the hon. member for Logan, the hon. member for Hawthorne and the hon. member for Toowoomba East, were very good. I feel there is quite a lot in what they had to say which, in the future, can be given further consideration.

To our new member, the only one of the female gender in the House, I offer my congratulations. There is a place in this House for the views of women. I am rather disappointed it was not our own party that was the first to have a woman in the House. I am not against women in public life and I feel that those who do take an interest in public life have certain skills and qualifications which befit them to bring the woman's point of view into this House and to assist their fellow-women outside.

I personally owe thanks to many officers of the Public Service who not only make a contribution to the State but are also very courteous and helpful to hon. members, so that our job on behalf of the people we represent is made very much easier. I could mention departmental officers at considerable length, but in particular I should like to convey my appreciation to the Secretary of the Housing Commission, Mr. Simpson, and his officers; to Mr. Sallows, Mr. Muir, Mr. McDowall, Mr. Lee, and other officers in the Department of Lands, and to the officers of the State Government Insurance Office for their businesslike approach to their work. I thank particularly Mr. Riding, with whom on many occasions I have had to take up workers' compensation cases.

All departmental officers have been exceedingly helpful. This applies even to the Valuer-General's Department, although my personal views about the Valuer-General's Department being the sole authority for valuing may not be acquiesced in by the officer in charge. By the same token one must pay credit where it is due, and I give due credit to Mr. Quinn and other officers who have been helpful whenever I have had to take up a case on behalf of a constituent. I pay the same compliment to the Director and officers of the Department of Harbours and Marine, particularly to Mr. Peel, to officers of the Railway Department, to secretaries to the Ministers, and to many other people who have been very helpful. I believe that the

commencement of a new Parliament is the appropriate time to thank all these officers for the help they have afforded.

There is a matter which I believe should be aired again in this Chamber. I have spoken about it at other times and in other places.

Mr. Bromley: You have not congratulated Mr. Speaker on his re-election.

Mr. HUGHES: I apologise for my oversight. I do congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, upon your re-election. I am indebted to the Opposition for this reminder. Yours is a high office, the duties of which must be carried out with dignity and a great amount of impartiality. As human beings are subject to the frailties of human nature, this is not always an easy task. I trust that in the years ahead hon. members will receive from the Chair the impartiality they are entitled to.

Mr. Davies: You should have said this before he "went crook" on you.

Mr. HUGHES: I never carry a grudge.

I wish to speak of a matter that I have mentioned before and will continue to speak about if the need remains. I believe that we do not provide at Parliament House facilities that are not only desirable but in fact are the right of people when they visit members. The present set of circumstances at the Technical College end of the building are something that must be put up with, but in normal times—

Mr. Bromley: The trouble down there is that Sam has started his tunnel.

Mr. HUGHES: There is no tunnel there, and if the hon. member thinks there is any white-anting he should look to his own party for that. Under normal conditions when people come to see a member of Parliament at the Technical College end of Parliament House there are no facilities for them. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that in your plans for the functioning of this Parliament, the House and its environs, you should give early consideration to the provision of the necessary facilities for people who come to see members of Parliament. When they call to see the member they require, they should be able to sit comfortably in a room with all the necessary facilities provided for them. After all, they are our masters; we are not theirs. I have seen people sitting next to rubbish baskets in draughty corridors; indeed the conditions are appalling. I realise that you have had to overcome a tremendous number of problems in making arrangements in this building; this has been a continuing problem over many years.

Mr. Melloy: Don't make them too attractive.

Mr. HUGHES: Why shouldn't we? After all, the people come to us with problems and their hearts are heavy. For that reason I believe everything possible should be done

for them. I am wondering whether the hon. member's interjection was serious or facetious. If it was serious it typifies the attitude of the Labour Party to the worker. This was exemplified a few years ago by the Brisbane City Council of which the hon. member for South Brisbane was Vice-Mayor. It sacked 2,500 workers and sent them home to their families. They were put on the bread-line because of the Labour council's disregard for the rights and welfare of its employees. If that typifies the general attitude of the party, the A.L.P. is in opposition here because of it, and no doubt it will remain in opposition.

In this matter the Government has shown not only that it considers the welfare of the people but also that it is a good, middle-of-the-road Government with a high regard for the rights of citizens. It has demonstrated this in every way; it has lifted the economic level, the standard of living and the facilities available to the people, and has brought about a creditable acceleration of development. No one can scoff at what we have done. However, it is only part of what must be done to achieve the utmost for the people of the State, who deserve it.

Even a dentist's waiting room or a barber's shop often has better facilities than those provided here for people who visit us with their problems. As with Ministers or other public officers, we should provide waiting rooms with good seating, with reading material available, and with courteous, and attentive attendants for visitors. Those things should be provided at each end of the House to make it little easier to conduct our business.

There is often a delay on the telephone lines in Parliament House. I do not think that is the fault of the switchboard operators, but because of the growth in the matters handled by hon. members. This is one of the problems under which we labour, but we must tackle it. The time is long overdue for re-equipping the telephone exchange in Parliament House to bring about a proper and more expeditious means of conducting business.

On the matter of questions Mr. Speaker has introduced an innovation which he said will be time-saving. Now an hon. member need not ask the "Minister for Knives and Forks and Internal Disorder", or whatever it may be, for the answer to such-and-such a question standing in the member's name; he simply mentions the number of the question on the Business Paper.

Mr. Bromley: Now the Ministers are saving time by not answering questions.

Mr. HUGHES: If hon. members opposite put questions that were worthy of attention no doubt they would be answered.

We may be able to shorten question time a little more by adopting a procedure whereby questions must be written by hon. members, as at present, and then tabled without any other notice being given. The next

day the hon. member could ask his question and receive the answer. The 24 hours' notice that is apparently required would be given by virtue of the question being tabled the previous day. By this method visitors in the gallery could follow the business of the House, whereas at the moment all they get is the answer to a question they have not heard. It must leave many of them at sea as to what it is all about.

There is a great need for questions without notice. As in other Parliaments of the British Commonwealth where it is the practice, it should and could well be adopted here. Our Ministers should be, and I think are, equipped to give answers to questions without notice.

Mr. Hanson: Have you brought this up at your Caucus meetings?

Mr. HUGHES: Apparently that is the only place the hon. member is prepared to say anything.

If members have not the right to ask questions without notice, or can ask them only with Mr. Speaker's approval and after notice to the Minister, their rights and responsibilities are negated. I believe that our Ministers are capable of answering questions without notice, and that they would not want to hide behind a 24-hour delay. Admittedly a Minister could not be expected to retain in his head the statistics sometimes quoted in answer to a question. But a member who seeks a straightforward answer that does not call for statistics, or a lengthy or detailed historical background, could have his question answered immediately.

Mr. Bennett: Do you agree that the present system promotes departmental sarcasm?

Mr. HUGHES: Sarcasm begets sarcasm, and it is up to hon. members to realise that if they ask a straightforward question they will get a straightforward answer.

Tourism is quite an industry today, and should be recognised as such. No longer is it the Cinderella department. Those who take a realistic view of the economic growth and development of the State realise that primary production has slipped, that mineral development is in the ascendancy, and that this State has a great future in tourism, which must be properly promoted. Many places, such as Honolulu, survive almost entirely on tourism. We could enjoy a greater share of the world tourist trade, which is a valuable industry with a tremendous number of hidden benefits in decentralization and service to the people who provide the tourist requirements. We have the potential throughout Queensland, from the Cape to the border, and in the West at Carnarvon and Emerald, and at other places. We have something to offer tourists. Therefore, every consideration should be given not only to increasing its budget but also to creating, if possible, a

separate portfolio of tourism or to appointing an assistant Minister so that tourism could be a special and separate matter.

I believe that we must look not only at presentation but also at our various tourist bureaux. I personally am not very happy with the one in Melbourne. It is so located that people wanting information on Queensland have to ascertain where to go. For that reason, I believe that the State would be better "sold" by a tourist bureau more strategically placed. It is quite a fair location, but if it had a more attractive frontage and a window display I believe that its result would be very much better. In its present form and style, one has to know where it is and have a specific reason for going to it. It has no display to entice anyone into making inquiries. Attractive displays tend to entice through the doors people who propose to travel.

I believe that architects with a sense of presentation and "ideas" men should be employed. We should have progressive, enlightened and up-to-date views on these things, and unless we have them, tourism, instead of increasing appreciably, will tend to grow only gradually. The report of the Director-General, Queensland Tourist Services, for last year shows fortunately that this is not so. It shows that there has been an increase in the value of tourism to this State from £82,000 in 1944 to approximately £2,500,000 in the year ended 30 June, 1965. This is an appreciable increase, and I believe that it affords every incentive to try to do much better.

I believe that we should have another look at the tourist bureaux in the capital cities and our methods of presentation of tourism overseas. I believe that there are many people on whom we could call for assistance, even in a voluntary capacity. We have a number of architects and other similar people who have won prizes and awards; Robin Gibson is one of the foremost of these.

Mr. Bennett: You could take them over to the Woolloongabba Fiveways so that they could take photographs of the man ringing the bell in front of the trains.

Mr. HUGHES: Rest assured, we will find a better job than that for the hon. member for South Brisbane.

There are many people who, if called upon, could assist in the development and economic growth of this State. I believe that much tourist traffic can be obtained from the southern States and Western Australia. There is still a great untapped market within our own shores in people who wish to see Queensland. With better form and presentation, we will be able to receive our fair share of the tourist trade. We must invest \$1.00 to win \$2.00, and there is a lucrative field for tourism in the United States. The Director-General says in his 1965 report that sales promotion had been pursued in

the United States, and he gave due credit to the A.N.T.A. for distributing tourist literature in that country.

I believe that we must investigate and pursue with great purpose a drive for tourism in the United States and other parts of the world. I have spoken to many Americans in the last six to 12 months. I found that they had been to Hawaii and the Continent, and that this country "down under" as they say, offered great possibilities for tourists. It has the things that Americans want to see but, in the main, Americans do not know very much about it and its tourist potential. Information programmes will have to be stepped up to obtain for us our full share of the tourist trade. I think that a combined Australian approach, perhaps with the A.N.T.A., or even a drive spearheaded by Queensland, could be undertaken to stimulate tourism from the United States to our shores.

We have the Barrier Reef; we have sunshine; we have a variety of animals; we have crocodiles and kangaroos; we have mountain resorts and ranges. If we cannot sell those things, we cannot sell anything. Of course, it depends on the sales presentation and the way the case is put. A business-like approach will have to be adopted by the Government if Queensland is to get its fair share of the tourist trade from other parts of the world. It is a real challenge.

I do not know whether or not this will have any bearing on the subject, but I point out that Press reports indicate that, whereas previously troops on leave from Vietnam were flown to Hong Kong, that city is no longer used as a rest area because of the attitude of the Chinese. If troops need a place where they can get a suntan, enjoy a surf, and be given a really warm welcome, it is here in Queensland. I believe that every effort should be made to bring them here. It would really be part of the tourist trade because troops, wherever they go, spend dollars. We are associated with the Americans in Vietnam, and, as far as I can ascertain, the extra flying time involved in bringing troops here on leave—it would be only about an hour—would add only infinitesimally to the cost. Troops of the various nations supporting the South Vietnamese could well be brought to Queensland on leave; I am sure it would be a great morale builder for them. I do not know to what extent the R.A.A.F. is involved in this operation, but I believe it could well take an interest in ferrying troops from Vietnam to Queensland. In my opinion the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau should investigate this means of selling Australia as a tourist resort. Hon. members all remember the days when 1,000,000 Americans passed through Brisbane.

Mr. Bennett: What do you think we should do to sell our sugar crop?

Mr. HUGHES: Troops on leave would certainly buy sugar while they were here; they would leave more "sugar" behind, too, which is what we need.

As I said, 1,000,000 Americans passed through Brisbane during the second World War and we had a great number of ambassadors selling Queensland in the United States. If American troops came here on leave from Vietnam a similar result would be achieved and both countries would benefit from it.

A number of hon. members who have taken part in this debate have commented on the recent election, and they have raised matters ranging from redistribution to the result in their own electorates. I wish to make one or two comments on the election, because I think there are some matters that could well be aired. One of the important matters is the question of the initials on the back of the ballot paper. I am sure that every candidate must have suffered because, under the Elections Act, the initials of the poll clerk must be inserted in a space provided on the back of the ballot paper. I saw many votes declared informal after people came along to exercise their democratic right of franchise and whose vote, in every way but one, was formal. They might just as well have stayed at home, because the vote was invalid, not through any fault of theirs, but because a poll clerk, for one of a number of reasons, had omitted to insert his initials on the back of the ballot paper.

Mr. R. Jones: They would be invalid anyway if they had the poll clerk's initials on them.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. I saw them with initials on the front, and all sorts of things.

Mr. Bennett: People like you print their own ballot papers.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not have to do that. People in Kurilpa have confidence in me and I do not have to resort to malpractices. I will not go into campaigns conducted by the hon. member for South Brisbane. I am in a very charitable mood this evening.

For a number of reasons, there is a need to overhaul the Elections Act. I have just mentioned one of them. No doubt a number of others could be brought to light, but that is the most significant one. We should not go into another election where the rights of any person are invalidated through no fault of his own. Of course, there is the usual complaint about bad pencils. The Government must also look at this, as well as other factors associated with election campaigns.

I wish now to discuss a matter associated with the meat industry. A question was asked in this House on my behalf several days ago. It was directed to the Minister for Primary Industries, and was as follows:—

"(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?"

The answer was that the Minister was not aware of the practices which operate in the delivery of meat to butchers' shops. He did agree that there were some grounds for describing the present practices as being not fully hygienic, but he knew of no reason to regard them as constituting any real hazard to public health.

He went on to say—

"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."

That is a question that has been raised with me by a considerable number of people. It is a matter that concerns them and that should concern every right-thinking person. Hazards to health are involved, and who is to say that this could not be the cause of some of the epidemics that we have experienced? I am not being a scaremonger in this regard but I cannot help wondering, when I think of the myriads of germs that may be in the dust to which these carcasses are exposed, whether this practice could not be the cause of some of the minor epidemics of which this community has suffered such a high incidence in recent times. I wonder to what extent we can lay the blame on this practice or to what extent it contributes. We should not only give every consideration to this matter but should actually get down to the business of doing something to overcome the problem, the existence of which is recognised by the Minister.

I believe that carcasses of meat used for human consumption should be covered for delivery to butchers' shops. I feel that the unhygienic handling of this meat and the manner of its distribution in this city is somewhat archaic and constitutes a hazard to health. No doubt health inspectors—and primary industry inspectors—oversee the abattoir, the meat hall and the butchers' shops, the retail outlets which generally are fitted with stainless-steel counters. They are frequently visited by health inspectors not only from the Government but from the Brisbane City Council, yet we allow to go undeterred, with apparently no interest, the present method of distribution. I believe this is crass stupidity.

We severely control deliveries of other food products such as bread. Bread cannot be delivered by hand unless it is wrapped. The carter must have his basket covered. Under the present unsatisfactory system, which seems to be so nonchalantly accepted, although the butcher must wrap his meat in approved material and in every other way observe hygienic conditions, the delivery of meat from the delivery van to the retail outlet is allowed under present conditions to go on unchecked. Some sort of suitable covering should be required. It is not unfair to suggest that the same standards should apply here as are rigidly applied to the delivery of other products for human consumption.

Mr. Bennett: Do you think that dog's meat should be wrapped in polythene.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member can bark and answer that question for himself.

Certain controls apply to the baker, who in any case is handling wrapped bread, yet we allow to go unchecked, the delivery of meat in uncovered carcasses, when it is handled by hands which have been unlocking and locking doors and touching public and other property.

I also believe that earlier deliveries of meat are necessary. First of all, this would assist in the alleviation of the traffic problems that beset us today, but in addition it would help to minimise the deterioration of the meat.

Mr. Davies: How early would you suggest?

Mr. HUGHES: The carters start at 6 a.m. now and I think they finish at 10 a.m. to 12 noon. If the deliveries were advanced a couple of hours the heat of the day would be avoided. It would probably mean a little more money for the lumpers and transport drivers in meal arrangements, but it would not mean an undue cost to the community. It is necessary for the maintenance of health standards.

Mr. Davies: You have not got onto the Brisbane City Council yet.

Mr. HUGHES: The last note of the song is the one that is remembered, and I will not be finished here for a day or two yet.

I think it is both possible and practical to make earlier deliveries of meat in order to prevent its deterioration. This has been proved not only in Queensland, where it is more necessary, but in other States. In Sydney the public meat markets open at 6.30 a.m. but wholesalers may start an hour or so before that. In Melbourne deliveries start from 5 a.m., and in Adelaide I think it is 5 or 5.30 a.m.

Mr. Murray: Some of the firms want to but they are not allowed.

Mr. HUGHES: I understand that there are probably a number of firms who want to but they are not entitled or allowed to. We should not have any socialistic extremes

applied to private enterprise if they act against the interests of the community. When firms make such applications we should not deter them or apply any controls that would prevent a more effective service, and one that is in the best interests of the consumer.

(Time expired.)

Mr. LONERGAN (Flinders) (8.24 p.m.): I join with the other hon. members in expressing my allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen.

I congratulate the mover and the seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, both of whom, I feel sure, will make their mark in this House. In the few weeks I have known the hon. member for Logan I have been very impressed with his ability and wide knowledge, particularly of land matters. It is good to have someone on this side, as has been proved over the years, who is capable of speaking with the voice of authority on the many problems concerning the land that crop up from time to time.

Unfortunately I do not yet know well the seconder of the motion, but as time goes by I will get to know him too. It is good to see both hon. members here. If the hon. member for Logan is a worthy successor to the late Mr. Harrison the House will be indeed lucky, because the former hon. member for Logan was a gentleman in every way.

I now put on record my appreciation of the efforts of the many people and the Ministers who came to my electorate to help in the campaign.

Mr. Bennett: You needed them.

Mr. LONERGAN: My very word I did. It was nice to have them there although I felt that they could have been used better in other places. With all due respect to their ability, I may say that before the campaign started I was asked by my honorary campaign director, Mr. J. J. McDonald, a man with the keenest political brain in Queensland, "What do you expect to win by?" I said, "I will win by 1,500 votes.", and I won by 1,968. That is not too bad for a person who got in in 1957 with a majority of one.

Mr. Bennett: You have had a redistribution since then.

Mr. LONERGAN: That is true. The hon. member for South Brisbane is on very dangerous grounds when he speaks about redistribution for I could floor him straight away. The number of voters in my electorate was doubled with the redistribution.

Because a great part of my electorate was ravaged by drought I thought it was not a good time to go to the polls. If something goes wrong, the Government always gets the blame, and many ill-informed people claimed that the Government was doing nothing to help the man on the land. Those who

clamoured the loudest knew least about what they were saying. A friend of mine lost quite a number of cattle during the drought. If he had cared to get off his seat and grow fodder he would not have lost any. He had the plant and the water, but he lacked initiative, yet he was one of the keenest critics of the Government. In view of the very limited finance available to the Government, I commend it for what it has done for the man on the land.

There were other factors which might have cost me my seat or lost me many votes. I do not say one thing and mean another although hon. members opposite do. In the Flinders electorate there is dissatisfaction amongst railway employees, unprecedented in my long experience of the railways. I do not propose to enlarge on it at this stage for I will have a later opportunity of doing so. I am sure I will open the eyes of some members opposite who imagine that they know something about railway matters.

I claim to have contested more elections in a short period than any other man, candidate, or member in Australia. In 1955 I contested a by-election, in 1956 a general election, in 1957 another general election, in 1958 a by-election when we were rolled by the Elections Tribunal, and general elections in 1960, 1963 and 1966, so that I am not exactly a novice at electioneering. But I must say that this was the easiest election I have ever fought. I give my opponent full credit for the manner in which he worked. He may not have fought according to the rules of the Marquis of Queensberry, as I do, but at least he worked hard for many months. He was an A.W.U. organiser. Possibly that was the last election in which an A.W.U. organiser will carry the A.L.P. ticket in Flinders because already I have been told that the Trades and Labour Council will nominate a candidate next time.

Mr. Bennett: Who told you?

Mr. LONERGAN: A member of the Trades and Labour Council. I do not label a man a Communist simply because he is a member of the Trades and Labour Council. I do not do that. But I do say that many of them are.

Mr. Houston: Name them.

Mr. LONERGAN: I could name them but it would not serve any useful purpose because they are well known to the hon. member. In fact, they are friends of his.

In Charters Towers, to give an indication how I coasted along, the A.L.P. candidate held 24 street meetings; I held three. There was a constant stream of A.L.P. senators and M.P.'s, M.L.A.'s, A.L.P. heads, and half-heads, but despite their efforts I was able to put the cleaner through them. Before the election I claimed that "A.L.P." no longer stood for Australian Labour Party, and that it meant "Another Lonergan Push-over." How right I was. In

1969, if I am still on deck, which I hope to be—otherwise Flinders would lose a good man—I shall roll the Trades and Labour Council; make no mistake about that. I can see the hon. member for Townsville North laughing to himself. He was not laughing a few weeks ago—he was really worried—and it would have been interesting to see which way the preferences went. He would have been an ex-member now and possibly would be in Victoria trying to take Benson's seat. It is all over and done with, despite the prophecy of the Leader of the Opposition whom I respect, that he would win 16 seats. I hope he is a better tipster on the race-course than in the political arena. If he followed his tips, he would be carrying his swag in no time at all.

I regard the result of the election not so much as a vote of confidence in me as a vote of confidence in the Government. I am only one of a team. I might add that at the time of the election the political climate in Queensland was not at all favourable for the Government. There was a crisis in the sugar industry for which the Government was blamed, and the State was passing through the worst drought in its history. In spite of that, the Government was returned. We lost votes in some electorates, but gained them in others. It is true to say that, although the result was a vote of confidence in the Government, it was also a vote of no confidence in the Opposition. No-one can deny that.

I have heard some good speeches in this debate. However, in the last week or so members of the Opposition have devoted quite a lot of time to reassuring the House that no members of the Queensland Central Executive of the Australian Labour Party are Communists, and hitting my old mate the hon. member for Gregory for six whenever the opportunity presented itself.

Mr. Newton: If he bowls like that, that's what he can expect.

Hon. members opposite devoted a lot of their time to commenting on three-cornered contests. I can remember when there were such contests in the Labour ranks, and that was in the days when there was not such a close affiliation between the A.L.P. and the Communists as there is today. It is no use hon. members opposite smiling, as I am quoting facts.

Mr. Bromley interjected.

Mr. LONERGAN: The hon. member for Norman and I have only one thing in common, and I am not going to embarrass him by saying what it is.

As I was saying, I can remember the day when the A.L.P. had three-cornered contests. At the last election I think only two Communist candidates opposed sitting A.L.P. members. If I remember rightly, they contested the seats of Cairns and Townsville South. There was no desire on the part of the Communist Party to take primary votes

from the A.L.P.; the purpose was to take preference votes from the Liberal candidate and Tom Aikens.

Mr. Newton: How was Killen returned in Moreton in 1961? It was on Communist preferences, and you know it.

Mr. LONERGAN: Those are only side issues. After all, I like to give members of the Opposition a little prodding now and again to keep them on their toes. If they were to get anything on us, believe me, they would use it.

Mr. Bromley interjected.

Mr. LONERGAN: If that interjection had been made by some members of the Opposition, I would have been rather upset. However, I like anyone who criticises me to be a person of some standing in the community. The hon. member's criticism, therefore, does not interest me.

What I am concerned about and what my friend the hon. member for Gregory is concerned about—I am sure that the hon. member for Burke, if he were here, would agree with me, too—is the lack of development in Western Queensland. I make no apology for saying that, no matter what Government has been in power, Western Queensland has never had one worth-while project begun or carried out in it. The only money spent there other than on main roads was spent on the beef roads, and we would not have got them if a Liberal-Country Party Government had not been in office in the Federal Parliament.

The thing that is most important in any country is an adequate water supply, and that is what we lack in Western Queensland today. Quite recently the Minister for Local Government and Conservation and his Commissioner were good enough to visit Hughenden and points west. They carried out aerial inspections of several areas in the Hughenden district, and I am sure that what they saw impressed them greatly. But it is not enough for the Minister to merely visit the area. I expect him—make no mistake about this—to endeavour to interest the Federal Government in two worth-while projects. If they show sufficient good judgment and good sense to decide to carry out either of the projects, it will be the making of Western Queensland and will save the Government hundreds of thousands of pounds per annum. Towns in the area would grow; more land would be thrown open, and more people would go onto the land. As a result, instead of the number of people in towns in the West dwindling, as it is now, the population would increase.

Mr. Bennett: They won't even appoint a Minister for the West.

Mr. LONERGAN: A.L.P. Ministers represented the area for years. They were not even ornaments; we did not get anything out of them—not even a snap of the fingers. I can go back to the days of Johnny Mullins.

I will continue to work as I have in the past. The vote in the recent election proves that the people of Flinders are happy with the treatment they have received, and the Minister for Primary Industries, my friend Johnny Row, will agree that I do appreciate what has been done out there. In the area are the Burdekin and Flinders Rivers, and farther west the Cloncurry, the Mort, the Burke, the Wills, and others. There would be dozens of dam sites on them, and 20 dams could be built out there for the price of one big Burdekin dam. When the Government has the money to build dams, I hope that preference will be given to the Far West, where the potential is greater and where it would be economically sound to build them. We know that over the years pressure has been brought to bear on many Governments to build the Burdekin Dam. I should like to see it built myself but I still feel that farther west the money would be spent to greater advantage.

Another problem that affects us out there is lack of secondary industry. I am sensible enough to realise that our chances of getting a secondary industry in that country are virtually nil. After all, if we cannot induce industries to go to cities like Toowoomba, what chance have we of getting them out in the Far West? In Charters Towers we have extended invitations at various times to small concerns to come there and start, but they have a coastal outlook; they must stick to the coast. For what reason I do not know, because in Charters Towers we have cheap land, unlimited water, which they have not got in Townsville, schooling facilities second to none in Australia, and councils who will co-operate.

In time inevitably the Ross River meat-works will have to shift from its present site, and like others I am hoping that when that time arrives the management will cast its eyes around and—so we hope—open up on the Burdekin River.

It is no good saying it is too far away from a port because Cape Creek meat-works is operating quite efficiently. They run their meat down daily, only because, I believe, they could not get the service they expected from the railways—and, I quite believe that.

Another point is that there has never been any worth-while investigation into the potential of any of our districts for industrial purposes. Quite recently a report was broadcast—I do not know whether the Minister for Industrial Development was correctly reported—that a survey would be made along the coast to see if they had sufficient lands for the various industries. It is a matter for great regret that when they are carrying out these surveys they do not look a little further afield and go up to the highlands adjacent to the coast.

However, I would be failing in my duty if I did not mention the wonderful part that has been played by the Department of

Education in Western Queensland. We know that the department, at the present time, is being criticised by quite a number of people.

Mr. Bromley: Rightly so, too.

Mr. LONERGAN: It is a great pity that the hon. gentleman who now interjects did not go out to the Flinders electorate in 1957 and see the type of buildings in which teachers had to teach and kiddies were accommodated, and the shocking conditions under which the teachers had to live.

Mr. Bromley: What are the teachers now talking about strike for?

Mr. LONERGAN: If any teacher had dared to open his mouth and talk of strike during the days of the A.L.P. Government, and believe me, there was plenty of reason to do so, he would have been in Birdsville, Bedourie or some other town right out in the West. In Flinders today we are proud of our schools.

I should like to place on record our appreciation of what the Government has done for the kiddies of the Outback. At least we, out there, appreciate it. The teachers certainly appreciate it, and I should like to have a poll taken as to their opinion of their living and teaching conditions. Today they have good accommodation, but what was the order of the day before we became the Government? They were staying at hotels where they were paying board at £10 or £12 a week and earning only about £13 a week. They had to live on £1 a week.

It irks me when I hear this criticism of the Department of Education. I realise that in some places there is reason for it. I know that some classrooms are too small and some classes are too big, but some notice should be taken of what has been done in a short time. If the Labour Government had done anything about the buildings prior to our becoming the Government, many of the problems we face today would not be with us. I will confine myself to those few remarks on this occasion.

Mr. Bromley: Hear, hear!

Mr. LONERGAN: The hon. member says, "Hear, hear!" I am no orator, and I know it, but at least I know my electorate well enough to get up and speak off the cuff.

Mr. Bromley: You have got a sense of humour, anyway.

Mr. LONERGAN: We would be lost here without it. The hon. member would be the last one I would laugh at. He is not a bad fellow, really.

It is pleasing to see the Government back in power again, and I hope that in the next three years this State will continue to progress as it has done under this Government in the past. I hope that we can continue to give sane government to the people of Queensland, which they were denied for so long.

Mr. RAMSDEN (Merthyr) (8.54 p.m.): I should like to join with other hon. members in associating the electors of Merthyr and myself with this message of loyalty to Her Majesty. At the same time, I take the opportunity to congratulate a very good Queenslander, Sir Alan Mansfield, on attaining the high office of Governor of this State. I hope that he and Lady Mansfield will be spared for many years. I am confident that Sir Alan will serve the State as well in this new capacity as he has served it as a jurist.

To you, Mr. Speaker, to Mr. Hooper as Chairman of Committees, and to all other office bearers, I offer my personal congratulations on re-appointment.

I should like also to congratulate the hon. member for Logan and the hon. member for Hawthorne who moved and seconded the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. As other hon. members have said, we can look forward to some very worthwhile contributions and work from these new members, which will be a change from the interjections of hon. members opposite.

I congratulate all new hon. members on both sides of the House. I hope that those on the Government side will be here for many years to come and that those on the Opposition side will remain there for many years to come.

Mr. Bennett: That is a bit stale.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I thought it would be fresh for the hon. member, as he is so rarely here.

I thank my campaign director, Mr. Gerry Langevad, and the other people in the electorate of Merthyr who worked so hard to return me for another term in this House.

In this debate there are three matters that I wish to discuss.

An Opposition Member: Will you be in the tunnel or in the gutter?

Mr. RAMSDEN: I will not be in the tunnel. Whether I get down into the gutter depends on the tenor of the interjections from the other side.

The first matter is of some concern to my electorate, particularly to New Farm, which is within 2 miles of this House. For the benefit of those who may not know it, New Farm is a growing area of high-density living. There is scarcely a street in the whole area in which some new development is not taking place. We have there, too, a high cosmopolitan content. There are over 800 Italians on the roll, without mentioning Greeks and other New Australians. In fact, New Farm is fast becoming the Kings Cross of Brisbane. A large proportion of the population of New Farm is comprised of married working couples and single people. Many people live in convalescent homes in the area. There are more convalescent homes in the electorate of Merthyr than in any other electorate in Queensland.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I do not intend to answer interjections, because I do not want to be facetious about this matter. I mention these matters because New Farm has certain problems which do not exist in other places, with the possible exception of West End. That area has similar problems.

Mr. Bennett: Leave West End to me; I will look after the problems there.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I hope the hon. member will, but, judging by his very rare attendances here, I doubt it.

As we have so many working couples and single people in New Farm, a cannon could be fired in Brunswick Street or Merthyr Road in the middle of the day and I doubt whether anyone would be hurt. In other words, throughout the day the shopping centres in Brunswick Street and Merthyr Road are quite dead. At a time when other suburban shopkeepers are making their money, most of those in my area might as well close up. To put the record straight, there are three types of shop which operate in the city. First, there are the exempt shops. They are the shops which can be operated for 24 hours a day, seven days a week, if the owners want to. They are permitted to sell exempt goods, a long list of which I have here, although I do not intend to weary hon. members by reading it. The list of exempt goods may be found in regulation 31 of the Factories and Shops Act, Part VIII. The list of exempted goods says—

“The following regulation 31 prescribes exempted goods. These goods may be sold—

“(a) In exempted shops (except as hereunder) at any hour;

“(b) In exempted shops (where hours have been fixed by agreement in accordance with section 63 of the abovementioned Acts) within such hours;

“(c) In small shops as defined (in areas where hours of trading have been prescribed for such shops) within those hours:—”

Then there is a list of exempted goods which may be sold legally.

The second type of shop is the small shop which can operate from 6 a.m. to 7.30 p.m., Monday to Saturday and from 8 a.m. to 7.30 p.m. Sundays and holidays, but which must by law remain closed on Christmas Day, Good Friday, Anzac Day, and Labour Day. They may sell goods which are limited in nature and character.

The third type of shop is the non-exempted shop. Shops in this category are those which are not included in the other two categories. They are the type of stores that we see in Queen Street and the suburbs and which open from 8.15 a.m. to 4.40 p.m. Monday to Friday, and 8.35 a.m. to 11.30 a.m. on Saturday.

Mr. Sherrington: I liked you better on your tunnel.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I like the hon. member better when he is out of the Chamber.

I want to see the end of the day when storekeepers in the New Farm area are penalised for trying to earn a living. There is a precedent for having hours different from those in the rest of the city. It was set on the South Coast, where there is a six-day trading week. When I raised this matter with departmental officers they said that the vast difference between the South Coast and New Farm was that on the South Coast the governing organisations and the shopkeepers themselves made an application for those trading hours, whereas in Brisbane an extension of trading hours is opposed by the Retail Traders' Association, grocers, traders, and general storekeepers.

Mr. Bennett: Where is the beach at New Farm, Sam?

Mr. RAMSDEN: I should hate to have the hon. member represent me in court, because it is obvious he cannot even follow the argument I am advancing. Because of certain living conditions and the type of people who live in New Farm there is a vast difference between New Farm and, for instance, Holland Park, Mt. Gravatt, or Indooroopilly, where the majority of people own their own homes. New Farm is a high-density living area where the home-owners are few and the tenants are many.

The last time an approach was made to the court for an alteration of shopping hours by the Retail Traders' Association, not one shopkeeper in New Farm was consulted by it. The result was that following the introduction of the amended hours, prosecutions and threats of prosecution became so frequent that a special conference was called with many of the shopkeepers concerned. When they were acquainted with the fact that the hours had been changed by consent, each of them protested vehemently that they had not been consulted. I plead with the Retail Traders' Association to have another look at the plight of many of the shopkeepers in New Farm and consider their thoughts and needs, as well as those of people who are in a special category, when the next approach to the court is being made.

Mr. Carey: You are to be admired for the way you look after your storekeepers.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I thank the hon. member. I am not concerned with shopkeepers alone; I am concerned also with the convenience of my people, a large number of whom have to do their shopping after work when the city stores are closed. They have no-one at home to do their shopping for them while they are at work.

I am not advocating that the Government take over the question of shop hours. I know it is our policy that shop hours and conditions are matters for the Industrial

Commission. I believe in it and I adhere to it. However, I merely place on record some facts that I hope will help the shopkeepers in my electorate the next time there is an approach to the Commission. I believe similar conditions exist at West End, but that is a matter that I shall leave for the hon. member for South Brisbane if he is as interested in his electorate as I am in mine.

The next matter that I want to discuss is of some importance to me as chairman of the Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board. There is a great need for legislation in Queensland to control the storage and transport of dangerous goods. My board feels that in any action involving dangerous substances, the safety of its employees and of the general public is paramount. Every precaution must be taken for their protection. We all know that we are living in a highly scientific and highly mechanised age, an age of road transport, and an age of road accidents and fatalities. Despite the denials of hon. members opposite, we in Brisbane and Queensland are, thanks to the encouragement of the Government, in the midst of an industrial revolution.

Because of these factors, the Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board has, since before 1961, been anxious to see the passage of legislation covering the storage and transport of dangerous goods. We all know that there are many differing views on this matter. Some believe, of course, that storage of dangerous goods is the responsibility of the local authority, and that their transport must be covered by a national code. I well remember an incident that occurred not very long ago in the heart of the city of Brisbane. A firm was bituminising a roof, and some of the hot bitumen overflowed onto the roof. It caught fire, and the brigade was called out to stop a major conflagration.

The board took this matter up, because it appeared to us to be quite stupid that a person or company putting bitumen over a roof could heat it on an open fire right in the heart of the city. We wrote to the City Council and suggested that they might have a look at their ordinances and see if it was possible to insist that when heated tar was being used on the top of a building, it be held in a special container so that it would be away from the actual fire.

In reply we received this rather amusing letter—

"This is not a matter covered by Council ordinances, nor is it considered it should be. Council ordinances in respect of buildings are concerned with methods of construction so far as tradesmanship is concerned and the correct use of materials; but safety in the using of materials or the safety of workmen is, in the opinion of the Council, a matter for the Department of Labour and Industry, and it is not intended that the Council would take any action in the matter."

It is therefore obvious that it is no good leaving control of fire hazards to local authorities. If the largest local authority in the State takes that view, how on earth can we expect small local authorities in rural areas to become interested in such matters?

We must therefore look further afield, because it is quite obvious that there is a need for such protection. For instance, barely a week passes without some news of a semi-trailer overturning and the driver being incinerated with his load. The Bexley chlorine gas incident in New South Wales is still fresh in our minds, and on 18 August, 1962, a semi-trailer carrying 6,070 gallons of anhydrous ammonia gas overturned on the New England Highway. Normally it is a gas, but when it is transported it is in a liquid state under high pressure, and when it is released into the atmosphere it turns back to gas and is highly dangerous to life. In that instance, a policeman had to be posted at the scene from 3 o'clock one morning till halfway through the next day to keep people away for their own protection.

With the establishment of the new ammonia plant in Brisbane, the Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board, the Government and the people generally must be more concerned than ever to see that the storage and transport of dangerous goods is regulated and governed by the necessary legislation. Not only are we, as a board, concerned; we are joined in our concern by the Fire and Accident Underwriters' Association of Queensland, and the Australian Dangerous Goods Transport Committee is preparing a model code for the road transport of dangerous goods in Australia. The Queensland representative on the committee is the Chief Inspector of Explosives, but no Fire Brigade officer is on it, either from this or any other State. The Standards Association of Australia came out with a draft set of rules.

Just to get the record straight, the Australian Transport Advisory Committee consists of the Officer in Charge of the Explosives Department in New South Wales; the Chief Inspector of Explosives in Victoria; the Chief Inspector of Explosives in Queensland; the Chief Inspector of Explosives in South Australia; the Chief Inspector of Explosives in Western Australia; the Director of Mines in Tasmania; the Conference of Australian and New Zealand Railways Authorities; the Australian Port Authorities Association; the Commonwealth Explosives Transport Committee; the Marine Services Division of the Department of Shipping and Transport; the Department of Civil Aviation; the Department of Supply; the Department of Health (Director of Industrial Hygiene) School of Public Health; the Department of Customs and Excise; the Department of Labour and National Service; the Department of Territories; the National Health and Medical

Research Council; and the Standards Association of Australia. All those people make up the committee, and the committee is moving towards a national standard code.

I am not opposed to uniformity, for uniformity can be quite a good and helpful thing; but I do express my concern at the growing tendency for State Governments to call interstate conferences to set up uniform legislation on this or that subject. I think one must remember that every time a new uniform code is developed, a new nail is driven into the coffin of State powers, State authorities, and State Parliaments, and another lock is undone on the treasure chest of Federalism.

The Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board has not merely sat on the sidelines and drawn attention to the dangers and the need for legislation. As far back as 1961 it went into the question of draft legislation, and on 3 March, 1964, the board sent to the then Minister for Labour and Industry a draft Bill based on the best features of existing legislation in other States and that of New Zealand. This draft Bill contained six parts and was mainly the work of the Deputy Chief Officer, Mr. Dowling, and the Fire Brigade Inspector, Mr. Johnston. The six parts of the Bill were—

- Part 1: Preliminary and interpretation;
- Part 2: Marking;
- Part 3: Packing and conveyance;
- Part 4: Storage (liquid);
- Part 5: Storage (solids);
- Part 6: Compressed liquefied petroleum gas.

Again for the record, there were classified six classes of dangerous goods, covering some 53 basic ingredients of various common mixtures, solutions, emulsions, and so on.

After much consideration over a long period, on 16 November, 1964, the board wrote to the Fire and Accident Underwriters' Association with a draft of suitable legislation and asked the underwriters to make any proposals they might care to make. Our main concern as a board, and mine as a member of the Legislative Assembly is that this subject of the storage and transport of dangerous goods has been the Aunt Sally of State departments, the Brisbane City Council, the police, the State Fire Services Council, and so on. "It is difficult to see how uniform regulations could apply to the storage and transport of dangerous goods," one department said; "It is a matter for the local authority," said another department; yet the Brisbane City Council—and I presume lesser local authorities—just are not interested in this subject. I make a plea to Cabinet to get this very necessary legislation off the ground.

Mr. Davies: Do you think they will be interested?

Mr. RAMSDEN: Of course they will be.

Mr. Davies: Have you put it to them yet?

Mr. RAMSDEN: Not yet; I am putting it to them now.

Whilst I am on this subject, let me point out something else that I think needs tightening up. It has to do not with the carriage of dangerous goods but with the carriage of any goods. Regulation 64 of the Traffic Regulations says that it is an offence for a person on any road to drive a vehicle when the loading is not safely and securely fastened.

I have been disturbed for some time now at the amount of debris lying on our roads that has fallen from trucks and that obviously, at the time of falling, would have constituted a grave hazard to following traffic. Only a few weeks ago, just on dusk, I had occasion to call at Newstead police station to ask the constable there to arrange to have removed from Breakfast Creek Road, near the foot of the Cloudland railway, a huge rock which, in the darkness, could have caused serious injury, if not death.

I draw attention to regulation 64 of the Traffic Regulations and warn drivers of their obligations under it. I also ask that where a load is obviously insecure a prosecution should follow.

Mr. Sherrington: Don't you think that part of this can be blamed on the inadequate trucks used for the type of load?

Mr. RAMSDEN: That may be so, but my concern is with danger to other people.

I want to direct the attention of the House to the urgent need for the setting up of a committee of inquiry to investigate the used-car trade. It is not my habit to single out any particular firm or company, but I do want to illustrate the need for such a committee to come to a decision and recommend specific action that can be taken to protect the public generally from being "taken for a ride".

Attending the multiple-handicapped school at New Farm is a multiple handicapped, blind boy who resides at Wynnum and who, for a variety of reasons that I do not intend to pursue here, must be transported to school daily by private transport. The boy's father is a plumber who is working for wages and the family decided to trade in their car, which was heavy and old, and buy a second-hand Volkswagen. To this end, they visited a firm here in Brisbane. They chose a grey Volkswagen which, after road testing, they decided they would purchase on \$40 deposit with the old car as part of the trade-in. The firm told them to go away and come back again in two hours, when the papers would be ready for signature.

The grey Volkswagen was going to cost £500 at that time, or \$1,000. After a period of two hours the family went back to the firm and were told that before they signed up perhaps they would care to have a look at another car at a branch office, as it were, in a new-car sales section. It was a green

Volkswagen; it was a bit dearer but a better car mechanically, one the firm could really guarantee.

Rather than buy one car without looking at the other the family accompanied the salesman to the other branch, which was in another suburb. They saw this green Volkswagen and to them it certainly looked better than the grey one. The green one was \$200 dearer, that is, \$1,200 instead of \$1,000. It appeared to be much better than the grey vehicle and the actual words of the salesman were, "This car I can really guarantee."

Mr. Davies: What firm was this?

Mr. RAMSDEN: I am not going to name the firm, because this is common to many firms.

On that line of sales talk the family decided to purchase the better-guaranteed car. They signed up in February, 1966. Exactly five weeks later, one week after they paid the first instalment, the motor seized up. They got a local mechanic to have a look at it. The local mechanic, to whom I later spoke on the telephone, was an old Volkswagen man. He told them that his inspection revealed that the motor had been under water and that certain parts of the engine were corroded with rust. The garage-man said, "Go back to where you bought it. Don't touch it. The engine was seized. You had better discuss it with the firm from which you bought it."

At this stage the mother, who was now almost frantic with worry because of the mechanical condition of the car and the fact that her son was deprived of his special schooling, got in touch with me. I immediately rang the managing director of the firm—apart from being the managing director of this particular firm he was the licensee of a hotel—and discussed the case with him. The first thing he tried to do was to shelve all the blame onto the family because they had taken the car to an unauthorised Volkswagen dealer. When I said, "Wait a minute, this fellow who had a look at it was Volkswagen-trained," he cooled down a little and said, "I can't accept responsibility when somebody else has been fooling around with the car." We had a few more words and some discussion, and finally he told me to send the family back to the sales manager to see what could be done about the matter.

Mr. Davies: Was this service place in Brisbane?

Mr. RAMSDEN: It was in Brisbane.

That was in March, 1966. After some pressure from me and an active interest by the R.A.C.Q. this unfortunate family finally got their "guaranteed" car back in May after they had been gypped of another \$80 for the cost of labour and parts. For this they were given a further guarantee—if it was not worth any more than the original

"guarantee" it was hardly worth the paper it was written on—of six months on all the parts that had been put in.

Just how shady some of these used-car deals are can be seen when I point out that when this lady rang the firm she was told that the car was ready to be picked up and put on the road. She rang the R.A.C.Q., because by this time she had been bitten at least twice, and asked the R.A.C.Q. to go out and inspect the car and see if they could pass it before she took delivery. I do not know what they would have done had they not had the R.A.C.Q. inspect the vehicle, because when the R.A.C.Q. did get there to inspect the car, which was supposed to be ready to put on the road, they found the engine had not been touched; it was still in the same condition as it had been in when the car was first delivered.

Mr. Davies: Does he offer a better service in his hotel?

Mr. RAMSDEN: I do not know; I do not drink.

Eventually the car was ready for the road and the reason for the breakdown was given as, "A part had come loose and fallen in the works and seized the engine up." They were told they were just unlucky. It was just unlucky that they were sold a car for \$200 more than the one they intended to buy; it was just unlucky that they had that car off the road for four months; it was just unlucky that they had four months of lost schooling for their blind and multiple-handicapped child; it was just unlucky that they had to pay another \$80 for repairs; and it was just unlucky that the father lost three days' wages going backward and forward to the firm who sold him the car.

I do not know the answer to this problem, but we are all aware that the case I have instanced is not an isolated one.

Mr. Tucker: I gave a parallel case to the Minister for Justice and he said nothing could be done about it.

Mr. RAMSDEN: Well, I am giving him this one.

The many sales of used cars throughout the State create an urgent need for consideration of the ways and means that can be devised to protect those who have no mechanical knowledge and no right of redress because the hire-purchase agreement contains a statement that they have bought the vehicle with all its faults.

Mr. Melloy: Why do you protect a firm that does that sort of thing?

Mr. RAMSDEN: May I suggest that I be permitted to give my speech my way and that the hon. member make his speech his way. I am quite aware that the Opposition want me to name the firm, but I will not name one isolated firm in respect of a racket that is carried on throughout Brisbane.

Mr. Davies: You mean they are all in it?

Mr. RAMSDEN: Yes. I am asking that a committee of inquiry be appointed to investigate all the ramifications of the used-car market and find out what can be done to protect the people, who have no right of redress. Once anyone signs his name to a hire-purchase agreement he finds written into it an admission that he has bought it with all its faults. I seriously suggest the appointment of such a committee to investigate this facet of salesmanship so that the honest working man who cannot afford a new vehicle but wants a vehicle for the benefit of his family, for his employment, or for any other reason that seems valid to him, will be protected from these vicious sharks who are feasting on his flesh.

Debate, on motion of Mr. Lee, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 9.30 p.m.