

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**WEDNESDAY, 9 AUGUST 1967**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## WEDNESDAY, 9 AUGUST, 1967

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

### ROMA BY-ELECTION

#### RETURN OF WRIT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to report that a writ was issued by the Acting Speaker on 23 May, 1967, for the election of a member to serve in the Legislative Assembly for the electoral district of Roma in the room of William Manson Ewan, deceased; and that the said writ has been duly returned with a certificate endorsed thereon by the returning officer of the election on 24 June, 1967, of Kenneth Burgoyne Tomkins to serve as such member.

#### MEMBER SWORN

Mr. Tomkins was introduced, took the oath of allegiance, and subscribed the roll.

### PAPER PRINTED DURING RECESS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to report that the following paper was ordered to be printed and circulated during the recess, in accordance with the Resolution of Parliament passed during the session of 1901:—

Report of the Brisbane City Council Subdivision Use and Development of Land Commission.

### PANEL OF TEMPORARY CHAIRMEN

#### NOMINATION OF MR. P. R. SMITH

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to report that pursuant to the requirements of Standing Order No. 13, I nominate Percy Raymund Smith, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Windsor, to fill the vacancy in the panel of Temporary Chairmen caused by the appointment of Mr. Campbell as Minister for Industrial Development.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

#### CHANGE IN MINISTRY

Hon. G. W. W. CHALK (Lockyer—Deputy Premier) (11.5 a.m.), by leave: I desire to inform the House that on 9 June, 1967, His Excellency the Governor accepted the resignation tendered by the Honourable Alexander Tattenhall Dewar as a member of the Executive Council of Queensland and as Minister for Industrial Development of Queensland.

On 20 June, 1967, His Excellency the Governor appointed Frederick Alexander Campbell to be a member of the Executive Council of Queensland and Minister for Industrial Development of Queensland.

I lay upon the table of the House copies of the Queensland Government Gazettes Extraordinary dated 10 June and 20 June, 1967, containing the relevant notifications.

Whereupon the hon. gentleman laid the Government Gazettes Extraordinary upon the table.

### PAPERS

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

#### Reports—

Public Accountants Registration Board for the year 1966-67.

Extension of St. George Irrigation Project.

Registrar of Friendly Societies.

Chief Inspector of Factories and Shops for the year 1966-67.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

#### Proclamations under—

The Public Works Land Resumption Acts, 1906 to 1955, and The State Development and Public Works Organisation Acts, 1938 to 1964.

The State Development and Public Works Organisation Acts, 1938 to 1964, The Public Works Land Resumption Acts, 1906 to 1955, and The Petroleum Acts, 1923 to 1962.

The Queensland Marine Acts, 1958 to 1967.

The Stamp Acts, 1894 to 1966.

The Marketable Securities Act of 1966.

The Justices Acts, 1886 to 1964.

The Decentralization of Magistrates Courts Act of 1965.

The Sugar Acquisition Act of 1915.

#### Orders in Council under—

The State Development and Public Works Organisation Acts, 1938 to 1964.

The Fisheries Acts, 1957 to 1962.

The Harbours Acts, 1955 to 1966.

The Queensland Marine Acts, 1958 to 1967.

The Racing and Betting Acts, 1954 to 1966.

The Workers' Compensation Acts, 1916 to 1966.

The Grammar Schools Acts, 1860 to 1962.

The Libraries Acts, 1943 to 1949.

The University of Queensland Act of 1965.

The Companies Acts, 1961 to 1964.

The Justices Acts, 1886 to 1964.

The Liquor Acts, 1912 to 1965.

The Magistrates Courts Acts, 1921 to 1964.

The Public Curator Acts, 1915 to 1957.

The Real Property Acts, 1861 to 1963.

The Supreme Court Act of 1921.

Orders in Council under—*continued*

The Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Acts, 1944 to 1965.  
 The City of Brisbane Acts, 1924 to 1966.  
 The Forestry Acts, 1959 to 1964.  
 The Water Acts, 1926 to 1967.  
 The River Improvement Trust Acts, 1940 to 1965.  
 The Irrigation Areas (Land Settlement) Act of 1962.  
 The Agricultural Chemicals Distribution Control Act of 1966.  
 The Dairy Products Stabilisation Acts, 1933 to 1957.  
 The Fauna Conservation Act of 1952.  
 The Meat Industry Act of 1965.  
 The Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Acts, 1926 to 1966.  
 The Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Acts, 1962 to 1966.  
 The Stock Acts, 1915 to 1965.  
 The Sugar Experiment Stations Acts, 1900 to 1965.  
 The Wheat Pool Acts, 1920 to 1957.  
 The State Housing Acts, 1945 to 1966 and The Local Bodies' Loans Guarantee Acts, 1923 to 1957.  
 The Medical Acts, 1939 to 1966.  
 The Explosives Acts, 1952 to 1963.  
 The Health Acts, 1937 to 1967.  
 The Ambulance Services Act of 1967.  
 The Factories and Shops Acts, 1960 to 1964.  
 The Fish Supply Management Act of 1965.  
 The Petroleum Acts, 1923 to 1962.  
 The Gas Acts, 1965 to 1966.  
 The Industrial Development Acts, 1963 to 1964.

Regulations under—

The Farmers' Assistance (Debts Adjustment) Act of 1967.  
 The Harbours Acts, 1955 to 1966.  
 The Motor Vehicles Insurance Acts, 1936 to 1967.  
 The Queensland Marine Acts, 1958 to 1967.  
 The Racing and Betting Acts, 1954 to 1966.  
 The Stamp Acts, 1894 to 1966.  
 The Workers' Compensation Acts, 1916 to 1966.  
 The Education Act of 1964.  
 The Auctioneers, Real Estate Agents, Debts Collectors and Motor Dealers Acts, 1922 to 1961.  
 The Trust Accounts Acts, 1923 to 1959.  
 The Public Curator Acts, 1915 to 1957.  
 The Co-operative Societies Acts, 1946 to 1962.  
 The Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Act of 1962.

The Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Acts, 1944 to 1965.  
 The Rural Fires Acts, 1946 to 1964.  
 The Local Government Acts, 1936 to 1966.  
 The Agricultural Standards Acts, 1952 to 1963.  
 The Fruit and Vegetables Acts, 1947 to 1959.  
 The Fruit Marketing Organisation Acts, 1923 to 1965.  
 The Meat Industry Act of 1965.  
 The Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Acts, 1926 to 1966.  
 The Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Acts, 1962 to 1966.  
 The Second-hand Fruit Cases Acts, 1940 to 1952.  
 The Stock Acts, 1915 to 1965.  
 The Health Acts, 1937 to 1967.  
 The Hospitals Acts, 1936 to 1967.  
 The Apprenticeship Act of 1964.  
 The Inspection of Scaffolding Acts, 1915 to 1966.  
 The Weights and Measures Acts, 1951 to 1966.  
 The Main Roads Acts, 1920 to 1965.  
 The Traffic Acts, 1949 to 1965.  
 The Gas Acts, 1965 to 1966.  
 The Miners' Homestead Leases Acts, 1913 to 1965.

Statutes under the University of Queensland Act of 1965

Rules under—

The Decentralization of Magistrates Courts Act of 1965.  
 The Coroners Act of 1958.

By-laws under—

The Harbours Acts, 1955 to 1966.  
 The Railways Acts, 1914 to 1965—Nos. 963, 964 and 965.

Ordinance under the City of Brisbane Acts, 1924 to 1966 and the City of Brisbane Town Planning Act of 1964.

Balance Sheet and Profit and Loss Account of the Union-Fidelity Trustee Company of Australia Limited.

## FORM OF QUESTION

Mr. LEE (Yeronga) having given notice of a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member's question is lengthy. I shall have a look at it.

PARLIAMENTARY LIBRARY  
COMMITTEE

## APPOINTMENT OF MR. J. E. H. HOUGHTON

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that a vacancy exists in the Library Committee consequent on the death of Mr. Ewan.

**Hon. G. W. W. CHALK** (Lockyer—Deputy Premier): I move—

“That James Edward Hiram Houghton, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Redcliffe, be appointed a member of the Library Committee to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Mr. Ewan.”

Motion agreed to.

#### PRINTING COMMITTEE

**Mr. SPEAKER:** I have to inform the House that a vacancy exists in the Printing Committee consequent on the appointment of Mr. Campbell as Minister for Industrial Development.

**Hon. G. W. W. CHALK** (Lockyer—Deputy Premier): I move—

“That Colin John Miller, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Ithaca, be appointed a member of the Printing Committee to fill the vacancy caused by the appointment of Mr. Campbell as Minister for Industrial Development.”

Motion agreed to.

DEATHS OF MR. E. COSTELLO, MR. E. J. LLEWELYN AND MR. G. A. MORRIS.

#### MOTION OF CONDOLENCE

**Hon. G. W. W. CHALK** (Lockyer—Deputy Premier), by leave, without notice: I move—

“1. That this House desires to place on record its appreciation of the services rendered to this State by the late Edward Costello, Esquire, Evan John Llewelyn, Esquire, and George Alfred Morris, Esquire, former members of the Parliament of Queensland.

“2. That Mr. Speaker be requested to convey to the relatives of the deceased gentlemen the above resolution, together with an expression of the sympathy and sorrow of the members of the Parliament of Queensland in the loss they have sustained.”

Major Costello, a Gallipoli veteran and retired grazier, of Thane, was well known throughout Queensland and especially in the Darling Downs-Maranoa area. He died on 27 June, 1967, at the age of 84 years, after a long illness.

Major Costello was born and educated in the Warwick district and followed in the footsteps of his father as a grazier. Soon after the outbreak of World War I he enlisted in the A.I.F. and served with the Light Horse at Gallipoli and in the desert campaign.

Six feet 6½ inches in height, he was the tallest Australian on the Gallipoli Peninsula. He was awarded the D.S.O. for bravery during the charge of Semakh, on the Sea

of Galilee, on 25 September, 1918. This action was claimed to be the only charge ever made by British Cavalry before daylight.

Two years after the end of World War I, Major Costello received Country Party endorsement as candidate for the Carnarvon seat and was elected. He retained the seat for 15 years, being defeated in 1935 by the Labour candidate, the late Mr. Paul Hilton. A man of quiet temperament, Major Costello had many friends in all spheres of community life. He was a stalwart of the R.S.L. Warwick Sub-branch and a former patron of the Spurs and Feathers Club.

Mr. Llewelyn, who died on 11 June, 1967, at the age of 91 years was known to some of us. Born in Wales, he migrated to Gympie with his family in 1887. He later took up ambulance work in Brisbane with the Army Medical Corps. In 1902 he became an honorary bearer in the Queensland Ambulance Transport Brigade and, after serving as senior bearer at Ipswich, was appointed ambulance superintendent at Toowoomba in 1907.

Mr. Llewelyn was elected to Parliament as Australian Labour Party member for Toowoomba at a by-election in 1925. He was re-elected in 1926, but was defeated when Labour lost the Treasury benches in 1929. He re-entered Parliament in 1932, but resigned in November, 1935, to resume control of the Q.A.T.B. in Toowoomba—a most humane task, for which he had a wealth of practical knowledge.

Mr. Llewelyn was a trustee of the Toowoomba athletic oval for 35 years and a member of the Toowoomba Masonic Lodge. He retired as Toowoomba ambulance superintendent in 1953—after more than 40 years of service. In his relatively short political life he looked after the interests of his constituents in a most sincere and able manner.

The late Mr. Morris, who died on 18 May, 1967, at the age of 73 years, had an even shorter parliamentary career, but quite a colourful one. He stood as Protestant Labour Party candidate for Kelvin Grove in the general election of 2 April, 1938, defeating Mr. F. J. Waters, the sitting A.L.P. member. During the August session of the following year, Mr. Morris was accused by Labour members of introducing sectarianism into the House, and there were some vitriolic exchanges.

When World War II broke out, Mr. Morris obtained leave of absence from Parliament to rejoin the Navy. He served for four years as instructor at Flinders Naval Hospital and at Balmoral Depot, Rushcutters Bay, and Leeuwin, Western Australia. He remained a member of the Queensland Parliament until March, 1941.

Born in Sydney, Mr. Morris first entered the Navy in 1913 as a sick-berth attendant, and went to Haslar Naval Hospital, Portsmouth, for training. He joined

H.M.A.S. "Australia" on her arrival in England in 1915, and served in that ship until the end of the war, leaving the Navy in 1923 with the rank of Chief Petty Officer.

Mr. Morris was a foundation member of the Taxi Cab Owner Drivers Association of Queensland, and was its secretary for 16 years, until his retirement through ill health in December, 1964. He is credited with having organised and gained Government recognition for the taxi industry in Queensland.

It can be truthfully said that all three former members of the House had given good service to their respective communities, their State, and their country, during their lifetime.

We mourn their passing, and I am sure all honourable members join with me in expressing to their relatives our sincere sympathy.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (12.11 p.m.): On behalf of the Opposition, I second this motion of condolence. As the Deputy Premier has related the qualifications of each of the deceased gentlemen I shall not refer to them. Each of them, as do most members of Parliament, not only tried to serve their country in this House but also gave great service in their private lives to the community as a whole. Two of them served in theatres of war; Mr. Costello in the First World War, with great distinction, and Mr. Morris in the Second World War. Mr. Llewelyn left Parliament to do what he felt was a greater service to mankind, namely, ambulance work. These three men did great service in this House and also to the State as a whole.

Mr. McKECHNIE (Carnarvon) (12.13 p.m.): I join with the Deputy Premier and the Leader of the Opposition in paying our respects to the late hon. members, particularly the late Ted Costello, who was the hon. member for Carnarvon prior to 1935. During the 1920's, in difficult times and conditions, considerable pioneering was carried out on the Granite Belt by soldier settlers, and Ted Costello was a tower of strength to those men, and continued to be so in the organisation of fruit marketing which arose as a result of the difficult marketing conditions at that time. I remember him as a distinguished and respected member who served his electorate well in the days after World War I.

I join with the Deputy Premier and the Leader of the Opposition in paying our respects to those late members, particularly Mr. Costello.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West) (12.14 p.m.): It is neither usual nor normally desirable for any member on this side of the House other than the Leader of the Opposition to speak on a condolence motion. I wish, on this occasion to depart from the normal practice for three reasons:

firstly, because Mr. Llewelyn represented Toowoomba for very many years; secondly, because I succeeded him in 1935; and thirdly, and more importantly, because he was a man blessed with an abundance of warm human qualities who endeared himself to a large number of people.

A recital of his services to the community, particularly in the ambulance field, has already been made. It was in the ambulance field, where he completed 40 years' service at a time when facilities in the Queensland Ambulance Transport Brigade were not as modern as they are today, that he perhaps distinguished himself most. He was called upon to travel long distances and for long periods in the country areas adjacent to Toowoomba, and he endeared himself very much indeed to the people of Toowoomba and the Darling Downs through the qualities that he displayed as ambulance superintendent. The Toowoomba centre was always a very efficient one, and, as a result of Mr. Llewelyn's organising ability and the public co-operation that he received, was always able to obtain as high a share of the public purse as an ambulance centre could secure.

Mr. Llewelyn did not have a long tenure of office in Parliament, as he was one of the many members who were removed by the election reverse in 1929. Nevertheless, he made his mark in this House. I do not think that he particularly liked the controversial aspects of politics, and it was perhaps rather paradoxical that a man of such gentle disposition should have been one of a few members of this House who were involved in a scuffle with, I think it was, a former Leader of the Opposition and subsequently a member of the Senate, namely, Senator Maher. I think that many were rather surprised and upset at that incident. It showed, however, that Mr. Llewelyn must have been deeply stirred, because he was a man who went to great pains to avoid involvement in political controversy. I do not think I am being unkind to him or to his memory by saying that I have known him to bypass Ruthven Street and use side streets when going to his home near the general hospital in Toowoomba to avoid becoming involved in long arguments over why the Government did not do this or that or why it was unable to relieve some personal distress. He was a very humane and generous man, and it distressed him to think that the facilities of the State could not be used to mitigate some of the problems of which he became aware as a parliamentarian.

He liked to help people. He was a passionate believer in the philosophy of the Australian Labour Party, and I am indebted to him for personal encouragement and advice. I therefore take this opportunity, as the one who succeeded him in Parliament and who received the benefit of much help from him, to record my thanks for that advice. On behalf of those whom I now represent,

some of whom he at one time represented, I express thanks and appreciation for a job well done.

I also served with Mr. Llewelyn as co-trustee of the Toowoomba athletic oval, and I am aware of his interest in many other fields. I shall confine myself, however, to the salient points of his career, namely, his work for, and association with, the ambulance, and his political service in this Parliament. The State has lost a gentleman who was highly esteemed and extremely well liked, and one who will be remembered with affection by a great many people for many years to come.

**Mr. CORY** (Warwick) (12.18 p.m.): I appreciate this opportunity to associate the Warwick district with this motion of condolence, particularly that part of it referring to the late Major Costello. I fully support the remarks of previous speakers. Major Costello served in many fields of public life, and had a distinguished military career, but at no stage did he lose his love for his own district. Those of us who knew him and lived close to him regarded him as a friend and a man of the very highest calibre. Although he was, with his family, very successful in his own business, he always remained a battler for the small man, which was shown by the advice and assistance that he was always so willing and happy to give.

I support this motion most sincerely, and so record the feelings of those in the Warwick district at our great loss in the passing of Major Costello.

**Hon. S. D. TOOTH** (Ashgrove—Minister for Health) (12.19 p.m.): I should like to join earlier speakers in supporting this motion, and to say in particular that the community has lost a very worthy citizen in the person of the late Mr. George Morris. I did not know Mr. Morris in the days when he was something of a stormy petrel in the political skies of Queensland. I became acquainted with him in his later and more mellow years, and one of the things that I always noticed about him was his great joy in living and in the activities in which he was involved. I became acquainted with him through the fact that he was the secretary of the Newmarket Bowling Club, of which I am a non-playing member, and he was always extremely popular and always very active in the needs and welfare of not only that institution but the community as a whole. I join with other hon. members in supporting the motion.

Motion (Mr. Chalk) agreed to, hon. members standing in silence.

#### GOVERNOR'S OPENING SPEECH

**Mr. SPEAKER:** I have to report that His Excellency the Governor yesterday delivered to Parliament an Opening Speech of which,

for greater accuracy, I have obtained a copy. I presume hon. members will take the Speech as read?

**Honourable Members:** Hear, hear!

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

**Mr. ARMSTRONG** (Mulgrave) (12.23 p.m.): I move—

"That the following Address be presented to the Governor in reply to the Speech delivered by His Excellency in opening this, the second session of the Thirty-eighth Parliament of Queensland—

'May it please Your Excellency,—

We, Her Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects, the Members of the Legislature of Queensland, in Parliament assembled, desire to assure Your Excellency of our continued loyalty and affection towards the Throne and Person of Our Most Gracious Sovereign, and to tender our thanks to Your Excellency for the Speech with which you have been pleased to open the present session.

"The various measures to which Your Excellency has referred, and all other matters that may be brought before us, will receive our most careful consideration, and it shall be our earnest endeavour so to deal with them that our labours may tend to the advancement and prosperity of the State'."

I should like to commend His Excellency for the manner in which he has discharged his duty as Her Majesty's representative in this State. Both he and Lady Mansfield have spared no effort in travelling around the State, meeting the people and making themselves familiar with the development that is taking place in various parts and with the problems and difficulties that have yet to be overcome.

At this stage I offer my sincere congratulations to the new hon. member for Roma, and wish him long and distinguished Parliamentary service in this House.

As a member of the Government who represents an electorate in the far northern part of the State more than 1,000 miles from Brisbane, I am pleased to have the opportunity of moving the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and, in doing so, I hope to bring to the notice of hon. members what I believe are important matters of significance to the people of Queensland.

Since the Nicklin Government has been in office we have witnessed rapid development of our resources in many parts of the State, involving the expenditure of very substantial sums of money, both public and private. Time will not permit me to mention them all. I will, however, mention some of the major projects going on in the State, such as Weipa bauxite, township and harbour, beef roads, harbour improvement at main harbours, bulk-sugar terminals at sugar

ports, expansion at Mount Isa Mines, Mt. Isa railway reconstruction, copper refinery at Townsville, Army base at Townsville—

**Mr. Thackeray:** What about the reduction in the number of railwaymen?

**Mr. ARMSTRONG:** I know the hon. member would not like this.

To continue, I mention the extensive coal exploration being carried out at Moura and Blackwater, oil and natural gas discoveries, the oil pipeline to Brisbane, the proposed gas pipeline, oil refineries at Brisbane, fertiliser works, the discovery of rock phosphate and nickel, expansion of the sugar industry, large electric power stations, the alumina plant at Gladstone, which was opened a couple of days ago, the new railway line to Moura, and the brigalow scheme, which is still under development. These and other schemes have involved expenditure of something of the order of \$1,308,186,000, which is no mean amount.

In addition to the schemes I have mentioned, we have had an announcement that a further \$20,000,000 is to be spent within the next two years to provide new ships and container-cargo port facilities for Queensland and on other port improvements at Brisbane, Rockhampton, Mackay, Townsville and Cairns. In the North we have the discovery of silica deposits at Cape Flattery, from which a quantity of 340,000 tons is to be supplied to Japan over a three-year period.

I heard somebody mention the "neglected" North. Let me point out that the amount of public money being spent in North Queensland is \$209,622,000. The amount in Central Queensland is \$126,840,000, in South Queensland \$188,649,000 and in the metropolitan area \$212,386,000. I draw attention particularly to the expenditure of over \$209,000,000 in North Queensland, which hon. members opposite claim has been neglected. The figures I have given include no project costing less than \$800,000, and there are many other schemes of smaller magnitude to which I have not referred.

In the field of private expenditure, North Queensland received \$174,110,000, Central Queensland \$219,000,000, Southern Queensland \$31,051,000, and the metropolitan area \$146,528,000. The total of those figures of private expenditure is \$570,689,000, and it excludes any project costing less than \$100,000.

If we group the two—this is the figure I want my friend to listen to—we find that North Queensland has received from public and private expenditure no less than \$383,732,000—that is the highest figure—Central Queensland has received \$345,840,000, Southern Queensland \$219,700,000 and the metropolitan area \$358,914,000. As I said earlier, the grand total, excluding the amounts I have referred

to—projects costing less than \$800,000 in one instance and \$100,000 in the other—is \$1,308,186,000. That is no mean figure.

These figures give some indication of the rate of development in Queensland, and its contribution to the economy and welfare of this State, as well as demonstrating a very fine record of achievement by the Nicklin Government. I am confident that the rate of industrial development will expand even further and at a faster rate in the years ahead.

In a State as large as Queensland, with an area of some 667,000 square miles, much of which is sparsely populated, there is need for much more development. Every encouragement must be given to people interested in taking part in any phase of development which tends to bring more people into these sparsely settled localities. Here I suggest that the closest co-operation of the Commonwealth Government should be solicited in an endeavour to formulate policies designed to achieve this objective without delay.

The loss of population from rural areas must be viewed seriously by all concerned. No doubt the devastating drought in many parts of the State at the time of the last census would have been responsible for a reduction of the work-force in affected areas, but a drift has been in evidence for some time, and I want to refer here to the Atherton Tableland area, which is partly in my electorate. It is an area I am fairly familiar with, and one which is represented very well.

The last census reveals a loss of about 1,000 people, a loss which is causing grave concern to the local authorities and business people, and, of course, to all people living in that area. This does not necessarily reflect a loss of production in the industries there, but it does affect the business people and, to some extent, work opportunities for the young people. I realise that some of the reasons for this decline in population are mechanisation of rural industries, amalgamation of small farms and the like in an endeavour to reduce production costs, the change from dairying to cattle-fattening, and the demand for labour by industrial development in the cities where the many amenities of modern times are readily available. This situation calls for immediate attention with a view not only to stopping the drift but to reversing it. I think this can be done in that area.

Some Government action may be required. One of the suggestions I offer is the rehabilitation and expansion of the pig industry. I am reliably informed that this year more than 12,000 pigs (alive or in carcass form) were brought into the Tableland, Cairns and Innisfail areas from Central Queensland. There is even some doubt that that number satisfies existing markets there. This industry should be established and cultivated.

The timber industry employs a fairly substantial labour force, and any assistance that we can give it will help it greatly. With this in mind, we should look closely at royalties with a view to reducing them, and examine sawmill licences with the idea of aggregating sawmills where this is economically possible and desirable. Perhaps the best way to assist the industry is to give some form of protection against products brought into Australia in competition with our home-grown timbers.

There is a market for many small crops that are grown on the Tableland. For instance, the sugar-cane industry uses substantial quantities of legumes. I know that some are grown at present, but I believe that there is room for expanding this local industry. Each year, between \$70,000 and \$100,000 is spent north of Ingham on legumes, and the Tableland area is suitably situated for providing this much-needed commodity. There is also a fair market for vegetables in the far northern part of the State, including Townsville, and I understand that quite large quantities of vegetables come from the Brisbane area, and even farther south. If these things were closely investigated, and assistance was rendered we could do much to rehabilitate these industries and so bring back some of the people who have drifted away.

There is also a need for fodder for drought areas. As hon. members know, the Atherton Tableland is not far removed from areas that suffered severely from drought. I believe that a reduction in road taxes and freight would provide an incentive for the people concerned to do something along these lines.

The desirability of irrigation and water conservation is highlighted by the contribution that our agricultural products make to the economy of Queensland, and Australia as a whole. This contribution is of sufficient national importance to warrant the allocation of greater sums of money for water conservation and irrigation. I should like to remind hon. members that the amount earned in Queensland in this important field is \$271,000,000 and, on an Australia-wide basis, the figure is \$1,500,000,000. All these matters are worthy of careful consideration.

During its 10 years in office the Nicklin Government has been very active in this field and has done everything possible with the funds available. Over \$68,000,000 from loan and trust funds has been spent on capital works throughout the State. Much money has been spent since the Labour Government was discharged from the Treasury benches. Dams have been built at Tinaroo, Moogerah, Borumba, Callide, Leslie, Coolmunda, Wuruma and Eungella.

During that period these and other works have increased threefold the total area under irrigation to 320,000 acres, with an estimated crop value of between \$70,000,000 and \$80,000,000. Whilst this is a commendable

achievement, it represents but a small proportion of the total area used for agricultural purposes, namely, about 4,000,000 acres and when the annual value of production of \$271,000,000 is considered, of which about \$200,000,000 is subject to the vagaries of weather conditions, one realises the need for, and importance of, water conservation and irrigation for the future welfare of this State and, indeed, of our nation.

When considering this problem we should be mindful of the tremendous losses of cattle and sheep through drought. In 1965-66, drought cost this State about 20 per cent. of its sheep population. Seven per cent. of its cattle perished in 12 months. Nearly half of the Australian beef population of 13,800,000 is in Queensland. The Queensland figure for 1965 was 6,200,000. In addition, we must consider the crop losses during the droughts which have ravaged Queensland and other States recently, the hardship suffered by those directly affected, the loss to the economy generally, the loss of revenue to the State, and the amounts given in drought relief.

It would be hard to assess this loss in dollars. But it is a national loss that our nation can ill afford, and one that no effort should be spared to avoid in the future. It is a task far beyond the financial capacity of State Governments; it is one that can be dealt with only on a national basis with close co-operation between Commonwealth and State Governments. The Commonwealth Government is conscious of this problem and has made a grant of \$50,000,000 over the next five years towards the cost of water conservation in the various States. But if the cattle, sheep, and crop losses to which I have referred are related to the \$50,000,000 it will be realised that we need more than \$50,000,000 ourselves to overcome this problem. The Government must press hard for more Commonwealth assistance. It is of paramount importance that we overcome as quickly as possible the drought losses suffered in this highly productive State.

I pass now to the primary industries and will give an indication of their value to this country. The net value of primary production in Queensland is about 1½ times that of secondary industry. The figures are—

Primary industry ..	\$565,792,000,000
Secondary industry ..	\$478,423,000,000

Of the value of primary production, our four main products, namely, wool, beef, sugar, and dairy produce, provide over half. Grain, timber, tobacco and other crops make up the remainder. Primary products are very important to Australia, and I hope every Australian realises this. This year's estimated gross value of rural products is \$3,733,000,000. In the year 1964-65 the value of Australian products exported, other than gold, amounted to approximately \$2,564,000,000. Of this, \$2,178,000,000 or 85 per cent., was mainly the produce of

primary industries, comprising \$1,588,000,000 of unprocessed produce and \$590,000,000 of goods processed to some degree before export. That will give some indication of what our primary industries mean, not only to Queensland but to Australia.

Most primary industry is experiencing very trying times in this era of ever-increasing costs, and in some cases decreasing prices for products, particularly on overseas markets. To illustrate what I mean, 10 years ago butter was worth about 320s. a hundred-weight on the United Kingdom market; today it is selling at about 300s. a hundred-weight. The Australian butter price has risen 11 per cent. during that time, while there has been a 31 per cent. increase in the Consumer Price Index. In the same period the average price of greasy wool fell from 60c a pound to 46c a pound, and the overseas price of sugar reached a record low. In 1957 the average export price was over \$90 a ton, and the No. 1 Pool price was \$99.71. Last year the average export price was \$57.45 a ton, and the No. 1 Pool price was \$85.69. Embraced in that was a Government-guaranteed loan of \$19,000,000, which contributed \$8.56 to the No. 1 Pool price. Over the same period costs have doubled.

I think all hon. members know my views on this matter. I said at the time—and I say now—that the assistance given was not enough, and I am afraid that every day I am being proved to be even more correct. The present position is not the fault of the Government. I know that the sugar industry and its leaders are very appreciative of the treatment recently received when they approached the Queensland Government, and then went to the Commonwealth Government and received a price increase. This will be of considerable help, but if the present export price remains the industry will certainly be looking for more help to keep it buoyant.

These three industries are among the four which, as I mentioned earlier, provide more than half the total value of primary production in Queensland, and must therefore affect our general economy. Primary industries, unlike other industries, are not able to pass increases in production costs on to the consumer, nor have they any control over them. I believe that the few figures I have quoted will serve to remind hon. members, and people generally, that Australia as a nation is still—and will be for many years—very dependent on the export earnings of these industries to meet foreign exchange to pay for the import of equipment and materials needed to assist in the development of our own resources and manufacturing interests.

These primary industries are thus worthy of the utmost consideration by Governments and a much better understanding of their importance by people in the cities of Australia.

As a further indication of the importance of primary production to Australia, it is interesting to note from figures of imports and exports that in 1964-65 manufacturing industries used more than \$2,000,000,000 worth of imports to produce \$386,000,000 in exports of manufactured goods. The figures for rural industries for the same period show that they used \$112,000,000 worth of imports to produce more than \$1,921,000,000 worth of exports. Here is another illustration of the great contribution being made by rural industry to the development of this State, and of Australia. All of these rural industries are being called on to produce and export more and more to earn increased foreign exchange, to become more efficient, and to cut production costs wherever possible.

I am of the opinion that the ordinary Australian primary producer is efficient, and surely he is entitled to some reward for his efficiency. But it seems that he is expected to pass on to his customers any savings resulting from his efficiency. I believe that the way in which primary industries have responded to the challenge of increased costs is remarkable, and so far they have managed to counter increased costs by increased efficiency. I suggest that Australia is unrivalled by other countries of the world in efficiency in primary production. In the United States of America, which is claimed to be one of the most efficient countries in the world, each farmer produces 23 times his own requirements. In Australia each farmer produces enough food for about 43 people. I think that proves my point. Since 1949 rural production has increased by about 60 per cent., with a fall of about 10 per cent. in its work-force.

Although Australia cannot prevent the fluctuation in world economic activity from affecting prices for its produce, I believe that the time has arrived when primary producers cannot carry further increases in costs. They are in what might be termed an economic strait-jacket, and if our national policy of growth and development has brought in its wake increases in costs burdensome to rural export industries, it is only fair and reasonable, and indeed in the best interests of Australia, that compensating policies should be devised to help carry the extra costs, because if these rural export industries wilt under burdensome costs and cannot earn adequate foreign exchange, the economic results will be disastrous to the nation.

Some of the critics of primary industries in Australia charge these industries with being a burden on the public purse because of the subsidies or bounties given in schemes such as the wheat stabilisation scheme and the butter and cheese subsidy scheme. An examination of Commonwealth expenditure on bounties and subsidies shows that expenditure is mainly on primary products and that subsidies paid to secondary industries,

such as ship construction, oil research, air services, and certain manufactured products, are of considerably less importance.

Subsidies and bounties are not the only forms of protection resulting from Government action. While they may be important forms of protection, they form only a small part of the total protection to all industries resulting from Government action. Direct support to industries by bounties and subsidies is a non-tariff form of protection, as is indirect support to industries by freight, taxation or other forms of concessions, import prohibitions, etc. Perhaps the most important form of protection is the tariff. The amount of money paid in bounties or subsidies to Australian industries is readily available, but the value of protection given by tariff cannot readily be extracted from official statistics. The objects of all forms of protection to the producers are more or less the same—to assist them to operate without loss—but the effects on the purchasers have this difference: a bounty or subsidy does not involve a rise in price, whereas a tariff usually does.

A few years ago a study of subsidies and tariffs was carried out by a committee which was appointed by the Commonwealth Government and which was known as the Vernon Committee. In arriving at what it termed a "subsidy equivalent", the committee worked on the basis that if it were possible to replace all tariffs by subsidies and to derive the revenue to pay them by indirect taxes on the goods themselves, whether locally made or imported, the effect would be the same as that of the replaced tariffs. Importers would pay the tax instead of tariff duties, and so would consumers; but local producers would receive the benefit of subsidies instead of tariff protection. Such a theoretical change produces the same current conditions of prices, resources, demands, profits, and Government funds, while allowing a monetary amount to be placed on the value of protection.

The committee used this method to enable comparisons of the extent of protection granted to different commodities in the same way that the magnitude of the subsidies paid may be studied. This study of the committee allows us to put the values of protection, in terms of both tariffs and subsidies, in their proper perspective, and when criticism based on the subsidy portion only of total protection is raised, primary producers have an authoritative reference to which to refer. In their conclusions the Vernon Committee summarised the cash value of protection (tariffs and subsidies) for the year 1961-62 as follows:—

SECONDARY INDUSTRY (excluding processed primary products)—

	\$
Tariff protection	900,000,000
Subsidies and bounties	10,000,000
	<hr/>
	\$910,000,000
	<hr/>

PRIMARY INDUSTRY—

	\$
Tariff protection on processed products	100,000,000
Tariff protection on unprocessed primary products entering directly into consumption	10,000,000
Bounties and subsidies	60,000,000
	<hr/>
	\$170,000,000
	<hr/>

TOTAL OF SECONDARY AND  
PRIMARY INDUSTRY 1,080,000,000

Our secondary industries enjoyed protection from tariffs and subsidies of \$910,000,000, whereas primary industries enjoyed protection from those sources of \$170,000,000.

The Government is conscious of the great benefits that accrue to our primary industries by research, and has now about 27 research stations throughout the State doing work on all facets of rural industry. In addition, the Bureau of Sugar Experiment Stations has four which look after the requirements of that industry. The C.S.I.R.O. is also doing excellent work in this field. The efforts of these research bodies have been of inestimable value to Queensland, and no doubt they will continue to exert their influence in advancing the great primary industries of this State.

Before I conclude, I must pay a tribute to the Government for introducing the Dairy Pasture Subsidy Scheme and to thank it on behalf of the dairying industry. I should also like to thank the officers of the Department of Primary Industries for the manner in which they have performed their part in implementing the scheme. This scheme will be of great assistance to dairy farmers and I know they appreciate the Government's action. In North Queensland 45 per cent. of the dairy farmers have already participated in it. We have also to thank the department for the Otto Madsen Research Laboratory in Brisbane, and there is also a laboratory in Malanda which will be opened shortly.

While the electors of Queensland continue to demonstrate their good sense and appreciation of what the Country-Liberal Government has done for Queensland, this State will continue to develop and prosper. There can be no doubt in any responsible person's mind that Queensland is now enjoying the best Government in its history. This fact is conceded by newspapers throughout Australia, and as recently as today there is an article in the leading Brisbane newspaper that commends the Government's efforts and is rather critical of the Opposition's efforts during the time they were in office.

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

Mr. W. D. HEWITT (Chatsworth) (2.15 p.m.): Yesterday, in a ceremony of pomp, pageantry and splendour, His Excellency the

Governor, our Queen's distinguished representative, was pleased to open this second session of the Thirty-eighth Parliament. He outlined the legislation now to be enacted and, in time-honoured fashion, invoked the blessing of Almighty God upon our counsels. The honour is accorded to the hon. member for Mulgrave and me to initiate the Address-in-Reply debate. It is now my pleasure to second the motion moved by my colleague.

This Government has now been in office for 10 years. The convulsive upheaval that unseated the Labour Government is now a chapter in the history book. Of the 70 members who participated in the dramatic division on 12 June, 1957, that led to that Government's defeat, only 25 remain in this Chamber today.

Ten years ago the Suez adventure and the eclipse of Eden were matters still topical; the tragedy of Vietnam a looming cloud on a close horizon. For a fleeting moment Queensland's political crisis was paraded on the world stage when the London "Times" speculated on the circumstance by which a Premier could be sacked by a political junta. Ten years ago Brisbane adjusted itself to parking meters. Ten years ago an untried team, emerging like the Children of Israel after 40 years in the wilderness, was entrusted with the great responsibility of administering the affairs of the State of Queensland.

They have been exciting and rewarding years. The source of drought has made them sombre ones as well. But drought notwithstanding, the Government's record of progress is a proud catalogue of achievement. Our population has increased by some 200,000; export income has risen by 28 per cent.; some 6,000 industrial complexes have lifted our secondary income to par with that from primary production; the burning oil-waste from two refineries colours our evening sky; a serpentine pipeline carries its black gold from the field at Moonie; our earth's treasures at Weipa, Moura and Mt. Isa yield to the onslaught of mechanised man; our harbours bustle with trade; a fine network of roads traverses our vast expanse of land. With Commonwealth participation, virgin brigalow has been cleared and tamed; beef roads snake their way to far-flung corners; ornate science blocks are a reality; the promise of commercial natural gas will soon come to fruition.

The Government can take quiet pride in a job well done. But in the turbulent and uncompromising world of politics he who rests on his oars does so at his peril. We live in an impatient world—one torn asunder with sudden and sometimes violent change. A restless electorate is less concerned with what has been done than with what has to be done, when it is to be done and how it is to be done. Therefore, while we pause a moment to reminisce on the decade past, let us, as a responsible legislative body, consider

the problems that face us in the new decade of the Government life that we now embark upon.

In considering the issues that confront us two guide-lines should be laid down. First. Ministers must be initiators and not merely administrators. There is a wealth of difference between the terms, and its understanding must be firmly grasped. Second, as a Government we must not be devotees of orthodoxy in an unorthodox world. The untried should never be rejected merely because it is untried.

How well were these sentiments crystallised in "The Australian" editorial of 14 December, 1966, when it said this—

"Now, more than at any time in its history, Australia needs new ideas, imaginative, far-sighted leadership and a willingness to tackle problems which will go on growing for many years to come. We live in an area where great forces, abstract and tangible, have concentrated, an area seething with political, commercial and military passions. We live in a country whose potential no man has fully calculated. The job is to weld the potential for the good of ourselves and South East Asia."

Putting aside the mundane problems of government, what are some of the issues of consequence that face us in the next 10 years, and what should be our approach to them? Transcending all issues of domestic consequence is the world food problem. Cited by the United Nations as the second of two global imperatives (the other being nuclear hazards), advisers to President Johnson have recently reported to him that if the world food problem is not solved in the next 20 years it may be permanently beyond solution. If land availability alone were the answer one could suggest that we devote our vast untilled acres to gigantic food-production areas.

Great problems seldom lend themselves to so simple a solution. Our rainfall is unreliable; the soil is deficient; the climate harsh; the distances great; the economies of those we would help poor. Davidson's treatise "The Northern Myth" poses too many pertinent points for one to talk loosely or grandiloquently about the undeveloped North.

Yet it is no overstatement to say that we will not be permitted to pursue our own peaceful development if we remain unmindful of the underfed millions who now comprise 60 per cent. of the world's population. Sooner or later the immensity of their plight must impact itself upon us all.

Australia's assistance to under-developed countries has been significant. A recent \$9,000,000 wheat gift to India lifts our help to that country alone to \$34,000,000. A new commitment under the Gatt Cereal Food Aid Arrangement makes provision for an annual over-all contribution of 225,000 tons of wheat at a cost of \$13,000,00. Nevertheless, as a nation still facing immense developmental difficulties of its own, there must of necessity be a limit.

The problems are these: food production in many Asian countries lags badly behind the needs of the rising population; many lack the implements to farm the soil, the chemicals to enrich it, and the knowledge of how to sow and harvest; and their economies lack the strength to buy the raw essentials or the refined food products.

The question of bolstering their economies is one of international significance and it lies with powers greater than ours. Much more should be done by European industrial nations that have allowed primary-producing countries such as ours to bear a disproportionate share of the obligation. It is significant that the latest Kennedy Round of negotiations established the principle that the financial responsibility for making wheat gifts should not be confined merely to wheat-producing countries but should be shared also by the more advanced industrial nations, including Japan, whether they are exporters or importers of wheat.

4,500,000 metric tons of wheat and other food grains will be provided annually to under-developed countries over the next three years, with two-thirds of the financial responsibility for this aid programme resting on the United States and the six European Common Market countries.

Yet there is an area of responsibility in food production that Queensland should further develop. This is the beef industry. The development of tropical legumes has improved vastly the carrying capacity of our grazing lands. The courage of entrepreneurs of the Sir William Gunn ilk has shown that vast areas can be used for beef production; recent phosphate discoveries hold out promise for enrichment of other areas. The American experience on desalination by nuclear power holds out the promise that in the foreseeable future the chronic problems of water resources will be overcome.

Contrary to popular belief, Asia is not restricted for land. Given the technical and financial assistance, she could produce domestically great quantities of food. No Asian country, however, is as fortuitously placed as we are to expand beef production to the degree that will be needed. The problem is a great humanitarian one. Firstly, through the agencies of the Commonwealth Government, we should explore the changing habits of Asia and assess her meat requirements, both short-term and long-term. We should interest ourselves in how the various economies can be strengthened through international channels, and ultimately we should see what part Queensland can play in expanding trade agreements with Asian countries.

Secondly, we should make an assessment of our potential in beef production. This would involve many factors, some of which, in isolation, have been investigated. We should consider the question of land availability, looking critically if necessary at our land laws to see how greater holdings can be taken up. The Gunn experience in Cape

York should be looked at not as a success story in isolation but rather as a pilot enterprise that will lead to similar development of the other six-sevenths of the Peninsula.

We should accelerate the widespread cultivation of the legumes as we should be tuned to the great possibilities of soil enrichment through our phosphate finds. The exploitation of these at an economic cost presents an exciting challenge to both private enterprise and Government. Its domestic use will, of course, be marginal only to the development of an export industry. We should probe closely the integrated problems of transportation, killing facilities and harbour development. Most importantly, the emphasis on water resources must be maintained.

These things have been said before and they have been considered. The Loder Inquiry has investigated transportation; a committee set up by this Government has made recommendations upon drought relief; the Federal Government's Cattle and Beef Research Act of 1964 provides \$2,000,000 each year for beef research; a new programme of collaboration with the Federal and West Australian Governments has been agreed upon; the examination of water problems is more critical than ever before. But these actions must be co-ordinated and the Government must interest itself in this question. The beef industry attracts little subsidy. It is almost entirely independent and self-supporting. It is deserving of expansion if for no other reason than this.

To apply ourselves to an issue that can expand a great industry, open up vast areas of land, and play a part in solving the world's most vital problem, is a prospect that to me at least is quite irresistible.

We live in a time that may well be looked back upon as one of the great transitional periods in our history. The world's trading vogues are in the vortex of change. If Britain's application to join the European Economic Community is successful, the impact on our markets will be of real consequence. Queensland cannot talk in complacent terms about the effect upon Australia's economy; we must take a vital interest in its effect upon our own State's economy. Australia is making strenuous efforts to broaden the scope of her exports through both increased attention to the exporting of manufactured products and the search for new markets for traditional exports. The problem is to obtain reasonable and predictable access to markets.

Certainly, new markets must be found to supplement or replace the old. The latest Kennedy Round of negotiations has made this easier with some commodities; with others, the door is at least still open. But internally we cannot delay much longer a critical look at the whole question of protective tariffs and subsidies. If Britain goes into the Common Market, formalities will not be completed till 1971 or 1972. This still gives us some time to implement new policies.

Either alone or in conjunction with other States, Queensland must establish which industries can remain economically viable under the changed circumstances. Those that cannot are faced with three clear alternatives: they must increase their efficiency to remain competitive; they must effect a transition; they must face the prospect of Government support being minimised or withdrawn. Subsidies and protective tariffs have been too long a part of the political pattern for them to be abandoned overnight. To continue in perpetuity support of inefficient or uncompetitive industries would be political folly.

It is in the interest of our economy and the industries themselves that Government support be reviewed in the light of a possible new situation. The method and timing of a possible withdrawal and the reorientation difficulties will present Governments with many headaches. There must be co-operation, sympathy and understanding in the difficult transition period. But a situation is being forced upon us that may give us little choice and little room for manoeuvre. There will certainly be no room for political timidity. Decisions must be affected not only by external marketing problems. There should also be a weighing of the findings of economic surveys that should be instituted and cost-benefit analyses, which should be better applied.

One hesitates to cite one example because there are others, but dairying, in particular, is left in a situation in which its largest export market may simply collapse. Already more butter is being produced than can be exported, yet there are no incentives for dairy farmers to get out of dairying. Mr. Harold F. Bell, economic adviser to the Australian Mutual Provident Society, recognised this when he wrote recently in an article discussing the Kennedy negotiations—

“The failure to get to first base with an agreement in respect of the marketing of dairy products, though disappointing to exporters of dairy produce in Australia, and even more so to New Zealand producers, is a confirmation that this is the area of greatest difficulty likely to be faced by Australia and New Zealand if Britain should enter the European Economic Community. Whilst various but as yet undefined assurances have been given in respect of the New Zealand position, it would be unwise of us in Australia to bank on cashing in on these.”

The fate of many of our basic industries will hang in the balance in the next 10 years. The largest proportionate trading nation in the world requires a high sense of efficiency and competitiveness. The need for firm government and a clear enunciation of policy has seldom been stronger.

World food and the Common Market are extraneous issues that will weigh heavily on our thoughts in the next decade and will vitally affect many of our decisions. Our

internal problems in this rapidly developing State may be overshadowed, but they cannot be ignored. The orderly development of our State, the adequate education of our young, the care of our sick, and the proper administration of government itself, make greater and greater demands on the public purse. There is no aspect of administration at the moment that is not under pressure for greater spending. The pressures will become more and more intense.

There is an impatience for greater action, and the demands must be met. Few would deny, for example, that expenditure on education must be maintained at a high level. It is unfortunate that, at times, pressure groups tend to see their problems in isolation without taking into account the over-all responsibilities of government. This is best exemplified by protagonists in the field of education who tell us that Victoria spends 40 per cent. of its budget on education and that we spend 15 per cent. The responsibilities of the two Governments are too dissimilar to make comparisons on this basis. The problems of finance hamper our development and we must explore ways of breaking out of the strait-jacket.

The financial relationship between the Commonwealth and the States needs critical examination. Indeed, the whole concept of our Federation must be looked at anew. The State must look at the size and effectiveness of its Public Service to see what procedures could be streamlined and how overlapping and possible duplication of services could be eliminated. We should satisfy ourselves that we get the best value for every dollar spent. There is, in my mind, a great doubt about the efficacy of our over-emphasis on day labour. It at least warrants a close examination.

Healthy private enterprise stimulates an economy. The Government should satisfy itself that it is doing everything possible to create the right climate for encouraging an increasing inflow of private capital. We are above all a capital-hungry nation; the inflow of overseas investment capital is vital. In his 1967 presidential address to the Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, Sir George Fisher said this—

“There are few countries in the world that are in a position to export capital; the overwhelming proportion are compelled to import funds to assist with their development and to raise their standards of living. Amid the economically advanced countries there is possibly no country at the present time which needs capital more than Australia.

“We have a huge and largely empty continent to develop, immense natural riches which are increasing almost every day, and a rate of population increase, based on a great immigration programme, which is among the fastest in the world.

These tasks set up an insatiable demand for capital which we have no hope of satisfying from our own limited resources."

What Sir George did, in a singularly competent fashion, was to set out the case for continuing overseas-investment capital in this country. With the chronic domestic shortage of capital funds, our alternative is a simple one: we invite capital or we remain dormant.

The critics of overseas investment neglect to say that Mount Isa Mines Limited did not pay its first dividend until 24 years after its formation, or that its export income has been \$442,000,000 and its payment to overseas stockholders only \$46,000,000. These facts do not suit their case, so they do not use them.

Rather than knock the overseas investor, we must strive to create the right climate for his continued interest. Otherwise these difficulties of finance will in fact be aggravated and our economy retarded.

It is not possible to look critically at the problem of government without looking also at the methods of government. For if the issues are great we must measure our capacity to deal with them. Parliament has been extolled many times; it has also been debased. With all its imperfections it still represents the greatest democratic instrument yet devised. Nevertheless, there is evidence of growing unrest in many Parliaments of the world with regard to back-benchers' rights.

Let me quote from the report of discussions at the Twelfth Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference held in Ottawa from 28 September to 4 October, 1966—

"The position of the back-bencher was considered unsatisfactory in many Parliaments. The back-bencher had a real sense of frustration because of his inability to take more effective part in the control of the Executive and in the control of Parliament itself. This frustration arose from the obligation of the back-bencher to follow the party line blindly and also from the difficulty of obtaining information from Ministers.

"The committee system could, in the view of several delegates, help greatly to remove the frustration of the back-bencher. In committee he would be able to question Ministers and civil servants. If, as happened in certain Parliaments, financial committees sat continuously to scrutinise Government spending and estimates, he would have a greater say in control of expenditure.

"The consensus of the committee favoured expansion of the committee system, enabling all members to take a more active part in the process of Government."

If this is the age of change, then Parliament too must change, not in a way that will abandon overnight the cherished traditions that are so much a part of our procedures but in a way that will expand even further our right as an assembly of free men and in a way that will allow us to play a greater part in the roles we fill.

We must satisfy ourselves that the forms of procedure in this place give us maximum opportunity to discharge the responsibilities entrusted to us. If we are not satisfied we must agitate for their review. Mr. Speaker's interest and sympathy in this matter are greatly appreciated by all hon. members, and we commend him for this.

We must revitalise our committee system to allow back-benchers a greater sense of participation. We should pioneer joint committees of members from all parties when our area of dispute is limited. The effectiveness of the committee system will vary according to the attitudes of members and their parties in sharing knowledge, judgment and confidence.

The opportunities and challenges in this seventh decade of this climacteric 20th century are great. The challenges must be met lest we earn our own generation's scorn and posterity's contempt.

We are not a society unto ourselves alone. The Common Market, the world food problem and the east of Suez proposals must interest and concern us as much as any domestic issue. They will influence the ultimate organisation of our State's development and our social life. Governments at all levels have to readjust their resources and priorities in accordance with these. The United States has adjusted its investment and Great Society programme. Great Britain's prosperity was influenced by her trading and military commitments. Our position is not dissimilar.

Therefore, in seconding the Address in Reply to His Excellency may I assure him on behalf of all hon. members that we will apply ourselves to the various measures he has referred to us, and that we will labour to propound good laws and wise administration for the advantage and good will for those whose interests we are privileged to represent.

Debate, on motion of Mr. Houston, adjourned.

#### SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

**Hon. G. W. W. CHALK** (Lockyer—Deputy Premier): I move—

"That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until 11 a.m. tomorrow."

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 2.47 p.m.