

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 31 AUGUST 1967

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 31 AUGUST, 1967

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

DISALLOWANCE OF QUESTION

MR. SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members, yesterday the Leader of the Opposition handed in a notice of motion which reads—

"I give notice that I dissent from your ruling on the disallowance of the question to the honourable the Premier, as given by me on 29 August 1967."

It is in no small measure disagreeable to me that I am bound to rule out of order a disagreement with what is described as my ruling.

It was, however, without hesitation that I decided to rule accordingly because had I not done so it would be tantamount to my agreement with the breaking of Rules of Practice governing the disallowance of questions.

To accept the motion would be to ignore the Rules and Standing Orders by which the Chair must be guided, in conjunction with May's Parliamentary Practice and the Rules of the House of Commons where our own Rules and Standing Orders do not cover the subject.

In this case I am bound by two guiding quotes in May's Parliamentary Practice; in the first instance by Quote No. 15, under the heading "Inadmissible Questions" (Page 353), which states—

"(15) Asking whether statements in the Press, or of private individuals, or unofficial bodies, are accurate."

Secondly, on page 349, under the heading "Speaker's Control of Questions", lines 12 and 13 state—

"(d) The refusal of a question at the table cannot be made the subject of debate."

As our own Rules and Standing Orders do not cover the subject I am bound by this dictum, and by permitting a debate on a disallowed question in the guise of a motion disagreeing with the Speaker's ruling would create a precedent and a farcical situation would develop in that hon. members, having had a question amended or rejected, would seek recourse to the same action.

For these reasons the motion does not appear on the Business Paper.

QUESTIONS

OFFICE CLEANING, MAIN ROADS DEPARTMENT

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

(1) How many persons are now employed as cleaners in the various offices of the Main Roads Department?

(2) Is it proposed that the services of such personnel be terminated on completion of the new building and the cleaning done by outside contract and, if so, for what reason?

Answers:—

(1) "The Main Roads Department presently employs seven male cleaners and fourteen female cleaners in the buildings which are to be vacated upon completion of the Department's new building."

(2) "Three male cleaners and fourteen female cleaners have been notified that their services are being terminated shortly. The cleaning of the new building is to be by contract and a tender has been accepted. An analysis of estimated day labour cleaning costs compared with contract cleaning indicated that cleaning undertaken by contracting specialists would result in savings to the Department."

ISSUE OF FIREARMS TO A.N.Z. BANK STAFF, BRISBANE

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the report in the *Telegraph* of August 28, "Security Course at Bank—Brisbane employees of the A.N.Z. Bank, Queen Street, are receiving guidance in the use of firearms"?

(2) Have the members of the A.N.Z. Bank staff issued with firearms been closely investigated by the police, and each person issued with a licence to use a concealable firearm?

(3) Are all the firearms held by the A.N.Z. Bank registered under the Firearms Act of Queensland? If so, at what date was such registration approved?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "No. Members of the staff of the Australian and New Zealand Bank Limited in this State who use firearms in the course of their employment in that Bank are not investigated by the Police Department, nor are those persons issued with individual licences to use concealable firearms. Under the provisions of the Firearms Acts of this State licences for concealable firearms are issued to banks in respect of concealable firearms purchased, used, carried, or kept by the proprietor, manager, or other employee of any bank for the sole purpose of protecting property of or in the possession of such bank or during the conveyance of property to or from such premises, and the concealable firearms

in respect of which such licences are issued may be purchased, used, carried, or kept by any other employee of such bank notwithstanding that the name of such other employee does not appear on the licences."

(3) "All concealable firearms held by the Australia and New Zealand Bank Limited are registered under the Firearms Acts of this State. This Bank has three hundred and fifteen concealable firearms licensed in this State. These firearms were first licensed at various dates since November 2, 1951, and are currently licensed to December 31, 1967."

FIXING OF ADMISSION PRICES TO PICTURE THEATRES BY FILM DISTRIBUTORS

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

(1) Do film companies, known as the Distributors, insist on fixing the admission price to moving picture theatres when certain films are being shown?

(2) If so, is he aware that under this scheme admission prices as high as \$1 per ticket are arbitrarily fixed with no reduction for children or matinees?

(3) Is he aware that for some films the Distributors demand from the moving picture theatre proprietor seventy per cent. of the gross takings?

(4) If the Answers to these Questions are in the affirmative, will he institute measures to protect the people from this grievous exploitation by the Distributors?

Answer:—

(1 to 4) "It has been the practice over a period of several years for the Distributor to invite offers from exhibitors for the hire of films. If the exhibitor submits an offer which is accepted by the Distributor, then the offer and acceptance becomes the basis of a formal contract. It follows therefore that if the exhibitor submits an offer which includes undertaking to pay a percentage of gross takings and to make certain admission charges and the offer is accepted by the Distributor then the parties are bound by the contract."

RESIGNATION OF MATHEMATICS TEACHER, TOWNSVILLE HIGH SCHOOL

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

(1) Did a mathematics teacher at Townsville High School recently resign to go to Canada and, if so, what is his name and what notice did he give of his intention to resign?

(2) Were fifty-six senior students thereby left "stranded" and their chances for a pass in mathematics at the qualifying examination at the end of this year seriously jeopardised? If so, what steps were taken to give them a reasonable chance of success at that vital examination?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes. Mr. R. P. W. Brown. He gave eleven weeks' notice of resignation."

(2) "No. Mr. Brown had only one senior class comprising twenty-five students. A replacement teacher was provided and the class has been taken over by a teacher who holds the Bachelor of Science degree, and a Diploma in Education and who is thoroughly qualified in advanced mathematics."

EDUCATION OF SCHOOL CHILDREN IN DRUG DANGER

Mr. W. D. Hewitt, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health,—

In view of the report in *The Courier-Mail* of August 29 that drugs were passed to three schoolgirls in New South Wales, what action is being taken in Queensland to educate school children in the dangers of taking drugs?

Answer:—

"With the introduction of the new syllabus into secondary schools in 1964, a lesson on drugs was included in the section on Health and Physical Education for tuition to Grade X students. This lesson was prepared by the Queensland Health Education Council under the supervision of medical officers of my Department and approved by the Sub-Syllabus Committee for Health and Physical Education of the Department of Education. In the light of recent developments and, in particular, of the increased interest in lysergic acid diethylamide (L.S.D.), this lesson on drugs has now been revised to include information on the deleterious effects of all the drugs now before the public eye and is carefully designed to create attitudes for their rejection. This lesson is included in the revised Teaching Manual on Health for Grade X which is now being published and scheduled for distribution to teachers in October. To supplement this lesson, the Queensland Health Education Council has acquired from the United States for circulation among secondary schools, two 16 mm. films entitled 'Drugs and the Nervous System' and 'Narcotics—Why not?' At the suggestion of my colleague, the Minister for Education, the Queensland Health Education Council has in production a publication, 'Drugs—Their Use and

Abuse', which is to be distributed to every teacher in Queensland and to be made available to parents of children attending secondary schools. The issue of this publication to schools will coincide with the despatch of the revised Teaching Manual on Health."

USE OF SECOND-HAND PARTS IN
REPAIR OF MOTOR VEHICLES

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to Press publicity in southern papers of the practice by motor vehicle companies in insisting on the use of second-hand parts for the repair of damaged motor vehicles?

(2) Has he any evidence to indicate whether this policy is being used by insurance companies in this State?

(3) What precautions are taken to ensure that this practice is not indulged in?

Answers:—

(1) "No."

(2 and 3) "Comprehensive motor vehicle insurance seeks to indemnify the owner of a motor vehicle against the loss which he actually sustains. It does not undertake to replace worn components with new ones. If a worn part is damaged, the insurer is entitled to replace it with a second-hand part provided it is of comparable standard. If this is impracticable, and a new part has to be used, the insurer can ask the owner to pay the difference in cost between the new part and the value of the worn part. I am informed that if all damaged parts were replaced by new parts, claims expenditure would rise, and it is likely premiums would then have to be increased accordingly."

INCLUSION OF "CONSERVATION" IN
NEW SCIENCE SYLLABUS

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

(1) Has any progress been made in introducing suitable conservation sections as part of primary teaching in the State?

(2) Is it intended to extend this important subject to secondary and tertiary curricula?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "A new science syllabus was introduced to all State primary schools this year. The context of this syllabus has been divided into five major units, each of which deals with some aspect of the central theme 'Man's Environment'. One of these units is 'Conservation' which is included in the programme of work for

each grade in the school. In secondary schools the need for conservation is stressed in the biology section of the grade 8 science course and is also inherent in the treatment of ecology in the grade 9 science A course and in the relevant senior science courses. The degree to which studies on conservation are made in tertiary education will depend upon the special areas of study undertaken by students. In a variety of existing courses the principles of conservation are inculcated without specific lectures being devoted to that topic."

APPEAL BY GOLD COAST CITY COUNCIL
AGAINST FULL COURT JUDGMENT

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

(1) Is he aware of a Press report that the Gold Coast City Council by five votes to four decided to appeal to the High Court over a judgment handed down by the Full Court in a case where the Gold Coast City Council were appealing against an arbitration decision given in favour of Canterbury Pipes Pty. Ltd.?

(2) Is he aware that the Mayor of the Gold Coast City, Alderman Bruce Small, is strongly opposed to the further approach to the High Court and is one of the four who voted against the decision?

(3) Will he advise the House whether the council can expect financial assistance or additional loan allocations from the Government to meet the already delivered judgment indebtedness and what will be the position if the council continues litigation but ultimately has to make full payment of the present judgment and all additional costs involved following on the council's latest decision to take the matter to the High Court?

Answers:—

(1 and 2) "Yes."

(3) "The Government has already provided this year for the Council a special allocation of \$200,000 loan and subsidy funds for urgent expenditure on beach erosion. In addition, at the request of the Council, the Government has tentatively earmarked further substantial sums of loan and subsidy funds for restoration work and erosion prevention works but is awaiting advice from the Commonwealth Government on the matter of a contribution by that Government before allocations can be confirmed. Against this background of special aid to the Council for erosion difficulties, I cannot guarantee to find further additional sums to meet costs and judgments in litigation arising from the construction of the Council's sewerage scheme. If the Council eventually requires such additional funds, it will have to defer for twelve months or longer other works

in its already approved loan/subsidy programme. However, any such transfer will have to be determined by the Council, but I make it quite clear that the final cost of the sewerage scheme and whatever litigation costs are involved in connection therewith will fall on the ratepayers of the Gold Coast who ultimately will be responsible for providing the funds to meet the loan costs involved."

ADDITIONAL POLICE, GOLD COAST AREA

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

In view of the greatly increased incidence of crime that appears to be developing on the Gold Coast, particularly in regard to the charges of August 29 concerning drug addiction and the charges heard last week in the Magistrates Court, Southport, involving female impersonators,—

(1) Will he allocate increased police personnel to the Coolangatta, Burleigh Heads, Broadbeach and Surfers Paradise police stations?

(2) Will he endeavour to complete the negotiations with the Gold Coast City Council to acquire land and property from that council for use as a Surfers Paradise police station?

Answers:—

(1) "Police strength at Coolangatta, Burleigh Heads, Broadbeach and Surfers Paradise police stations has been considerably increased in recent years. The position at these police stations in common with other police stations throughout the State will be kept under constant review."

(2) "Negotiations for the acquisition of the old Fire Brigade site and buildings as a police station at Surfers Paradise are proceeding between the Land Administration Commission and the Gold Coast City Council, the owner of the land, as expeditiously as possible."

APPOINTMENTS, DIRECTOR OF TEACHER EDUCATION AND PRINCIPAL, TEACHERS' COLLEGE

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

Further to his Answers to my Questions on August 22 relating to the appointment of Director of Teacher Education and the appointment of Principal, Teachers' College, Kelvin Grove,—

(1) On what dates was the position of Director of Teacher Education advertised and what were the names of the twenty applicants for the position?

(2) What were the names of the seven-teen applicants for the position of Principal, Teachers' College?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "The position was advertised in the *Education Office Gazette* for the month of April and in the *Government Gazette* on April 1, 8, 15, 22 and 29, May 6, 13 and 20, 1967. The position was advertised also in *The Courier-Mail* on April 29, and in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, the *Melbourne Age* and *The Australian* on May 6, 1967. All applications are regarded as confidential and, in the interests of the persons concerned, it is not Government policy to publicise the names of unsuccessful applicants for positions in any Department."

PROPOSED MARCH BY CIVIL LIBERTIES CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

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

As the Civil Liberties Co-ordinating Committee intends holding a march from the university to the city on September 5, have the proposals of the committee and the Student Union president been accepted or otherwise and to what extent?

Answer:—

"The proposals of the University of Queensland Union have been under examination since they were lodged at my Department on Monday, August 7 last. On Monday next, Cabinet will have before it for consideration a submission outlining the results of such examination."

FORMER GOVERNMENT HOUSE BUILDING, GEORGE STREET, BRISBANE

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

Regarding the building which was at one time Government House, George Street, and is now used as a university building,—

(1) Is this historic building in good condition? If not, what would be the cost of renovating it, together with general maintenance expenses?

(2) Will this building be demolished?

(3) If so, as so many of our fine older buildings which have an educational link with the past are being demolished, will consideration be given to having the decision reversed?

(4) Will he use his good offices to ensure that some historic buildings which have been built in different periods of Australian history are preserved for posterity and that the policy on demolition and what may be termed desecration of these types of edifices reviewed?

Answers:—

(1) "I am advised that the former Government House, George Street, Brisbane, now used as a university building, is not in good condition. The cost of renovating it is not known. General maintenance of a building is a continuing necessity, and it would not be practicable to estimate the expense that would be involved in maintaining this building."

(2) "There is no current proposal before the Government to demolish this building."

(3) "See Answer to (2)."

(4) "Yes, within the limits of my jurisdiction."

RH BLOOD SERUM

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to a report from Adelaide in the *Telegraph* of August 12 referring to a serum which will ultimately make Rh disease in children a thing of the past?

(2) Can such a serum be obtained in Queensland? If so, will he make available all relevant information so that prospective parents of Rh babies may secure all possible benefits from it?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "Yes, I have read the Press report referring to the new product called Anti-D gamma globulin. Supplies of the new product have been distributed to both metropolitan maternity hospitals and to forty-nine hospitals in country centres. As supplies increase every public hospital will hold stocks. Supplies are also held by private pathologists. Anti-D gamma globulin can save the lives of babies threatened with hemolytic disease of the new-born. The product is distributed by the Red Cross Blood Transfusion Service. The House will be interested to learn that all Anti-D gamma globulin presently in Australia has been made available from supplies of special serum from the Queensland Red Cross Blood Transfusion Service. Other States are now beginning to obtain their own sources of this product."

VACATION IN-SERVICE SCHOOLS FOR TEACHERS

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

Will vacation in-service schools be organised again this year? If so, where will they be held and how many teachers is it anticipated will be able to attend?

Answer:—

"Vacation in-service schools will be held for primary teachers in the mid-summer vacation, the first at Townsville from December 11–15 inclusive and the second at Brisbane from December 18–22 inclusive. A total of 16 different courses are to be offered but as applications for enrolment will not close until Monday, October 9, it is not known how many teachers will be attending."

POSTERS TO ATTRACT STUDENTS TO TEACHING SERVICE

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

(1) How many of the posters designed to attract the attention of students to a teaching career have been issued?

(2) If they have not yet been issued, when is it expected the distribution will take place?

(3) Will he make a poster available for the perusal of Honourable Members?

Answers:—

(1) "None."

(2) "A selection is at present being made of a suitable design for a poster."

(3) "Every effort is being made to ensure distribution in the next few weeks."

TELEVISION ADVERTISING OF CIGARETTES

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

(1) In relation to advertising of cigarettes on television, will he enforce the provisions of the relevant Act which prohibits the use of false or misleading advertising?

(2) Is there any legislation requiring that packets of cigarettes carry the warning that the contents may injure health? If not, why not?

Answers:—

(1) "Section 85 of *The Factories and Shops Acts, 1960 to 1964*" provides that a person shall not publish or cause to be published any statement which is intended or apparently intended to promote the sale or disposal of any goods and is to his knowledge false in any material particular. If the Honourable Member will let me have details of the manner in which he considers the advertisements referred to contravene this section, I shall have them investigated."

(2) "This is not a matter coming within the purview of my portfolio."

AIR SERVICE, THEODORE-BRISBANE

Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport,—

In view of Ansett-A.N.A. cancelling their Brisbane-Theodore flights,—

(1) Was subsidy being paid by the Commonwealth Government on this run and, if so, what amount did Ansett-A.N.A. receive?

(2) Have any applications been received for the cancelled Theodore-Brisbane flights and, if so, what procedure will his Department adopt before making such an allocation?

Answers:—

(1) "I will obtain this information and advise the Honourable Member."

(2) "No applications have been received up to the present for the cancelled Theodore-Brisbane flights. However, the Commissioner for Transport has already taken action in accordance with section 25 of "The State Transport Acts, 1960 to 1965" to invite applications by public advertisement from interested parties for a licence to provide and carry on a service for the carriage of both passengers and goods by air between Brisbane and Theodore and the other places affected by the recent cancellation of Ansett-A.N.A. flights to those centres. Applications must reach the Commissioner not later than noon on Thursday, September 7, 1967. Any applications received will be dealt with by the Commissioner in keeping with the procedures laid down in section 28 of the Acts. The section provides that where more applications than one are received, the Commissioner may grant the application which on a view of all the circumstances appears to him to be most advantageous in the public interest or he may decline to grant any application notwithstanding that it is the only application received by him. If, however, the Commissioner is satisfied that two or more applications are equally advantageous in the public interest, he must decide the application to be granted by ballot."

LAND DEVELOPMENT (FITZROY BASIN) SCHEME

Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Lands,—

(1) What number of lessees lost land within Area No. 1 of the Brigalow Lands Development Scheme?

(2) How many lessees decided to keep the retention area offered and surrendered the balance for closer settlement?

(3) How many blocks were made available for ballot?

(4) How many blocks were sold at public auction?

10

(5) What was the average price of land per acre made available to those who took part in the ballot?

(6) What was the average price of land per acre sold at public auction?

Answers:—

The following information relates to Areas I and II of the Land Development (Fitzroy Basin) Scheme and extensions of those areas, the whole of which were worked as one.

(1) "Seventy-three."

(2) "Four landholders elected to sell the whole of their holdings to the Department, one landholder's case has not yet been finally determined, and the balance of the acquisitions (sixty-eight) have been concluded by amicable negotiation."

(3) "A total of ninety-seven blocks have been opened to date of which seven were surrendered and subsequently offered for sale at auction. Sixty of these blocks were opened as Purchase Leases and the remainder as Grazing Selections."

(4) "Twenty-nine blocks have been sold at public auction which includes seven blocks which were originally opened by ballot and surrendered."

(5) "The average price of land per acre made available as Purchase Leases is \$2.45."

(6) "The average price of land per acre sold at public auction is \$6.29."

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS AND DERAILMENTS

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

(1) What was the total number of railway accidents reported (a) for the twelve months to June 30, 1967, and (b) to date?

(2) How many were subject to departmental enquiries under the provisions of the Railway Acts?

(3) In these inquiries or other investigations, what were the findings on the number of accidents or derailments on the main line attributed to (a) speed, (b) mechanical or rolling-stock defects, (c) defects of the permanent way, (d) negligence of employees, (e) negligence by other than railway employees, (f) other known causes, and (g) unknown causes?

Answers:—

(1) "(a) 205; (b) 38."

(2) "Eight were investigated by Boards of Inquiry, but all railway accidents are investigated by responsible railway officers qualified to do so."

(3) "To extract the information in the form sought by the Honourable Member would involve a considerable expenditure in clerical hours which would not be justified for the purposes of answering the Question. However, if there is any particular information which the Honourable Member is seeking he may care to discuss this request with me."

CLERK OF THE COURT, GEORGETOWN

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

(1) Is it intended to close the Georgetown Court House?

(2) If so, in view of the importance of the Clerk of the Court there, the amount of work attended to and the inconvenience to the residents of the district if the Clerk of the Court is transferred, will he give early consideration to retaining his services there?

Answers:—

(1) "The duties of Clerk of the Court at Georgetown are performed by the local Mining Registrar, an officer under the administrative control of the Department of Mines. The Department of Justice has given no consideration to the closing of Georgetown as a place for holding Magistrates Courts."

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

BRIDGE WORKS, GEORGETOWN-MT.
SURPRISE BEEF ROAD

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

With reference to the Georgetown-Mt. Surprise beef road—

(1) Have tenders been accepted for all the remaining bridge works necessary to make this road an all-weather road?

(2) Who were the successful tenderers and what were the tender prices?

(3) When is it anticipated that the last bridge will be completed?

Answers:—

(1) "No. Tenders for Etheridge River Bridge close September 11. Work on other bridges over Sisters Creek and O'Brien's Creek is dependent on funds to be made available for beef roads."

(2) "No tenders yet received."

(3) "This will depend on obtaining of suitable tenders, and on progress of work."

ELECTRICITY FOR HOUSES ON
ABORIGINAL RESERVES

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

How many assisted Aborigines are at present living in departmentally-sponsored homes and hostels where electricity has not been supplied and what is the number and the location in each area?

Answer:—

"The general nature of the Honourable Member's Question would necessitate considerable research to provide all of the details sought. However, information presently available indicates the Department has built the following homes not supplied with electricity for various reasons, including non-availability of local supplies:—Torres Strait and Peninsula Division—1,443 persons, 213 homes; Far Northern Division—278 persons, 37 homes; Northern Division—83 persons, 12 homes; Central Division—27 persons, 5 homes; Southern Division—28 persons, 4 homes. Investigations are proceeding to ascertain whether some centres can now be economically supplied with power, and negotiations are at an advanced stage for the reticulation of 240-volt electricity to the entire Weipa community. It is the Department's policy that other centres will receive this amenity as funds permit and in the light of the possibility of economically connecting local power supplies to the homes."

INSURANCE OF GOVERNMENT
BUILDINGS

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

(1) Did a fire occur at the Manly State School on Thursday, August 3, 1967?

(2) Was the building affected insured with the State Government Insurance Office?

(3) If so, by whom was the insurance taken out and by whom are the insurance premiums paid?

(4) Does the Government allow insurance of Government buildings to be taken out by persons or organisations other than the Department concerned?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "No."

(3) "See Answer to (2)."

(4) "No person or body other than the Government has an insurable interest in Government buildings."

GAZETTED HALF-HOLIDAYS,
TOWNSVILLE

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

(1) With reference to the gazetted half-holidays granted in Townsville on Wednesday, July 26, 1967, and Wednesday, August 16, 1967, which appeared to apply only to members of banks, insurance companies and the Public Service, what person or organisation made the application?

(2) Who makes the decision that such holidays shall apply only to a certain section of commerce and industry and why should they not be available to the whole community?

Answers:—

(1) "As was the policy followed over the years by the previous Labour Government, this Government only recognises requests for holidays under the Holidays Acts if they be submitted by the local authority concerned. The Townsville City Council, as it has done on many previous occasions, on March 8, 1967, made an applications for half-holidays on Wednesday, July 26, 1967, and Wednesday, August 16, 1967, for the annual race meetings of the Townsville Turf Club and North Queensland Amateur Turf Club respectively."

(2) "In pursuance of the provisions of *The Holidays Acts, 1912 to 1961*", I, as Minister, approved of this request. The application of holidays granted under *The Holidays Acts, 1912 to 1961*" to employees of banks, insurance companies, and the Public Service, is provided for in those Acts, and also in *The Public Service Acts, 1922 to 1965*." Statutory holidays applicable to all are provided for in *The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Acts, 1961 to 1964*" and race meetings are not included. The position concerning holidays has not changed over the years, irrespective of the composition of the Government. However, if the Honourable Member be of the opinion that employees of banks, insurance companies, and the Public Service should not receive such holidays, and he lets me know, I shall have his views carefully examined."

ROAD CONSTRUCTION, MULLIGAN
HIGHWAY

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

Has the Main Roads Department plans in hand for further road construction on the Mulligan Highway this financial year? If so, where will work be carried out and what amount is to be expended?

Answer:—

"The Main Roads Department has plans ready for certain works on the former Mulligan Highway. However, where works will be carried out and the amount to be expended cannot be determined until it is known what funds will be made available by the Commonwealth Government."

NEW SCHOOL BUILDING, MT. MOLLOY

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

When will work commence on the building of the new school at Mt. Molloy?

Answer:—

"Present indications are that funds will not be available during the 1967-68 financial year to permit this project to be undertaken."

ANTI-SMOKING CAMPAIGN

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

(1) Has his attention be drawn to the report in the *Telegraph* of August 29—"Anti-smoking States' duty—The Federal Minister for Health, Dr. Forbes, today threw the responsibility for an anti-smoking drive back to the States"?

(2) What positive measures have been taken by his officers in the form of health education campaigns to draw the attention of the public to the harmful effects of cigarette smoking?

(3) Have any tar or nicotine tests been taken? If so, what were the results?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "A campaign to acquaint the public with the dangers of smoking in relation to health was commenced by the Queensland Health Education Council in 1958. The campaign was introduced into schools in 1959. The campaign has been a continuous one using displays, posters, pamphlets, and films, all of which have been circulated to every corner of the State. For instance the Health Education Council for the year ending June 30, 1965, has issued 63,173 pamphlets, and it is estimated that 28,330 people saw films on this subject during the year. For three years now seven 'smoking machines' have been demonstrated in secondary schools throughout the State, almost all schools having been visited by June 30 last. A survey conducted in a metropolitan high school at the end of 1966 showed that the number of regular male smokers had been reduced from 39 per cent. in 1959 to 29 per cent. Another survey among 400 adults

showed that 73 per cent. of adult males and 37 per cent. of adult females were regular smokers, and that now approximately 42 per cent. of the males and 39 per cent. of the females had either stopped smoking completely, or had restricted their cigarette consumption."

(3) "No tar or nicotine tests have been conducted in this State.

PAPERS

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

Report of the Nominal Defendant (Queensland) for the year 1966-67.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Proclamation under the Queensland Marine Acts, 1958 to 1967.

Order in Council under the Fisheries Acts, 1957 to 1962.

ABORIGINAL RELICS PRESERVATION BILL

INITIATION

Hon J. C. A. PIZZEY (Isis—Minister for Education): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to provide for the preservation of anthropological, ethnological, archaeological, and prehistoric Aboriginal relics."

Motion agreed to.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—SIXTH ALLOTTED DAY

Debate resumed from 30 August (see p. 283) on Mr. Armstrong's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. CHINCHEN (Mt. Gravatt) (11.40 a.m.): Yesterday in this debate I spoke on education in a general way, and it is now my intention to deal a little further with this most important matter. The hon. member for Toowoomba East said that education in this State had reached a stage of crisis. Those are very strong words from one whom I consider to be a very responsible young man, and I feel that he has been caught up in the type of propaganda being promoted by people such as the two that I mentioned yesterday, namely Evans and Baldwin, and the rat-bag fringe who are using every endeavour to create such a situation of crisis. I firmly deny that there is any such thing.

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

Mr. CHINCHEN: A third gentleman named Churven is another one in the field and I understand he recently went to Moscow presumably to study languages. They are examples of the ones who are endeavouring

to make people believe that there is a crisis in education. No-one denies that problems are being experienced, but they are to be found in every other State and also in other countries.

Endeavouring to make people believe, for political purposes, that there is a crisis in education is ridiculous and an indication of complete irresponsibility. Earnest attention to these problems is required, and in this hon. members on the other side of the House should assist. I suggest that they subscribe to the thinking contained in an article written by Mr. H. E. Roberts, Principal of the Church of England Grammar School, which recently appeared in the Press. It was an excellent treatise on forward thinking and planning in education. That is what is required, not assertions of crisis. The hon. member for Toowoomba East seems to be very interested in attracting people to the teaching service. How can he hope to achieve that with constant talk of a crisis?

The way some people are endeavouring, for political purposes, to show that there is a crisis in education was demonstrated recently when some teachers were leaving for Canada. Those who saw the departure on television noticed about 20 banners being displayed. Brian Laver was there, and also Lyndall O'Neil. They are not teachers but professional protesters. I do not think one member of the Teachers' Union Executive was there.

Mr. Murray: Alex Macdonald and Labour Party members.

Mr. CHINCHEN: They are the ones who are promoting the whole thing, and I think it is a great pity that the important matter of education is being used in an endeavour to gain political advantage. There is, of course, a general awareness of all the things that have been done in this State for education, and it is for that reason that the present attacks are being made. I trust they do not have the support of responsible members on the other side of the House.

Much is being made of the fact that some teachers are going to Canada. Is there any similar worry about the engineers, doctors, dentists and other professional people who go overseas? This has happened and will continue to happen, and it is a wonderful thing. I, for one, am very pleased to see many young teachers leaving Australia to gain experience in other places, because they will come back—do not worry about that—and we will then have much better teachers than we have now.

Mr. Aikens: Under the Labour Party they didn't have enough to pay for a taxi round to the station.

Mr. CHINCHEN: That is probably true.

We have to be wise enough to understand that, although these teachers are doing this

in their own interests, ultimately the Department of Education, the State, and the young people who are being trained, will benefit. So I, for one, do not regret this for one moment. It causes difficulty now; ultimately it will be to our advantage.

I think it is wrong to label the present situation as one of crisis. It is normal today for young people who have the chance to go overseas and further their education to do so. I was speaking to two young ladies who were going to Canada—they may have left already—at a sports meeting three or four weeks ago. I said, "You are going to Canada?" They said, "Yes." I said, "What is the problem?" They looked at me rather surprisedly and said, "What do you mean, 'what is the problem?'" I said, "Why are you going?" They said, "We have always wanted to go overseas. This is a heaven-sent opportunity. We saw this in the paper. We do not have to think for ourselves. We can go." I said, "You are not dissatisfied with the conditions here?" They said, "No; we are extremely happy. We will be back, but here is a chance to go overseas." That is the general attitude of young people—a working holiday.

More and more of that sort of thing will happen, and we must prepare for it. I have no doubt whatever, having been in Canada myself, that the people who go there will come back to their homeland, and that will be to our advantage.

In "Sunday Truth" last week-end there was a story by Mr. Peter Coughlin, who came back from Canada and had a great deal to say. It is the sort of story that "Sunday Truth" prints, but it is interesting to note that that gentleman was earning \$5,000 a year in Canada. He said that the combined income of himself and his wife was \$9,250, from which they were able to save \$1,600. Of course, if his wife had not been working, he would have been about \$2,500 down the drain. There is no question that, even with the higher salaries, the cost of living in Canada is higher than it is here, and that must be accepted.

I was offered a position in Canada in 1951 or 1952—a very senior position—and many of my friends in the company for which I worked went over there. However, I looked into the position and found that I would have been worse off in Canada than I was here. Many of my friends sold their homes here, found that they could not afford homes in Canada, gradually used up the money they had, and were caught. When they did come back here, they were without a home. Consideration must be given to that factor. It is not important to young people, but it is extremely important to the family man.

All these young people who go overseas have my good wishes. I wish to see all the senior officers of the Department of Education go overseas. New thinking and new

ideas are needed—the Department recognises that—and I believe that these young people doing what they are doing will, in the long run, be a wonderful thing for the State.

In my opinion, the Opposition is abysmally ignorant of just what has been done in the past 10 years. Although it is not my habit, I shall list a few things that I think should go on the record. They are matters of importance, and if they are included in the record I believe that the ignorance that exists at the moment will be corrected.

What has the Government done for education in Queensland? First, it has provided every child with a secondary education. In 1957 only about 14,000 children were attending high schools; today, with the additional State high schools, there are over 70,000. How did the Government do that? First, it raised the school-leaving age to 15—something that previous Governments had talked about for many years but had never done. Secondly, it abolished the scholarship examination and the selective process for secondary education. It also built State high schools and secondary departments throughout the State. It greatly increased the provision of school transport. It increased the value of allowances for secondary-school students whose parents are in the lower-income brackets. It increased aid to non-State schools. It encouraged students to stay longer at school and promoted the values of education.

Another point is the greatly increased educational provision for handicapped children. Many hon. members will not be aware of this but it is extremely important. This was done by creating the position of Director of Special Education Services, by providing many more places for slow-learning children in opportunity schools and classes, by building new schools specially designed to meet the needs of handicapped children, by providing separate schools for those with hearing handicaps and those with visual handicaps, and by training teachers for work in special schools.

Another point is the completely reorganised technical education in Queensland. Think back! A few years ago we had only a few trade schools and no institute of technology. But the position is now totally different and has been achieved by separating technical colleges and high schools in country areas, by establishing institutes of technology for the training of technicians and technologists at Brisbane, Rockhampton and Toowoomba, by establishing suburban technical colleges and specialist colleges for tradesmen at Yeronga, Eagle Farm, Ithaca, Kangaroo Point and South Brisbane, and by equipping those colleges and institutes with the latest equipment and highly qualified staff.

A further point is the question of the face-lift given to agricultural education in Queensland. This was done by a complete rebuilding programme at the Queensland Agricultural College, by the provision in 1967 of courses at the subtertiary and tertiary levels at Gatton,

by sending the principal of the college on a world tour to study the latest overseas developments in agricultural education, by the establishment of the Longreach Rural Training School, and by the extension of agricultural courses at State high schools throughout Queensland.

Then there is the question of improved facilities for teacher training. That was done by building a new teachers' college at Kedron Park, by building a new home science block and a secondary block at Kelvin Grove and greatly improving amenities such as the provision of a swimming pool and a cafeteria, by planning to open new colleges at Mt. Gravatt and Townsville, by offering scholarships for prospective teachers at the new institutes of technology, by increasing the allowance for teachers in training, and by extending teacher training to two years. Those are all very important matters and they are all designed for the future.

The next point is the updating of the curriculum in primary schools. This was achieved by instituting a policy of continuous syllabus revision, by encouraging experimentation with new methods and materials, by introducing completely new approaches to the teaching of reading, mathematics and science in the primary schools, and by greatly increasing the provision for in-service training.

Another important thing is that the standard of education in this State has been greatly enhanced, first of all by increasing the seniority and prestige of the portfolio of Minister for Education. Under a Labour Government I think he was the second junior Minister but, as hon. members know, today we have a very senior Minister in charge of this very important portfolio. Other important points in achieving this improvement have been by providing a Minister with a detailed knowledge of the working of the system and an appreciation of the importance of education, and by financial provision for education to the limit of our available resources.

Those are all important matters and ones which I trust everyone here will take note of.

Mr. P. Wood: Was that authorised by Jack Pizzev?

Mr. CHINCHEN: It does not matter who authorised it.

There are other matters I should like the hon. member for Toowoomba East to note. There are now nearly three times as many high schools, twice as many secondary departments and five times as many State secondary students as there were in 1957. If the hon. member wants the figures, I will tell him. In 1957 there were 36 high schools; today there are 96. Secondary departments in 1957 totalled 33; today there are 68 and our standards are of the best. Today our high schools are situated on areas of 20 acres and State schools on areas of 10 acres. What a difference from the position that existed under Labour, when State schools attended by many hundreds of children stood on 4½ acres of land!

I wonder if the hon. member knows that there are now more than three times as many classrooms for slow learners as there were a decade ago, that teacher-trainees now receive twice the length of training they did a decade ago, that there are now two teachers' colleges compared with only one in 1957, that there are now three times as many kindergartens as there were in 1957, that there are now three times as many university students as there were in 1957, that there are now three institutes of technology in Queensland compared with none in 1957, that teachers with degrees are now paid a special allowance but received nothing in 1957. It may be said, of course, that the present allowance is not enough, but there was nothing in 1957.

There are now three Schools of the Air for outback children; there were none in 1957. Is the hon. member for Toowoomba East aware that housing units for unmarried teachers are now provided in country areas, whereas none were provided in 1957? And so it goes on; it is never-ending.

There is an awareness of a time of change. We are aware of this. I do not say that everybody who is complaining about education standards is doing it for political purpose; I do not say that for one moment. There are many dedicated and interested people who are aware of the present situation. Because so much has been done there is a much greater interest in education today. Consequently, more people are taking an interest in and talking about education. This is a wonderful thing, as long as any criticism is made constructively and in the right frame of mind, not like the Baldwins, the Evanses and the Churvans.

I do hope that hon. members opposite adopt a common-sense attitude to education so that Queensland can keep moving forward in this field. I ask that they not be knockers of our own State. We want to attract people here. We want people to know that we have a good standard of education. There is no question about that; we have. I proved that yesterday. If a constructive attitude is adopted the State will really start to move, which will be to the Opposition's advantage as well as ours. I should like to see more of a common-sense attitude on the part of hon. members opposite, not this talk of crisis and suggestion that we are so far behind other States in expenditure under various headings. The test is the standard of education.

I feel that the teacher is in a magnificent profession and is doing a wonderful job. I want to see higher salaries for teachers. Everybody agrees that they are far too low, but this is a matter for the Industrial Commission, not the Government.

Mr. O'Donnell: It is the job of the Government to provide the money.

Mr. CHINCHEN: If the Industrial Commission said they should be paid higher salaries they would be paid higher salaries. We realise that conditions in some of the old schools are not as good as we would like, but look at what has happened with high

schools and technical schools. They have been built to proper standards. There will be this inability to take care of all these other requirements at this stage. As most hon. members probably know, pupil numbers in primary schools will level out in 1970. This is when there will be a possibility of catching up on the backlog, if not before.

In all earnestness, I say that there is no crisis in education in Queensland. Our Department of Education is doing an excellent job. It is fully aware of the shortcomings in our system—shortcomings which I say occur in every other State in the Commonwealth. But in some things we are ahead. At a seminar held at the New England University, Queensland was complimented on its science syllabus in primary schools. We know that the secondary syllabus has been reorganised. Things are happening and moving. All I ask is that those who are interested in education be constructive in their thinking.

Mr. HUGHES (Kurilpa) (11.59 a.m.): I have the honour and privilege on behalf of the electors of Kurilpa to reply to the Opening Speech delivered to Parliament by His Excellency the Governor. I take this opportunity to extend words of appreciation to His Excellency and Lady Mansfield for their interest in the welfare and development of this State.

I join with other hon. members in extending congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the motion that is now being debated. By the interest they have shown in their contributions to the debate they have brought quite some credit to themselves.

I also extend congratulations to the recently elected member for Roma, Mr. Tomkins. I am sure he will find a great deal that he can contribute to his electorate and to this Assembly. I think we should also congratulate the hon. member for Windsor on the appointment he received in the recent changes.

In examining the progress made in this State, we should look at a number of factors. The term of 10 years was mentioned in the last speech. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Toowong and others, there have been noticeable changes. In many ways we live in a society of change, and I believe it is fair to say that there has been very noticeable progress in many fields. We have only to look around the city or the country to see tangible evidence in brick and mortar reaching skywards, changing the face of the city and State, to see developing industries and many other changes taking place that have a tremendous bearing on the stability of our State, and on its progress and development. All this necessarily has a marked effect on the affluence of our society and the welfare of the individual.

We could consider the matter of industrial progress very fully in many ways. There has been a tapping of the mineral resources, and opening-up of Queensland in rural

pursuits and primary production, the construction of the beef roads system, and so on. I could continue at length.

As I say, the term of 10 years has been referred to. Generally speaking, that is a fair span of time. At this stage it would be well worth while for the Government to take stock, to assess what has been done, and to plan for future requirements, because when changes are made they must necessarily be flexible. We must ensure that we introduce measures that will be in the best interests of planned progress and development for the future.

Mr. Davies: Do you think there has been a lack of planning?

Mr. HUGHES: I do not say that, but I do say that we must be flexible in our approaches at all times. We must assess the present position, giving consideration to what is lacking today and making proper plans for obtaining the utmost benefits for the future. If that is not done there will be stagnation—and we cannot afford stagnation.

I do not suggest that any hon. member has become apathetic or lazy in the last 10 years; nevertheless, it is always wise to thoroughly review what has happened and to plan well ahead. I believe that our coalition Government has proved by results in many fields, some of which I have mentioned, not only that it has the confidence of the people—and it will continue to retain their confidence—but also that it has the ability to govern wisely and well. I also believe that there is an independent spirit amongst many of its members. We cherish the right to speak and to act as our consciences dictate. This right will not be curtailed or taken from us, and many of us with a great sense of responsibility use it to act and speak as we see fit. On the other hand, I believe that in our coalition Government in the future there must be—possibly more so than in the past if we are to develop Queensland to meet future demands—even greater teamwork, tolerance and understanding. I do not deny that the Country Party, the Liberal Party, the Labour Party, or any other political party, has the right to take its policy to the people, the right to expand its branches and activities and the right to expound its policy, and to put it to the people. By the same token, I believe this should not be done in a way that could be detrimental to the coalition Government of the State. It is essential to have a responsible application of these themes. I support their application, but it must be done in a reasonable way.

If we are to take stock of the future, we must also look at the past. I believe it is well worth while to look at the past but, by the trend of the debate, Labour does not wish to recognise the advances and progress made in Queensland over the last few years.

The education facilities in this State are being attacked by members of the Opposition, and their attacks seem to me to be a lot of tub thumping and sham. If members of the Opposition are genuine and sincere in their protests they have been misguided on the facts and figures, which are readily obtainable, or they do not really want to see what is happening and what has happened. I believe they are only trying to beat up some enthusiasm by knocking the progress that has been made in this State. In this way they are doing a tremendous disservice to the education facilities and opportunities that are available under our system, which I believe ranks second to none in Australia.

I do not suggest that there is no room for improvement or that all is perfect. But we must, in a sense of fairness and justice, give credit for what has been done and realise the problems that there were to overcome and the problems that there will be to overcome. In stocktaking in this regard, the Government as well as the Opposition needs to scrutinise the situation closely so that some of the present problems can be overcome in the near future. There have been great achievements in education. If members of the Opposition want to pursue this attack, the matter could be debated on the floor of this House or in any public forum. I do not think the Government has any need to apologise for the present situation or what it has done in this regard.

Mr. Davies: The Queensland Teachers' Union president does not agree with you.

Mr. HUGHES: The Teachers' Union is a fairly responsible body, and no doubt its members believe they have justification for some of their complaints. That is fair enough. I admit that there are ways and means of improving the system. There are probably many matters associated with teachers and their union that have a bearing on the matter. There have been problems within the Teachers' Union.

But we should be big enough to look at this matter in a broad way and not in a personal way. If members of the Opposition pursue a personal argument they will have a hopeless task. The multitude will not believe any arguments they advance, because the public see and know the facilities, opportunities, and standards which are availed of today by our young people. We have a good standard of education—it is second to none—available to all young people who wish to avail themselves of it, and the record shows that many more are staying at school longer and going further in their education, many to the tertiary level, and reasonably minded and thinking people recognise the opportunities and facilities that exist.

I am sure that these people join with me in paying a tribute to the Minister for Education and the Government for the good work that has been done in this regard. I do not suggest that all is perfect. As the

hon. member for Toowong said the other day, we are in times of change in many ways and we must not be blind to this. There is still room for improvement. The Government is neither blind nor deaf to the need for improvement or to take note of any suggestions made or constructive criticism offered. That is fair enough. If the Teachers' Union or members of the Opposition put forward constructive, fair, reasonable, and responsible criticism, the Government has an obligation to take note of it and do something about it if a case is proven. On the other hand, I cannot for one moment go along with the attitude adopted by some people, one instance of which has been referred to in this House. I deplore the unfair and unjust criticism put forward and circulated recently in a pamphlet issued by certain Young Liberals.

Mr. Davies: Do you think there is a Communist influence in the Young Liberals?

Mr. HUGHES: Ask a silly question and you get a silly answer. The hon. member for Maryborough would be the last Opposition member I should have thought would put forward a silly interjection. Human nature being what it is, there will always be young hotheads who will do things through lack of experience and immaturity. We all did things years ago which, with our present sense of responsibility, we would not do now. We should, of course, defend the right of all to say what they think—that is a democratic entitlement—but is it not better to be fair and just and put forward suggestions courteously than in an unjustified, "poison-pen", satirical way? I believe that criticism made in the proper way is a good thing, and that no Government, Minister or member should be beyond taking note of it. I agree that in some ways the education system may not be perfect.

Mr. P. Wood: In what way is it not perfect?

Mr. HUGHES: Who likes to see temporary classrooms? The hon. member does not, and I do not. And there are still too many classes with too many pupils.

Mr. Aikens: In Townsville they used to have classes out under the mango tree.

Mr. HUGHES: When I went to school, classes were held on the school veranda, where it was draughty and cold. The Government has had to cope with the problem caused by the very great increase in the birth-rate following the Second World War, which has produced what one might call a tidal wave of students. There have been dramatic changes in education, and an affluent society has meant that many more students now extend their period of education as increasing numbers take advantage of the facilities presently available.

To cope with this problem there are temporary classrooms, although those that I have seen are in no way detrimental to the sight, hearing, health, or learning capacity of students. Indeed, they are probably of a

better standard than many dwellings occupied by people in and outside Australia, although I agree that they are not perfect. Temporary classrooms are not a good thing, but let us be reasonable and face facts. The important thing is to know and understand the problem and do something about it.

There is also a need for teachers to have more periods for preparation and correction of work. No doubt there are many minor improvements that could prove beneficial and many suggestions that could probably be made by responsible people in the community, including teachers and members of the Opposition.

It is said that classes contain too many pupils. Let us look at the comparative figures. In a span of 10 years under Labour administration the teacher-pupil ratio was 1 to 36. Today it is 1 to 31. The training of teachers cannot be accomplished overnight. Nevertheless, the Government is undertaking an extended training programme and, thanks to careful planning and administration by a good Minister for Education, the teacher-pupil ratio has been reduced to 1 to 31. Education authorities in Australia aim to achieve a ratio of 1 to 26 by 1975.

It is also a fact that standards have changed, and for the better. The qualifications required of teachers, and for entrance to training colleges, have been raised. I think the Government has done something that the public can appreciate by the facilities and opportunities available, and the end product. The results prove the system's value.

That is what counts. Surely hon. members opposite are not suggesting that the end products of our schools at the primary, secondary or tertiary level are any less capable than those in southern States, or even those in countries overseas? If they suggest that, they show very little faith in parents and their sense of responsibility for the education of their children.

The knowledge is there; we can see it in the students who come from our schools. I challenge any hon. member opposite to pit his knowledge and wits against a young person in his teens who is the end product of the system that members of the Opposition allege is so full of faults, so hopeless, and so inadequate. I suggest that the teenage student will come out on top in any general knowledge test that an hon. member opposite cares to submit him to. Young people at high school can answer difficult questions on science and mathematics, in addition to having a good general knowledge.

Mr. Melloy: Haven't you people read the complaints of employers about the inability of some of their typists to spell correctly?

Mr. HUGHES: I have read letters containing that complaint. I do not say the system is perfect; I think the standard of English and spelling could be improved.

Mr. Porter: Is Queensland different from other States in that respect?

Mr. HUGHES: That is true. Is the position any different in other States? Also, I invite hon. members to look at the standard of the work being done by children in Grades I and II at primary schools. Grade II pupils can read "The Courier-Mail" or the "Telegraph". They cannot read every word, of course—their vocabulary is limited—but they can read a good deal of it. Let hon. members look at the Cuisenaire system and what the children learning it can do in the field of mathematics.

Mr. Duggan: Reading the newspapers will not increase their knowledge very much.

Mr. HUGHES: Young people of today are more worldly-wise than our generation were. They are reading both better and faster. Their knowledge of mathematics is far greater than ours was at the same stage. They would leave far behind many of us who sit in this Chamber and many others who are mature adults.

Mr. Hanlon: The Minister has said that they would not know how to tear a paper towel off a dispenser.

Mr. HUGHES: Surely the hon. member is not serious in suggesting that they would not know how to tear a paper towel off a dispenser; but I have heard so many wild and woolly ideas from members of the Opposition that that one would not surprise me. In fact, as chairman of the Yeronga Infants School committee, I had soap and paper-towel dispensers installed some years ago.

Mr. Melloy: Do you say that because our standard is as low as that in other States, we should leave it at that?

Mr. HUGHES: I have so much to say that I will not answer the hon. member other than to say that the standard is not low in any Australian State by comparison with other Western countries.

I have a high regard for teachers. One has to really want to be a teacher to enter the profession. It is a profession to which one can dedicate oneself—in fact, in some ways it is comparable to professions such as nursing. Teachers mould the child's mind and character. That is why, as the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt said, a number of teachers are going overseas. They wish to increase their knowledge and, at the same time, have a working holiday. They wish to become better teachers.

In the main, teachers in Queensland are responsible men and women; but a minority of them are misguided and irresponsible in attempting to achieve their objectives. Although I am in sympathy with their claims for increased salaries, I believe that they should resubmit their case to the Industrial Commission. If they believe that the Commission has erred in its judgment, they have a right to continue to press their claims. That is the course they should take if, in their opinion, the salary scale laid down by

the award is low. They should continue to hammer for an improvement, not sit by and do nothing; they should look for further arguments to fortify their case. The Government is not to blame for the position; the matter is in the teachers' own hands.

Let us dispassionately and factually view the state of education in Queensland. Let us see how far the State has come and what plans the Government has for the future. Let us compare the situation now with the situation when the Country-Liberal Government came to office. In 1957 there were 36 State high schools; in 1967 there are 96: in 1957 there were 33 secondary departments; in 1967 there are 68; in 1957 there were 14,300 students; in 1967 there are 73,000 students. That is where the big problem lies today.

It is a good thing that many more seek and attain higher education, but again one must appreciate the magnitude of the problem that this Government has had to overcome. It has been overcome by administrative ability and foresight. Had hon. members opposite been the Government at this time I doubt very much if they would have been able to cope with this; I suggest they would have been found wanting. We have 5-year courses today as against 4-year courses in 1957. We have no Scholarship system, which is a good thing. We also have Schools of the Air.

In 1957 there were 23 kindergartens, to which the Government in 1957 granted assistance totalling \$13,600. Today there are 95 kindergartens and Government assistance totals \$135,000. We have a new kindergarten training college today which is financed to the extent of 50 per cent. by the Government. I do a large amount of work associated with young and aged people and we—the Kurilpa Child Care Centre—receive a subsidy from the Department of Health because of the work that is being done. That was never recognised before, but this pre-school training of young children is a form of character-moulding advice and assistance in education. You must start training children at the earliest possible age, and, of course, you are continuously training them from then on.

Mr. Aikens: What about the wonderful job that has been done for people in the back country with high schools and high-school tops?

Mr. HUGHES: Admittedly, one must be big enough to recognise this and not make a purely sham case. People in the country can see these buildings and they know what is being done. In the city a more impersonal attitude exists, although our high-school buildings, in the main, are much different functionally, from the point of view of utility, and aesthetically from what they were a few years ago when they contained bad lighting, and dingy, dirty classrooms painted a brown colour throughout. Gardeners are now employed, and there are many facilities that make a tremendous difference. Many high

schools are not situated on main roads and are not so much in the public view, but responsible people know, appreciate and understand what has been done.

Mr. Aikens: In Western Queensland, if children could not afford to go to Charters Towers or Townsville, they got no secondary education at all under Labour.

Mr. HUGHES: That is so.

Look at what has been done in the field of transport. Today there are 737 primary-school transport services, as against 369 in Labour's day. Under Labour, there were no secondary-school services at all; today there are 228. Parents and pupils could not in those days avail themselves of the opportunity of secondary education, but the provision of these facilities opened up a new vista and they were not slow to avail themselves of it. This is borne out by the fact that, in 1957, 9,832 pupils were conveyed daily, whereas today the number has increased to 35,084 pupils. Expenditure in those days was \$545,000; today it is just on \$3,000,000—spent on benefits associated with the training and teaching of children.

In our technical colleges we have overcome night training of apprentices and now have day training, and training at many more places. Taking technical colleges as individual institutions, in 1957 there was only one; today, technical colleges as individual institutions number 10 and five more are being planned. There was no institute of technology then, whereas there are now three, some in the country. The hon. member for Townsville South knows what has taken place in Townsville.

Mr. Aikens: In Townsville, under Labour we did not even have a high school. We had a combination job between high school and technical college.

Mr. HUGHES: That is so. Throughout the country we have high schools, technical colleges and a university at Townsville.

I suggest that the best and fairest comparison is to check what there was in those days with what there is now. Even though the system may not be 100 per cent., there will always be need for improvement. In spite of that, it is fair to recognise what has been done and not to put up a sham case which, to a great extent, hon. members of the Opposition have done, trying, with woolly, hollow argument, to cloud the thinking of parents and children who benefit by worth-while existing facilities. There is a textbook allowance today, whereas in Labour's day there was none.

I could go on to deal with many, many aspects of this matter. Suffice it to say that with the type of school, the method of teaching, the subsidies paid, the effort to cope with the problem of classrooms and teachers, student-teacher ratio and so on, and the tremendous sums of money spent on education today, where we are getting full value for our dollar, this Government has no need to apologise to anyone. It can go

out into the back-blocks and public forums anywhere and hold its head high with the feeling that it has achieved something.

Something worth while has been done, and in the future there will be even greater advances because this Government is alive to change and is keeping pace with modern requirements. We will not be fooled by any sham argument put forward by the Opposition, nor will the public. The youth of today sees, knows and appreciates this. The 44 per cent. of the community in the early 20-year-age group are the people influencing the voting trend. With a sense of appreciation of the value of their vote they have been voting, and in the future will vote, for the Country-Liberal Government.

I have great admiration for youth. I should like to see them pit their knowledge and sense of educational responsibility against that of the hon. members opposite.

If I could speak for the rest of the day I would not run out of examples to indicate that this Government has no reason to apologise, but indeed has achieved a great measure of success. Look at what has been done in the field of hospitals. Consider our humane treatment of the aged in the provision of senior citizens' centres. In Labour's day they rid themselves of the problem by putting them at Goodna.

Mr. Aikens: Twelve hundred were put at Goodna to rot.

Mr. HUGHES: That is right. What an inhuman way to treat people who were not mentally sick but were only suffering the problems of age. Age will come to us all.

We have done a lot in this direction, and hon. members opposite know it. There have been tremendous improvements in the facilities for the aged. This has been done with a humane and genuine regard for their welfare. The late Dr. Noble did a tremendous amount to restore the dignity of aged people and to provide an understanding of their problems.

We have appointed social workers; we have sent medical-fellowship holders to Canada and the United States of America to study alcoholism. We have established a clinic at the Royal Brisbane Hospital. The Child Guidance Centre in Mary Street is doing very worth-while work. Hearing and behaviour problems are now being given attention by this Government in our school health services, which provide for the medical examination of children. Care and attention is given to geriatrics. Our services provided in hospitals cover an area which could be likened to one extending from London to Moscow, a distance of 1,400 miles. There is no reason to apologise for the job the Government is doing.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: Don't forget the wonderful work that has been done for sub-normal children.

Mr. HUGHES: That is worth special noting. One could enthuse at great length on this, but as time will not permit it I simply raise the point for its recognisable value.

We have the confidence of the people. We made a pledge about free hospitalisation and we have kept that pledge in spite of rising costs. I will give figures on which our performance can be judged. It is all a matter of performance. An efficient Government must get the most possible out of every dollar. This can be done only with efficient management, which is what this Government has provided and which has been the means of retaining our free hospitals. In 1957 there were 10,000 hospital beds; by 1965 the number had risen to over 12,000. In 1956-57 the daily average cost of treating an in-patient was £3 8s. 4d. whereas in 1964-65 it was £5 0s. 8d. Compare that increase with the tremendous increase in costs generally, bearing in mind the millions of dollars poured into hospitals by this Government compared with what was spent in the days of Labour.

We have coped with rising costs and have kept our pledge. Of course, human nature being what it is, there will always be some complaints and there will always be room for improvement. But as long as the Government is alive to the need to plug the gaps, to avoid deterioration, and to improve the service, we have every reason to be proud of our accomplishment. Despite the tremendously-rising cost factor that the community and the Government have had to cope with, we have maintained and improved the system. I believe in this system and consider that it is to the advantage of the State and the people. But with rising costs causing concern we have continually to look at how we can keep a worth-while system without letting cost factors get away from us. Look at the cost of our dispensing service and the treatment of out-patients. A good Government with a sense of responsibility will do this. We are charged with doing it and we will have to do it. We must do what we can with what we have; we must prune expenditure, cutting cost factors down to a minimum without detrimental effects; we must retain efficiency without wasting money.

Mr. Aikens: Can you justify paying \$600,000 for the Bellevue Hotel and leaving schools short of accommodation?

Mr. HUGHES: In many ways, especially in education, we have a responsible attitude. I cannot reconcile the hon. member's interjection with the needs of education. If we followed it to the end it could be said that the Government should never buy another building, that it should not build certain bridges, construct road works, or do other things. We will never please 100 per cent. of the people all the time. Surely we must provide facilities for public administration. We cannot conduct interviews in the Botanic Gardens. We must plan for the future. We require centralisation of certain Government administration to make it easier for people to conduct their business. I suggest

that we must do these things to provide public utility services, otherwise we would not have staff and buildings—and we would never have democratic government. If we do not do these things we will not create improvements. If we followed this line, we could relate it to what is happening in the city with Anzac Square and Clem Jones's city square. If the hon. member followed that argument to its logical conclusion he would say, "Let us not do anything." I think that answers his interjection.

Mr. Aikens: Couldn't we decentralise Government departments and put them out in the country areas?

Mr. HUGHES: I agree that there should be a degree of decentralisation but we could not have the headquarters of a department at Woop Woop or Mt. Isa. We must have a sane and sensible approach, with a central city location to look after the State's business and economy. After that, we can provide facilities and services with decentralisation to meet the public needs.

Town and regional planning is a vital matter. Brisbane has had its share of problems, and there have been abortive attempts at town planning. The first abortive attempt at town planning for Brisbane was in 1950; it was shelved by the Labour Government. The hon. member for Bundaberg shelved Labour's abortive attempt in 1950. It took the C.M.O., when it came to power, to grasp this nettle and, with a sense of obligation and purpose, something was done. A planning staff was recruited, surveys were carried out and traffic counts were taken. Land-use surveys were conducted and town planning was commenced in Brisbane in an orderly, defined and successful manner.

Brisbane now has a town plan, thanks to the C.M.O. and to Mr. Alan Heath, the Town Planner, who was the brains behind it.

The book of pretty colours denoting zoning and land usage was fortified by some ordinances and the Town Planning Act passed by this Government. If it had been left to Labour the town plan would have suffered the same fate as the Weipa file; it would have been gathering dust in a forgotten pigeon-hole. But it is a plan without a law-enforcement agency; it needs a police force. Many things are going wrong, and in my view the Government must accept responsibility and share the blame with the council for some of the shortcomings.

We need town and regional planning and, more urgently and importantly, a qualified planner and a section in the Department of Local Government capable of understanding, interpreting and policing town planning in Queensland. In this form of organisation lies the greatest deficiency. The Government is not in a position to properly sit in judgment on local authority ordinances and requests. I ask the Government to give urgent consideration to bringing into force a planning Act for Queensland and a planning authority or commission for Brisbane.

In dealing with this subject, I believe that a planning authority should be established to deal with Brisbane's town plan. It should be staffed with competent officers, financed jointly by the Brisbane City Council and the Government, and responsible to the Government under a town planning Act for reporting to the Government, preparing a budget, and justifying by its work the annual financial grant required for its existence. Such an authority should be free of political control; it should be autonomous. Such a town planning authority under a town planning Act must be divorced from political interference and political considerations. In addition to land use, such a body would correlate information and be the clearing house for matters such as traffic, roads, transport, schools, community services, and city and urban development, and it should also plan and organise redevelopment.

Time will not permit me to expand on this subject. However, all matters relating to building codes and requirements and land use approvals should continue to be the responsibility of the Brisbane City Council, acting of course at all times within its statutory powers and within the requirements and principles of the town planning Act and town planning authority.

Relative to Queensland's need for modern town and country planning, the people of Queensland are living in a State of great wealth. Planning of the development of the State's resources means developing them in the most efficient way and therefore the way that would benefit the greatest number of people, and ultimately Queensland and Australia.

Planning is far from new. It is as ancient as human history. Throughout history the essential purpose of planning has always been to ensure the happier, more comfortable, and more secure survival of those who are living in the planned area. There are archaeological remains which show clearly the planners' work in Babylon, Egypt, and Greece, as far back as 480 B.C. Later on, in England, King Edward I wanted—

"Wise men of the most knowing and most sufficient, who best know how to order and array a new town to the utmost profit of King and Merchant."

This was not only for the planning of Berwick-on-Tweed as a garrison and market town, but also for the protection of all of that part of the north of England and ensuring its peaceful and efficient development, and indeed, its survival. There is always planning for survival, and better survival.

Queensland, in its fight for survival and yet better survival, has to hold its own at the Australian Loan Council. At these council meetings it must try to press its claims for loan funds to carry out development against those of States with well-prepared plans for development in the form of roads, bridges, and designed industrial areas.

Until quite recently Queensland had no such town or country plans. It had only a handful of zoning schemes which showed mainly what people would not be allowed to do. Practically nothing of a dynamic form of planning existed. In such circumstances, by comparison with the more positive claims of other States, it cannot surprise anyone that the Queensland Premier comes back annually from the Loan Council with the complaint that the State's claims have not received fair recognition. It may be said that its claims had not received fair presentation in the best and fairest sense, and that has been to some extent, in my view, due to this lack of town or regional planning. To help Queensland's survival we should do something about this. We must have planned, orderly development, making use, for the benefit of the people of Queensland, of all the State's vast resources, with due regard to all the people's requirements for comfort and prosperity.

This involves careful planning to preserve the State's good agricultural land, to ensure that its needs are provided for, to find and protect its vast mineral resources, to protect the catchment areas of its water resources, and to provide reliable information on where future development requires new roads and rail services; in short, to ensure that the State's resources are discovered, charted on maps, and protected, and that provision is made for their subsequent efficient development.

This is positive, not restrictive, planning, directed towards preserving, and ultimately encouraging, the development of the State's resources. Much of this falls within the category of regional or country planning.

This sort of work should and must be done by people trained and experienced in the planning field. As we have it now, with different colours on different areas denoting different things, it is incomprehensible to people who come to Queensland looking for a site for industry. They cannot understand it. I believe that we are charged with this responsibility, and that it is the Government's responsibility—indeed its urgent obligation—in the interests of the people, to establish orderly planning for the progress and development of the State.

(Time expired.)

Mr. DIPLOCK (Aubigny) (12.39 p.m.): At the outset, I wish to associate myself with the expression of loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen and to compliment His Excellency the Governor on the active interest he is evincing in all sections of the community and in all parts of the State. My electors are very grateful indeed to him for his visits during the year.

I also join with previous speakers in congratulating the mover and the seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

For 10 years I have followed the practice of getting up in this Chamber and saying what I had to say without criticising or having a dogfight with any other hon. member in the Chamber. I intended to do so today until the latter part of the speech of the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt. For the major part of his speech he put forward very constructive ideas on education, and I was pleased to hear his remarks on that subject.

However, after criticising the Opposition for engaging in political propaganda, for the last 10 minutes of his speech he launched into "rubbishing" what the Labour Government did in the education field when it was in office. One thing with which he charged the previous Government was allotting the Education portfolio to the junior Minister. It now belongs to the second-senior Minister. I intend to defend the action of the Cabinet of the day, as I was the junior Minister who was appointed Minister for Education. What the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt did not say was that a much senior Minister stepped down from that post because when I entered Parliament I had had 40 years of successful experience in education. Just prior to entering Parliament I was head-teacher of a Class I school with a high top, and at the same time was inspecting a very large western district. The Government of the day gave me credit, because of that experience, for being able to do a worth-while job for education, and my appointment, even though I was the junior member of Cabinet, was hailed with enthusiasm by teachers throughout Queensland generally. I have proof of that in the journal of the Queensland Teachers' Union.

I make no apology for what was done during the short term that I was Minister. I think it is a waste of time to compare 1967 with 1957. If we compare 1957 with 1947 or 1937 it will be found that very much progress had been made. If we compare the conditions that applied in 1957 with those during the time when there was not a Labour Government in office, I should say that there was tremendous progress during that period.

Mr. Aikens: Do you think that the chief obstacle in the Labour Party system of education was the Scholarship?

Mr. DIPLOCK: No, I do not.

Having engaged in that little dogfight, I shall now proceed with the other things that I wish to say. There has been so much adverse criticism of education in Queensland that one must wonder whether our standard has fallen considerably; whether the administration of the department by officers who, throughout their careers, have proved themselves experts in all branches of education has deteriorated to a great extent; whether the Government has not availed itself of the expert advice of these officers; or whether much of the criticism has been inspired and organised for some specific purpose not necessarily revealed in the criticism.

I think all agree that problems connected with education are not confined to this State or country. In fact, they are evident in every State of the Commonwealth and, with a rapidly increasing school population, they will not be solved either by this Government or by the next. Therefore, in my opinion there will always be room for criticism in some form or other. It is highly important, however, that this criticism should be positive and responsible. The great danger of irresponsible, adverse criticism is the image that it can produce in the public mind, and which did exist in the public mind many years ago in the field of education. That was not the fault of any Government. That image may assist to gain a desired end for a particular section of the community, in the short term; but, in the long term, it could have a very damaging effect on the public's attitude towards education generally.

I think that my long and—I say it with pride—successful association with education in Queensland has equipped me to advance an opinion, no better than anyone else's, but at least as well-founded as those expressed by many of the present-day experts, many of whom have no educational background. It is my considered opinion that the general standard throughout the schools and colleges in this State has not deteriorated, nor has it remained static—one must be honest about these things. Those entrusted with the administration of the department are at least equal to any of their predecessors, in my opinion. I can speak from experience in that respect because I had 40 years in the department, and I know that many of the men who formerly occupied the positions that the present executive heads of the department are occupying did not put the effort into their work that the present administrators are putting into theirs. In fact, if one can be too conscientious and put too much effort into one's work, I say that, at the expense of their own health, the present executive heads of the department are doing just that.

I claim—I do not say this idly—that those who are educated in Queensland will continue to hold their own with those who are educated elsewhere. I advance this opinion for one purpose: to endeavour to reassure parents that, in the main, their children are receiving a sound education. But, although I believe that what I have said is true, I do not wish it to be inferred that I consider there is no room for criticism or that I have any quarrel with teachers for endeavouring to better their conditions. I began in the teaching service at 12s. 6d. a week (some people might consider that was too much), and after five years I was receiving £100 a year. I was always a prominent member of the Queensland Teachers' Union—I attended my first conference 50 years ago—and teachers had to fight for better conditions. However, I say

that one must fight in a way that will not damage the image of education in the public mind.

I join those who are of the opinion that the Commonwealth Government should be pressed hard for a much larger grant for education—and I am sure that the Government and the Ministers are of that opinion, too, for with sufficient funds they would have fewer problems. We have to be realistic about the matter, however. We cannot use more than the amount that is allotted to us, and, because of this, the positive approach obviously is to use that allotment to the best advantage.

In my opinion, over all, the Government has done a very good job. I said that in front of masses of teachers before the last election, when I defended the Government on its education policy. But that does not free the Government from criticism on certain points.

I repeat what I have said on two previous occasions during Address-in-Reply debates: the Government would have been wise to hasten slowly with its policy of extension of secondary education to rural areas. If it had done this, then it would not have many of the problems it has today. I do not expect the Minister to agree with that in this House, but I think he will agree in his heart that if that had been done he would not have had many of the problems he has today.

Mr. Aikens interjected.

Mr. DIPLOCK: I did not say that; wait until I finish.

Mr. Pizzey: We would rather give them the opportunity and have the problems.

Mr. DIPLOCK: I repeat, too, the obvious fact that whilst money can be used to build high schools and colleges in a comparatively short time and whilst the Government can procure the necessary equipment, there is no way it can produce trained and qualified teachers quickly enough to staff these institutions adequately—and the Minister knows that, too.

This development—the extension of secondary education to the rural areas—proved to be very popular, and the Government—I suppose any Government would have done the same—decided to cash in on it. It certainly has proved good election propaganda. The race began, and secondary schools were sought by most districts through their members of Parliament. However, there is no shadow of doubt that the establishment of many of these very small schools was not, and cannot be, justified, inasmuch as they are far too expensive to run. Staffing them has resulted in a shocking wastage of effective teaching power; they are providing courses which are of little or no value to the students who attend them, and consequently there is the urge for these students to bypass the particular school and attend a school where a more desirable and suitable course is available.

Mr. Aikens: Can you name some of those schools?

Mr. DIPLOCK: Of course I can. There is no doubt that when these facts are realised and their significance appreciated by parents who have pressed so persistently for the establishment of these very small high schools, they will suffer the same fate as the small primary schools are experiencing at the present time.

Mr. Pizzey: What about those children whose parents cannot afford to send them away?

Mr. DIPLOCK: I did not say they would have to send them away. The Government provides transport services to take pupils to the larger centres. I have never suggested curtailing the taking of secondary education to the rural areas. I spoke of very small schools, and the Minister knows I am right, although he is not going to say so.

Mr. Aikens: Name a few so that we will know what you are talking about.

Mr. Sullivan: Whether or not you are implying it, I do not know, but don't say that the small schools in my area are not appreciated.

Mr. DIPLOCK: Certainly the people appreciate them, but that does not alter the fact that if pupils were transported to one central part of a rural area they would be educated at much less cost, there would be a saving of teaching power, and they would be able to take courses that were more useful to them.

Mr. Pizzey interjected.

Mr. DIPLOCK: I am not advocating taking them to Dalby at all.

Mr. Sullivan interjected.

Mr. DIPLOCK: I have not had very much experience with education and the hon. member has had a lot! I am giving my amateurish idea. I could suggest one school in the hon. member's area where there is no way in the world he could justify the establishment of a school.

Mr. Sullivan: Name it.

Mr. DIPLOCK: Bell.

Mr. Sullivan: Ask the teachers at Bell. They won't agree with you.

Mr. DIPLOCK: That does not make it right that a school should have been established there. I have one in my area that I could mention, but if the hon. member could have one I decided I was going to have one, too. Why not?

An Hon. Member: I think the Minister had a very good look at Bell before the school was established.

Mr. DIPLOCK: If the Minister had had a very good look at Bell the school would not have been established there. The Minister knows that, too.

From my conversations with a number of old friends in the teaching service, I have formed the opinion that, although the majority of them feel that their salaries, conditions, etc., do not compare favourably with those enjoyed by members of other professions, they consider that this is a matter which should be determined by the Industrial Commission. Most of the more responsible ones—the middle-aged and older teachers—are in favour of doing everything through the Industrial Commission. They are critical of the Government, however, because of its niggardly attitude towards the supply of stock and equipment. I have gleaned this from the teachers themselves. They are expected to teach subjects listed in the syllabus that require the use of a great deal of material not supplied by the Government. At times some of this is purchased by parents and citizens' associations. However, there is quite a list of materials that they have to purchase out of their own cash. They consider that there is no option. The subjects are included in the syllabus and they are examined by the district inspector on them. Therefore, it is a matter of either purchasing the material or running the risk of suffering professionally because of an indifferent result during the inspection. To my way of thinking, this is unfair both to the teachers and to the children concerned and is a matter which should be investigated promptly.

Another complaint put to me on many occasions concerns preferential treatment given to married women. This is a matter of concern to most single women in the teaching service. I am fully aware that the employment of married women is doing much to relieve the teacher shortage. I know, too, from my own experience that many of these women are doing an excellent job of work. I also know that the officers responsible for placing these women, particularly the mothers of young or large families, have to place them as near to their homes as possible, but I can well understand the resentment of the single teacher who has done out-service, and is doing home-service at a school convenient to her home—say, at Coorparoo—receiving a transfer—say to Chermiside—still on home service, to make room for Mrs. X, who lives near Coorparoo and who must leave home as late as possible in the morning and return home as early as possible in the afternoon to prepare the evening meal for the family, particularly if she knows that Mrs. X has applied for re-admission to the service merely to save enough for a new motor-car or an overseas trip. That sort of thing is happening. I think hon. members will agree that whilst we must have the married women, it is not fair to the single women that married women should have all the cake.

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

Mr. DIPLOCK: Continuing with my thoughts on married teachers, I point out that the fact that many young lady teachers marry shortly after they are transferred from their home centres and apply for readmission at their home centre is aggravating the position. To my mind, the matter requires some investigation, because unless some policy is decided upon in regard to the placement of married women there will be no room in the larger centres for the single lady teacher whether she has done out-service or not. After making many inquiries from young women in the service, and from young women in their Senior year whom I have endeavoured to influence to enter the teaching service, I am quite sure that the transfer problem is of more concern to them than the salary they are receiving or that they will receive should they join the service. I think the Minister will agree with that.

Mr. Pizzey: That is one of the problems with having married women on the staff.

Mr. DIPLOCK: Yes, it is.

When members on the Government side of the House were sitting in Opposition they criticised very strongly the Government of the day for doing little to assist decentralisation by encouraging secondary industries in areas removed from the ports. During the last week-end I read through the election speeches made by some of the present Ministers, and I was amused by the importance placed by them on stressing the urgent necessity for decentralisation and the promises made by these gentlemen about what would be done if the present Government was returned.

During the past 10 years the Government has had ample opportunity to do something practical in the way of assisting development of secondary industry in the inland areas, but I can think of no assistance other than lip-service that has been forthcoming. Yesterday one hon. member eulogised the Government for erecting big placards reading, "Buy Queensland Made". I think all hon. members will agree that that is more or less lip-service. People will buy Queensland-made goods if the Queensland product has the quality they desire and sells at a competitive price. I give credit to the Government (as I do to the former Government) in that it gives priority to Queensland-made goods. However, I am quite sure that no person who goes to buy an article will be swayed by the fact that it is made in Queensland unless the price and quality are right.

Lip-service, however, is of no value in offsetting the difference between the cost of electricity in the country town and the much reduced price in the nearby coastal city; lip-service is of little value in helping to offset the freight which has to be paid on the raw material from the port to the source of manufacture, and on the manufactured article from the factory to the port; lip-service is not of much value in helping to offset the higher wages that have to be paid

to the skilled tradesman to attract him to the country town; lip-service is not of very much use when an employer is attempting to accommodate the worker after he has succeeded in attracting him to the country town.

I wish to say a sincere thank you to the Minister for Works and Housing for his efforts in this regard. He has tried to help not only the firm with which I am connected but also all other firms by supplying houses. We should like a lot more of them.

It has been proved that secondary industry can be as successful in country towns as it is in the larger cities. Articles produced by workers in country factories here have proved to be equal to, and often better than, the products from any other country in the world. These products are of such high quality that they have been responsible for capturing world markets in competition with the products from factories in all parts of the world and have resulted in winning millions of dollars annually for Queensland's export trade.

Mr. Aikens: How far afield have you sent machinery?

Mr. DIPLOCK: Chile, Uruguay, various parts of Africa, and various parts of Asia. To win those markets Napier Bros. Ltd. had to compete with the most sophisticated and largest factory in England. That proves that our country tradesman is equal to any other tradesman in any part of the world.

The question the Government has to decide is whether this development and export is worth while, and, if it is, then to do something to lessen the handicap under which a factory works if it is established in a country area. I have made extensive inquiries as to what is being done in other Australian States, and I am certainly on firm ground when I say that less is being done in this State than in any other State in the Commonwealth. Is it not the business of the State to do something about it, to help in some way, if it wishes to decentralise industry? If a business head who wishes to set up a secondary industry in Queensland has to decide whether to set it up in Brisbane or in the country, he would be absolutely mad to decide on the country because of the fringe costs of working in the country, and businessmen do not do that sort of thing. They may become philanthropists after they have made pots of money, but while they are making their money they work in the places where costs are lowest.

In one State at least, companies which function in remote areas are subsidised according to the number of their employees. I do not advocate subsidising any secondary industry. To be worth while it should be able to stand on its own feet. But I do strongly suggest that if the Government is sincere in stressing the importance of, and necessity for, decentralisation in the interests of the State, it should be prepared to assist by sympathetic action in respect to the

factors I have mentioned. I can say in all sincerity that I have no doubt that the quality of our exports will continue to develop an increasing market for them. This calls for expansion of the factories, and, with rising costs, etc., companies will be forced to consider establishing sections of their workshops in locations where they will be able to reduce considerably these fringe expenses if the Government is not prepared to give their case more sympathetic consideration.

When I refer to fringe expenses, I am certainly not speaking of small amounts. I am in a position to give definite figures in connection with one firm and, although smaller manufacturing concerns in the inland areas would not be affected to the same extent, their expenses would be just as great if they were related to their sales and paid-up capital.

I think most hon. members will be surprised when I quote these figures. During the year ended 30 June, 1967, this firm had to meet \$100,708 in freight charges on the carriage of goods between where it is based and the port, which it would not have had to meet if it functioned in the vicinity of Brisbane; approximately \$2,000 for trunk calls between the factory and Brisbane; an excess of approximately \$2,000 for electricity; and approximately \$1,000 expenses necessary in relation to visits to the capital city by executive and managerial officers.

Those are only some of the added expenses occasioned by the factory's being located away from the port. I am sure a detailed exercise would reveal that excess costs, which would not be incurred if the company had its factory in Brisbane, would be between \$120,000 and \$150,000, which, on a paid-up capital of \$950,000, would pay a dividend of from 12½ per cent. to 15 per cent. That is what the company operating in the country is not able to pay because it has to meet extra fringe costs.

I know that there is no thought of the company's transferring its present activities. It has a work-force of which it is justifiably proud, and those men have all their interests in the town in which the factory is located. But the present trend suggests that expansion must take place. Increased business means increased fringe expenses. Business is becoming more competitive every day, and this could force the company to consider locating the necessary expansion near the port. I feel sure that the Government would not like to see that happen.

What I have said about this one company applies to others, and I suggest that the Government, if it really desires decentralisation, gives consideration to assistance in some form or another.

Mr. DEWAR (Wavell) (2.28 p.m.): As usual, I associate myself with the messages of loyalty to the Crown in the person of Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, because my loyalty to her and the British way of life will never diminish.

Loyalty means a great deal to me. This is the second speech of personal involvement that I have made in this House in 17 years. The first one was 11 years ago when, following the tragic death of my mother, it became necessary for me to go to the city mortuary to identify her body. I was so appalled at what I saw there that I told the story in this House. As a result, this city obtained a new morgue. If the speech that I now have to make gets rid of some of the "little league" thinking that is going on in this State, it could be equally worth while.

The date 24 May, 1967, will ever be a milestone in my life, for on that day the Premier sought an audience with me at which the Deputy Premier also was present. Mr. Chalk said that Mr. Herbert had demanded that action be taken against me. In the discussion that followed, they both appeared to be reasonably satisfied with what ensued.

The following day the Premier requested my presence again and said, "As the story has been carried out of the Department of Labour and Tourism, I request your retirement from Cabinet."

My reaction, of course, was one of sheer and utter disgust, because there were no thoughts of any loyalty to a colleague. You see, Mr. Speaker, when you disagree in Cabinet with your Cabinet colleagues, you are very smartly reminded of the collective responsibility of Cabinet; but it appears that it works one way only.

The request for retirement was based not on the alleged incident but rather on the fact that the department concerned had promulgated the story. There were male staff members in that department with little to do while their Minister was away on a five-week world trip to attend a conference of one week's duration in America. The Minister for Labour and Tourism returned three weeks after the alleged incident and, with all the treachery of a Judas and all the dexterity of a Brutus, plunged in the knife.

I have been asked by good friends and colleagues, "Why did you resign in these circumstances?" As I have said, Mr. Speaker, through sheer disgust—to have given these "fearless" leaders 17 years of loyalty, on the one hand, and 16 years of teamship and over a year of loyalty, on the other. I cannot live in an atmosphere I cannot respect. I believe that I am my brother's keeper. That is how I have lived my life; I will continue so to do. I refer to the words of John Donne, who said, 300 years ago—

"No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the maine. If a clod be washed away by the sea, the continent is the less as well as if a promontory were, as well as if a manor of thy friends or of thine own were. Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind."

So, Mr. Speaker, I submitted my resignation because I wanted to breathe once again the clean air of the common man, the man in the street, the real people of this earth, who do not live in an ivory tower, remote from reality.

But why should this man, this honourable Minister for Labour and Tourism—

Mr. Mann: Where is he? He is not here.

Mr. DEWAR: I do not know. Why should this man whom I called "friend" take this action? We had not at any time had any disagreement of any kind; yet, two days after my assuming the role of Acting Minister for Labour and Tourism, Mr. Chalk told me that Mr. Herbert had left instructions that I had not to act for him. Knowing this, he still arranged with the Premier for me to act.

I do not suggest there is anything sinister in this. To the contrary, the fact is—and I shall refer to this later—that it had been the practice during the first three years of my ministerial experience for me to be not appointed as an Acting Minister. When I assumed responsibility as Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party, I drew Mr. Chalk's attention to this and said that I thought it was rather a poor show. So, in an atmosphere of correcting this, Mr. Chalk had taken action over the previous six months.

A week after I assumed the office of Acting Minister of the Department of Labour and Tourism, the Under Secretary of that department told one of my colleagues that his Minister had left similar instructions; so the Minister's feelings towards me were well known to his staff. However, I carried on as an Acting Minister should, making no changes in the policy of the Minister. I correct that statement; I did make one change. I was horrified to find that the girls confined to single rooms at "Karrala" were not given outside exercise, so I issued instructions that they be given outside-exercise periods.

That was the only occasion in the five weeks that the public relations man had to do a Press statement. Incidentally, I cut out 60 per cent. of that and maybe this upset him. This Minister has a public relations man in his own office and one at his disposal at the Tourist Bureau. He is the only Minister with two public relations officers. Some, including the Treasurer, do not even have one. I handled that department in addition to the Police Department without one in head office.

Before I proceed to outline the real reason for my colleague's treachery, I want to make one thing very clear. It has been said, and will be said again by innuendo, by smear, or by off-beat suggestion, "But, of course, this incident is not the whole story". Well, let the record show that on 25 May Mr. Chalk in the Premier's presence, said,

"I agree that this matter has been magnified out of all proportion", and he repeated it to me on the following Monday. Mr. Chalk will not deny that. Let the record further show that in respect of suggestions of entertaining in my room at Parliament House which had come to my ears, I did not have a refrigerator in my room as some Ministers do, and further that during the four years and eight months that I was a Minister, my secretarial work was entirely handled by my male secretary at Parliament House. Other Ministers with female secretarial assistance at this House might take heed for their own protection.

This new "dog eat dog" approach is a disturbing thing. I know at least two Country Party Ministers who are very disturbed about this new attitude. I am told that you now need a pedigree to get into Cabinet. Even if your electors have twice shown confidence in you, that does not mean that you qualify. War wounds come into the same category.

And now for the real story behind my demise. Somewhere about 1964 Mr. Lewis Pottinger, of the Oasis, came to see me in my capacity as Minister administering the Tourist Bureau and told me of the dilemma in which he found himself. He and his family had built up the Oasis as a tourist attraction over a long period of time and they had reached the stage where his brother desired to withdraw. He was very concerned, because he found when he approached the Brisbane City Council that they were not anxious for him to sell; rather, they wished to buy it to retain this attraction for the city of Brisbane.

Incidentally, at a public function the Lord Mayor had asked me, again as Minister in charge of the Tourist Bureau, if I would discuss with the Treasurer the possibility of the city council's being able to buy the Oasis and so retain it for the city on the express condition that the cost be not regarded as part of his loan allocation. I duly reported the Lord Mayor's request to the Treasurer, who said that was not possible. I heard nothing further from Mr. Pottinger and presumed that his difficulties had been resolved.

In about November, 1965, Mr. Pottinger, through a friend, came to see me again and recounted to me that these difficulties still existed—even more so—because they had reached the stage where they had decided that they would close the Oasis, and he showed me a subdivisinal plan. I said, "Why do you wish to see me?" He said, "Well, we are having difficulty with the city council. We wish to subdivide the Oasis, but they are not anxious to give us permission to do this. They still insist on buying." I said, "Why don't you sell to them?" He said, "They are not offering us the real value of the property; we consider the figure is too low." I said, "There is nothing I can do at Government level because of the policy that

is laid down in regard to assistance to the tourist industry in competition in a developed area." I said to him, "You go back to the council and find out if they are prepared to increase the offer to the extent that you can accept. If not, let me know." He did this, and he let me know. I said, "I have nothing tangible in mind at this stage but it does occur to me, because of my own belief in the tourist industry and the asset that this place is to the city, that it should be possible to be able to get a group together with sufficient money to take over the asset, provided you will be one of the group." He said, "Yes"—that he was most interested.

To cut a long story short, I was able to do this. I gathered around me a group of eight people, and this property was bought by a company which is now known as The Oasis Pty. Ltd. The Oasis was taken over by this company about March last year, and it carried on in the same way as the Oasis had been carried on for a long period of time. The directors—I am not one of them—decided that they would enlarge the aspect of the Oasis which, for the information of those hon. members who have not been there, is basically a very lovely garden of about six acres with a fair coverage of the fauna and flora of this State. They have quite a substantial range of animals and bird life kept under excellent conditions. At a meeting round about April or May last year the directors decided that in view of the fact that the Oasis had koalas prior to the war, they would enlarge the attraction from the tourist point of view by putting in a few koalas. So one of my colleagues in this Chamber, who is one of the group—it is for him to state whether he is or not, not for me—with Mr. Pottinger approached the Minister for Primary Industries, indicating the interest of the Oasis in having koalas there as they did before the war. They were received courteously and advised to see Mr. Roff, the department's fauna officer. That was in June, 1966. On 15 June, 1966, they saw Mr. Roff, who outlined the department's requirements for the keeping of koalas. On 22 June, Mr. Roff visited the Oasis on invitation and approved wholeheartedly of the location of the suggested enclosure, which was created simply by changing one of the existing enclosures, and said that the specifications of the enclosure proposed were satisfactory. In July, the enclosure was built.

Around about this time I declared my interest to Mr. Row, having told him that the Oasis was virtually ready for the permit, when, to my horror and amazement, he said he was worried about it because John Herbert was opposed to it.

Mr. Walsh: Who is John Herbert?

Mr. DEWAR: The Minister for Labour and Tourism. On 21 July, 1966, Mr. Row wrote a letter in which he said, *inter alia*—

"John Herbert is strongly opposed to it and Mr. Robinson had an interview with me recently to explain his position. Quite frankly, after hearing both cases—"

I interpose by saying that he heard only one.

The letter continues—

"... I am sympathetically inclined towards Lone Pine having what could be regarded as a monopoly in the Brisbane area."

At this stage I should like to apologise to the Labour Party.

Mr. Walsh: This is unusual.

Mr. DEWAR: It is. I did not think the day would come when I would sit in a monopoly Government and be apologising to the Labour Party for its democratic views. During the years that Labour was in office there was not one, there were not two, but there were three places in this city that had koalas—Lone Pine, Mandalay, and the Oasis. But here, under the free-enterprise Government that I have supported for 17 years, I find a Liberal Minister—a free-enterprise Liberal Minister—opposing competition; a Government Minister stating that he believed in monopoly.

The important thing to bear in mind is that there was no thought in Mr. Row's mind of withholding this permit until Mr. Herbert, a free-enterprise Liberal, intervened.

Mr. Aikens: Did he give any reasons for opposing it?

Mr. DEWAR: I do not know. This matter came to Cabinet; I declared my interest, and then retired from the room.

Mr. Walsh: That is to your credit, anyhow.

Mr. DEWAR: Has the hon. member ever known me to be dishonest? That is a fair question.

Mr. Walsh: No.

Mr. DEWAR: In all, it was at Cabinet three times. In late September the Premier left for London and, prior to leaving, assured my colleague that the permit was to be issued.

In October—here comes the tear-jerker—an injured koala was found by a man travelling on the Nanango Road. Being a lover of animals, he picked the little animal up and brought it to his home in Brisbane, somewhere on the south side. When he got home he rang Lone Pine and was told that the proprietor had gone home to tea, and that if he rang a certain number in half an hour he would get him. This man rang the number half an hour later and found that there was no answer, or that the person he wanted was not at home. He decided to have his own evening meal and, before the time came to do something else about it, a constable of the Queensland Police Force called on him socially. He said to him, "I found a koala on the way home from Nanango. It is injured. What will I do with it? I have been trying to get Lone Pine without success." The police officer is a friend of Lew Pottinger and he said, "Lew Pottinger has been looking after animals for the last 40 years to my knowledge; I will take it down to him," which

he did. This was about 10 o'clock at night. The following morning Mr. Pottinger rang my colleague and told him about it.

Mr. Aikens: Who is your colleague?

Mr. DEWAR: The man who I said will declare himself if he wishes. My colleague told the Acting Premier; the Premier was then overseas. His reply was, "You are getting your permit in a few days; feed him and fatten him up, but don't advertise him."

Mr. Chalk: That was good advice.

Mr. DEWAR: It was very good advice, and in this regard my ex-colleague in the Liberal Party Cabinet has been very sound.

There followed a mass of circumstances that could only be encountered in a Gilbert and Sullivan comic opera. Gilbert and Sullivan would have made a great farce out of this story and, if it is necessary some day to tell the whole story, I can tell it. I am touching only on the salient points. These circumstances were caught up in the Premier's return. By some devious means, someone out at Lone Pine heard about the koala when visiting the place, and apparently reported it to the Department of Primary Industries.

Mr. Aikens: A bit of cloak-and-dagger work.

Mr. DEWAR: Exactly. The night of the long knives.

My colleague was told that, in view of these circumstances, there would be no permit for six months. This made a complete fool out of the Deputy Premier, who was Acting Premier at the time. But then of course this is not unusual. I am not saying this unkindly at all. The Minister for Transport, Mr. Knox, went to Longreach not so long ago and gave Government policy in respect to freights and drought relief. The Premier followed and virtually undermined Mr. Knox.

Mr. Walsh: Knox might have spoken out of place.

Mr. DEWAR: The Minister gave Government policy. The Treasurer, Mr. Chalk, made a pronouncement at Surfers Paradise on Government policy with regard to flood relief a month or six weeks ago, and the same thing happened.

By November or December the eight participants in this group—six of whom served overseas in the service of this country in the fight for democracy and freedom—completely and utterly disgusted with this whole sorry mess resolved to document the whole affair and seek legal advice, which they did. This resulted in the view that a writ of mandamus had a fair chance of succeeding in the Supreme Court. In fairness, and adopting my own attitude of loyalty, I communicated this to Mr. Chalk and gave him a copy of the document. I also told him that I felt so strongly about the sheer injustice and anti-Liberal attitude involved that I was prepared to resign from Cabinet on the issue. This was just before Christmas.

Mr. R. Jones: These are the "bear" facts.

Mr. DEWAR: These are the very fair facts. I am giving only the salient points, and they consist of only 10 per cent. of the whole story.

Mr. R. Jones: I said "bear".

Mr. DEWAR: No, a koala is not a bear.

On 25 May, 1967, after the request for my resignation, I asked the Premier for the first time, "What are you going to do about the koalas at the Oasis?" He replied, "The permit will be issued next week", and it was. So, at the Oasis, Sunnybank, are the most famous koalas in Australia. They cost a Cabinet Minister his portfolio. Four little koalas cost a Cabinet Minister his portfolio. At least that is the real reason behind the catalyst provided by the Minister for Labour and Tourism.

I do not regret the experience of my Cabinet life. It was rewarding in many ways. The frustration of being unable to convince colleagues of something I believed in was not easy to suffer, but the opportunity for positive thinking in departmental work was soul-satisfying. I look back with no small pleasure on the friendship and co-operation of men like Fletcher, Bjelke-Petersen, Richter, Tooth, and Knox, all dedicated men, totally incapable of an unkind act.

However, I am a non-conformist and an extrovert, so it was destined that I should often be out of step. This of course caused me no worry, for I am not a worrier. I have not worried for some 30 years, for a very good reason. I had the experience of being in communion with my God when this message from Philippians 3 came to me in my early 20's. It reads—

"Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before.

"I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

So facing adversity has never really bothered me. Of whom should I be afraid?

The story of the great King of Scotland, Robert Bruce, with the spider and its web, is well known. The history of the Dewar Coigerach tells that they were his standard bearers. He lost many a skirmish, but he won the big battle when he belted the pants off the English. That is probably what started us in the "belting" business! I have lost the skirmish, but I shall be here for about two years at least, and it will be for the people of Wavell who will decide that issue, and no-one else of lesser ilk. The Premier requested my retirement from his Cabinet, and in disgust I complied. I also, that day, retired from his Government. From now on I sit as a Liberal member of the Liberal Party, not as a member of the Country Party Government.

Mr. Walsh: There will be a few stones thrown now.

Mr. DEWAR: Let those here without sin throw the first stones I shall have no trouble dodging the rocks.

Of course, the brushes I had do not cover the whole story. I cannot honestly say that I was as "welcome as the flowers in May" when I was elected to Cabinet by one vote in 1962. Only Boko the blind horse could mistake the signs. I was more than three years in Cabinet before I acted for another Minister. Even on the occasion when the Country Party had a conference in some remote area of the State and all the six or seven portfolios held by Country Party Ministers were divided between the four or five Liberal Ministers, I was the only Liberal Minister who did not act for another Minister. One does not have to be a soothsayer to read that type of sign.

Ken Morris was the only Liberal leader we have ever had. He was a fighter, and was loyal to his colleagues. The fact that he was not given loyalty in return, and the frustration that he endured, caused his health to deteriorate considerably and he was virtually forced out. That seems to be a sure hazard; you cannot be a forceful Liberal and be acceptable in this Government.

I should like to tell briefly—I shall have another opportunity when the Bill to ratify the agreement is brought down before the end of October—of some of the backwash of the operations with which I was associated concerning the large fertiliser plant to be established here and thus illustrate the attitude that existed and in which I lived. It was about September, 1965, when the first approach was made by a group of people seeking information concerning the utilisation of our natural gas and the possibility of building a fertiliser complex in this city. The matter was very quickly referred to me and my department, and from then on officers of the Department of Industrial Development and I conducted all the negotiations.

These went along fairly well, and I personally was satisfied with the way in which the project was proceeding till about April last year, when I received a wire from Mr. Peterson, of Chemical Construction Company, from Hong Kong, enclosing a Press statement that he requested me to place with the local newspapers. This was done. For some time then there was a hiatus, and virtually nothing happened. During this period I had gentle nudges from my friends in the Press about inactivity, all of which were in some way or another seized upon by my colleagues, and, in the subtle way that innuendo has, I got the impression that they considered I had made a mess of things.

This went on till there was a rejuvenation of interest. It was not really a "rejuvenation" of interest, because interest had never fallen away; it was always there. Certain

things had to be ironed out—I am well aware of them but, because they are sacrosanct as far as I am concerned, I shall not divulge them—and there were delays. That does not mean I could make my colleagues understand why there were delays.

Shortly after Christmas the group began to come together again. Negotiations had been taking place over this whole period with the department and with the people who own the gas. At our level, we had ironed out every problem. We had made a deal on the land at Gibson Island, which I had had ratified by Cabinet; we had established very good relations with the Department of Harbours and Marine, the Brisbane City Council, and the various off-shoots that were concerned—the officer in charge of air pollution, and other people in similar positions—so everything was coming together beautifully.

In February of this year the groups came together, and ultimately negotiations reached the stage where the groups had spread. One of the senior personnel, who was still in Sydney, rang me and said he was greatly concerned that things were not going along terribly well at a level that had nothing to do with the department, and that unless a conference could be convened on the site of the main participants from an outside source who were to be partners in the gas, he was very fearful whether the negotiations would proceed as he knew I wanted them to proceed. He requested my presence at such a conference. I said it was not for me to decide that; he would have to wire the Premier. The wire eventually caught up with the Premier in Central Queensland. That was on a Thursday night, and the plan was for me to be in Dallas, Texas, on the following Tuesday, prior to final decisions being taken in Chicago on the following Saturday.

I was given permission to go—leave it at that—and I was instructed to be back within 14 days because the House was beginning its sittings on the following Tuesday week. There were a number of calls I could have made on firms over there with which we had been in conference and in which I thought there was a likelihood of some interest, and it would have been a good opportunity to see them; but I was prevented from doing that. I went to Dallas, and the negotiations took the rest of that week. I then went to Chicago and sat in on the final conference, returning to Queensland through Japan because I was anxious to look at the gas turbine set-up of the Mitsui Company at Ishikawajima, Harima. I had not seen a gas turbine and, as this was being discussed at State Electricity Commission level, I thought it was a good opportunity to see one, and I did so. I also saw a group with which the department had been in touch over the possible assembly of tractors in this State. I found that what we thought they wanted was not in fact what they wanted, so that was abortive.

I returned to Brisbane, got off the plane at about half past 8 after flying all night from Hongkong, had a shower and went straight to a Cabinet meeting. I thought the other Ministers had probably forgotten that I had not just been down to the Gold Coast for the week-end. I walked in and said, "Good morning". At some stage I said, "I am pretty tired. I would like to get home to sleep. I would like to give a run-down on what I have been doing. I have been away for 13 days." I did that. From then on the whole situation changed, because we saw Mr. Herbert Doan, of Dow Chemicals, and Mr. Ed. Swift, of Swift & Company, coming out and there were not enough band wagons for everyone to get on.

I merely tell this story to indicate that following my return the directors of the associated group who own the gas—unless they were telling me an untruth—wrote to the Premier and indicated to him their opinion of the worth of my presence and its value, and to this day that has not even been mentioned to me by the Premier. That is the sort of atmosphere that I cannot live in—an atmosphere of jealousy, I guess.

There has been a fair amount of success in industrial development, and that is the sort of atmosphere I have lived in. I will be frank and say that I do not feel unhappy about getting out of that atmosphere; I cannot live in an atmosphere I cannot respect, and I have no reason to respect this one.

I take some satisfaction in the knowledge that I was able to contribute something to this State. I think I helped lift its image. At least I promoted it as a State that was going places, and I had a fair amount of success. I take a great deal of satisfaction in the knowledge that the figures of the Government Statistician, issued about April, showed that in the last two years the output of secondary industry has been a great deal higher than that of primary industry in the State, while the proportion of manufacturing to the over-all production of Queensland has increased considerably on the 37.2 per cent. in the year we became the Government. Five years later, the year I came into the Cabinet, it was 43.9 per cent., an increase of 6.7 per cent., and during the four years that I have been in Cabinet—I think last year will be even better still—the increase in the secondary industry proportion of the State economy has been 5.7 per cent.

Mr. Walsh: A tribute to the workers of Queensland.

Mr. DEWAR: I pay no small tribute to all people in industry in Queensland. I claim to have no small knowledge of industry, because I grew up in it. Mr. Richter had a small engineering shop and Mr. Bjelke-Petersen has been interested in industrial activities of all types, but there is not one other man in the Cabinet who has had any experience in the employment of labour, who

has invested his own capital in creating employment, or who has worked in industry as a trade unionist.

Mr. Walsh: You will agree you have no experience in rural industry.

Mr. DEWAR: No, but I grow good lettuce and tomatoes.

I have some concern still with a number of things. I am concerned that I sold a story over four years and eight months to many people—a story of confidence in this State and this Government.

Mr. Bromley: Now they have sold you.

Mr. DEWAR: They have not sold me; they have sold the State.

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

Mr. DEWAR: I thank the hon. member for Clayfield, and the House for its indulgence.

I feel a great deal of concern about the case of one man who, after having decided he was finished with Queensland, did in fact bring in plant of quite a sizable nature. I am greatly concerned that this type of thing that has been evidenced in the last two or three months should now show itself after he has established his plant here.

Questions have been asked about Industrial Engineering Pty. Ltd. The history of this firm is that some four years ago—maybe less—a representative came to see me, and as a result of the enthusiastic story I sold the firm at that time they decided they would start in Queensland. In fact, they took over one of our buildings at Rocklea, and ultimately bought it for £40,000, if I remember rightly. This firm kept in touch with the department over a period of time until about a year or so ago when the managing director, with his board, came to see me at Parliament House. I spent an hour with them going through every activity that they engaged in, and part of the programme that they might bring to Queensland as a further expansion of a decentralised nature. I am anxious that these people to whom I told the story that this is a big State with big-thinking people should be aware that I am not so sure I was right when I told them these things.

Now that I am a free agent, in fact as well as in deed, it is my intention to do and say a lot of things in respect of this State and its activities—

Mr. Walsh: You had better get over here amongst the Independents.

Mr. DEWAR: That is virtually what I am, although I will never sell out the Liberal Party. I believe in Liberalism. As I said earlier, I am not suggesting I was as welcome as the flowers in May when I made Cabinet, because it was not unusual

to find me out of step as a back-bencher. One of the troubles when you get into Cabinet is that if you have a belief you are stuck with whatever the decision is. I am a non-conformist, and now I will be able to place these ideas before the House without being curtailed in any way.

Before I make any attempt to do even that, I want to point out something which, to me, borders on a situation that might even be termed criminal in the approach of this Government, and no doubt previous Governments, although I have not had time to go back to see whether this was the pattern prior to this Government.

I asked a question a week or two ago about the amount of money spent by the Main Roads Department on permanent works and maintenance of the roads of Queensland. The reply was that \$4,470,000 was spent in the City of Brisbane and \$265,470,000 in the country areas of the State, that is, 1½ per cent. and 98½ per cent. respectively. In addition, \$25,900,000 was spent on brigalow and beef roads. I am going to disregard that because obviously you could hardly spend money in the brigalow country in Queen Street—

Mr. Walsh: They are different funds.

Mr. DEWAR: Exactly. I will disregard that entirely and think only in terms of permanent works and maintenance of the Main Roads Department in the normal course of events.

This week the Minister for Main Roads gave me an answer which, stripped of its verbiage, meant that \$37,550,000 would be spent on stage 1 of the Wilbur Smith plan during the next five years. I take it that he was referring to this financial year and the next four. If we add \$37,550,000 to \$4,470,000 the total is \$42,020,000, which will be spent in the City of Brisbane over 15 years. Ignoring the expenditure on brigalow land and beef roads we find that last year, on the figures given to me by the Treasurer, \$37,660,727 was spent on public works and maintenance throughout the State. Using the figure for the last financial year and multiplying it by five for the next five years, we get \$188,300,000, but obviously, with escalation, the figure is more likely to be \$200,000,000 over the next five years. If we take out of that \$200,000,000 the \$37,550,000 for stage 1 of the Wilbur Smith plan, we are left with \$162,500,000 for the other areas of the State. When that is added to the figures for the last 10 years we get the result that over a 15-year period \$42,020,000 will be spent in the Brisbane area and \$427,970,000 in other areas of the State. In other words, less than 10 per cent. of the money will be spent in the area where 40 to 45 per cent. of the taxpayers reside. Surely the figure of 20 per cent. of such funds would be a little bit more just to all.

Mr. Aikens: Will you tell us why the Premier asked you to resign? That is what we are all waiting to hear.

Mr. DEWAR: He that hath eyes to see, let him see.

In no other State of Australia does the Government fail to accept responsibility to a very large degree, if not entirely, for the roads in the capital city. It is criminal to neglect the city roads and ignore the fact that problems occur here. Why was traffic-control responsibility alienated from the Government? I was one who opposed it. It was simply because in Brisbane the whole cost of traffic-flow improvements was borne by the Government whereas in other areas the Government merely provided materials. Despite the fleecing of Brisbane on roadwork expenditure, this little help to it was denied. I wonder why my innocuous episode is so reprehensible, when robbing the people of this city bears all the elements of respectability.

On one occasion I raised the matter of this inequity and I was told that the people of Brisbane also used country roads—a profound, statesmanlike remark, from which I assume that the country people never come to the city! Of what use is it to build reasonable highways some miles from the city if the city outlets still have the dimensions of the horse era? Consider, for instance, Gympie Road from Chermside to Landsborough, and then look at the other end, from Nambour to Landsborough, which has a beautiful highway where four-lane traffic is quite normal. Sandgate Road, from Virginia to Redcliffe, is a goat track, as are also some parts of the Pacific Highway in the Mt. Gravatt area. Certainly, today at Aspley we can see work being done, but it is all being done piecemeal, three-quarters of a mile out near the creek, and, back at the corner of Webster Road, about three-quarters of a mile of road. It is piecemeal work, simply moving the problem to another part of the road.

What is the use of building a double, four-lane highway at that portion of Webster Road if, as soon as travellers get across the Cabbage Tree Creek bridge, they have to revert to single-lane traffic? Of what use is it that a man, on leaving Nambour, can drive south on a magnificent highway for a few miles, or that he can drive from Noosa to Landsborough in comfort and safety when, until the new sections are opened, he has to travel from Landsborough to Burpengary in a single lane, and from Kallangur to the suburbs of Brisbane at a slow walk, almost parked on the highway? This is happening because of the myriad of bottle-necks in and around the city. It is a disgrace. A man travelling to Bribie has to suffer many disabilities. But if he is going to Nambour, once he gets to Landsborough he can drive in comfort. This whole programme is in reverse. The roads at the extremities of this city are in a shocking state.

Mr. Aikens: Why did you wait till you were tossed out to talk about this?

Mr. DEWAR: I will never spill Cabinet secrets. I raised these matters in a place where I was not able to make any progress. There have been plenty of problems with spilling Cabinet secrets. This is my private opinion.

I believe that it is a rather questionable practice to make promises and guarantees in policy speeches and then fail to carry them out. I refer to such matters as the Bill of Rights and a Public Service Board. I believe that the failure to face up to the road toll is deserving of the greatest censure. It is no good turning our backs on this problem and contending that it does not exist. To me that is not statesmanlike, nor is it honest. When I was Minister in charge of police I faced up to the problem of the road toll and put special cars on the road. The moment I was taken off that particular work the progress that had been made in this field was just allowed to go.

The failure to grasp the nettle and establish sane trading hours is another thing that has made me unhappy for a long period. I had the opportunity, and I am grateful for it, of looking at traffic problems and trading problems and things of that nature when I was overseas. I never missed a chance of looking into those matters. I see money being wasted in this State in installing a Rolls Royce type of traffic lights at intersections. In Japan and some other countries where a proper approach is made to these things, the minimum facilities are provided yet the effect is just the same. If anybody goes to James Street, on the outskirts of Toowoomba—it is over the Range and then to the left—he will see a traffic intersection with no fewer than 13 sets of lights.

I defy anyone to dispute that on main city thoroughfares in Japan there are no more than four sets of lights at any intersection; mostly there are two sets. They are not on the ground; they are the overhanging type. They are so designed that they can be seen two ways. The whole of the traffic in the centre of Tokyo is controlled by that type of system, which must cost a fraction of the elaborate over-done traffic-light system we install in Queensland.

I believe that this State has a great future in tourism. I was associated with that activity for a couple of years and managed to engender into the industry something that had previously been lacking. I got rid of the parochialism and brought people together. I convened the first tourist industry seminar in Queensland, and it was hailed by the industry as a forward move.

I believe in the possibilities of the tourist industry in this State. To be prating about those possibilities on the one hand, and then, on the other hand, turning round and refusing to face up to the responsibility of providing adequate trading hours begs the question. I

was walking along a street in Chicago one night at 10 o'clock, and to my amazement, through the windows at footpath level—in almost all buildings there the basements are used for commercial purposes—I saw a woman having her hair set. I commented on this to the person showing me round and he told me that trading hours were virtually in the hands of the people themselves. They themselves decide the hours during which they will trade; that seems to be the pattern.

Mr. Walsh: Do you think we should do that here?

Mr. DEWAR: I think we should be a little more realistic than we are. The present restrictive attitude to trading hours is not businesslike. You cannot talk, on the one hand, of freedom, and, on the other, lay down restrictions on business. I was in Sydney last Friday afternoon, and there I saw trading in the shopping centres till 5.30 p.m.

Mr. Walsh: You closed the banks on Saturday mornings.

Mr. DEWAR: I realise that there are "bugs" in these things, and unless someone has the stomach to face up to them there always will be. There has to be some approach to them. You cannot have, on the one hand, proper promotion of the tourist industry when, on the other, people who come here are deprived of the opportunity to do the things that they want to do and which they can do in their own country. You cannot have it one way and not the other.

The whole approach to this matter is sickening. Is it absolute honesty or is it gross misrepresentation to mouth democratic principles, and then in an electoral redistribution arrange things so that there is a minority Government? This is a Country Party Government, just as it is a Liberal Party Government in Canberra, Sydney, Melbourne and Perth. The responsible party must take responsibility for the things that are done. This is a Country Party Government; it has the support of 19½ per cent. of the people of the State. It is an agrarian dictatorship, and the only countries where primary pursuits are predominant have peasant economies.

I want to contribute all that I can to this State, and whatever I have to say in this Chamber from now on will be directed to what I believe is for the benefit of the people of Queensland. I believe this to be a State with a great future. It is a State that can go forward only if its horizons are broadened and matters of government are not approached with scales before the eyes.

In conclusion, I want to say that I expected more of the Premier and the Minister for Labour and Tourism. At least they should have learned the value of loyalty, as they both served in the Armed Forces of this country.

Hon. G. W. W. CHALK (Lockyer—Treasurer) (3.30 p.m.): It is 20 years since I entered this House, and I have sat in this Chamber on at least two previous occasions when I regretted something that happened. Perhaps some hon. members would disagree when I say that I regretted the incidents that occurred in this Chamber when the Labour Government fell. But it is true that on that evening we listened to bitterness thrown about among those who had previously been loyal friends, who had worked and striven together for the betterment of Queensland. The second occasion that I recall was not so long ago when, during the absence of the Premier, I was in charge of this House and an incident arose associated with a colleague and—I emphasise it again—a friend.

This afternoon, having listened to the speech of the hon. member for Wavell, I feel that I would be lacking in responsibility and unfaithful to the oath of office I have taken if I did not rise and refer to some of the things that have been said by him. All I can say is that the hon. member himself has chosen to promote this particular discussion, and if he believes, because of things that have occurred, that he is doing the right and just thing so far as he personally is concerned, and so far as those with whom he has associated for many years are concerned, then I say that he is entitled to reach that judgment, but such is his judgment—not mine.

I said that I regretted the two previous incidents. I regret this one, too. I have no prepared speech this afternoon. I came into this Chamber just before the hon. member rose to speak—I had been told that he was to speak this afternoon—but I must confess at no time did I consider that he would adopt such a line of address to this Chamber, or, more importantly, to the people of Queensland, as he has done.

It would be right to say that the speech of the hon. member can be divided into two parts, and then further subdivided. We heard the hon. member being given an extension of time. Usually an extension of time is granted for the purpose of enabling an hon. member to complete his speech associated with the remarks that have gone before. On this occasion, I think it is fair to say that the speech during the second, or extension, period was a separate speech—one dealing with matters associated principally with State, matters associated principally with the administration of certain Government departments. There was some insinuation in it that the Country Party, because of its majority within the Government, was securing some greater benefits for country areas of the State of Queensland than are provided for the metropolitan area.

May I say that the hon. member has been a member and a Cabinet Minister of the Government that he has criticised. At the appropriate time the Ministers concerned with the departments that have been criticised will have an opportunity to speak in support, or in explanation, of the administration of

their own departments and the carrying out—I emphasise “carrying out”—of distributions of money in the fulfilment of work approved not by them individually but by the Government itself. Therefore the responsibility for the allocation of funds is the responsibility of every colleague who sits on this side of the Chamber. I feel that I have said enough in relation to that portion of the hon. member's speech to indicate that it is the responsibility of the Government. No doubt, in due course an opportunity will be taken by my colleagues to reply on their own behalf.

I propose to deal now with the first portion of the hon. member's speech, which I think can be divided into three parts. If my memory serves me correctly, the first portion of his speech was a direct personal attack on one of my ministerial colleagues—a Minister who, until Mr. Dewar's resignation from the Cabinet, worked side by side with him.

Mr. Lloyd: Why isn't that Minister here?

Mr. CHALK: At the moment, the Minister is with a deputation that had previously been arranged. That can be checked. I have heard sarcastic remarks and laughter from the Opposition. May I say that I regard this—and the average member would—as a serious situation not only for the Government but for the State of Queensland. Insinuations have been made which, if they could be substantiated, would involve this State not only in what has happened in recent times but in other happenings. All I have indicated is that I have ascertained the location of the Minister concerned and have learned that a deputation involving a number of people is in progress. I hope that the deputation will conclude as quickly as possible, and I believe that the hon. gentleman will, in due course, avail himself of the opportunity to reply. However, I do not think it necessitates, at this moment, the breaking-up of that arranged deputation.

Mr. Lloyd: You said this matter was important to the State of Queensland. Do you think the deputation is as important?

Mr. CHALK: I am not going to debate this point with the hon. member for Kedron. I think the people of Queensland can be the judges in this. However, I will debate the matters that have been raised.

Mr. Aikens: The people want to know why Dewar had to resign.

Mr. CHALK: I am telling the story. This is my responsibility to my oath of office.

The hon. member's speech was divided into three parts. The first consisted of an attack on a ministerial colleague with certain innuendoes towards other Ministers, and I do not leave out of that the Premier and myself. The second portion of the speech related to incidents associated with koala bears. The third part contained some sort

of insinuation that something occurred during the hon. member's absence overseas during the period, when, on behalf of the Government, he was negotiating an agreement with Austral Pacific Fertiliser Company.

Mr. O'Donnell: Why are you making this speech, and not the Premier?

Mr. CHALK: I am the Leader of the Liberal Party. If the hon. member will just be patient I will reveal everything about this.

Mr. Bennett: I think you had better plead "Not guilty" and reserve your defence.

Mr. CHALK: I would not get the hon. member for South Brisbane to plead for me.

I hope the House will accord me the opportunity to set before it everything that I desire to relative to this matter.

Mr. Walsh: Why don't you tell us the whole story?

Mr. CHALK: I propose to.

The attack that has been made on the Minister for Labour and Tourism is something which, I say again, I regret. It is true that because of one or two little differences at times there has been a certain amount of, perhaps, uneasiness between two of my colleagues. That is not unusual. It applies in the Opposition; it applies in any human outlook. But that is not the issue. A charge has been made, and the opening words of the hon. member for Wavell were to the effect that when I spoke to him I said that Mr. Herbert requested action against him. I correct the hon. member by the omission of the last two words. It is true that action was requested by Mr. Herbert in a certain matter.

The House has been told that the Minister for Labour and Tourism was away for a period. On his return to his office certain charges were made to him by two female employees. The Minister was somewhat in doubt as to how the matter should be handled, and he came to me, as the Leader of the Liberal Party and Deputy Premier, and asked for my advice. I told him I would not be prepared to listen to charges of the nature that were made unless the persons concerned were prepared to repeat in my presence—so that there would be no doubt as to what was said—the occurrences that were alleged.

Shortly after that conversation with the Minister, two young ladies came to my office. I inquired of them as to what I had been told of certain happenings in the office during the previous weeks. I have in my possession notes which I took during that conversation. I did not know, or did not know previously, the two persons concerned. I have endeavoured, and I hope I always will be able, in the interests of these young ladies, their families and parents, to keep their names out of print.

Mr. Aikens: Provided their charges were factual.

Mr. CHALK: If the hon. member will just be patient, I will tell him the facts as I know them.

Mr. Bennett: In other words, did you condone a felony?

Mr. CHALK: The hon. member did not hear the speech of the hon. member for Wavell. He was not in the Chamber at the time.

Mr. Bennett: I heard most of it.

Mr. CHALK: I believe that, as a legal man, he would want the story told of these events. If that is the case, I think he should show more respect to this House if he wants the story told. If he desires to debate it, he will have his opportunity.

Mr. Bennett: I just wondered why it was not investigated.

Mr. CHALK: I will tell the hon. member about the investigation if he will only listen.

The two young ladies concerned repeated certain charges to me. They accused Mr. Dewar of kissing them, and of certain other actions. I recorded these happenings, but I was not prepared to accept their evidence alone. At the expense of quite some time to myself, I decided that the only way to ascertain whether these young ladies were telling the truth was to send for certain members of the staff of the department involved and question them on whether they had any knowledge of the happenings that I had been told had taken place in that office during previous weeks.

I interviewed three officers associated with the department. All told me stories which indicated to me that there was truth in the accusations. One of the officers drew me a plan showing his location and the location of the hon. member for Wavell and one young lady concerned when one of these acts took place. I have retained that drawing. Having done that, and having convinced myself that there was something that could cause the Government embarrassment, because it had been reported, I immediately informed the Premier of the happening. That is why I have risen this afternoon to reply to what has been said by the hon. member for Wavell.

Mr. Duggan: If what you have said is so—and I am not challenging that—why did you and the Premier say in your Press announcement that Mr. Dewar resigned for business reasons?

Mr. CHALK: As I say, the matter was reported to the Premier. In the meantime, I was interviewed by a parent of one of the girls. The story had broken completely in the office of the Department of Labour and Tourism. Because it had broken, and

because the father was extremely concerned—in fact, he indicated thoughts about taking a certain line of action—I requested him to give the Premier and me time to discuss the charges with the hon. member for Wavell.

This afternoon the hon. member repeated some of the statements that I made. I do not deny any of those statements because I believe they are a fair version of what took place in various conversations. I have no notes of the conversation between Mr. Dewar, the Premier, and myself on the morning following the reporting of this incident, but I am prepared to rely on my memory to the same extent as the hon. member for Wavell.

I shall tell this House that when he was confronted with the charge of kissing these young ladies, the hon. member for Wavell admitted that he had done so. He indicated to the Premier and me that such happenings were acts of stupidity—and I repeat the word he used, “stupidity”—because of his personal make-up. We all have our own peculiarities in normal life. He said that it had been an act of endearment. This was the attitude of the hon. member.

Further opportunity was taken by me to discuss the happening with the father of one of the girls. It was a question of whether some action would be taken by the parent or whether it could be settled without the good name not only of the girls concerned, but also of the hon. member, being hurt.

Mr. Hanlon: Did the hon. member invite the laying of a charge?

Mr. CHALK: I ask the hon. member for Baroona to be patient. I am trying to tell the story as I know it.

After I had discussed the matter with the parent, he indicated to me that it was a matter that he felt the Government could perhaps settle without any disgrace—I use that word advisedly—to anyone.

The Premier later indicated to the hon. member for Wavell the nature of the discussion with the parent, and because of that it was felt by both the Premier and myself that, in view of all the circumstances, possibly the hon. member would have to vacate his portfolio, the reason being that this was common knowledge within certain sections of the Public Service, and in the name of good government it was felt that someone who had this charge laid against him should not be in charge of his present or any other department.

Mr. Hanlon: Did the hon. member for Wavell invite the laying of a charge, and did he say he would defend it?

Mr. Dewar: Yes, I did.

Mr. Bennett: That was his right as a citizen.

Mr. CHALK: The hon. member for Wavell has interjected in relation to that.

The hon. member for Wavell indicated to the Premier and me that he thought it would be best if he resigned. I stake my honesty against his on this occasion. When he indicated that he was prepared to resign, discussion took place as to when this would take place. Because of his handling of the Austral Pacific dealings, it was felt that an opportunity should be given to him to complete those transactions.

Mr. Dewar: Nobody else could have done it.

Mr. CHALK: I do not deny that, and I believe that so far I have been honest in everything I have said.

These happenings took place on a Thursday afternoon and a Friday morning, and on the following Monday the hon. member for Wavell, in keeping with the undertaking that he had given to the Premier and me, tendered his resignation as a Minister and also a written resignation to me as Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Bromley: He didn't resign from the Liberal Party.

Mr. CHALK: I want to add just one thing in relation to that; I had proposed doing it in any case, so the interjection has not assisted me in any way. When these events happened, I discussed with the hon. member for Wavell all the problems that would confront him, his family and the Government. I indicated to him, as he has said, that I believed that in some cases there could have been some exaggeration. I do not deny that, because anyone who has been in public life knows only too well that a rolling stone gathers a heck of a lot of moss.

Mr. Dewar: You said it was magnified out of all proportion.

Mr. CHALK: I believe that, and I am not denying it. By the time this matter had reached that stage, it had grown beyond all proportion. It is true, as the hon. member said, that references were being made within our own ranks to the koala bears and the vendetta between the two Ministers concerned over the issuing of a permit. Still I shall let the people of Queensland be the judges of whether the action taken by the Premier and by me was the fairest to all concerned.

This matter was handled in the belief, firstly, that protection would be provided against any possible future recurrence, and, secondly, that the good name of the girls concerned should be protected.

Mr. Dewar tendered his resignation. An announcement was made in due course, and the Premier and I prepared statements thanking the hon. member for the part he had played in the development of Queensland. I repeat that this afternoon.

Mr. Lloyd: With tongue in cheek.

Mr. CHALK: It is not said with tongue in cheek. I know the sincerity of purpose of the hon. member in his actual official activities. On the other hand, there is a responsibility on all public citizens, particularly those who have taken oaths of office as Ministers of the Crown. When the hon. member finally departed from my office, I shook hands with him and asked him that, before ever he decided to leave the party to which he had given allegiance for so long, he would come and see me. I believed that was the responsibility of a good leader.

The difficulty that has arisen this afternoon has also been engendered by matters associated with the request for a permit for the keeping of koala bears at the Oasis.

Mr. Duggan: With respect, I still do not think you have answered my earlier interjection. You have indicated now that the sole reason for your acceptance and the Premier's acceptance was the alleged involvement of the hon. member with two females; but both you and the Premier were parties to the release of a statement to the effect that the hon. member's resignation was for business reasons.

Mr. CHALK: The hon. member for Toowoomba West is, I believe, an experienced politician. What we said was that that was the reason given by Mr. Dewar for his resignation.

Mr. Bennett: Oh, no, you didn't!

Mr. CHALK: We are not quibbling over this.

Mr. Bennett: Yes, you are.

Mr. CHALK: We accepted the nature of the resignation as it was presented by the hon. member, not the word of any typist or anybody else. The hon. member in his own time—whether at his office or at his home I do not know—wrote his resignation in his own handwriting and signed it.

Mr. Hanlon: The hon. member for Fassifern wrote a resignation, too. It is the second time up; that is the trouble.

Mr. CHALK: I know that the Opposition would like to capitalise on the Government's position when a set of unfortunate circumstances arises in relation to any hon. member. But as long as I am here I shall be prepared to protect and speak openly in support of any hon. member when I see that there are difficulties confronting him. I have shown that on previous occasions. If the hon. member for Toowoomba West is sincere, he will admit that I did not put the boot in when he had his problems.

Mr. Hanlon: He stated his problems.

Mr. CHALK: That is correct.

Mr. Duggan: I think you will acknowledge that I thanked you publicly.

Mr. CHALK: Yes, the hon. member did. There is no argument between myself and the hon. member for Toowoomba West. I am dealing now with the Opposition's endeavour to make some political capital out of what has happened on this occasion.

As I pointed out, there were problems associated with the issue of a permit relative to three or four koala bears. Again the incident has been magnified considerably. Before the Country-Liberal Government came to office, a policy had been laid down relating to the keeping of native bears in captivity. Because one organisation at Lone Pine had native bears in captivity and had built up a very large tourist business—the hon. member for Wavell referred to it as a monopoly, and I do not deny that what he said is correct—naturally its representatives went to the Minister for Labour and Tourism and endeavoured to point out what would happen if koala bears were allowed to be kept in captivity at this spot and that spot in the metropolitan area. Whether or not the argument that organisation put forward was sound is not the point. The point made by the Minister for Labour and Tourism was that he believed that, in the interests of tourism, it would be better if that monopoly continued. That was the basis of the argument.

I was involved in the matter to some degree, because, as the hon. member for Wavell said, he furnished me, his Leader, with some of the letters that were written. I did speak to the Minister for Primary Industries about the matter, and I also spoke to the Premier about it. It is true that, after discussions at Cabinet level, it was decided that we should break down the monopoly and issue a permit.

I wish to add just a little more to what has already been said about the matter. It is true that we decided at the beginning of a certain month that a permit would be issued, possibly against the feelings of some members of Cabinet. Mr. Dewar has very rightly said that a few days before this it was reported to him that a bear was in the possession of the very people who had applied for this permit. When I was told about it I said, "For heaven's sake, if you do anything in relation to this you can be prosecuted," and the words used were, "Take him away, feed him and fatten him up, but don't show him." That would be the advice of anybody placed in the same position—with four days to go, the koala bear all ready, and no permit.

I know that a report was lodged by persons whose interests were opposed to the koala being at the Oasis, and naturally the Department of Primary Industries had to send a person out to the Oasis. But the bear was not there; the message got there first. It is true that the bear was shown. A statement was made by a person who was sent out there, no doubt as a spy

on behalf of those concerned, and who saw the bear. A girl was asked where the bear was and she said, "Oh, it is around there." The person came back and reported to that effect.

This shows the whole stupidity of the animosity that has arisen simply because of a koala bear. I believe that the Premier did the right thing. When it was reported to him that a bear had been seen there, the Premier said, "Well, if that is the case the law has been broken. I believe we should defer consideration of this matter for at least a period."

Mr. Dewar: The moral is, "Never leave your 'bear' behind."

Mr. CHALK: All I want to say is that I approached this whole issue this afternoon in an extremely serious manner, and I believe that the Government has now given its reply to the charges made by the hon. member for Wavell. I believe we have told the people of Queensland the full background of what has occurred and what brought the hon. member for Wavell to his feet. I hope that, within the Government, we can continue to have loyalty and trust in one another. The hon. member for Wavell took an oath of office as a Cabinet Minister but he did say a few things this afternoon that came to his knowledge as a result of his holding that position. That is something we all regret. The action taken by the Government on something that was started by the hon. member for Wavell was for the protection of the good name of the girls to whom I have referred and of the hon. member himself. I trust that the incident is now closed.

Mr. THACKERAY (Rockhampton North) (4.10 p.m.): We can read in "Hansard" about the break-up of the Australian Labour Party Government in the past. As we listened to the debate this afternoon we could see the wide cracks that are developing in this coalition Government. After 10 years of government the coalition seem to be fashioning their break-up on the story of the four teddy-bears and Goldilocks. As the story unfolds we see the mother bear in the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat. The father bear is the Premier and the roles of the two baby bears are played by the hon. member for Wavell and the hon. member for Yeronga. Goldilocks is represented by the Minister for Labour and Tourism.

Mr. LEE: I rise to a point of order. I wish to make it clear to the House that I have no shares or any interest whatever in the Oasis.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Rockhampton North will accept the denial of the hon. member.

Mr. THACKERAY: I accept his denial.

I wish to associate myself and the electors of Rockhampton North with the expressions of loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen.

Today I wish to raise several matters concerning Rockhampton. First of all, I want to tell the hon. member for Rockhampton South that if the picture of Rockhampton as outlined by him in his speech was a correct one, I would be the first to congratulate him. My earnest desire is to see Rockhampton as a city of rapidly increasing population with prosperous, developing industries. The hon. member said—

"The industrial upsurge in Gladstone and Rockhampton and the mineral development at places such as Moura, Blackwater, and Marlborough, are writing exciting pages in Queensland's history books."

Unfortunately, the position in Rockhampton is not as stated by the hon. member for Rockhampton South. I wish he would speak facts rather than his customary untruths.

The real truth is that over the period we have had a Country-Liberal Government, Rockhampton has had the lowest increase in population of any provincial city in Queensland. Of the four major provincial cities, the highest population increase has been in Townsville. Between the 1961 census and the 1966 census Townsville's population increased by 16.8 per cent. The next highest increase was attained by Ipswich, with 12 per cent. Ipswich was followed by Toowoomba, with an increase of 11.57 per cent. Rockhampton was last, with an increase in population of only 5.83 per cent. How can the hon. member for Rockhampton South suggest that we are having a great industrial upsurge in Rockhampton and that we are writing exciting pages in Queensland's history book when we have the lowest increase in population of any provincial city in the State?

Let us look at the present position. Yesterday I asked a question of the Minister for Transport concerning the Rockhampton railway workshops employees. As at 1 July, 1966, 918 employees were employed at the Rockhampton railway workshops. In 1967, exactly 12 months later, only 801 were employed, a decrease of 117. The railway unions are very upset and alarmed at the position. They have called on the Premier, the Minister for Transport and the Treasurer on many occasions—sometimes they have been refused interviews—in an effort to overcome the retrenchments in the Railway Department, not only at Rockhampton but at other centres in Queensland.

Whilst talking about employees at the workshops, I will also refer to apprentices.

Mr. Davies: The hon. member for Rockhampton South will be interested to hear this.

Mr. THACKERAY: No, he will not. So far as he is concerned, exciting pages have been written in the history book—exciting pages of redundancy.

In 1964, over 50 apprentices were indentured at the Rockhampton railway workshops, but that number has now been reduced to 14.

Mr. Donald: Where will we get our tradesmen?

Mr. THACKERAY: That is the position. That is exactly what is happening in the workshops, which is looked to as a training ground for our youths.

We now have an additional meatworks at Rockhampton. I agree that that is so, and that men are employed there. However, I checked the figures with the district secretary of the A.M.I.E.U., who told me that there are 200 fewer employees on the books now, with two meatworks operating, than when only one was operating. That is the result of automation.

The hon. member for Rockhampton South said there was virtually no unemployment in Rockhampton; he said that only 200 people were unemployed.

Mr. Pilbeam: I did not say that. The Commonwealth Statistician printed those figures.

Mr. THACKERAY: The hon. member said that in his speech. I am quoting from it. If he wants me to quote exactly what he said, I will do so.

This is what the hon. member said—

"For the last two years the unemployment figure in Rockhampton has been down to less than 200. We had the lowest unemployment figure in the State, despite the fact that, because there are more jobs in Rockhampton than ever before, there are more married women working and more people with two jobs." We still have 200 people unemployed. Isn't the hon. member worried about them?

Mr. Pilbeam: According to the Commonwealth Statistician's figures, 200 people are unemployed.

Mr. THACKERAY: I am not denying that, but you are saying that there is no worry about unemployment.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Will the hon. member please address the Chair.

Mr. THACKERAY: Yes. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

While dealing with unemployment in Rockhampton, I will refer to the mushroom growth outside Rockhampton.

Mr. Smith: When did they start that industry?

Mr. THACKERAY: When the hon. member for Windsor was in the chair as Deputy Speaker an hon. member said to me, "We will have reserved decisions now, because we have a judge advocate in the chair."

Many Rockhampton men are working at Blackwater, Moura and Gladstone. They have had to leave Rockhampton to get work.

Let me say this about the exciting pages of the history book written in Rockhampton; from our State high schools and our private schools, at the end of this year we will have 750 boys and girls on the street looking for work. They are boys and girls of Junior, Sub-Senior, and Senior standard.

In reply to the remarks of the hon. member for Rockhampton South relative to the exciting history written about Rockhampton, I point out that there are more empty shops in East Street than there are in Townsville, Toowoomba, or Ipswich. That is what is happening in Central Queensland. I believe there should be a sound policy of development for Central Queensland and the Capricornia Regional Electricity Board.

Because the hon. member for Rockhampton South referred to high wages, I shall record in "Hansard" that male workers in Central Queensland are the lowest paid in the State. In 1965-66 the wages of male factory workers averaged \$2,782 in Brisbane, \$2,210 in South-east Queensland, and \$2,179 in Central Queensland.

We must have a planned approach to development. At present the Liberal Party and the Country Party have no planned approach to northern development. It will be interesting to hear the Federal Liberal candidate for Capricornia put forward his ideas on northern development. At present the A.L.P. is the only party, after nearly 70 years of Federation, with a policy on northern development, and that takes in the Burnett, Fitzroy, and Burdekin areas. In case the hon. member for Rockhampton South does not believe that, I quote from "The (Rockhampton) Morning Bulletin" dated Friday, 11 August—

"A.L.P. Policy on the North"

Mr. Pilbeam: Does it say it is its only policy?

Mr. THACKERAY: This is what it says—

"Only the politically purblind in Central Queensland can fail to see the sense in the newly-announced Australian Labour Party policy on Northern Development, for it contains much that all political interests throughout the region have been seeking for many years. The proposed programme was announced by the member for Dawson (Dr. Patterson) and is clearly his brainchild. For his work and his advocacy he deserves the fullest praise.

"The basis of the A.L.P. policy is the retention of the Snowy Mountains Authority for investigation, design and construction of power and water projects. This has been sought from the Federal Government, with increasing urgency by Queensland's State Government. It has not got very far, and the Authority's disbandment, as a construction group, has already been foreshadowed.

"A.L.P. policy envisages the use of the Snowy Authority in the development of river systems in the Fitzroy, Burnett, Pioneer and Herbert systems, and for the steady development of other water resources in the State's pastoral areas.

"It also lays great stress on the need for urgent supplementary programmes to give Central and Northern regions of Queensland the chance to attract industry, and touches on a tentative scheme of taxation relief to offer industry further financial reasons for breaking out into the provinces.

"This is, of course, a policy by a party not in power, and must be viewed in that light. It is nevertheless thoroughly welcome, since it is the most solid support Northern development has yet been given by any party, in power or out of it.

"It is bound to spur the Government into going at least part of the way towards matching it, for such a clear-cut Northern development policy cannot be ignored. To do so would be to court disaster in this region.

"Before this, there had been no real policy issuing from Canberra relating to balanced development of the Australian tropics. The recommendations of the Stanford Report, on the total development of Australia, had been largely ignored, and so far as Central and Northern Queensland were concerned, development was a matter of unrelated, piecemeal hand-outs.

"The A.L.P. now has a proper policy; the first one put out by any party in nearly 70 years since Federation. Is it asking too much for the Government to see that such a policy is needed, and to do something about formulating one?"

That is an editorial in "The Morning Bulletin" stating that the A.L.P. is the only party with a policy for northern development. In spite of that, the Federal Liberal candidate for Capricornia and the Liberal member for Rockhampton South in this House say, "We have had a policy all the time." That editorial makes it clear cut that the Liberals have never had a policy since they have been in Government. How can the Liberal candidate for Capricornia go out and say, "I support all of those things," when his party does not believe in them and has no policy on them? How can they hoodwink the people like that? That is the thing that will kill them; that is the rock they will perish on.

I have also raised in this House the subject of electricity charges imposed by the Capricornia Regional Electricity Board in Rockhampton. I want to know why the charges for private consumers, based on 250 units, are higher than the charges made by the boards at Cairns, Townsville, Mackay, and Maryborough. I have been given the old tale by the Minister for Industrial Development. He told me that one reason was the

accelerated programme to cater for an unprecedented loan growth, the effects of a long drought in Central Queensland, and the difficulties that have arisen in connection with the construction and operation of the Callide Power House.

There have been many editorials in "The Morning Bulletin" on this matter. I say quite openly that I support most of them. The hon. member for Rockhampton South should support me when I say that the Government should do something about a second power-house for Central Queensland. It should be a form of development planned by the State and subsidised by the Government.

An editorial in "The Morning Bulletin" of Thursday, 27 July, 1967, reads—

"The Price of Power

"So Rockhampton won't be going back to candles and oil lamps after all—a gas turbine generator will be built to take up the burden of power supply at peak periods. Everything is fine, then. Or is it?

.....

"We ask! Why delay in any case? The need for another power station is already apparent. To seize on the installation of a minor gas turbine as an excuse for postponing even the planning stages of a new station is playing with the future of Central Queensland. And we are tired of being played with.

.....

"Within three years, Rockhampton will have in abundance one of industry's primary requisites—cheap water. Match this with cheap power and there will be no end to development. Make power dear, and hard to get, and industry will steer clear."

That editorial is very factual.

Recently a 10 per cent. increase in tariffs has been imposed by C.R.E.B. I wish to know whether that increase is to be borne mainly by the private consumers or whether it applies also to the heavy industries to which power is being supplied. Has an agreement been reached between C.R.E.B. and those industries?

Whilst I am dealing with electricity and its price, I stress the urgent need for another power station in Central Queensland. Only 12 months ago this area lost from Gladstone the second stage of the alumina plant because C.R.E.B. either did not have the generating capacity to provide Queensland Alumina with the amount of power required or could not supply it at an economic rate. That second stage, of course, is the conversion of alumina to aluminium.

I am asking the Government to say straight out what it intends to do. Firstly, I want to know what increased costs consumers will have to meet as a result of the installation of the gas turbine at the power-house to offset peak loads. Mr. Neil Smith

said, according to a report that appeared in "The Morning Bulletin," that there is adequate power for the foreseeable future with the present power-house and the new gas turbine. I should like to know what he meant by the "foreseeable future".

The Minister has given me reports relative to the power-house at Callide. I should like to know whether the Callide Power House is situated in the right place and also whether the Callide Dam is situated in the right place. Admittedly, there has been a drought for eight years; but there have been good rains recently and the dam is still dry. It seems to be a cement monument as far as the C.R.E.B. is concerned.

Mr. Richter: What do you suggest we do about it?

Mr. THACKERAY: I want to know whether the Government says it is or is not situated in the correct place.

Mr. Richter: It is

Mr. THACKERAY: I want to know when the Government intends to get off its backside and do something about a second power-station for Central Queensland so that we can at least curtail the decline in the population of Rockhampton. It is not progressing as other provincial cities are.

I shall deal now with a racket that is being foisted on the housewives of Queensland in the sale of broiler chickens. Let me tell hon. members first that the Government of Tasmania intends to introduce legislation covering the water content and legs and necks of broiler chickens. Investigations into this racket have been carried out in Tasmania, and it has been found that there is a waste of up to 17 per cent. in broiler chickens. That is why the Government proposes to introduce legislation in that State.

I know that you, Mr. Speaker, like a bit of broiler chicken now and again, so I think you will be interested in the figures that I have taken out. They are the latest figures available in the Parliamentary Library, and they show that in 1960, 1,000,000 broiler chickens were slaughtered in poultry abattoirs in Queensland, and that in 1964-65, 8,000,000 were slaughtered—an increase from 1,000,000 to 8,000,000 in four years. Taking the average frozen weight of a broiler chicken as 2½ lb.—I am being very conservative—it means that the 8,000,000 broiler chickens slaughtered in this State in 1964-65 would have weighed 20,000,000 lb.

Taking into consideration not the 17 per cent. waste that was found in Tasmania, and in regard to which that State is introducing legislation—I wish the Minister for Primary Industries was here to hear this—let us assume that the legs, neck and frozen-water content amounted to 10 per cent. of the total weight. Ten per cent. of 20,000,000 lb. amounts to 2,000,000 lb. of waste for which the public are paying. On that basis of

2,000,000 lb. of waste and working on an average price for chickens of 40c a lb., the housewives of Queensland have been "touched" for over \$800,000 in being forced to buy legs, necks, and frozen water.

That is the racket that is operating in this industry today, and something should be done about it. If this Government was sincere it would introduce legislation to curtail this racket, which is operating at the present time.

Last year I raised in this House a matter which, in my opinion, is of vital importance, and in relation to which I think the file, if it was available from the Treasurer or the Minister in charge of police, could be marked "Killed in action". In my opinion the matter was killed by one or the other of those snipers, and I make that statement quite openly.

The matter I refer to relates to the benevolent asylum at Rockhampton. At the outset, let me make it quite clear that I am not drawing any inferences against the president, Mrs. Collins, or the secretary, Mrs. Mills, or any member of the committee, but I will make allegations—and substantiate them this time—and ask the Government what it intends to do about the matter.

Recently I telephoned the secretary of the benevolent home asking her if I could come and inspect the books to see if they were correct. She said, "Yes, it is all right to come out." I do not know whether or not the decision of the committee was unanimous.

Mr. Carey: Are you an accountant?

Mr. THACKERAY: Let me say to the hon. member who interjected that he would not be able to count the hairs on his top lip if he stood before the mirror for 24 hours of the day.

I wish to make allegations concerning the conduct of a former secretary of the benevolent home in Rockhampton, and also another person whose name I do not know, but whom we might call Mr. or Mrs. X.

I went to the benevolent home and inspected the books, and I was given certain information. In August, 1963, when the former secretary was there, the benevolent home committee received a letter from the Department of Health giving certain advice about the way the books should be kept. I think this was during the late Dr. Noble's term of office. The secretary replied, stating that the committee would accede to the request of the department and open a trust account, which is the normal procedure for any Government department when handling trust funds. Two signatures were required to operate the account—those of the secretary and Mr. or Mrs. X. The trust account was duly opened at a certain bank in Rockhampton, but it had only been opened for three weeks when they "knocked the willy off it". They opened and closed it within that time.

I do not make this accusation against only one person. One does not have to be a Rhodes scholar to know that two signatures are required to operate a trust account. The second person is just as guilty as the one who has been "touching" these age pensioners' funds for years.

Before I go any further, I draw attention to an editorial in "The Morning Bulletin" headed "Support for City Benevolent Home". Having had a good look at the present old building, I realise that we need a new benevolent home in Rockhampton. However, this is the crux of the argument—this is why I am raising this matter today and this is why I am going to charge two Ministers with being in cahoots with the hon. member for Rockhampton South.

Mr. PILBEAM: I rise to a point of order. I must take exception to that remark and ask that it be withdrawn. At the time of this incident I had nothing to do with the benevolent home at all. My only association with the benevolent home has been an appeal to raise money for its rebuilding. I take strong exception to the remark of the hon. member, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Rae): Order! The hon. member for Rockhampton North heard the hon. member for Rockhampton South.

Mr. THACKERAY: In deference to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will withdraw the remark.

I will now deal with the editorial in "The Morning Bulletin". This is why I am on my feet and doing something about the matter. The hon. member for Rockhampton South knows more about it than he is prepared to admit.

Mr. PILBEAM: I rise to a point of order. I will not be maligned by this individual. I have had nothing to do with the benevolent home in any shape or form. All I have done is to make an appeal to raise money for rebuilding. I have had nothing to do with its administration. Those remarks are offensive to me, and I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr. THACKERAY: Tell him to withdraw "individual", and I will most likely withdraw some other statement. If he is prepared to do that, all right.

Mr. PILBEAM: I ask him to withdraw that offensive remark.

Mr. THACKERAY: I will not withdraw until you withdraw "individual"—you mug!

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Rae): Order! I ask the hon. member for Rockhampton North to withdraw the remark. It is offensive to the hon. member for Rockhampton South.

Mr. THACKERAY: I do so, but at the same time ask him to withdraw his remark "individual".

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I did not hear the remark.

Mr. Bennett: I heard it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Rockhampton South has withdrawn the remark.

Mr. THACKERAY: I thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I will now quote from the editorial that appeared in "The Morning Bulletin"—

"Every society has a real and deep duty to its older members, particularly to those who can no longer take care fully of themselves. The efforts of these old people contributed in considerable measure to the society we know today, and everything that can possibly be done for them should be done, as a mark of gratitude, of justice, of recognition and of charity."

I would like to lay charges against the former secretary of the benevolent home at Rockhampton. She should be prosecuted at law. A letter was forwarded from this woman to a pensioner 80 years of age admitting that she "touched" trust moneys. She gave him a post-dated cheque and it bounced. The letter was received in March of this year.

Is it any wonder that I rise to fight for these people when the editorial I have quoted says we want justice for these old people. I will mention something else that this woman did. She made out receipts and falsified the amounts. I looked at the receipts and saw what she had done. After I spoke on this subject in the House last year, she very quickly rushed in and made three deposits in one person's name.

Mr. Murray: What did you do about it?

Mr. THACKERAY: I raised the matter in Parliament last year and one member of this House, the hon. member for Rockhampton South—

Mr. PILBEAM: I rise to a point of order. I insist that the hon. member for Rockhampton North shall not associate my name with what happened at the benevolent home before I had anything to do with it. This aged person has a right of action against the former secretary if she cares to proceed with it. That has been indicated to her if she is prepared to press the charge.

Mr. THACKERAY: What about my time limit, Mr. Deputy Speaker?

Last year I said the books were in the hands of the C.I.B., but they turned up in the benevolent home. The receipts were altered; everything was touched up. What happened? I reckon I know what happened; the screws were put on from a political angle by the Treasurer or the Minister for Education, and the books were returned. That is why no action was taken. The Government

is condoning the "touching" of aged people's money. That is what happened; the hon. member for Rockhampton South or the Minister for Education took action.

Mr. PILBEAM: I rise to a point of order. The books were put in the hands of the police without any strings attached. The police decide whether any action shall be taken. Their hands were not tied by me or any other member of the Government. I ask for a withdrawal of that remark.

Mr. MURRAY: I rise to a point of order. I object strongly to the implication of the hon. member opposite who is submitting that the Treasurer and the Minister for Education were involved in some shady covering-up of books. I object strongly to that remark, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. CHALK: I rise to a point of order. I do not know anything of the matter that the hon. member is referring to. It is beyond any knowledge of mine so, as far as I am concerned, I have had nothing to do with it.

Mr. THACKERAY: It is very convenient to be forgetful when the plain facts are stated. That is exactly what happened in this case.

An Opposition Member: Do you think you will receive any subsequent explanation as we had earlier today?

Mr. THACKERAY: No.

(Time expired).

Mr. TOMKINS (Roma) (4.50 p.m.): Mr. Speaker—

Government Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. TOMKINS: I am afraid that I cannot conduct myself in this Chamber either in the manner adopted by the last speaker or in the way things happened earlier today. I do not know why I picked today to make my maiden speech.

As the new member in this Assembly for the electoral district of Roma, I desire to reaffirm my loyalty, and that of the people of the electorate of Roma, to Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, who was so ably represented at the opening of this session of Parliament by our Governor, Sir Alan Mansfield. It is very pleasing to me indeed that we have a Queenslander as Her Majesty's representative. His Excellency can be congratulated on the distinguished manner in which he has carried out his duties.

To all hon. members on this side of the Chamber I say, "Thank you for the way you welcomed me to this House. I appreciate your good wishes very much and I shall do all I can to play my part in the betterment of Queensland." To those members on the other side of the House who seemed to wish me well but did not seem to want me to stay here very long, I say that I cannot follow their reasoning. I have always been told that

by-elections notoriously go against the Government, that all the ills of the Government come out and descend upon the Government candidate, and that's it. We saw that happen in the recent Corio by-election. Fortunately, in my case, no such catastrophe occurred. I found that I was particularly well supported in the campaign by all Country Party Ministers and various private members. We presented, I think, a good campaign, and we got through. I believe that my election is perhaps more a victory for the Government than for me.

Despite what has happened here today, I feel quite sure that the Government will continue in office for many years to come. I believe that the policies we stand for are the ones that the great majority of our people support. The one sad thing I can say about being in this position today is that I am perhaps the last recruit of the Parliamentary Country Party in Queensland under the leadership of the present Premier. His leadership and the way he conducts himself certainly encouraged me to enter this fray, and I am very happy that in the contest I did not let him down. I feel that my position is unique in that I am probably his last successful recruit.

I take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the former member for Roma, the late W. M. Ewan. He represented the electorate of Roma from 1950 to 1953 and from 1957 till his death in March, 1967, a total period of 13 years. There is no doubt in my mind that Bill Ewan gave of his best in the interests of the people he represented, and during those 13 years he had some very tough problems to handle. Perhaps his toughest problem was the negotiations between the Roma Abattoir Co-operative Association Ltd., Roma Meat Works Limited, and the State Government, for the building of the abattoir at Roma. Those negotiations resulted in killing being commenced at the works in 1959. The works have been of untold benefit to the district and I believe that the late hon. member was one of the strong supporters who got it going.

In addition, in the Roma electorate he was responsible for the new Olympic swimming pool at Miles, the Taroom hospital, the Injune hospital, the State Government offices in Roma, housing for the staffs of the Department of Lands and the Department of Primary Industries, and the new Roma high school with its beautiful oval, about which I shall say more later. Wherever I went during the by-election campaign people in all walks of life said the same thing about Bill Ewan, namely, no matter what their political beliefs were, he would work for them. He was certainly a hard-working man, and I should like to think that I can follow in his footsteps and that people will eventually think the same of me.

I feel that I should also say, "Thank you very much for all that you did" to the hon. member for Condamine, who looked after the electorate of Roma for three months.

The people there thought a lot of his representations. He treated the electors as though they were his own, and was always readily available when his advice was sought by shire councils, producers' organisations, hospital boards, and so on. He did the job extremely well, and I thank him very much for his efforts on behalf of the people of the Roma electorate.

The Roma by-election campaign was conducted under extremely wet conditions. In fact, for three weeks rain fell almost all the time. Although it was not heavy, it was nevertheless rain, and it seemed to me, and also to my opponents, that the election could be more or less a farce if the rain continued. I made inquiries of Mr. Callaghan, the returning officer, concerning the possibility of postponing the poll if rain continued, because we felt that it would be difficult for people even in some of the towns, let alone in the country areas, to get to a polling booth. What we found is rather extraordinary. Under the State Elections Acts, 1915 to 1965, there is no way that a poll can be postponed because of untrafficable roads or similar disabilities. So far as I can see, there can be postponement only as a result of riots or similar disturbances. This meant that, in spite of the weather, the election had to proceed.

It so happened that the rain eased on the Thursday night and stopped on the Friday and Saturday, so the election proceeded normally. There was an 82 per cent. poll, which is quite high for a by-election and means that justice was done. Had rain continued to fall, justice would not have been done because the poll could have been as low as 50 per cent. I should like the Government to give this matter some thought.

I studied the Commonwealth Electoral Act of 1965 and found that section 125 reads—

“The presiding officer may adjourn the polling from day to day in any case where polling is interrupted by—

- (a) riot or open violence, or
- (b) storm, tempest, flood, or occurrence of like kind.”

I believe that if (b) could be incorporated in our Act in such a way that the returning officer for the electoral district concerned could recommend to the Governor-in-Council that the poll in certain areas affected by rain be postponed for a week or some other period, the position would be much more satisfactory than it is now. I repeat that if rain had continued to fall the voting position in the Roma by-election would have been chaotic.

I believe that the Roma electorate contains some of the finest grazing and farming land in the State, as well as being rich in timber resources, and it is, of course, the centre of a vast proven natural-gas field. It is to the credit of the Government that substantial development has taken place in all these activities over the past 10 years.

It is my opinion that the Government's policy on land settlement is a good one. The right to convert living areas to freeholding tenure, and ultimately to freehold, is of great assistance to those landholders who face heavy expenditure on timber treatment, development of watering facilities, and, indeed, the conversion of grazing lands to farming lands. A landholder must know that he has security of tenure before he can undertake this type of development. The size of a living area will always be a contentious matter, and for many reasons I feel that this problem must be handled in a sympathetic manner.

We are passing through changing fortunes in the beef-cattle and wool-growing industries, and this in itself must have an effect on the size of living areas. To breed either sheep or cattle requires an area where the landholder is not forced to over-stock to make a decent living.

I have seen many instances in which that has happened, but it happens mainly in areas that were cut up into substandard living-area blocks after the First World War. The problem is being overcome to some extent by the aggregation of these small areas into more effective units, and the Land Act, with its living-area concept, allows this to be done.

The delay in dealing with freeholding cases appears to be decreasing. In reply to a question in the House a few days ago, the Minister for Lands said that 14,184 applications had been received and that 12,189 had been finalised, which means that slightly less than 2,000 cases remain to be dealt with.

Some of these cases are delayed because the Department of Forestry has to value the commercial timber, and that can be a very costly procedure in the larger areas. To my mind, when applying for freehold tenure, a landholder should be able to exercise an option over commercial timber. If he does not wish to buy the timber upon conversion to freehold tenure—or agricultural farm, as the tenure is known—I think he should be able to exercise the right to allow the commercial timber to remain the property of the Crown during the period of conversion, which is usually of 25 to 30 years' duration. If the Department of Forestry has not removed the timber by the end of that period, I believe it should become the property of the landholder.

Some protection may have to be provided in cases in which the owner of an agricultural farm decides to pay up his instalments and freehold earlier than the end of the stated period of conversion. In those circumstances it would be necessary to have the Department of Forestry value the timber for sale to the owner before the freehold title is issued. In other words, I believe that freehold is freehold, and if one pays up the instalments and freeholds the land, one must buy the timber. But I make the

point that, during the conversion period, I cannot see any reason why it should be mandatory for a landholder to buy timber that in many cases he does not want.

Brigalow lands are much discussed nowadays, and I am pleased to learn that Area III of the Fitzroy Basin Scheme, north of the Central railway line, will be proceeded with in the very near future. These lands are of very good quality but are expensive to develop. Heavy machinery—big tractors with a chain between them, and so on—is required to pull the timber, and that is expensive work. After the timber has been pulled, it has to be burnt. Very often aerial seeding with buffel grasses, green panic, sorghum, or similar seed, follows. Costs are very heavy in the initial stages, and I point out, too, that the carrying capacity is affected greatly during this period because the grasses must be given time to grow. If the land is stocked too heavily, grasses will not grow and seed.

Another problem is that brigalow and sandalwood suckers appear after a few years, and it is necessary then either to plough the country or burn the suckers, or treat them by chemical means. There is no doubt in my mind that ploughing will eventually beat brigalow and sandalwood suckers, and, of course, good crops can be grown while the area is under the plough.

I point out that development of this type may cost up to \$20 an acre, and while this work is taking place the carrying capacity is greatly reduced. In my opinion, valuations of brigalow lands by officers of the Department of the Valuer-General or the Department of Lands appear to overlook the heavy expenditure that is necessary when the land is being developed, and also the loss in carrying capacity. The valuations always appear to me to be high in relation to those of the better type of forest country, which, although not having the potential of the brigalow country, is certainly not nearly as expensive to maintain.

Natural gas comes from the electorate of Roma and very soon a pipeline will be constructed to Brisbane, a distance of some 280 miles. The two principal consumers here are Austral Pacific Fertiliser Co. Ltd. at its Gibson Island project, worth about \$65,000,000, and the South Brisbane Gas & Light Co. Ltd. The Roma Town Council has been granted a franchise associated with the use of natural gas for the town of Roma, and negotiations have been proceeding for some time in an effort to work out a scheme along practical lines.

A survey of the town indicates that not fewer than 1,100 householders are prepared to join a natural gas reticulation scheme, provided the scheme is not too expensive, is soundly based, and is workable.

To my knowledge, this is the first attempt in Australia to provide a natural gas scheme for any town, and consequently there is no set pattern to follow to help the scheme along. It appears to me that the scheme will be off to a slow start and it will take two, perhaps three, years—perhaps longer—before the scheme can be fully effective. Quite obviously people will not come into the scheme straight away. Some will come in, some will not.

The council is still compiling information on the subject and is getting commercial advice from experts in this field, and shortly it hopes to be in a position to make some approach to the Government with a scheme it can proceed with.

I understand that in South Australia considerable assistance has been received from the Commonwealth Government in the development of a natural gas scheme. If that is so, then an approach by this Government to the Commonwealth Government for some assistance could be the answer. Natural gas will substantially replace the wood stove and perhaps the hot-water systems in most houses, and as the scheme develops I can see the day when all houses, hotels and business houses will use natural gas in some form or other.

On behalf of the Roma Town Council and the Bungil Shire Council, I should like to express to the State Government my gratitude for its action in bringing to a successful conclusion the purchase of some 135 acres of land situated at Romavilla, just north of the town of Roma, which very shortly will become the Roma showgrounds and the centre of most sporting activities in the district, including racing, football and cricket. It is to be known as Bassett Park and is part of the Romavilla vineyards. It contains soil of a loamy nature and is considered ideal for all sporting purposes. It is also gratifying to be able to say that the well-known Romavilla vineyards will still be carried on and that this great industry will not be lost to the town.

Mr. Sullivan: I think you are to be highly commended for the part you played in this.

Mr. TOMKINS: I thank the hon. member for Condamine for his remark. He knows the true position, and, for the benefit of this Chamber, I should like to say that it was rather a complicated deal. The showground was held by private trustees, the racecourse also by private trustees, and the Roma Town Council held an area which was called the old Roma golf links. By various means we were able to get all these trustees to surrender these areas. The Minister for Lands sent Mr. Muir out and he and the local land commissioner valued the lands. After valuing them, they put a proposal to the council under which the council had to find a certain sum of money to make up the difference in the purchase

price. It was a complicated deal and I should really like to express my thanks to the Department of Lands and also to the Minister for Local Government, whose department assisted greatly by having an Order in Council issued.

I believe that in future we might even have in Roma the Englishmen playing cricket or football. It is an excellent ground and it was sensible Government action that did this. The development of this area is very widely acclaimed and I believe, as the hon. member for Condamine interjected, that this proposal will be of tremendous help to an inland town that is on the move.

Some few months ago the Minister for Education announced that he had been approached relative to the establishment of a regional cattle husbandry school somewhere in the Central Highlands and that he was giving some consideration to the matter. This arose, of course, because of the success of the Longreach Pastoral College. Perhaps it specialises more in sheep, but I know that the hon. member for Gregory would agree that it has been very successful. It is felt that a college specialising more in cattle would be ideal.

There are various reasons why I want to suggest to the Government that it give some thought to the Taroom Shire. The northern part of the shire is ticky and the southern part is not. I believe that a school should be established in one of these marginal areas so that research can be carried out in a practical way. One school of thought is that the only way to handle the tick problem is to eradicate ticks completely. If it could be done I would be all for that, but experience in northern New South Wales indicates that with known methods we are a long way from being able to eradicate ticks. Therefore, I believe that a research school set up in a ticky area where this sort of work could be carried out, with a view to containing ticks and slowly pushing them back, would be a wonderful thing.

I feel that the Taroom Shire area is an ideal one for such a purpose because it is a fast-developing cattle-breeding and crop-fattening area, most of which is in the tick area. Not only could tick research be carried out, but there would be ample scope for research into crop-fattening techniques. In recent years the fattening of cattle has been undertaken on cultivated crops in larger proportions. The undulating nature of the Taroom Shire lands lends itself admirably to this purpose owing to drainage and the retention of stubble to mitigate the rainfall impaction and run-off. The variable soil types applying to this region of country open the opportunity to purposeful study and experiment for a variety in fodder crop usage, as well as pasture improvement and development in conjunction with it.

The geographical situation of the Taroom Shire places it almost midway between the breeding areas of the shires of Duaringa

and Bauhinia—the northern portion of the Taroom Shire itself joining these two shires—and fattening areas south of the town of Taroom, which include Wandoan, in the southern part of the shire, Condamine, Dulacca, Miles, Chinchilla, Dalby, Oakey and Pittsworth on the Darling Downs, with further regard to fattening areas further south in New South Wales.

On completion of the Bauhinia Downs-Taroom beef road, which is now under construction, the shires of Emerald and Peak Downs also could find outlets for cattle—fat and store—to the southern markets through the railhead at Wandoan.

The town of Wandoan is the rail terminus of a 40-mile length of railway line which joins the Brisbane-Charleville line at Miles. In an east-west direction through Wandoan runs the tick line which separates the ticky country to the north from the clean country to the south. All stock moving south from Wandoan are required to pass through a cleansing dip under the supervision of a Government stock inspector. The number of cattle that have passed through this facility since 1959 gives some indication of the increase in production that has been achieved in the Taroom Shire. It reveals an increase from 48,000 head in 1959 to 134,393 in 1964. The increase for the year 1964 could be attributed, to some degree, to drought conditions necessitating forced sales to relieve the strain on depleted pastures and crops.

The figures available for the year 1966 show that 94,892 cattle passed through the cleansing dip at Wandoan to outlets for slaughter or fattening. It could be reasonably assumed that this figure is of a substantive nature, and on these results would constitute Wandoan as one of the major cattle-trucking centres in Queensland.

As a matter of fact, my understanding is that Wandoan is one of the major trucking centres. The only one anywhere approaching it is Dajarra. In certain years Dajarra has been ahead, but in recent years, particularly in drought years, Wandoan has been the major centre.

Cattle numbers in the shires of Duaringa, Bauhinia and Taroom, as revealed by the 1964 publication of the Bureau of Census and Statistics, stood at 153,683, 190,259 and 226,669, respectively. That makes a total of 570,611 beef cattle. The consequent increase in cattle numbers as a result of the future brigalow land development previously mentioned would constitute this area as the most densely populated cattle region in the State.

In view of the above, I ask the Minister to give serious consideration to this proposal as I believe the area has all the necessary facilities for this work to be carried out, including educational facilities, reasonable roads, and so on.

To give an idea of the productivity of this shire, I point out that in 1962, there were 211,633 beef cattle in the Taroom Shire; in 1963 there were 226,629; in 1964 the number rose to 232,532. In 1965, which was the year in which the drought started, the number decreased to 217,490. In 1966 there was a further drop to 198,837. Although there is a decline in the number of cattle, if we were to compare those figures with the figures for other areas we would find that the decrease in the Taroom Shire is far less than that in other regions of the State. This is a safe area, where a research station would be a very practicable proposition. I should like the Government to give consideration to this matter.

Since my election to Parliament I have noted that the Department of Education has come under continual fire. That surprises me, because in my electorate the department is doing a really good job. The development of school bus-transport systems has been of great assistance to country people. No fewer than 47 such services operate in the Roma electorate today. Only last week I accompanied a delegation which met the official in the Department of Education who handles school bus runs. The members of the delegation came from Miles and they were seeking a bus run from Miles to Dogwood Creek. We advanced a good case and supplied certain figures, which the department is going to study. I believe that some time next year this school bus run will be in operation. The Department of Education deserves great commendation for its attitude to school buses.

As I said earlier, I do not know why this campaign against the Department of Education has developed. I can see no reason for it. In the Roma electorate, secondary-school departments have been established at all the main towns. They are to be found at Injune, Miles, Wandoan, Wallumbilla and Taroom. A full secondary-school transport service operates in the Yuleba area to take pupils to Wallumbilla. This means that all the main towns in the electorate have secondary-school facilities. It further means that children in the country have access to these schools. In addition, considerable expenditure has taken place on buildings and residences for teachers in the electorate. New head-teachers' residences have been built in seven different localities in the electorate at a cost of \$62,000, as well as one for the high-school principal at Roma. In addition, four twin-unit dwellings, as well as a house, have been provided for single teachers in five centres, at a cost of \$60,000. No less than \$1,100,000 has been spent on new and enlarged school buildings, and all of this expenditure has taken place since 1957.

The Department of Education is looking for a suitable site in Roma for a further primary school. I suggest that a first-class site now exists on the old Roma show-ground, which I referred to previously. This area is to be handed back to the

Government now that it is no longer required for show purposes. It would be a first-class site, as it is almost in the centre of the town.

On Tuesday, 26 September, our district is to be visited by the Hon. J. C. A. Pizzey, Minister for Education, for the opening of the new Roma High School. It is a most imposing building, with first-class sporting facilities. The people of the district can well be proud of it. Its construction was instigated by the late Mr. Ewan and I, for one, regret that he did not live long enough to see it officially opened. At least he saw the project launched and under way. I think hon. members can judge from my remarks that there is no evidence of any criticism of the Department of Education in the Roma electorate.

The beef-cattle industry is going through a period during which the producer is trying to build up his numbers following a series of drought years starting in 1964. Stock numbers are down in all main producing areas throughout the State, and it will take two years, perhaps longer depending on seasonal conditions, to catch up to the 1964 figures. As a producer, I was alarmed at the slaughter of breeding stock over the past three years. The industry and the State simply cannot afford to let this happen if there is any possible way of preventing it. I am one who believes that much of this type of killing could have been avoided if a more suitable type of finance had been made available to producers.

To illustrate my point, in 1965 drought was spread over the greater part of Queensland and New South Wales and I, for one, would not blame any producer who felt forced to sell some breeding stock in that year to reduce carrying capacity. In that particular year the only market available was the meatworks, and consequently quite a number of stock were sold to the meatworks. Of course, I do not blame anybody for that. I think it was the sensible thing to do in the circumstances.

However, in January the following year, 1966, quite a different set of circumstances arose, for the state of drought was broken in many areas of Queensland. It was not broken in the far west of Queensland, but all inside country got some rain early in January. Producers in those areas wanted to buy some breeding stock and wanted carry-on finance so that they would not have to sell the breeders they owned. Finance was particularly tight in this period, and many owners were told to sell in order to put their affairs in order. The boner market to the U.S.A. was very strong at this time, and these cattle went straight to slaughter at a time, when, I repeat, seasonal conditions were reasonably good.

Finance was available to some producers for restocking. But conditions were applied that not more than \$90 could be paid by the producer for cows and calves, at a time

when meat companies were paying \$100 and more for this type of cattle, so it is easily understandable where the cattle went. To my mind, this is a ridiculous state of affairs. Breeders must be worth more to the producer than to any meat company, or the economics of this great industry are just plain crazy.

The position becomes even worse when a producer, having spent all his resources to get his stock through a drought, is told to sell them to put his affairs in order, with the possibility that he would be refinanced to buy more. Surely the answer is carry-on finance for a period of at least two years to let his breeders produce, and he can then sell the offspring. Short-term finance is just not suitable for the producer of cattle, and this applies in the same manner to sheep, and I believe a more realistic approach must be made to this problem if we are to save our herds and flocks.

There is no doubt in my mind that the shortage of beef cattle is creating problems for all meat companies and abattoirs. Meatworks require a continuing through-put if they are to operate successfully, and if the numbers are not forthcoming and killing figures are therefore not maintained, a meatworks is faced with the prospect of either closing down or trying to maintain minimum kills.

The meatworks at Roma was in this position earlier this year, and I regret very much that this plant had to close down. It employed approximately 200 people, all of whom lived in Roma. The effect on the town was most noticeable, and in fact, if the Government had not made drought-relief money available to councils, quite frankly the situation could have got out of hand. The provision of this money at the right time, in those circumstances, relieved the unemployment situation, and I believe that the position has now largely caught up with itself.

It has been my privilege to serve on the Queensland Meat Industry Authority, which was set up in July 1965 under the able leadership of Mr. J. A. Barton. The primary function of the Authority is to act as adviser to the Minister for Primary Industries on all matters affecting the meat industry, including the approval of finance for the construction of new abattoirs and extensions to existing abattoirs where considered necessary. The Authority also has the responsibility of extending abattoir areas where practicable, and also to make arrangements, where needed, with suitable existing meatworks for the slaughter of stock on behalf of domestic operators to improve the hygienic standards of meat treated for human consumption.

The subject I wish to raise, however, is the proposal to rebuild the Brisbane abattoir at Cannon Hill. Early in 1964 the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works issued a report which stated that the structural condition of the main building at the abattoir

was seemingly affected by exposure in varying degrees to attacks by organic acids, hot salt water, leakage of calcium chloride brine, and freeze thaw conditions or abrasions, and therefore the expected life of the building should be regarded as being of the order of five years from then.

The report of the Committee of Inquiry into Matters concerning the Development of the Livestock and Meat Industry in 1964 recommended that the Cannon Hill abattoir be rebuilt on or near its present site, with a daily capacity in the vicinity of 1,000 head of cattle and approximately the same capacity for small stock as the present works.

Whilst I have my doubts that a capacity of 1,000 head of cattle a day will be enough in view of the fact that the works at present are capable of killing in excess of 1,500 head a day, I want to raise the question of whether it is wise to rebuild on the present site. Before I do this, I want to make some brief comments on this abattoir and its value to the State.

As far as I am able to find out, the Brisbane meatworks was built in or about 1912, and was owned and operated by the well-known firm of Swifts. In 1931 the Moore Government purchased the meatworks from this firm and converted it to a public utility. In my opinion that was a very worth-while purchase, because it enabled local butchers and export operators to have their stock slaughtered there under more hygienic conditions than obtained in those days. This policy proved an outstanding financial success. The revenue of the Queensland Meat Industry Board, as the controlling authority became known, was obtained by killing charges on stock slaughtering and the sale of by-products, and over the years this revenue was sufficient to pay the vendors in full. Further, the operations there have financed many desirable improvements at the works, as well as their maintenance.

In short, the purchase of this undertaking and its operations have cost the taxpayers of Queensland exactly nothing. Built on the waterfront, it was ideally located to load carcass beef direct into ships for the United Kingdom market. Indeed, considerable quantities of chilled beef were loaded from this works and attracted very favourable comments at the Smithfield Market in London just prior to the Second World War.

The point that I now wish to make, however, is that the meat trade has changed. No longer do we export beef in carcass form. It now goes in cuts, which are easily handled, and mostly to the United States of America. This means that having a meatworks or abattoir on the waterfront for easy loading is no longer an advantage. The Brisbane abattoir is situated on the south side of the river, where tremendous industrial development is taking place. Already an oil refinery is established there, and the

recent agreement concluded between the Government and Austral Pacific Fertilisers Ltd. will no doubt result in the further building-up of this area. I therefore believe that the area in which the Brisbane abattoir is situated could become congested in the years immediately ahead.

I respectfully suggest that now is the time when serious consideration should be given to rebuilding the abattoir on a new site. I feel quite sure that a suitable place could be found in the area between Ipswich and Brisbane, perhaps somewhere around Wacol, or somewhere handy where the existing railway lines could service a new abattoir from both the north and the west. The present site of the abattoir at Cannon Hill could be sold when the new abattoir is completed, and I believe that the sale could largely finance new works. I am informed that there are 350 acres of land at Cannon Hill, and figures quoted to me show that it could be worth up to \$20,000 an acre. I believe that this matter should be thoroughly investigated.

Finally, I should like to thank hon. members opposite for hearing me in silence.

Debate, on motion of Mr. Inch, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 5.30 p.m.
