

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**THURSDAY, 7 SEPTEMBER 1967**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

**THURSDAY, 7 SEPTEMBER, 1967**

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

SUB JUDICE MATTER  
MR. SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members, I have received the following letter from Messrs. Hawthorn, Cuppaidge & Badgery, Solicitors, dated 5 September, 1967:—

“The Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, Parliament House,  
BRISBANE.

“Dear Sir,  
“re A. T. Dewar v. Mirror Newspapers Limited

“We are acting for the abovenamed Alexander Tattenhall Dewar, of Power Street, Wavell Heights, Member of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland.

“We are instructed to inform you that we have today issued a Writ out of the Supreme Court of Queensland, Brisbane, on behalf of our Client against Mirror Newspapers Limited.

“The plaintiff's claim as set out in the Writ is as follows:

“\$50,000.00 Damages for the publication of defamatory matter in writing of and concerning the Plaintiff in the newspaper called ‘Sunday Truth’ on Sunday, 3rd September, 1967.”

“Yours faithfully,

“HAWTHORN, CUPPAIDGE & BADGERY

“R. M. Badgery”

Since receiving that letter I have given very serious consideration to the question whether the discussion of this matter would now come within the rules relating to sub judice matters. “May”, at page 454, states—

“Matters awaiting the adjudication of a court of law should not be brought forward in debate (except by means of a Bill)”, and then is set out the procedure that has been adopted by the House of Commons.

Apart from criminal matters and courts martial, it clearly states—

“The ban further applies to matters awaiting or under adjudication in a civil court from the time that the case has been set down for trial or otherwise brought before the court, as for example by notice of motion for an injunction; such matters may be referred to before such date unless it appears to the Chair that there is a real and substantial danger of prejudice to the trial of the case.”

I feel that further discussion of this matter, which relates to an hon. member of this House, could present a real and substantial danger of prejudice to the trial of the case and that therefore the matter is sub judice.

Mr. AIKENS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that your ruling be disagreed with. If we are going to have solicitors writing to us and telling us what to do, we might as well disband.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the hon. member that I have given reasons for my ruling. If he studies my ruling, he will see what I refer to in it.

QUESTIONS

PRINTING OF EDUCATIONAL PUBLICATIONS  
IN HONG KONG

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

(1) What publications used in Queensland State primary and secondary schools are printed and bound in Hong Kong?

(2) What is the name of the firm in Hong Kong doing this work?

(3) Is this firm associated with any Queensland firm and, if so, who are the directors and shareholders of the local firm?

(4) Is he aware of any legislation in Western Australia ensuring that such educational printing is carried out within the State?

*Answers:—*

(1) “No publications prepared by the Department and supplied for use in schools are printed in Hong Kong. The Honourable Member will be aware that there are a large number of other publications in use in schools often chosen by teachers. I have no complete list of these nor do I have precise information on the place of printing of these publications. I am aware that some are printed in Hong Kong. I would point out to the Honourable Member that the choice of publications for use in schools is determined by the educational quality of such publications rather than by their place of printing. Furthermore, teachers are not expected to seek approval for all the publications they use.”

(2) “Among the firms in Hong Kong doing this work are Lee Fung Printing Coy. Ltd., Hong Kong Printing Press Ltd., Wing, King, Tong Coy. Ltd., Peninsula Press Ltd.”

(3) “Some of these printing firms are associated with Australian and overseas publishers; one of them with a Queensland firm, Jacaranda Press Pty. Ltd. I suggest to the Honourable Member that he obtain the names of directors and shareholders from the relevant authorities.”

(4) “No.”

OFFICE CLEANING, MAIN ROADS  
DEPARTMENT

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

Further to his Answer to my Question  
on August 31 concerning cleaning of the  
new Main Roads building,—

(1) What are the factors that make  
cleaning of the building by contracting  
specialists cheaper than by day labour?

(2) For how long has the contract  
been let and who are the contractors?

(3) What steps will be taken regarding  
security of Departmental records, &c.?

(4) For what periods have the dis-  
missed individual cleaners been employed  
and will they be offered alternative  
employment?

*Answers:—*

(1) "Specialization together with wider  
experience and knowledge of techniques,  
equipment and materials."

(2) "(a) 12 months; (b) Specialised  
Treatments Pty. Ltd."

(3) "(a) The Department has the right  
to reject employees. (b) The Contractor  
and his employees must enter and leave the  
building via the watchman on duty.  
Confidential correspondence and documents  
are kept inaccessible."

(4) "(a) Three male cleaners less than  
2 years service. Fourteen female cleaners  
with the following periods of service:—  
17 years, 14 years, 13 years, 12 years, 8  
years, 4 years, 3 years 3, 2 years, 1 year  
2, less than 1 year 2. (b) No.

SHAREHOLDINGS OF MINISTERS OF THE  
CROWN

**Mr. Houston**, pursuant to notice, asked  
The Premier,—

What are the commercial or business  
establishments, if any, with which  
Ministers of the Crown are associated by  
way of shareholding or directorship,  
either directly or through their immediate  
family?

*Answer:—*

"The information sought by the Honour-  
able Member is not in my possession."

RELEASE OF LONG-TERM PRISONERS BY  
PAROLE BOARD

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

(1) On what date were Sylvia Clare  
Ferguson, Albert Eric Murphy and William  
Ernest Hamilton sentenced to life imprison-  
ment for the murder of Ferguson's  
husband?

(2) Have any of these three convicted  
murderers been released from prison and,  
if so, on what date?

(3) Did William Ernest Hamilton apply  
to the Parole Board this year for release  
and was his application rejected? If so,  
was he told that the rejection of his  
application was prompted by his reluctance  
to take up painting or some other form  
of art or culture which would have  
enabled the Parole Board to assess his  
degree of redemption and rehabilitation?

(4) If long-term prisoners are required  
to cultivate artistic hobbies and pursuits  
to impress the Parole Board with their fitness  
for release, will this be made known to all  
such prisoners so that they can, if they  
wish, adopt the cultural vogue or painting  
'school' most favoured by the Parole  
Board?

(5) Are prisoners provided with paint,  
palette, brushes and other articles necessary  
for painting and are instructors made  
available to train and assist them?

*Answers:—*

(1) "November 14, 1953."

(2) "All of these prisoners have been  
released on parole—Sylvia Joyce Clare  
Ferguson on November 14, 1963, and both  
Albert Eric Murphy and William Ernest  
Hamilton on July 14, 1967."

(3 to 5) "See Answer to (2)."

RETAIL TARIFFS, TOWNSVILLE REGIONAL  
ELECTRICITY BOARD

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

Under the revised retail tariffs of the  
Townsville Regional Electricity Board  
recently promulgated, is not the cost of  
610 units of electricity per month to  
farmers in the Board's area almost  
double the cost of the same amount of  
electricity supplied over the same period  
to farmers by the Electricity Department,  
Brisbane City Council? If not, will he  
give particulars?

*Answer:—*

"The cost of 610 units per month  
supplied by the Townsville Regional  
Electricity Board from its main coastal  
network under the tariff now applicable for  
farm purposes is about 56 per cent. higher  
than the cost of the same number of units  
per month under a comparable tariff at  
present applying in the area of supply of  
the Brisbane City Council."

VACCINATION AGAINST MEASLES

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

Regarding a report that in an address  
to the Health Inspectors' Conference in  
Bundaberg this week the Deputy Director-  
General of Health, Dr. Johnson, referred

to pending campaigns for vaccination against measles, when will they begin and how will they be conducted?

*Answer:—*

“The question of vaccination against measles was discussed at the last meeting of the National Health and Medical Research Council when it was decided a joint Commonwealth-Victorian pilot trial with a live measles vaccine be carried out in Victoria. A similar procedure was carried out in Tasmania before it was approved that Sabin vaccine be used as the vaccine of choice for immunisation against poliomyelitis. The Commonwealth Health Department is still investigating the best type of vaccine to be used and its availability. The pilot trial will not commence until a decision is reached in this matter. The results of the trial will be referred to the National Health and Medical Research Council which will then determine the conditions under which vaccine will be made available to the States. A measles vaccination campaign will be commenced after the result of the pilot study is known and it will probably be conducted in a similar manner to the anti-poliomyelitis campaign which has been so successful.”

**STORMWATER DRAINAGE SYSTEM, BANYO STATE HIGH SCHOOL**

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

In view of the serious drainage problem existing at the Banyo State High School and the consequent inconvenience caused to adjacent private property owners and residents due to stormwater run-off and seepage from the school grounds, will he negotiate with Brisbane City Council for the preparation of a joint Government-City Council plan for the provision of an adequate stormwater drainage system, a prerequisite for a drainage system for the high school?

*Answer:—*

“The provision of stormwater drainage to the area in the vicinity of the Banyo State High School is the responsibility of the Brisbane City Council. Action could be taken by the Department of Works to connect drainage from the school building area to the stormwater drain if and when the drain is provided. There is no concentration of stormwater run-off from the school grounds and the Department of Works is not responsible for natural run-off of stormwater.”

**UNPAID HOSPITAL FEES**

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

(1) Regarding the statement in the *Telegraph* of August 31 that \$13,500 was owing to Longreach hospitals in unpaid hospital fees, what are the categories in which the debts were incurred?

(2) What is the amount of unpaid hospital fees owing to the North Brisbane Hospitals Board and the South Brisbane Hospitals Board, respectively, for the years ended June 30, 1965, 1966 and 1967 and for what categories of service were they incurred?

*Answers:—*

(1) “The unpaid fees of \$13,500 at the Longreach Hospital mentioned in the *Telegraph* of August 31, 1967 are classified as follows:—

Private General Patients . . . . .	\$	10,818
Private Maternity Patients . . . . .		2,225
Ambulance Charges and Others . . . . .		542
		\$13,585”

(2) “The amount of unpaid Hospital Fees owing to the North Brisbane and South Brisbane Hospitals Boards as at June 30, 1965, 1966 and 1967 were:—

(a) North Brisbane Hospitals Board:

—	1965	1966	1967
	\$	\$	\$
Extra State, Third Party and Seaman Patients . . . . .	27,802	35,899	44,106
Private General Patients . . . . .	7,805	8,644	7,815
Private Maternity Patients . . . . .	Cr1,808	Cr2,368	399
	\$33,799	\$42,175	\$52,320

(b) South Brisbane Hospitals Board:

—	1965	1966	1967
	\$	\$	\$
Extra State, Third Party and Seaman Patients . . . . .	38,122	37,811	45,179
Private General Patients . . . . .	26,670	26,305	27,523
Private Maternity Patients . . . . .	1,999	1,116	Cr2,638
Chronic Ward Patients . . . . .	13,314	8,042	9,526
	\$80,105	\$73,274	\$79,590”

**REFRESHER COURSES FOR FORMER TEACHERS**

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

Regarding the re-engagement of former teachers and particularly those teachers who have not taught for a number of years, are any refresher courses made available to acquaint them of teaching methods and textbooks which may have come into use in the meantime?

*Answer:—*

“The inservice courses conducted in Brisbane and Townsville early in December last year and similar courses to be conducted this year are designed to provide for varying levels of experience and understanding of new methods. These courses give an opportunity for professional refreshment to teachers readmitted after

a significant period out of the service. Furthermore, there are, during the year, seminars conducted by district inspectors of schools to meet particular needs of teachers."

RESERVATION OF SCENIC AREAS IN  
NORTH QUEENSLAND TROPICAL  
LOWLANDS

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

What progress has been made towards setting aside as scenic and scientific reserves the twenty areas, each of approximately 1,000 acres, as recommended by Dr. Leonard Webb following a survey of the tropical lowlands of North Queensland?

*Answer:—*

"It is hoped to have one area proclaimed a National Park in the near future. The other areas await a joint inspection by officers of the Lands and Forestry Departments which it is anticipated will be carried out this year."

NEW BRIDGE OVER WILD RIVER,  
RAVENSHOE-MT. GARNET ROAD

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

Has he considered the provision of a new bridge over the Wild River between Ravenshoe and Mt. Garnet? If so, when will work commence?

*Answer:—*

"As the superstructure of the present bridge was virtually rebuilt after the recent major floods, the provision of a new bridge is not being considered at present."

NEW BRIDGE OVER BARRON RIVER,  
MAREEBA

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

When is it intended to commence work on the new bridge over the Barron River at Mareeba and where is the exact location of the proposed bridge?

*Answer:—*

"It is proposed to commence work on the new bridge before the end of 1967. The new bridge will be upstream from the existing bridge, about 65 chains from it."

NEW BUILDINGS AND HOUSES, EDWARD  
RIVER AND MITCHELL RIVER  
ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES

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

(1) Have any new buildings been constructed at the Edward River and Mitchell River communities since May 1, 1967? If so, for what purpose were they built?

(2) Is it intended to build more homes for the residents of the communities during 1967? If so, how many homes will be built and by whom will they be constructed?

(3) Has sufficient material been transported to each community to allow building to commence?

(4) How are heavy materials and supplies transported to the communities and what is the cost per ton in each case?

*Answers:—*

(1) "One staff cottage has been constructed at Mitchell River."

(2 and 3) "Materials have been forwarded to enable a further eight houses to be erected at Mitchell River and five at Edward River. In addition a prefabricated building for use as a workshop has been sent to each community. Further homes will be erected on each community during this financial year. All will be built by Departmental personnel. It is not possible at this juncture to advise the exact numbers to be provided, as such will be dependent on funds available."

(4) "The Department has entered into a contract to cover the transport of heavy materials and supplies by road from Cairns to Mitchell River and Edward River, the cost being \$35.70 per ton. Departmental vehicles are also being used to transport such materials."

RECORDING OF QUALIFICATIONS OF  
TEACHERS

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

(1) Does his Department retain a card for each teacher employed recording his or her qualifications?

(2) At the end of each year does the university forward to his Department the names of teachers who sat for university examinations together with their subjects?

*Answers:—*

(1) "Yes."

(2) "No. It does however provide the Department with results in the Annual Degree Examinations in relevant subjects."

SITES FOR HOSPITALS, MT. GRAVATT  
AND WYNNUM

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

Has land been resumed by his Department for the proposed Mt. Gravatt and Wynnum hospital sites? If so, (a) where are the sites situated and (b) what is the area of each site?

*Answer:—*

"Land comprising 53 acres 3 roods 38 perches being Subdivision A of Portion 378, Parish of Yeerongpilly, situated south of Kessells Road, Mt. Gravatt and known as the Mt. Gravatt Pound has been acquired by the South Brisbane Hospitals Board as a site for future hospital development. An area of 9 acres 1 rood 23·4 perches situated at the corner of Wynnum Road and New Lindum Road has been held for some years by the South Brisbane Hospitals Board for hospital purposes. Other land has not yet been resumed or acquired in the Wynnum district as a hospital site."

**BAGASSE DUST NUISANCE, FAR  
NORTHERN SUGAR-MILLING  
TOWNS**

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

In view of the discomfort and widespread concern of residents of Mossman, Babinda and other far northern sugar-milling towns caused by the bagasse nuisance, will he have the Director of Air Pollution Control in consultation with the Director of Industrial Medicine examine and report on the air pollution for recommendations for corrective measures by mill managements there?

*Answer:—*

"The nuisance created by bagasse has been investigated by the Director of Industrial Medicine on several occasions and also by the Director of Air Pollution Control. The Director of Air Pollution Control is working in close consultation with the Director of the Sugar Research Institute at Mackay to devise techniques and set standards which mills will be expected to meet. Mr. Gilpin recently had a meeting with seven representatives of the sugar industry to review progress in this matter. I am advised that the problem is not a simple technical one and research by the Sugar Research Institute into this matter is being vigorously pursued. From the public health aspect I am advised there is little ill-health caused by bagasse; its major impact on the community is its nuisance effect and this results in a degree of resentment and tension against the sugar industry. The effect on the health of operators is negligible although it has been assumed that the occasional cases of bronchitis or allergic respiratory symptoms have been aggravated by working in mill areas where excessive bagasse dust circulates. The Director of Industrial Medicine advises that action which has been taken by sugar mills has reduced the nuisance caused by bagasse in their areas."

**WARNING LIGHTS AT RAILWAY LEVEL  
CROSSINGS, MACKAY**

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

When will all open railway crossings within the municipality of Mackay have warning flashing lights installed?

*Answer:—*

"Each financial year the Main Roads Department and the Railway Department each provide \$50,000 for electrically operated warning signs at level crossings and those Departments determine the crossings for each year's programme having regard to the traffic requirements of the crossings in all districts throughout the State. It is not possible to estimate when all the crossings in Mackay will have flashing lights."

**TAILORING OF UNIFORMS FOR  
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES**

**Mr. Harris**, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

(1) What is the name and address of the manufacturer and the cost of the uniform (coat and trousers) at present worn by members of the Queensland Police Force, Railways Department, Mental Hospitals and Prison Service?

(2) What supervision is given to ensure that garments are made in accordance with the Government's requirements and are finished in a workmanlike manner?

(3) If, as stated by the Minister for Health, these uniforms are individually tailored, what check is made before delivery as to the correctness of the measurements?

(4) As the self-measurement-form system appears to be the only practical method used to take individual measurements from outlying areas, why are the measurements not adhered to even if bulk-cutting is carried out?

(5) If measurements are in accordance with measurements sent to the manufacturer, why are so many uniforms returned for alteration?

*Answer:—*

(1 to 5) "General Service Requirements: Police—Contractor: Woulfe & Son, 15-17 Adelaide Street, Brisbane. Price, \$25·251. Special Hospital attendants—Contractor: Woulfe & Son, 15-17 Adelaide Street, Brisbane. Price, \$18·476. Prison Officers—Uniforms for these officers are made at the prison. With regard to police uniforms, the contract provides that each metropolitan police officer is entitled to a try-on, and when the garment is ready for the try-on, the Police Department is notified and appropriate arrangements made therefor. When the uniform is finished, the contractor again advises the Police Department and the uniform is then inspected by police officers for workmanship and finish before delivery. Uniforms for country

officers are also inspected for workmanship and finish before despatch. No check is made before delivery as to the correctness of measurements. However, the conditions of contract provide that any uniform which is considered to be a misfit shall, at the expense of the contractor, be rectified. The contractor is also required to pay freight, both forward and return, on uniforms returned for alteration. Individual measurements are taken by the contractor for police uniforms in the metropolitan area or in any centre where he has a branch. For all other centres, self-measurement forms are supplied. With regard to special hospital uniforms, the contractor is required to visit all centres except Charters Towers and Rockhampton and take individual measurements. Officers in Charters Towers and Rockhampton are provided with self-measurement forms. Generally, the measurements provided on the self-measurement forms are adhered to, but a big percentage of misfits are due to the officers concerned supplying faulty measurements. For details with respect to prison officers' uniforms, the Honourable Member is referred to the Answer given by the Honourable the Minister for Health on August 29 to Question No. 13 asked of him by the Honourable Member for Chatsworth.

**Railway Department:** Uniforms are issued to employees of the Railway Department in a variety of classifications, and costs for the last issue ranged from \$14.85 to \$28.37 for a full uniform (coat, vest and trousers). Materials for the uniforms are purchased by the Department, and supplied to Messrs. Woulfe & Sons, Brisbane, for manufacture. The materials are required to conform to a specification laid down by the Railway Department. Samples of materials are submitted to the Government Analyst, and any materials which do not meet the specification are not accepted. Uniforms are supplied to self-measurement forms submitted to the manufacturer by employees. Relatively few complaints have been received. The principle of the use of the self-measurement form has applied throughout the Railway Department for many years. Very few uniforms are returned for alteration. Out of a total of 42,000 uniforms supplied in the last 12 months, only 851 were returned for alteration."

#### PAPERS

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

Report upon the Operations provided for by Part III—Aid to Development, of the Financial Arrangements and Development Aid Acts, 1942 to 1947, for the year 1966-67.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

The Racing and Betting Acts, 1954 to 1966.

The State Electricity Commission Acts, 1937 to 1965.

The Southern Electric Authority of Queensland Acts, 1952 to 1964.

Regulations under—

The Queensland Marine Acts, 1958 to 1967.

The Electric Light and Power Acts, 1896 to 1965.

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS AND GRIEVANCES

**Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN** (Landsborough—Premier): I move—

"That, during this session, unless otherwise ordered, on the days on which general business has precedence of Government business—

(a) The time allocated for speeches on private notices of motion shall be:—Mover of the motion, twenty-five minutes; seconder of the motion and any other member, fifteen minutes; the mover in reply, ten minutes, notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order No. 109; and

(b) On each alternate sitting Thursday, notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order No. 37, a question shall be proposed by Mr. Speaker, 'That grievances be noted' to which question any member may address the House for ten minutes. If this question is still under consideration at 1 o'clock p.m. the debate thereon shall be brought to a conclusion by Mr. Speaker putting the question:

"Provided that the consideration of the business of Supply may take precedence on these days."

Motion agreed to.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

##### RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—SEVENTH ALLOTTED DAY

Debate resumed from 6 September (see p. 410) on Mr. Armstrong's motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH** (Tablelands) (11.38 a.m.): At the conclusion of my speech yesterday I was dealing with the tobacco industry and had informed the House that appraisers quite often become buyers for manufacturers. I want to continue on that line and deal with the actual sales. Unless there is an 80 per cent. clearance on the first auction line of any tobacco sale, then there is usually trouble. Unless this clearance is maintained there is no competition. Once the first line of auction is passed over, the

manufacturers can then negotiate. The arbitrator cannot refuse a product that has been passed over and he may—and quite often does—put that bale into a different schedule. The buyers will then come a second time and, without competition, or with very little competition, will buy the tobacco they had previously passed over.

Mr. Frank Celodoni, who is the arbitrator, was a grower and an appraiser, and he is one of the best officers and most humane and fair-minded arbitrators one could wish to have. Although it has been necessary for him to change his place of residence to Canberra, his interest in the tobacco farmers and the fairness of his judgment leave little to be desired. It is only right that a man in the position of arbitrator should receive the credit due to him, and I extend to him my compliments and congratulations. But this still does not solve the problem for the small farmer. The arbitrator has a job to do, and the carrying out of his job usually results in the farmer receiving a lesser price for his tobacco.

I hope to be able to show the House that there is a possibility of overcoming the present shortcomings of the industry. Sometimes the baling of the tobacco is done in a way that is not in the best interests of the product. There have been instances of bales of good tobacco hiding a quantity of inferior-quality leaf, and it does not take the buyers very long to realise that they have been caught. Their reaction when this happens can be easily understood. The remedy for this lies in the hands of the farmers. It is up to them to be honest with their product and not to try to get rid of inferior leaf by concealing it in the middle or bottom layers of a bale. When they do this sort of thing they are not fooling anyone; however, they are harming the industry as a whole.

As a result of research, there has been a marked advance in the various types of tobacco. I have here a recent publication dealing with the new tobacco variety known as Hicks Q46, which has been tested over a number of years. It could be the means of reducing costs for the farmers and enabling them to get a better return from their land. This variety gives a 25 per cent. increase in production, with no decline in leaf quality. It does not take much imagination to realise that if a farmer can get a 25 per cent. increase in production with this variety he can reduce his area under cultivation to such an extent that it is much easier to look after it. In addition, he can protect it better from disease and insect attack. It means that the cost of fertilisers is reduced. Another very important factor is that crop rotation can be carried out more effectively. It is desirable that the farmers rotate one in four, which means that the ground is spelled for three years. However, some farmers who desire to get that little bit extra sometimes come down

to one in three or even one in two, but this is detrimental both to the crop and to the industry.

Finance is necessary for all these things. Yesterday I touched on Agricultural Bank finance. In answer to a question, the Treasurer told me that the Agricultural Bank will not finance the low-quota tobacco-farmer. I suggest the remedy here is the issue of instructions that the quota be not taken into account, that the amount be increased to \$10,000, and that the repayment period be extended from 10 to 20 years.

A tobacco farmer with a small quota has only to experience two or three bad seasons, or adverse selling seasons—sometimes both the season and the leaf are quite good but the selling of the leaf leaves much to be desired—to realise that instead of keeping level with his financial commitments he is dropping further behind. For that reason I believe that we should give him a longer period—say, 20 years instead of the present ten years—to make the repayments.

The plight of the small-quota tobacco farmer could be talked about for at least an hour or two, and I intend to try to show hon. members how easy it would be to help him if the Act was amended to permit the Minister or the Quota Committee to give special consideration to the small quotas that operate in the State today. Yesterday I told hon. members that the number of small-quota farmers is very large, and I pointed out that 60 per cent. of the quotas are of 10 tons or less. With that in mind, I think the Minister should urgently consider their plight—not just look at it or simply give it serious consideration, but treat it with the same urgency as the Government has shown in other calamities. This is a calamity of the highest order. There is no chance of a snowballing of trafficking in quotas, for they are far too valuable. If a farmer has a 5-ton quota and the land on his farm is not recognised as first-grade tobacco land, he must stay on his farm and grow the tobacco on the inferior soil because the quota attaches to the land and cannot be transferred. What could be wrong with his negotiating with another farmer who has plenty of land, and saying to him, "I will transfer my quota to a portion of your land. I will grow it there and I will sell it to you."? People may say that is an aggregation of quotas, but many conditions could be imposed. I should say that if one condition was that a farmer could not aggregate more than 12 tons of tobacco, this avenue of aggregation would immediately be closed.

Any farmer could earn a wonderful living from 12 tons of tobacco. The farmer who took advantage of this scheme would still reside on his farm and he could grow other crops. He would still be in the locality. This would help to prevent the population drift from the rural areas, about which we hear so much but in respect of which so little is done.



The Government must take action under the Commonwealth Stabilisation Act. I do not wish to hear the Minister or anyone else say that because it is a Commonwealth Stabilisation Act our hands are tied. We went into this quite openly. We allowed the Minister and his officers to make the arrangements for us. In their negotiations they took into consideration the tobacco farmers and the tobacco-farmers' organisations, but the results are not satisfactory to the farmers, who now find that they are faced with two alternatives: they can either forego the tobacco quota completely—that is, allow it to lapse—and stay on their land and grow something else, or they can have their farms sold by the banks to meet their commitments.

This is not merely supposition. I have seen letters from banks to the growers saying that as from a certain date the bank will consider the farm as being for sale and will make the necessary arrangements. That is a poor look-out for the farmer who has reared his family on the farm but is not permitted to transfer his tobacco quota and grow other crops on his property. It is easy to lose a farmer, but it is very difficult to obtain one. Once a farm gets the reputation that so-and-so went broke on it people shy clear of it. That is another reason for the drift from rural areas to the provincial and capital cities.

I cannot emphasise too greatly the need to amend the act. This is not only my own idea. I have put this to the growers, the organisations, the department, and the Tobacco Leaf Marketing Board—I do not think there is anybody else interested in it—and in each and every case there has been agreement that something should be done. But nothing is done. Unless the urgent need for this is driven home to the Minister, the industry will be in a hopeless position.

We should not wait until next March. The Minister and his officers say there might be an increase in quotas next year. That will happen only if the percentage is raised, and who are we to say that it will be raised? Yesterday I referred to the international flavour associated with this matter when I quoted Mr. McEwen's statement that wool has a very serious influence on tobacco at present. Therefore, we are not sure that there will be an increase in quotas. The Minister will no doubt admit that. If there is no extra leaf to go around, he will ask us to wait for another three or four years.

A resolution was passed at the Darwin conference that the stabilisation plan be renewed. It could work. I am all for the stabilisation plan if it means security, but in its present form it does not mean security for the small grower, and small growers comprise 60 per cent. of the tobacco-growers in this State. One of the reasons I raise this matter over and over again is to impress on the Minister the urgent need to amend the Act and thus keep these small farmers in North Queensland.

**Mr. Davies:** They do not seem to get much support from the Country Party.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** I have heard only one interjection—from the hon member for Albert—and he has since left the Chamber. That proves I am a one-man band. Even if I am a one-man band, I hope that the Minister will take note of what I am saying and will instruct his officers to investigate the matter and give to the small-quota-holder some form of redress that he does not have at present.

Only this morning I received news that a new industry, namely, stock-food production, is to be established at Kairi by two people named Beaver and Mostyn, of Craig Mostyn fame. This will give to tobacco farmers who have passed on their quota the opportunity of producing economically another product for which there is a market.

**Mr. Muller:** What is the nature of it?

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** The basis of it has not been disclosed to me. I understand that it contains fish meal and other foods necessary for stock. The hon. member for Fassifern probably knows what they are. It was mentioned over the air in the North only this morning that this factory is to be opened in the near future. Ample grain and pasture and fodder crops can be grown in the area, because the Australian Labour Party provided the necessary water. It is there for all to use.

The Government could do much to improve the lot of farmers in tobacco areas by adopting a more realistic approach to the cost of water. When the first scale of charges was drawn up, it was envisaged that farmers could grow as much tobacco as they wished and the charges were based on one-third of the irrigable land on farms. Since then, however, the position has altered completely. No longer are farmers allowed to grow whatever they like, yet the charges for water have not been altered. I have repeatedly asked the Minister to look into this situation, but all that I have been able to obtain is a statement that charges are about to be reviewed. Nothing seems to be done in favour of the farmer who is paying just as much for water now as he did initially. He is paying for water that he is not using and does not want. Instead of assisting farmers, water, which is the very life-blood of agriculture, is helping to make their activities uneconomic.

**Mr. Coburn:** How much an acre-foot are they charged?

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** There are various charges, from \$9 an acre-foot, depending on location. The charges are fixed on the basis of one-third of the irrigable land on a farm. Although farmers are now allowed to grow only a restricted amount of leaf, their charges for water have not been altered.

I think this is another way in which the Government could help without very much trouble.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! There is too much audible conversation on my right.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** A review of charges to place them on a more satisfactory and sensible basis would assist the farmers. When I first entered this House and spoke for the tobacco farmers, I advocated a living area. Now I speak for a living quota. Although a quota has been established by the Government, it is not a living quota for 60 per cent. of the growers. We heard here the other day that 30 new farms are to be established in the St. George irrigation area. I am speaking for 60 per cent. of 580 farmers.

**Mr. Walsh:** How would you define a living quota?

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** I would define it as a quota that would allow a farmer to meet his financial commitments. The Minister will confirm my statement that no quota under 10 tons could be regarded as a living quota. There are, of course, areas in which, because of their location, production costs are higher. Although costs of production vary, I should say that 10 tons is the absolute minimum at present. That is why I have already said that aggregations of quotas must not exceed 12 tons, which gives an extra 2 tons. If A, who has a quota of 5 tons, wanted to transfer to B, who had a quota of 8 tons, that should not be allowed because the aggregate quota would exceed 12 tons. If A and B each had 5 tons, one could transfer to the other. This is particularly applicable in areas that are no longer first-class tobacco soil.

Many areas do not have first-class tobacco soils. When people first took up land in those areas, soil surveys were unheard of; now they are very important. Every farm in the district is surveyed and an assessment is made of the land—so many acres of first-class tobacco soil, so many acres of second-class tobacco soil, and so many acres of soil unsuitable for tobacco. It would be very easy for the Minister to act on that information instead of hiding behind the statement that the suggested change will result in trafficking in quotas. If he does what I have suggested, more farmers will stay in the area, there will be a greater diversity of farming, the correct type of farming will be carried out on land that is not first-class tobacco soil and, above all, the drift from rural areas to provincial and capital cities will be prevented to some extent.

I leave this thought with the Minister: act now, not in March 1968, as he is talking of doing, and do something to assist people with small quotas. If it is necessary to bring down a Bill to amend the Act, I will guarantee that all hon. members will agree

to its being put through in one day, as other legislation is put through on occasions. Such action would get the scheme working and allow farmers to stay on their farms and produce the goods that are needed so badly in North Queensland.

**Mr. LONERGAN (Flinders) (12.2 p.m.):** Many parliamentary practices that have been handed down over the years are no longer in keeping with present-day thinking. But there is one such practice to which I subscribe and which I think is good, provided one is sincere. I join with other hon. members in affirming my loyalty to Her Most Gracious Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II.

Another custom that is well worth perpetuating is that of commending the mover and the seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and I sincerely commend those two hon. members on this occasion. It was obvious that the mover of the motion, the hon. member for Mulgrave, had devoted a good deal of time to thought and research in the preparation of his speech. The hon. member represents an agricultural area of the State, and there would not be an hon. member in the Chamber more competent than the hon. member for Mulgrave to speak on the many problems confronting the sugar industry today. He applies himself to his duties very conscientiously; in fact, I am afraid that at times he drives himself too hard. How different are the activities of most hon. members representing country electorates from those of hon. members from the metropolitan area, who are fortunate in having small electorates round which they can travel without any great inconvenience to themselves.

I also offer my congratulations to the hon. member for Chatsworth, who made a speech very different from that of the hon. member for Mulgrave. His contribution to the debate was quite sound and, as usual, it was obvious that he had devoted a good deal of thought to it. Although at times I do not agree with some of the things that the hon. member for Chatsworth says, I always give him credit for saying them; I appreciate his ability.

As is to be expected in a debate such as this, the comments of the various hon. members who have taken part in it have been many and varied. Almost every electorate throughout the length and breadth of Queensland has problems different from those of the adjoining electorate. Some of the speeches from the Opposition benches, I will confess, were very interesting, most outstanding being that of the hon. member for Toowoomba West and former Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Duggan. He has not lost any of his skill and I would say that he made a constructive speech. When he got on to figures he was possibly a little confusing. Unless one had the opportunity of comparing his figures with the

authorities from which he quoted, one did not know whether they were right or wrong. However, I pay him the compliment of accepting them as being correct, and his speech can be described as the typical speech that one would expect from a leader.

On the other hand, how different was the speech made by the present Leader of the Opposition. He lacked all those things one would expect in a leader. I would class his speech as dull, lacking in imagination, and utterly devoid of constructive thought. In fact, I could sum it up in a few words as a "typical Jack Houston speech." If I were a betting man—if I had a "flutter on the ponies" at all—I would be willing to wager that within a short space of time Jack Duggan will again be Leader of the Opposition. We know, and every member of the Opposition knows—I am not being personal in this but speaking in a political sense—that the present Leader of the Opposition just does not measure up as the leader of a political party.

There are members in the right-wing group opposite—I could refer to the hon. member for Baroona, but by doing so I might embarrass him because he is still young in years—who, unfortunately, are not acceptable to the left-wing group. Jack Houston is acceptable to them but lacks the ability to lead. In fact, if I summed it up in western terms, Jack could not lead ducks to water.

I do not propose to devote a great deal of my time to what other hon. members have said, but there were a couple of speeches from this side of the Chamber that are worthy of comment. The hon. member for Mt. Gravatt made a very good speech in reply to that of the hon. member for Toowoomba East, who, I am sorry to say, is not in the Chamber at the moment. However, even if he was, I would still say what I propose to say. Obviously he has been selected as the shadow Minister for Education, and until I heard him speak I thought he might have been a good selection. I might say in all sincerity that I was really sorry for him, because I had credited him with knowing something about the education system. Possibly I gave him too much credit, because in all my life I have never heard a worse speech—and believe me, I have heard some bad ones.

I expected something better from this young chappie. I am not going to term him a "day-old chick politically", as we were all that at some time or another.

**Mr. R. Jones:** You have not improved.

**Mr. LONERGAN:** The hon. member for Cairns says I have not improved. He will have observed that at least I do not read my speeches whereas the hon. member even reads his interjections.

I do not propose to waste much time on the hon. member for Toowoomba East. I am sorry for him. He was done a grave injustice by his Leader in being asked to make a speech on education. I really believe that the hon. member for Maryborough could

have done a better job. I will go even further and say that the hon. member for Barcoo would have made a better job of criticising the Government for its efforts in the field of education than did the hon. member for Toowoomba East.

Before moving on, I should like to congratulate the newly-elected hon. member for Roma, Mr. Ken Tomkins, on being elected to this Parliament. We have already heard something of his background. He is following a very good member in the late Bill Ewan.

Most hon. members on both sides come here conscientiously hoping to go a good job for their electors, and quite possibly with a misguided idea of just what they can do. I am speaking as a member of the Government now. We very soon learn. If the hon. member for Roma does not already realise it, he will very soon learn the very little power any hon. member has in this House. However, I do not propose to develop that line of thought. Possibly at a later stage I may have more to say on that subject. I feel sure that the hon. member's stay here will be a long one. He brings to the House a wealth of knowledge of land matters, and that is what we badly need.

I have already commented on the remarks of the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt. I now pass to the speech of the hon. member for Isis, the Minister for Education. Possibly I am wrong in referring to it as a speech; it might be more correct to refer to it as a lesson to hon. members opposite. I am really amazed, and have been for a long time, at their lack of knowledge of what the Department of Education is doing for Queensland. I agree with the Minister that the department is not perfect; it never will be perfect, because with changing trends in teaching what is accepted as sound practice today is obsolete in six or eight months' time.

I enjoyed the hon. gentleman's speech and I hope that he will circulate copies of it to hon. members on this side of the House, as well as to hon. members on the other side, for their benefit and so as to restore confidence in parents, which has been undermined by certain people, many of whom, for party-political purposes, have set out to destroy confidence in our educational system.

**Mr. Hanlon:** You must have something on your conscience.

**Mr. LONERGAN:** I have a clear conscience. The hon. member always has a preoccupied worried look on his face. It could be described as a frustrated look. I am unable to appreciate his difficulty and embarrassment, because I have never been placed in a similar position. We know he is off-side with the "Moscow-house crowd", otherwise he might have been boss-cocky.

**Mr. Hanlon:** Your concern is touching.

**Mr. LONERGAN:** I think he would have made a good job of it. I think he would have done better than the present incumbent; that is not said in a personal sense.

I have touched on a few matters, some of no great importance, I now wish to pass onto other matters. In so doing, I should not like it to be thought that I am being parochial, as I will not be confining my remarks to my electorate. I intend to refer to the whole of western Queensland and, in passing, I will mention one of my very able colleagues.

One of the gravest problems in western Queensland and central Queensland is the pronounced and alarming drift of people from the country to the coastal areas. Over the years, many reasons have been advanced for this drift. I consider some of them to be rather ridiculous, while, on the other hand, some have merit. One of the most frivolous came to my notice recently, namely, that people in the West were denied TV. I do not think too many people would leave the West just because they cannot watch TV, although I believe that they should have it, and I will be happy to do anything I may be able to do in my small way in assisting them to get it.

There are other reasons for the drift. The first one is the problem of finding jobs for school-leavers. That is the main problem; it is very real. In western Queensland today our children can proceed to the secondary level of education, which they could never do when the A.L.P. was in Government. But where can they go from there? A very few of them may get jobs in offices or stores, but there are no great prospects of advancement despite their ability. Consequently, they must move to the coast. Their parents sell up everything they have at give-away prices in the interests of their children, and I commend them for doing so.

The lack of opportunity must be coupled with the high cost of living which, in the main, is brought about by the extortionate rail freights and fares inflicted on people in western Queensland.

Only last week-end the Treasurer and Deputy Premier, Mr. Chalk, was quoted in the Press as saying that the Liberal Party hoped to bring down a policy that would appeal to country people—naturally they would be Country Party supporters. I say to the Deputy Premier, with all respect, that a good way to start is to reduce rail freights and fares. If he did that, he would be away to a flying start. But it is hardly likely that will be done because the Minister for Transport is influenced to a great degree by the Treasurer, who is an able man in the field of transport. No matter whether I disagree with him or not, I give credit where credit is due and say that he did a good job as Minister for Transport. However, that is beside the point. But that is one reason people are leaving western Queensland.

In the three years up to December, 1966, 660 names were deleted from the electoral roll for Flinders. That is not a true indication of the number of people who left the electorate because, in addition, large numbers of New Australians who did not bother to become naturalised or to enrol have left the area.

**Mr. Davies:** But you know that people are leaving the country electorates to go to the cities. The hon. member for Gregory said that.

**Mr. LONERGAN:** The hon. member for Maryborough has never been a help to me since I came here. He does not help his electorate, so how could he help me?

The figure I quoted gives some indication of the drift from the country to the cities. It is an unhealthy state of affairs. In the same three-year period, 719 voters left the Gregory electorate. This could be attributed to many factors. I do not know the answer.

**Mr. R. Jones:** You can't blame it on the Labour Government.

**Mr. LONERGAN:** When Labour was in power, people in the country could not afford the fare to leave.

As I said, I do not know the remedy. Towards the end of my speech I shall indicate what I think could be done. But nothing will be done; in fact, my suggestion will not even be well received.

Another major reason for the drift, as I see it, is the reduction in the labour force in western Queensland brought about by the present drought. It is one of the worst droughts in living memory. I shall quote figures from only one small local-government area, namely, Richmond Shire. In my electorate I have four shire councils and one city council, and a conservative estimate puts the area's losses at 200,000 sheep. Even averaging them at as little as \$3 a head, that is \$600,000, which is quite a large sum of money in a small community.

In addition, shearers are paid \$20 a hundred to shear sheep. Anybody who is good at mental arithmetic can readily see what that means to the shearers. In the space of five or six months, shearers, station hands, pressers, woolclassers, rouseabouts, and the like, will lose \$40,000 in wages. Losses will also be sustained by those who cart wool to railway sidings. On the assumption that the wool would be transported by rail and taking an average of 26 bales to the ton, my estimate is 770 tons, which is one complete train-load of wool. It must be apparent to all who ponder those figures that the western districts of Queensland have really suffered.

The takings of business people in the towns are well down, and there are no jobs available. If there had been normal seasons and prices, graziers would now be carrying out maintenance and improvements on their properties, and possibly some would be conserving fodder. None of that type of

work is being done. I know of only two properties in the West today on which fodder conservation is being carried out. It is not that graziers do not want to do these things; they simply have not the necessary money. If it rained tomorrow, it would still be two years before many of the graziers in the area had any money to spend. No-one there has any money now, and very few are able to go ahead in even a very restricted way with some of the work that is badly needed but has been neglected for years.

**Mr. Davies:** Do you consider that there has been sufficient financial help from the Government in this direction in your area?

**Mr. LONERGAN:** I am glad the hon. member for Maryborough raised that subject. But for the drought-relief assistance given by the State Government, western towns would have been in a very bad way indeed. Shed hands and station hands have been looking for jobs, and drought-relief finance has been of great assistance to them. However, I take this opportunity to state that we require more assistance, because the shearing season is virtually finished and there is no other work in sight. What those who need jobs are going to do, I do not know. No doubt this plea will reach the ears of the Treasurer.

The Main Roads Department and the Townsville Regional Electricity Board are spending huge sums of money in the West. Without that expenditure by those authorities, western Queensland would be dead. I would not care to say how many men are employed by the local authority in Richmond on road work. I was speaking in Hughenden to a member of the Flinders Shire Council who informed me that more than 70 men were employed in road work in that shire. That is quite a large number for a small community. Although we are very appreciative of what the Government has done, I urge the granting of more assistance so that men can remain in western towns and maintain their wives and children.

If there were good seasons for the next five years, what impact would that have on far western Queensland with wool prices as they are today? The major industries in Australia are wool and beef, neither of which receives one cent assistance by way of subsidy from the Commonwealth Government. Those industries have to compete on the open market and take what they can get for their products,

It is interesting to note that the average price of greasy wool in 1955-56 was 46.50 cents a lb. At the wool sales just completed there was a further drop of 5 per cent., and the price of greasy wool has now reached the shockingly low level of 46 cents a lb. No-one in Western Queensland can make a living out of wool-growing at that price.

I defy anyone to prove that what I say is incorrect, bearing in mind the cost of rail freight and labour. The cost of labour represents 38 per cent. of the return that the grower receives for his wool. It is interesting to note that from 1963 to 1967 the Consumer Price Index has risen by 13 per cent., and that the shearing rate has risen by 22 per cent. and the rate for station hands by 20 per cent. in the same period. I should not like it to be thought that I am quibbling about the higher wages being paid to those men; the worker has only one thing to sell—his labour. But I say this to the people concerned: "Don't destroy the industries in the process of getting higher wages."

Unless the people living in western Queensland are shown some consideration by way of a reduction in transport fees and rents, I do not say that area of the State will become a desert, but I do not know what will happen to it. The Minister for Lands will have to change his thinking about areas, because many men on the land in the West have told me that it is quite impossible to make a living out of wool-growing and that they will have to change to beef production. Anyone who has had experience with sheep and cattle knows full well that it is not possible to run cattle on a 40,000-acre block in western Queensland. What is going to happen?

That brings me to this point: in my electorate, just outside McKinlay, a large property named Eulolo is being resumed. Some years ago, when I heard what the boundaries were to be, I thought that the blocks were far too small—35,000 acres up to 50,000 acres—and I brought the matter very forcibly under the notice of the Minister. I suggested that the blocks should be resurveyed and that there should not be any under 55,000 acres because, in my opinion—I may be pessimistic; I should like to think that I am realistic—there is no future for wool-growing in that area. That is in spite of the opinion expressed by a very learned man who should know more about the wool industry than I do, Mr. LeCouteur, the general manager of Australian Mercantile, Land and Finance Co. Ltd. I had the opportunity of reading his book last week-end—it is quite a good one—and I propose to quote one paragraph from it that appeared in "Queensland Country Life" on 6 July this year. Mr. LeCouteur said—

"The world requires more wool. Australia has the capacity to grow more wool; it has the markets to absorb the gradually increasing volume.

"Australia is a producer of apparel-type wool fibre of outstanding quality, and this is the fibre the world is seeking."

If that is so, what have we a Wool Promotion Board for? Why does the consumption of wool amount to only 9 per cent in Australia? Why do the growers pay \$2.50 a bale for the promotion of wool if there is such a market for wool? Those are

questions that not only I should like answered but many of my friends in western Queensland as well—the people I have already mentioned who are going out of wool into cattle.

Mr. LeCouteur goes on to say—

“A price subsidy to the woolgrower would be undesirable in the long term and unsound for the economy in principle and practice. But the causes of cost of production inflation can be dealt with internally. Productivity, not protection, should be the objective.”

I should like to know how they are going to improve production. Over the past 10 years the average weight of a clip of wool has increased by about 2 lb., and, even if we did produce more, our costs are based largely on supply and demand. It is all right for this gentleman, whose opinion I value, to say these things. On this occasion I think he is well astray. It is not working out in practice.

The article goes on to say—

“Mr. LeCouteur does not spare the pessimists in his book.”

Possibly I would be one. He says—

“Some of their comments about wool’s future perhaps reveal a loss of determination to succeed in the face of difficulty.”

I suggest to this gentleman that he should go into central and western Queensland and see what his reception would be if he told wool-growers out there—men who have been battling with drought for years, or even the ones with grass on their properties—how they could increase production, and how increased production will increase the price of wool. In my short experience I have found that persons whom we would expect to be authorities on particular industries are usually the worst informed. What would be the position tomorrow if I, or any other member of this House, was a primary producer or wool-grower and went along to A.M.L. & F. Co. Ltd. and asked for a loan to tide me over a difficult period? I would be told, “We are very sorry; we have no money,” or “There is no great future in the wool industry.” I would certainly agree with that.

Another matter on which I should like to touch briefly is decentralisation in western Queensland.

Mr. Newbery: What do you think about the setting up of a Ministry of Northern Development?

Mr. LONERGAN: That is an excellent interjection from this side of the House. Since the question has been asked—I have never evaded anything in my life—I think it would be a sheer waste of public money if this Government or the Federal Government appointed such a Minister. It would be an admission that our Ministers and the Federal Ministers have not done their jobs

so far as western and northern Queensland are concerned. On the other hand, let us assume that one was appointed.

Mr. Davies: Assume you were appointed.

Mr. LONERGAN: I would be conscientious but I would achieve nothing. Make no mistake about that. What would be the position if I said, “We want a road up Cape York Peninsula.”? The Minister for Mines and Main Roads would say, “You are intruding into my domain.” All I could do would be to see the position for myself and then come back and make a recommendation to Cabinet. In fact, I would be only another highly-paid tourist. When I say “highly-paid tourist” I am not reflecting in any way on present Ministers, but that is all that a Minister for Northern Development would be.

Another factor that has brought about a drift to the city is the closing of the railway workshops in my area. This is a hardy annual with me; it is something I feel very strongly about. I can appreciate the need to transfer running staff if there is no work for them. If they cannot be gainfully employed they must go, whether we like it or not. I do not like to see anyone go. No doubt what I am saying applies to Cairns, too. I am surprised that the hon. member for Cairns did not go into this matter in more detail. When work can be done just as efficiently in one centre as in any other centre it is quite wrong that people in the first centre should be taken away from their homes. We know what is behind it. Messrs. Ford, Bacon and Davis recommended it.

There is the old saying, “There’ll be another day.” I hope at a later stage in this session to have an opportunity to say what I want to say on this subject.

(Time expired.)

Mr. SULLIVAN (Condamine) (12.42 p.m.): I am pleased to have the opportunity to reaffirm my loyalty and the loyalty of my electors to Her Most Gracious Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II.

I take the opportunity to express my appreciation of the work being done in Queensland by His Excellency, Sir Alan Mansfield and his good lady. I am sure it is very pleasing to all Queenslanders that our first gentleman and lady are Queenslanders who are doing such a fine job for this State.

I join with other hon. members in congratulating the mover (the hon. member for Mulgrave) and the seconder (the hon. member for Chatsworth) of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. We naturally expect sound contributions from hon. members of their calibre. The hon. member for Mulgrave is a man of vast experience, and now one of the old hands in this Chamber. His contributions are always full of meat and well received.

Although a newer member, the hon. member for Chatsworth certainly has a future in this Parliament. I think he has proved that on the occasions we have heard him.

It is a privilege to express my delight at having the new hon. member for Roma, Mr. Ken Tomkins, take his place in this House to represent the people of the Roma electorate. After the death of the late Mr. Ewan and prior to the Roma by-election it was my privilege, at the Premier's request, to look after the affairs of the people of that electorate. During that time I got to know the people of the Roma electorate and became acquainted with many of their problems. At the same time I became very aware of the wonderful work done by the late Bill Ewan for the people of that area. It was very pleasing to learn of their appreciation of his efforts.

**Mr. Melloy:** You nearly lost the by-election.

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** What a silly interjection. It is in keeping with the hon. member who interjected. We won in a canter, and I will tell the hon. member why.

The people of the Roma electorate were very pleased with the man who was nominated by the Country Party. I said at the time—and I am pleased to repeat my statement—that in my memory I knew of no political party which had nominated a candidate who was better qualified for a particular electorate. As those who have met him get to know him better, they will realise the truth of my prediction.

The hon. member for Roma has had vast experience in the pastoral industry, in land development, in graziers' organizations and many other organizations, and in the local authority field, being chairman of a shire council. Such a wide experience fits him exceedingly well to represent an electorate. What I liked most was what I heard from people whom he had previously employed. I met between 15 and 20 of them, and they all spoke very highly of him as an employer. He indeed possesses wonderful qualifications, and the Government is very fortunate in having a man with such a vast experience to take over from the late Mr. Ewan.

In the Roma by-election there was solidarity within the Country Party. We held a plebiscite and when the Premier went out to open the campaign the two defeated candidates in the plebiscite attended the meeting and indicated their support for the chosen candidate. Things were a little different with the Opposition's candidate.

**Mr. Bennett:** Didn't a disgruntled Country Party plebiscite candidate stand against Mr. Tomkins as an Independent?

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** What about the disgruntled men in the Labour Party? They moved a vote of no-confidence in their candidate and then they let him stand. The

hon. member should not talk about disgruntled people at Roma. We had solidarity, but the poor fellow who had to carry the banner for the Labour Party had a vote of no-confidence passed against him. I mention that only to indicate that we are very happy with our man.

The hon. member for Flinders, who has just resumed his seat, referred to some of the comments made by the hon. member for Toowoomba East in his attack on our education system. Yesterday, it was refreshing to everyone to hear the Minister for Education, Honourable J. C. A. Pizzey, answer some of the criticisms levelled at him, both personally and also at our education system. I think most of us are aware that over the last 12 months a personal attack has been levelled against the Minister for Education, as it is known that, on the retirement of the Premier, Mr. Pizzey will become the new Premier.

For political purposes a designed attempt has been made at destroying the image that Mr. Pizzey has developed both here and overseas. We condemn those who launched this attack, which is designed to destroy the Minister's image before he becomes Premier. In the eyes of many hon. members in this House, and of the people of Queensland—the many thousands who really appreciate the job he has done as Minister for Education—he stands 10 ft. tall. The day the present Premier of Queensland, Mr. Nicklin, vacates his position, he can shed his shoes knowing that Jack Pizzey can step straight into them, as he has the qualifications. There is no need for me to say anything more in answer to the criticism levelled at the Minister for Education by the hon. member for Toowoomba East, as I believe the Minister did pretty well in his reply yesterday.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say something to the hon. member for Toowoomba East. Some 12 months ago, when I was not present in the Chamber, the hon. member referred to the fact that I had said that I kept in close contact with the schools and teachers in my electorate. The hon. member said that he had been acting head-teacher at Chinchilla for a period and that during that time I did not call at the school. For some reason he raised it in his speech again the other day. Again I did not happen to be in the Chamber, but I read the proof of his speech.

It is true that during the time he was acting head-teacher at Chinchilla I did not call at the school while he was present. When I go to Chinchilla for a day's business I have a pretty busy time and I endeavour to call on the head-teacher, for his convenience as well as mine, either before or after school hours. When the hon. member for Toowoomba East was acting head-teacher there, I called at the school on two occasions after school hours—and not very long after—but he was not there. I was talking to the bus operator just before I went in at

20 to 4. That is the story. Anyway, whether I contacted him when he was acting head-teacher or not does not matter very much, because I suggest that the hon. member cannot tell me of any town of similar size in Queensland that has better educational facilities. We have everything there that we want. Apparently the hon. member had no problems on which he needed to seek my advice, so I do not know why he should bother to raise the matter here on a couple of occasions.

**Mr. P. Wood:** I am sorry if I hurt your feelings.

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** The hon. member did not hurt my feelings.

I attended a meeting in Chinchilla the other day at which I spoke to some railwaymen who are affected by redundancy. I shall refer to this matter later on. Many of them are hard-working railway fellows, but they were pretty discouraged—

**Mr. Houston:** You have changed your views.

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** The Leader of the Opposition should have been present to hear what the hon. member for Flinders had to say about him. I warn the Leader of the Opposition that he is only keeping that seat warm until the return to that position of the hon. member for Toowoomba West.

These people told me they were appalled at the criticism levelled at our education system by the Queensland Teachers' Union and members of the A.L.P. and their supporters. One man said to me, "You know, it is shocking the things these people do. I have been working in the railways all my life and it is because of the policy of the previous Labour Government that my children were denied a good education." This has been said in the House before. He referred to a report of a meeting held in Toowoomba at which the hon. member for Toowoomba West, Mr. Duggan, said some years ago, "We don't want to upbuild the education system, because once we educate the young people we stand a great chance of losing them from the Labour Party." This has been said before in this House.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I rise to a point of order. In view of the gravity of the statement made by the hon. member for Condamine, I consider he should cite his authority before he proceeds. His remarks are offensive to me personally, and they are untrue.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The words used by the hon. member for Condamine are offensive to the hon. member for Toowoomba West, and therefore they must be withdrawn.

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** If the words are offensive, I withdraw them. My point is that these people are very aware and appreciative of what this Government has

done in the field of education in their areas. Their children are benefiting very much from it.

The hon. member for Aubigny spoke in part of his speech of what is being done, and, after all, he was Minister for Education in the previous Government. He said he was concerned about the establishment of a high-school top at Bell, and considered that it would have been better to enlarge the high school at Dalby to accommodate the children from Bell. I think the Minister for Education well understands the position, because I discussed the situation with him on the spot. Whilst it may have been all right to bring children 25 miles from Bell to Dalby, I pointed out to the Minister before the decision in this matter was made that children travel to Bell from areas 25 miles beyond it, which means that they would have to travel 50 miles to reach Dalby, or a round trip of 100 miles a day. The people of the Bell district are very grateful for the decision to provide secondary education at Bell.

At the week-end I went to the trouble of making a comparison between the Junior examination results obtained by children at Bell and other small high-tops and by those attending larger schools, and I found that the former compared admirably with the latter. I know that I am expressing the sentiments of the people I represent when I thank the Minister for Education and his department for what has been done in the development of education in the Condamine electorate. No doubt what has been done there follows the pattern throughout the State.

For those reasons, I thought it was high time the Minister for Education put the real story before the people of Queensland, and this he did yesterday in answering his critics in no uncertain way. Any damage that may have been done was thrown back into the hands of those who have tried to destroy his image.

I now wish to speak about the grain industry. It is a large, fast-developing industry, particularly wheat and barley-growing. A fast-developing rural industry undoubtedly creates some problems, and those engaged in grain-growing are concerned, particularly this year, about the handling of the crop. Last year a record crop of wheat, approaching 34,000,000 bushels, was grown in Queensland, as well as 7,000,000 bushels of barley. The Wheat Board is the handling authority for the Barley Marketing Board and the Central Queensland Grain Sorghum Marketing Board. For that reason, there is a real need for more bulk storage for the increasing grain crop.

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

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** Before the recess for lunch I had begun to outline to the House the expansion that is taking place in the



wheat industry, in particular, and in the growing of other grains, such as barley and sorghum.

There is quite a lot of concern among grain growers about rising costs in the industry. As hon. members know, I am a wheat farmer, and as more than one-third of the total Queensland crop of 34,000,000 bushels of wheat is grown in my electorate—in fact, about 12,670,000 bushels—and a considerable proportion of the barley crop, I suppose it might be expected that I would raise some objection to the present freight rates. The people of Queensland are aware that the Country-Liberal Government is a responsible Government, and if freight rates are increased, I believe that I, as a member of the Government, must accept my share of the responsibility. It is pleasing to note that, although freight rates have been increased, expansion in the industry has made necessary the provision of more and better rolling-stock and more bulk storage. Because of that, I think that wheat farmers are well aware that the Government is doing something to assist them in that regard. Contracts have been let for the construction of 50 aluminium bulk-grain wagons with a capacity of 32 tons each, and they will cost about \$570,000. In addition, 125 coal-hoppers have been converted at a cost of about \$60,000, and tenders have been called for a further 75 wagons, each of 32 tons capacity. On the basis that 50 wagons cost \$570,000, one could say that 75 should cost about another \$800,000. Admittedly the Railway Department is earning more and taking more in freight from wheat farmers; but I think it is only fair to mention that it is spending quite a large proportion of that additional revenue in an endeavour to assist grain growers.

I commend the grain-growers' organisation, and particularly its president, Mr. Les Price, for the very good case that was submitted to the Premier and the Treasurer for a reduction in rail freights. It was pointed out in that case that rail freights in other Australian States are lower than in Queensland. When I was in Sydney and Melbourne earlier this year with the Minister for Transport, I discussed this question with the Commissioners for Railways, the Ministers for Transport, and other Ministers. It became fairly obvious that in those States, because of the volume of traffic on the railways, because of the higher revenue resulting from a larger population, motor vehicle registrations, and other matters associated with general revenue, freight rates can be subsidised. The Premier has informed me that Queensland is not yet able to do that. That is why wheat and other grain freights are lower in those States.

New South Wales, for instance, has only about 230 miles more railway line than Queensland has, but last year New South Wales hauled more than 6½ times the quantity of wheat that we in Queensland did. With the volume that New South Wales hauls, it can afford to do it at a lower charge. The

same thing applies to Victoria. Although that State has only a fraction of the rail mileage that we have in Queensland, its crop was about four times as large as ours.

I suppose we could say that the development of the grain industry into marginal areas was brought about by seasonal conditions last year, which were suitable for wheat-growing. A number of people, having endured many years of drought and having lost stock—and with stock not available for restocking—have turned wheat farmers and have made quite a go of it, with the result that they have been able to re-establish themselves very quickly. Having done this, and having found that the wheat industry is fairly prosperous at the present time, they are prepared to stay with it and extend still further. This, of course, increases the problem of handling the crop.

The Government has been criticised in certain places for not making more money available for the bulk storage of grain. These critics think that the Government should supply the money but, as was mentioned by the Minister for Education (Mr. Pizzey) when he opened the Grain-growers' Conference in Toowoomba the other day, there is no vault full of money under the Treasury. I believe that the industry has to face up to supplying its own storage as has been done by the sugar industry over the years. Loan finance has been made available to that industry, and provided its own storage.

As a wheat farmer representing a wheat-farming electorate, I believe that grain growers also are becoming aware of the need for this. The Government, through the Treasurer, has this year extended the loan-raising authority of the Wheat Board, for the purpose of building storage facilities, to \$1,200,000, and the Treasurer has indicated that he is prepared to lend the board \$7,000,000 over the ensuing three years. However, with the expansion that is taking place I believe that more money is required, and fairly quickly. I believe that we wheat farmers ourselves have a responsibility. I talked this over with many grain growers and discovered that they are prepared to do something to help themselves.

Some years ago there was a growers' levy for storage of 2d. a bushel. A few years ago it was reduced to one-tenth of a cent a bushel. I believe that at the present time we are not making a big enough contribution towards providing storage for ourselves. I believe that is also the thinking of most wheat farmers because, if the Wheat Board has not sufficient storage to take the crop at railhead, then it is necessary for the farmer to provide his own storage. This presents problems. Firstly, there is the capital outlay involved; secondly, the weevil infestation that the farmer is required to fight against; and thirdly—and possibly this is the most important of all—there is the

fact that until such time as the wheat is delivered to the board, the farmer is not paid for it.

I believe that consideration should be given by the Wheat Board to increasing the levy, I should say at least back to the 2c that it was before. I have heard some farmers say it should be as much as 5c or 6c a bushel. I discussed this matter with the Treasurer as recently as yesterday to see whether the Government could authorise the Queensland State Wheat Board to do this. It has been suggested by growers that if this money is not made available by levy it might be forthcoming by loans from the farmers themselves. This is one way of getting more finance for the Wheat Board to provide storage.

Various arguments have been advanced about where the storage should be provided. Some say increased storage facilities should be developed at Pinkenba. At the present time the storage at Pinkenba is something of the nature of 2,250,000 bushels. More storage may be necessary at Pinkenba, particularly in view of the fact that the Wheat Board is the handling authority for barley and grain sorghum. However, I think the main expansion of storage should be in the growing area itself. After all, the wheat-harvesting season is not a very long one, and it is important that we avoid hold-ups at wheat dumps. This is something that cannot be done in one, two or three years; it is something that we have to work towards gradually. Any great expansion of storage, I believe, should take place in the growing area, with a sufficient stockpile of grain at Pinkenba to meet the requirements of the available shipping.

Only a few weeks ago, the general manager of the Railway Department in Toowoomba, Mr. Mendoza, assured me that if this were done the railways could handle up to three times as much wheat as we are producing at the present time. It was suggested at the grain-growers' conference in Dalby that the Railway Department provide a double track from Toowoomba to Brisbane. Hon. members can imagine the expenditure that would be involved in that. As Mr. Mendoza assures me that the railways can handle three times the present crop, I think it will be some time before a double track between Toowoomba and Brisbane is needed.

I have dealt with some of the problems facing this great industry. I have mentioned that costs within the industry are high, particularly for people coming into it as new farmers. Their capital outlay for machinery, clearing and all that kind of thing is rather high. As we expand and the crop increases, we should have another look at the freight rate. Last year the freight increase was worked out on 17,000,000 bushels; in fact, we produced 34,000,000 bushels. In framing the Budget, Cabinet should take this fact into consideration. The Premier promised

the deputation that approached him that the Government would examine freight rates. Although I am aware of what the Government is spending on rolling-stock to help the wheat industry, I hope that every consideration will be given to the volume of the crop grown with a view to a reduction in freight rates.

The hon. member for Flinders expressed concern at the costs that face the wool industry. Those of us in primary industry have always worked this way: if one industry is in trouble and another is prosperous, possibly one can balance the other. I agree entirely with the hon. member for Flinders that with a depressed wool market consideration should be given to reducing freight rates, road taxes and the other costs that the wool growers have to meet.

I sincerely hope that the hon. member's plea on behalf of the people he represents does not fall on deaf ears. A week or so ago I was in Cunnamulla, Thargomindah, and other western centres where I discussed this matter with several graziers. Only the week before they had suffered a big drop in the price of wool. After the years of drought they had experienced we have a definite responsibility to assist them in some way, not only in freight rates, but perhaps also by having another look at their rentals and similar matters. I support to the full the plea made by the hon. member for Flinders on behalf of these people.

I come now to a matter that I wish particularly to bring to the notice of the House, namely, redundancy in the railways because of dieselisation. Redundancy is occurring in my electorate at Chinchilla. Early last week I discussed this matter with the Combined Railway Unions. They are very concerned, and some anomalies have arisen. I also discussed the matter with Mr. Mendoza, who had met a deputation from the Combined Railway Unions and informed them of his proposals. He suggested that if they could advance any better proposals he would consider them. That is fair enough.

I hope these anomalies are brought to the Minister's attention. Men who have lived in Chinchilla for 20 years, with growing families and their own homes, have been notified that they are to be transferred, yet single men living in quarters, and doing the same jobs—drivers, guards, and so on—are being retained. The single men have indicated that they are quite willing to go elsewhere so that the married men can remain there. This matter should be investigated in fairness to the men who have lived there for years and are part of the community. If they sell their homes they will sell them on a buyer's market and, if they go to Toowoomba or elsewhere, they will be buying on a seller's market.

**Mr. Houston:** Your Government is not worried about those people.

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** I do not want the hon. gentleman to make this a political matter. I am making a plea on behalf of these men at Chinchilla.

The general manager of the Railway Department is prepared to investigate any case that is advanced, and I have told the men that I would bring their plight to the notice of the Minister for Transport. I am sure we will be able to do something to help them.

The hauling of the wheat crop in that area is regarded as a seasonal occupation for the railways, but with the expansion in the grain industry it is no longer a seasonal occupation. By the time we harvest this year's crop the Wheat Board will be hard put to it to clear last year's grain from the bulk stores. From the point of view of the railways, I emphasise that wheat hauling is no longer a seasonal occupation but an all-year-round job.

In the Wandoan area, which the hon. member for Roma knows only too well, the Wandoan branch line ranks third highest for railway truckings in the State; in one year, it was the highest. Those are some of the facts that I wish to put before the House, particularly the Minister for Transport, in support of the plea of the railwaymen at Chinchilla.

**Mr. Newton:** What have you done with the Roma-Injune line? Has it been sold yet?

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** If the hon. member wants to make it rough, I point out that we do not do the things that the Labour Government did. We do not indulge in the wholesale sacking of people. In 1956 or 1957 the Labour Government of the day sacked 2,124 men in one go.

**Mr. Houston:** You know that is not true.

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** That is not true? "Hansard" shows what the Treasurer of the day said. The Government sacked 416 forestry employees, 508 irrigation employees, 300 public works employees, 500 railway employees, and 400 building workers. They were all sacked because of lack of funds. I am making a plea on behalf of the railway workers in Chinchilla.

(Time expired).

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Condamine said that the sacking to which he referred was done by an A.L.P. Government in 1956 or 1957. In fact, those employees were sacked after the defeat of the A.L.P. Government in 1957, and that is recorded in "Hansard".

**Mr. BENNETT** (South Brisbane) (2.36 p.m.): It was rather interesting to listen to the hon. member for Condamine, who brags that he is a proud member of the United Graziers' Association. I have with me the latest publication issued by that association, dated August, 1967. It contains a graph which shows that from 1954-55 the wool price

increased to its peak in 1956-57, during the time of a Labour Government. Since 1956-67 the production and marketing expenses of wool have increased quite substantially until at the moment they have reached a record high level. At no stage did they recede. Since 1956-67 prices have slumped, and in 1958-59 they reached their lowest level. At the present time they are a little above the trough of 1958-59. This graziers' Government, as Government members call it, surely cannot feel proud about what it has done for the wool industry, which is supposed to be represented by members like the previous speaker, whose submissions confirmed what was said by the hon. member for Flinders.

As usual, I express my allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen. I well reflect with happy memory the occasion when, as Vice Mayor of Brisbane, I played some part in entertaining Her Majesty at the Royal Ball. Having spoken to her on that occasion, I know that she would be ever conscious of the standards of this State and of the sovereignty of this Parliament. On reflection, I consider that she surely must be embarrassed by what has happened in recent times with her counsellors and advisers in this State. As a member of Parliament I feel humiliated by their conduct. Share sharks and deceivers like Stanley Korman and his fellow directors are now rightly serving terms of imprisonment because they misled their shareholders. The directors of this State, in the persons of the Premier, the Deputy Premier, and other senior Cabinet Ministers, owe a greater measure of integrity to their shareholders, the taxpayers of Queensland, than do ordinary company directors, and in that regard this State has been sadly let down.

I feel that in matters of State, and those affecting the integrity of Parliament, the Government and Cabinet, only statements that are absolutely true should be made to the people who should know, and are entitled to know, the truth. I feel that if it is good enough for Stanley Korman and other deceivers to be charged before courts of law, no person, whether he be a parliamentarian, Cabinet Minister, or ordinary citizen, should be above the law. If such a person is entitled, in the process of law, to a fair trial, the Minister for Justice has not only an obligation to the people of the State to take the necessary legal proceedings but also an obligation to the suspect to give him this opportunity.

**Mr. Aikens:** What if they go into the witness box and claim privilege and refuse to give evidence?

**Mr. BENNETT:** I shall deal with that. It is rather strange that the hon. member for Townsville South continues to hark back to the royal commission into affairs associated with the National Hotel. It is equally significant that that royal commission involved in its confined terms of reference, among other things, an investigation into the promiscuous conduct of some top-level men

with girls at the National Hotel, and the Minister in charge of police administration at that time was none other than the hon. member for Wavell. It is little wonder that the evidence was prepared in the manner in which it was and gerrymandered by Detective Sergeant Tony Murphy before witnesses ever entered the witness box.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The hon. member is imputing improper motives to a member of Parliament and Cabinet. I ask him to withdraw his remarks.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I was not imputing any improper motives at all; I merely related what Detective Sergeant Tony Murphy did. He interrogated all the witnesses before they even entered the witness box.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The hon. member has imputed improper motives, and I ask him to withdraw his statements.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I do withdraw them, although I was not aware that I was imputing improper motives. Speaking as a historian and one who has been a member of this House for some time, I merely say that perhaps it is purely coincidental that the then Minister in charge of the Police Force was the present member for Wavell. That is all I say. I do not know whether that has any sinister significance or not.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The hon. member cannot gloss over statements such as the ones that he has made by adding to them. He has withdrawn them, and that is all I want.

**Mr. BENNETT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased that you appear to be very sensitive, as I am, about the sovereignty of Parliament. All responsible members have an obligation to preserve that sovereignty, and they should look in a very sceptical fashion at the conduct of any person who tries to deride Parliament. The day that that happens will be the end of democratic government in this State.

Whilst you have given a ruling, Mr. Speaker, which I respect and do not challenge, as is my wont, as a lawyer I feel that in a debate such as this I am entitled to refer to what I believe is the law and, if it is not, suggest that it be amended to conform to what I consider to be justice and, more importantly, the inviolability of Parliament among Crown instrumentalities. I do not think that Parliament should be subservient to any court in this State. My belief is that it is not. I also believe that no person should be able to issue a writ out of the Supreme Court not for any bona-fide reason but merely to stifle free and proper discussion in this House. That happens too often in this State. We have even seen on occasions a person issue a writ, speak on the matter himself, and then complain if anybody else deals with it.

I do not believe it is good law—nor do I believe it is the law—that any person can hold up the business of Parliament by issuing a writ from the Supreme Court of this State or any other State. That is not the law. I do not ask hon. members to accept my opinion on this subject; I merely invite them to get an independent opinion from any practising member of the Bar in Queensland. If need be, they can get the opinion of a “silk”—not that his opinion is better than that of the average lawyer, as a rule. If hon. members want a Queen’s counsel to give an opinion about the Queen’s Parliament, then I invite them to get such an opinion on this matter, because the situation is becoming serious when one individual can thumb his nose at every parliamentarian, and at Parliament itself, in this State.

It is even more tragic and prejudicial if a member of the community or a member of the Public Service can, for ulterior motives, issue a writ to prevent free and proper discussion in this House, and that has happened within the last three years. I have photostat copies of evidence to support my claim.

There was a matter in recent times affecting the very kernel of police administration in this State, and I began to raise it in the House. A writ for defamation was issued against me personally by the Commissioner of Police. I entered an appearance and endeavoured to force the matter to trial as quickly as possible so that the authenticity of my claims and the integrity of the plaintiff could be dealt with properly in court. It took the best part of two years—I do not blame the courts for this, because there are many reasons for it that I do not wish to explore at the moment—to get the case on the list and get it ready for trial. I was not the plaintiff; I was the defendant. I was battling to clear the air, as a defendant, by using all my best endeavours, through my solicitor writing to the Registrar of the court, to have the matter brought on for trial. Eventually, after that long lapse during which my lips were sealed in this House—

**Mr. Smith:** Had it been entered for trial?

**Mr. BENNETT:** It came up and was entered for trial.

**Mr. Smith:** That is when it should have been sub judice, not before.

**Mr. BENNETT:** It was ruled that the matter was sub judice. I am not trying to capitalise on that point; I am dealing with people who issue writs in this way.

When the case was ready for trial and I was prepared to defend myself, feeling confident that I would be successful, the plaintiff—the Commissioner of Police—filed a notice of discontinuance and I was powerless to do anything to have the matter properly tried in court. I asked for costs, and the plaintiff paid my full costs because he knew he would be ordered to do so if he

did not consent. I have a photostat copy of the cheque that he paid for those costs; I have a photostat copy of the notice of discontinuance. There was an allegedly responsible member of the Public Service holding up the business of Parliament for the best part of two years and holding the courts in contempt with an action that he never intended to proceed with. That happens far too often, Mr. Speaker, and something should be done about it.

I might mention another matter, in which I was involved but to which I was not a party, in which the same person issued a writ that had the effect of stifling discussion in this Parliament. In that case, not only did he file notice of discontinuance—incidentally, when that is done a defendant cannot in any way proceed to bring the matter to trial—but he paid the defendant woman's full costs and, in addition, paid her damages. Yet we in Parliament, representing the community—the taxpayers—and supposedly conducting the affairs of the State properly, have our tongues tied by skulduggery of that nature.

**Mr. Aikens:** Now you are talking sense—for the first time this week.

**Mr. BENNETT:** It is the first time I have spoken this week.

I realise that many Parliaments, and in particular this Parliament, follow fairly closely Erskine May's "Parliamentary Practice", the latest edition of which in this House is the 17th edition. Of course, Erskine May's original edition has been changed considerably over the years, and the latest edition has been edited by Sir Barnett Cocks, K.C.B., O.B.E., Clerk of the House of Commons.

In the first place, my observation about Erskine May is that in many Parliaments, including the House of Commons, it is honoured more in the breach than in the observance. Very often the House of Commons follows Erskine May when the ruling, according to May, is acceptable to it, but completely ignores and disregards May when the ruling is embarrassing to it. In any case, at page 454 of the latest edition, under the heading "Matters pending judicial decision", May says in effect that when criminal proceedings are pending then, in effect, the matter is sub judice so far as Parliament is concerned and it would be in contempt of court to discuss the matter.

When we speak of contempt of court, I do not know how, in practice, Parliament could be in contempt. We rely on many legal forms and solemnities that are purely artificial and cannot be enforced factually, because if any judge was to commit this Parliament for contempt he would be a very courageous man; in any case, his commission could be withdrawn.

**Mr. Aikens:** Do you know that the Criminal Code absolves us from contempt of court?

**Mr. BENNETT:** Yes, I agree. In effect, the claim about contempt of court is purely artificial because, in fact, it could never happen. Admittedly it is referred to on a theoretical basis in any case, as the hon. member for Windsor has said, in May. In civil matters—and, after all, defamation cases are only civil matters; in the main, the vast majority of them are only hoaxes and foxing actions that clutter up the business to the court, and something must be done about it—if a plaintiff abuses the court by issuing a writ in order to stifle discussion, he should be ordered to pay heavy damages unless he proceeds with his writ.

**Mr. Hanlon:** He is more in contempt of court than anybody else.

**Mr. BENNETT:** Of course.

I did not intend to raise these matters because of certain rulings in this Parliament. I want to deal with some other aspects of administration in Cabinet about which my hands are tied and explain my position not because I have been humiliated but, on behalf of Parliament, I feel that this matter needs airing. I say it is a shocking thing that a man who, as a public servant, outside of Cabinet and outside of this Parliament, is charged with the responsibility of enforcing the law and making people obey it, is himself handling it contemptuously and without any respect for it, abusing this Parliament and the courts as well.

However, to get on to the point raised by the hon. member for Windsor, civil actions, such as defamation actions, are not sub judice until they are set down for trial, and, of course, the issuing of a writ does not put an action in the position of being set down for trial. Long pleadings have to be delivered in the *iterim* and a statement of claim has to be filed in the Registry of the Supreme Court, long before the matter is set down for trial.

**Mr. Aikens:** Mr. Speaker ruled differently this morning.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I am not challenging Mr. Speaker's ruling. The hon. member knows how I get along with Mr. Speaker.

A matter does not become sub judice, according to May, until it is set down for trial. It will be found, as I have found with the Commissioner of Police, that some people who issue a writ do not even file a statement of claim setting out particulars of the cause of action.

I am rather sorry to think that Parliament—quite consciously, I will admit—has been deceived by the intrigue and methods of these men who can use Parliament for their own purposes. I hope the time will come when that practice is stopped. I have a High Court authority which says that in these circumstances such matters are not sub judice.

**Mr. Aikens:** Be honest about it: they can only use Parliament if the Speaker is willing to be used.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The hon. member for Townsville South has cast a reflection on the Chair. I ask him not only to withdraw the remark, but to apologise to the Chair.

**Mr. Aikens:** Must I kneel?

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The hon. member is again insulting the Chair by inference. If he continues in that strain I will have no alternative other than to name him.

**Mr. Aikens:** Very well. I withdraw and apologise.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I was about to refer to a High Court authority which in my opinion is very relevant to the point. It refers to the Petrov Commission. It has reference to proceedings issued by Rupert Ernest Lockwood, of Sydney, who issued a writ in order to avoid certain action or prevent certain matters coming before the Petrov Commission. I do not wish to go into the pros and cons of the Petrov Commission, but this is a High Court authority which is binding on all other courts and has relevance to this discussion. It is referred to as *Lockwood v. The Commonwealth and Others* and is reported in 1953, 90 C.L.R., at page 177. It was held, among other things—I will not go into irrelevancies—

“A person against whom allegations were made before the Royal Commission procured the issue of a writ out of the High Court against counsel assisting the commission and the Commonwealth. The causes of action were slander and libel, the words complained of having, it was alleged, been spoken by counsel in the course of the proceedings before the commission and been printed and published by the Commonwealth as part of the transcript of the proceedings.

“On 8th July, 1954, Rupert Ernest Lockwood of Sydney, New South Wales, commenced an action in the High Court against the Commonwealth of Australia.”

Lockwood did in fact, unlike some others, file a statement of claim, paragraph 11 of which read—

“The plaintiff has issued out of this Honourable Court writ No. 9 of 1954 under which he claims damages for defamation against the Commonwealth and one W. J. V. Windeyer, Q.C., in respect of statements made by the said W. J. V. Windeyer, Q.C., at the said Royal Commission and the commissioners are hearing evidence and argument relating to issues in the said writ.”

As the top commission, we have even greater powers than any royal commission. We are the commission of the State—the supreme commission—the supreme Parliament of this State—so that any law relating to commissions issued outside have no relevance to us.

Paragraph 11 of the statement of claim continues—

“By reason of those facts the plaintiff respectfully submits that the commissioners are in contempt of this Honourable Court.”

In other words, many people claim that parliamentarians are in contempt of the honourable Supreme Court of Queensland merely because they discuss a matter that is being considered in the Supreme Court of Queensland.

**Mr. Aikens:** This Parliament can never become inferior to any court.

**Mr. BENNETT:** That is quite so.

This is what Mr. Justice Fullagar says at page 185—

“The last ground on which a limited injunction is sought is based on the issue out of this Court by the plaintiff on the 6th July, 1954, of a writ in action No. 9 of 1954.

“The defendants in this action are the Commonwealth and Mr. W. J. V. Windeyer, Q.C., who is the senior counsel assisting the Commission in its investigation. The causes of action are alleged slander and libel, the words complained of being said to have been spoken by Mr. Windeyer in the course of proceedings before the commission, and to have been subsequently printed and published by the Commonwealth as part of the transcript of the proceedings. The words in question are concerned with ‘Document J’ and ‘Exhibit 46.’

“It is said that the commission cannot lawfully, while this action for alleged slander and libel is pending, proceed with its inquiry so far as any matter referred to in or connected with ‘Document J’ or ‘Exhibit 46’ is concerned. I understood Mr. Laurie really to put the matter in two ways. He said that to proceed with the inquiry in respect of these matters while Action No. 9 of 1954 was pending in this Court would be a contempt of this Court. He suggested also that there was a rule of common law, based on natural justice, to the effect that a Royal Commission could not inquire into and report upon a matter which was the subject of pending civil or criminal proceedings. I am not sure that he did not put the suggested rule even higher, but he certainly put it as high as I have stated.

“The short answer to the whole argument seems to me to be that this commission is authorized and required, in pursuance of a statute, —”

Of course, we operate under a statute.

The quotation continues—

“— to undertake the inquiry in which it is engaged. No court could hold in any circumstances which I find it possible to envisage, that what is expressly authorized by or under a statute is a contempt, and

it is a rule of the common law that the common law itself gives way to statute law.

"In disposing of the case on this short and simple ground, I must not be thought to entertain the view that any violation of any principle of justice is involved, or that the position would have been in any way different if the Royal Commission had been appointed by the Governor-General by virtue of the prerogative and not in pursuance of any statute. The judgments in *McGuinness v. Attorney-General for Victoria* (1), and particularly the judgment of the present Chief Justice, strongly suggest to my mind that the position would have been the same if this commission had been appointed without statutory authority. Mr. Laurie referred to certain events which took place in Victoria in 1952, when a Royal Commission had been appointed, in the exercise of the prerogative, to investigate certain allegations of corruption. One of the persons whose conduct might have been in question issued a writ, claiming damages for defamation, and the commission, which consisted of three judges of the Supreme Court, declined to proceed further with the inquiry. I have not seen a copy of any reasons given for this decision, and I can therefore express no opinion upon it, but I cannot help feeling that the soundness of the decision may be open to question. It would indeed savour of absurdity —"

I emphasise the word "absurdity".

The quotation continued—

"— if an inquiry duly authorised by law could always be stultified by the simple expedient of issuing a writ out of a superior court.

"For the reasons I have given I am of opinion that the motion should be dismissed. The order which I make is that the motion be dismissed."

I repeat that it would be reducing this Parliament to an absurdity if any private individual could interfere with its functions by merely issuing a writ. How ridiculous it would be. How ludicrous it would be if a person involved in a matter concerning a budget in the Federal Parliament could issue a writ claiming defamation about certain matters in the budget, and thereby stop the Federal Parliament from dealing with it. The mere thought of it is so shockingly ludicrous that we could not entertain it as intelligent men, as courageous people, which we are supposed to be, representing the taxpayers of Queensland. We should not allow any instrumentality outside this Parliament to interfere with our free, frank and lawful discussions. It will be a sorry day for the authority of Parliament when any individuals can twist us around their little fingers. Sometimes these people are dishonest. It is not only the share sharks and other dishonest

members of the community who deal contemptuously with Parliament and parliamentarians.

We have paid a lot of respect to Her Majesty, and I hope that the remarks of a number of speakers were made sincerely and genuinely and were meaningful; that they were not made merely to give lip service in an artificial and insincere manner. I hope the speakers really meant everything they said. If they did, in view of all that has transpired during the conduct of this debate and in view of our feeling for Her Majesty, there is only one thing this Parliament can do, that is, to support the claim made by my Leader for the appointment of a royal commission to investigate the matters that have been discussed by at least four prominent members of this Government.

If we are sincere in what we are doing and say that we owe allegiance to Her Majesty, surely we do not want to suppress the truth. Surely, when conflicting allegations are made by four senior Ministers of the Crown, there is only one way that the prestige of Parliament can be preserved, that is, by using the technique or method suggested by my Leader, namely, to have a properly constituted royal commission to inquire into those allegations, because lying, deceptiveness, evasiveness, and untruthfulness do not inspire the confidence of the people we represent or of the other Parliaments with whom we have dealings, or, in our international affairs, the confidence of countries that do not subscribe to democratic government.

The House could well bear in mind section 133 of the Criminal Code, which reads —

"Any person who asks, receives, or obtains, or agrees or attempts to receive or obtain, any property or benefit of any kind for himself or any other person, upon any agreement or understanding that he will compound or conceal a crime, or will abstain from, discontinue, or delay, a prosecution for a crime, or will withhold any evidence thereof, is guilty of an indictable offence.

"If the crime is such that a person convicted of it is liable to be sentenced to . . . imprisonment with hard labour for life, the offender is guilty of a crime, and is liable to imprisonment with hard labour for seven years.

"In any other case the offender is guilty of a misdemeanour, and is liable to imprisonment with hard labour for three years.

"The offender cannot be arrested without warrant."

If portion of what we have heard is true it would appear, subject to the matter being inquired into by the royal commission suggested by my Leader, that there has been a determined, considered breach of section 133 of the Criminal Code.

Let me say in passing that any member of the community, be he parliamentarian or otherwise, should not be above the terms or concept of the law set out in the Criminal Code. We should not determine our thinking on whether or not a person wants to be prosecuted if there is evidence to support a prosecution. We should not be motivated by sentimentalities such as lack of desire to reveal the identities of people, because, after all, the vast majority of criminal cases that are prosecuted in our courts involve reluctant witnesses. But it is their bounden obligation to be in attendance, according to law. If they are subpoenaed they can be dealt with for contempt, and prosecuted, if they do not attend. They have to be there. Most witnesses do not want to be involved in criminal prosecutions.

Let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that even juries do not wish to be in attendance. But they, too, have a bounden obligation to carry out their duties according to law. The natural tendency in any man is to hesitate to convict a person, but a jurymen is required by the State to be in attendance to help carry out the precepts of the law.

It ill-behoves any Cabinet Minister, and in particular the Minister for Justice, to say that he refuses to proceed according to law simply to protect and not embarrass any witness, whether male or female. Many young girls who are subjected to violent rape do not want to give evidence, but they are subpoenaed and are called upon to give some very embarrassing evidence. They have to appear in court. It would be a sorry day if a Minister, because of personal acquaintance with a person and a wish to spare him or her embarrassment, could decide whether such a witness should be spared from appearing in court to do justice to the community.

Although the more serious matters such as rape and attempted rape could, I suppose, be taken into consideration from time to time, I shall not deal with them on this occasion. Section 350 of the Criminal Code reads—

“Any person who unlawfully and indecently assaults a woman or girl is guilty of a misdemeanour, and is liable to imprisonment with hard labour for two years.”

We have heard in this and previous Parliaments statements by persons who might be considered responsible members of the community, including men who have presided over, or sat as members of, committees inquiring into juvenile delinquency. Although I have not always subscribed to this line of thought, we have frequently heard it argued that the bodgie type of young fellow who attacks girls without their consent should be severely dealt with by the courts. Prominent parliamentarians, both Ministers and backbenchers, have frequently said that sentences imposed by judges are inadequate.

**Mr. Dean:** They are, too.

**Mr. BENNETT:** As the hon. member for Sandgate says, in some cases they are. In those cases, we are dealing with men who have been taken to court and dealt with according to law.

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

**Mr. BENNETT:** Whilst I agree that those hon. members are entitled to their views on the adequacy of sentences, surely they should be the first to say in the House, “While I think that some sentences are inadequate, at least the persons concerned have been prosecuted and dealt with. I am not going to condone a situation in which a person who is known to have committed this type of bodgie offence is not dealt with in any way at all.” Those matters obviously can be considered only by the type of royal commission suggested by my Leader. Indecent assault, of course, is only one matter that such a commission could consider.

Whilst I do not know exactly the ruling that has been made, the matter of the Oasis, of course, does not come into it.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I have given the hon. member quite a lot of latitude. Now that he is referring to things such as the koala incident, it is not difficult to guess what he is talking about and he is treading a rather thin line. I ask him not to pursue that line.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I understood there was no mention of matters concerning the Oasis in the court action; they are subsidiary to it so far as I am concerned. I know that some people like playing squash while others prefer “squeeze”. That is not the matter I am concerned about for the moment. The matter that I really wish to discuss deals with the shareholders and shareholdings in that company. This matter has already been introduced here not by Opposition members but by Government members, and they have left the Opposition in a state of confusion and a strong feeling of suspicion. I think Parliament has an obligation to the taxpayers of Queensland to investigate the questionable circumstances surrounding the complete change in the company and also in the shareholdings.

Although I have been in politics and public life for many years, I have had only a short term—I suppose I should call it a “short” term—in Parliament. But I studied political science at the university, and never, either in history or during my actual experience as a public man, have I known a Government to be in a greater state of embarrassment than this Government is at present. It is not for me to sit in judgment on the allegations that have been made.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! It is not for the hon. member to discuss them, either. The matter has previously been ruled out of order.



**Mr. BENNETT:** I thought only one matter had been ruled out of order; I am subject to your correction, of course, Mr. Speaker. I am dealing with four Ministers of the Cabinet, not with the former member of Cabinet who is now a back-bencher and who is having a fight with "Sunday Truth" about a matter that was not discussed in this Parliament. I am dealing with the Cabinet.

I did not wish to be nasty or vitriolic. I was about to say that I do not wish to sit in judgment on any of the allegations that have been made. The Premier did not see fit to speak in Parliament during the Address-in-Reply debate; that is his prerogative. However, he did give a statement outside the House that appears to be in conflict with other information that we have been given inside the House. I am not condemning the Premier—I should not like to do that in the twilight of his career—but I think that, in the interests of fair play and justice, and as his last act as Premier of Queensland, he should endeavour to preserve the standards of this Parliament by complying with the request of the Leader of the Opposition. That is all I am saying. The evidence is so confusing and conflicting and leaves hon. members in such a state of suspicion that I think the Government has a duty to iron out the conflict that is obvious within Cabinet itself and within the Government parties, so that not only will we know the truth, not only will the taxpayers of Queensland know the truth, but Government members themselves will know the truth. Surely that is not too much to ask and is not being unreasonable. Those who are beyond blame can then be exculpated, and those who are worthy of blame must receive their fair measure of blame; but the blame that is due to those deserving ones should not cast a shadow on the character and good name of those who do not deserve it. That, surely, is a fair enough proposition.

I have become a little nauseated by Ministers' replies to questions. I have often said—I hope it will not be taken to be an obsequious comment—that I admire the way in which the Minister for Works and Housing replies to questions asked by hon. members and the way in which he deals with their representations. If a thing cannot be done, he tells one quite bluntly that it cannot and why it cannot, and on most, if not all, occasions his arguments are sound and do not give offence. One does not come away soured or believing that the Minister is evading the truth of the issue.

On the other hand, I cannot say the same of the Minister for Education, who is in charge of police affairs. In answer to a question that I asked yesterday morning, he said there was no meeting of top police officers with the Commissioner at the "Crystal Palace"—that is Police Headquarters. First, I quite frankly admit that the Commissioner is entitled to call in his top officers and have a conference with

them. He did that, and there is ample evidence to support that statement. Why the Minister should deny it I will never know, but that is just what he did. He also said that the reference made to the bomb scare was just a hoax. I should like him to make further and proper investigations into that subject in the interests of the Police Force and in the interests of the integrity of this Parliament.

I suggest that the Minister, in sifting that allegation, might probe the possibility of an actual amount of £5,000—\$10,000—being handed over by a couple of people from the South interested in the formation of a brand new baccarat school in this State.

**Mr. Aikens:** Whom was it handed to?

**Mr. BENNETT:** I am making this speech.

Inspector McNeil, who was then in charge of the Licensing Squad, and who, I understand, faithfully carried out his tasks and duties, decided that this baccarat school could not, and would not, operate, because he would carry out the law. The school operated for one night and he closed it down on the second night. I should like the Minister in charge of police to inquire whether or not the so-called bomb scare that was allegedly a hoax had any relationship to the refund of the £5,000 because the protection no longer applied.

**Mr. Mann:** That is a lot of baloney.

**Mr. Aikens:** "Johnno" would know more about baccarat schools than you would.

**Mr. BENNETT:** The hon. member might know more about baccarat schools than I do.

It has been the policy of all Governments, and in particular this Government, not to consider, and certainly not to make decisions about, matters that affect the welfare of unions or other people in this State whilst a gun is being held at their heads or whilst a threat of direct action is current. I am not going into the pros and cons of demands made by members of the Queensland University Union for an amendment of the Traffic Act in relation to what they call "civic liberties". That is not an issue that I wish to discuss at the moment—I have not the time—but there was a threat of direct action that unless the Premier made a decision in their favour—I should say the threat did not come from the official body of the Queensland University but from a minority group led by Mr. Brian Laver—

**Mr. Mann:** Do you think he is a Comm?

**Mr. BENNETT:** The hon. member has said enough this afternoon.

This group of students, led by Mr. Brian Laver, said that unless the Premier, or the Cabinet, came to a certain decision, they would take direct action and do other things. The Premier knew that was intended because it had been publicly announced in the Press;

yet, according to what we read in the Press, the Premier said he would amend the regulations or the legislation and that he considered and believed that it would be in favour of the persons who were threatening direct action.

That is not in keeping with the treatment that is accorded genuine unionists who have a good cause of grievance affecting their wages or welfare. They are always told that their case will not be considered or dealt with whilst there is any such threat. That is again a matter for the Premier to consider, but let me assure him that on Tuesday morning the selfsame Brian Laver, at a meeting of students on the campus—there were at least 1,000 or more present—said—

“We have had a victory against the Government; we have forced them to retreat.”

When I am speaking about standards of government and what we expect in the way of parliamentary respect, I feel that this Government should be more cautious in what it tells the people and in how it tells them the truth about what is happening.

There is one other matter which I agreed to bring up, and which perhaps has been overlooked by the Minister concerned. It relates to the Workers' Compensation Act. In case it is argued that I am only furthering the interests of legal men and their fees, let me assure you from the beginning, Mr. Speaker, that this argument has nothing to do with the income of barristers or solicitors. Irrespective of what is done, they will charge the same fees.

According to the Magistrates Court Act, in civil actions a person is entitled to recover from his unsuccessful opponent certain moneys under a scale that was amended by Order in Council on 9 February, 1967. That scale sets out the amount of costs, according to scale, that a successful litigant can obtain from an unsuccessful litigant. Incidentally, the maximum jurisdiction of the Magistrates Court is \$1,200.

Take the case of a worker who appears before an industrial magistrate. The only difference between an industrial magistrate and an ordinary magistrate is that the industrial magistrate is sitting in a court constituted as an Industrial Court. Both courts are presided over by the same class of people—suitably qualified magistrates.

**Mr. Duffy:** It is a matter of jurisdiction.

**Mr. BENNETT:** It is a matter of jurisdiction, as the hon. member for Warrego points out.

In the Industrial Court a worker can claim compensation up to \$7,000, but the scale of fees is fixed under the old regulations, which do not appear to have been amended since 1941. Therefore, a worker who is successful in the litigation he embarks upon cannot recover the same amount as the ordinary

person can recover in civil litigation. Let me put it more plainly. If a person is injured, say, at the meatworks and suffers damages well in excess of \$1,200, the total amount he can recover in costs against his opponent is \$117.60. On the other hand, if he received the same injuries in a road accident out on the highway, and was successful in litigation, the total he could recover in costs against his unsuccessful opponent in a civil court, before the same magistrate sitting in a different jurisdiction, would be \$185.75. A person who is a worker operating under the Workers' Compensation Act virtually loses \$68 because of the difference in the scales of costs. It would seem that the appropriate Minister should consider an amendment to the regulations under the Workers' Compensation Act with a view to bringing them into parity with the Magistrates Court scale of costs.

**Mr. Aikens:** There is very little litigation under the Workers' Compensation Act now that we have set up all these various boards.

**Mr. BENNETT:** Don't be silly! The Industrial Magistrate is sitting every day in Brisbane. He cannot cope with all the work that comes before him.

The next point I wish to make is that the Government should introduce legislation providing for the payment of compensation to the victims of violent crime in the community. We have heard many suggestions that certain people should not be forced into court in certain circumstances. In fact, as I mentioned, we do insist on their going to court, and many girls, and sometimes men, are taken into court following the commission of violent crimes upon them. That, in itself, is embarrassing enough, but very often these people are deprived of the ability to work. They sometimes suffer permanent injury and damage, and it would seem that we should try to do something to help them.

I point out that in an article in one of the latest Australian Law Journals, the following appears—

“In contemporary Australian society we all too frequently have brought to our attention headlines announcing the commission of some violent crime. Case No. A267 raises starkly the tragedy which may lie behind these headlines. Yet it is a tragedy which all too rarely comes to the notice of the public at large. It is also a tragedy for which the victim is unlikely to receive compensation. For while in primitive legal systems great importance was attached to redressing harm caused by criminal acts, in our supposedly sophisticated legal system scant attention is devoted to this aim. The courts seldom exercise their limited powers to order offenders to pay compensation to their victims. Nor are the civil remedies of victims against their attackers likely to result in the recovery of compensation, most such offenders being men of straw.

In the case of offenders who remain undetected, victims have no opportunity to obtain redress through either the civil or criminal law."

Other States in Australia have done something by what is known as the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act.

I am fully conscious of the fact that the House was good enough to allow me an extension of time to deal with another matter. This is a subject that calls for a great deal of development, and many arguments could be advanced in favour of the implementation of some scheme for compensating victims of violent crimes. I hope that other speakers will deal with the matter. In view of the time that I have spent on this and other subjects, I will now conclude my submissions.

**Hon. R. E. CAMM** (Whitsunday—Minister for Mines and Main Roads) (3.33 p.m.): In rising to participate in this debate, I wish to support the hon. member for Mulgrave and the hon. member for Chatsworth in their expressions of loyalty. I should also like to welcome to this House the hon. member for Roma, Mr. Ken Tomkins. I am sure that, with his vast experience of the rural industries in his electorate, and also as an administrator, he will prove a very worthy representative of the people in that district. I am also sure that he will make some very worth-while contributions to the debate in this House.

During my speech I will be replying to some of the criticism that has been levelled at the departments under my control. However, before doing so, as a representative of a large cane-growing district, I should like to pay a tribute to the growers, millers and workers associated with the sugar industry of Queensland for the manner in which they have been accepting their responsibilities during this period of recession in the industry. For many years, Governments in Queensland have acknowledged the value of the sugar industry to the economy of the State, and have recognised the efficiency of the organisations that have been built up by the growers and the millers themselves, who respectively administer and control the growing and marketing of this product.

It is unfortunate that the overseas price has fallen to such an extent that it is uneconomical—it could even be described as disastrous—for growers to continue to attempt to grow sugar for disposal at the world market price. This Government has been criticised by members of the Opposition for agreeing to the expansion undertaken by the industry when the overseas price reached such a high level and the future demand for sugar appeared to be so assured.

I emphasise—and it is well known to people in the industry—that this expansion took place as a result of investigations by a committee of inquiry appointed by the

Government after an approach to it by representatives of the sugar industry organisations. If those recommendations had not been adopted by the Government the sugar industry today would be growing and manufacturing a far lesser tonnage of sugar.

As a result of the increased tonnage now being grown, the income from sugar produced last year by the eight mills in the Mackay-Proserpine district was the third highest on record. Indeed, if we take into consideration the \$19,000,000 injected into the industry by the Commonwealth Government's loan we find that, for the whole of Queensland last year, the income of \$182,785,251 was the second highest ever earned by the State's sugar industry.

**Mr. Hanlon:** Did you say that was taking the \$19,000,000 in, or leaving it out?

**Mr. CAMM:** Taking it into consideration.

The figure I quoted was exceeded only when we had a boom price period in 1963, when the sugar crop returned \$211,266,024. Even without the \$19,000,000 loan advanced by the Commonwealth Government—deducting it from last year's gross income—the return last year would have been the fourth highest ever received in the history of the sugar industry.

This expansion has resulted in large sums of money being spent on fertiliser, machinery, fuel, and wages, covering all activities from the growing to the milling of this product. This amount of money must have had a profound effect on the economy of this State.

The real sufferers from the low price are the growers themselves and the sugar millers. Nevertheless, it is to their credit that they have been loyal to the organisations which they themselves elect to control their future, because it is readily accepted that the future prosperity of the sugar industry relies on a stable International Sugar Agreement. If Queensland is to have a right to a fair share in any future allocation under the International Sugar Agreement, we must be prepared to show the rest of the world that we are capable of growing such large tonnages of sugar. To obtain the large tonnage of sugar which we must produce, large sugar peaks have been allotted to mills, and, from the mill peaks, cane farm peaks have been allotted to farmers. So it goes right back to the fact that the cane farmers themselves and the raw-sugar millers must bear the brunt of the low overseas sugar price.

**Mr. Coburn:** Up to now you have done everything they have ever asked you to do.

**Mr. CAMM:** The Government has done everything the sugar organisations in Queensland have requested.

It was very pleasing to me to find that the Queensland Cane Growers' Council and the Australian Sugar Producers' Association combined last year in an approach to the Queensland Government for a \$19,000,00

loan to assist in the marketing of last year's crop. In addition, the success of the case they submitted through the Queensland Government to the Commonwealth Government for an increased price for home-consumption sugar has been responsible for alleviating much of the hardship that otherwise would have been experienced by the farmers and the millers. This increased price, by the way, has been opposed by members of the Australian Labour Party. It was opposed in this House, as will be seen by a reference to Volume 243, page 215, of "Hansard," when the hon. member for Mackay rose in the House and criticised anyone who advocated an increase in the home-consumption price of sugar.

We now find in the presentation of the Federal Budget that the Commonwealth Treasurer has indicated that this year provision will be made for a loan of from \$10,000,000 to \$15,000,000 to assist the sugar industry further. It has been drawn to my attention that it has been stated by some people with academic knowledge but very little practical experience in the sugar industry that now is the time for cane-growers' executives and mill suppliers' committees to approach the Queensland Government to have No. 2 Pool sugar included in the tonnage to be benefited by this loan money. That is misleading advice, because the Queensland Government deals only with the elected parent body of the growers' organisation, namely, the Queensland Cane Growers' Council. I am confident that that council will be approaching the Queensland Government with suggestions on how this money can be used to assist the industry. Local organisations, whether they be mill suppliers' committees or district executives, should channel their requests on claims through the parent body.

There has been considerable argument among growers in the sugar industry over whether or not No. 2 Pool sugar should be included in the disbursement of the \$10,000,000 to \$15,000,000 loan from the Federal Government.

**Mr. Coburn:** Would you have recognised our representations from the Queensland Cane Growers' Council?

**Mr. CAMM:** That is correct; the Queensland Government can recognise only the parent body.

I now wish to deal with the talk that there has been about dissatisfaction among school teachers in Queensland. Some speakers have even intimated that this dissatisfaction extends to parents and general citizens alike. I want to make it clear that the progress in the provision of education facilities in the Mackay district since this Government came to office can only be described as fantastic. I am not denying that there is some dissatisfaction among teachers, mainly, I am sure, because of the salaries that teachers are paid in Queensland compared with those in other States

and even some other countries. However, the fixing of salary rates for teachers is a matter entirely for the Industrial Commission, and I am confident that, with a proper approach to that Commission, teachers will receive just recognition, bearing in mind the relationship that must exist throughout the wage structure of Queensland.

There is a shortage of teachers, and the Minister for Education made it clear yesterday that he is not entirely satisfied with the number that his department has. I remind hon. members that since this Government came to power, with the industrial development that has since taken place in Queensland, the demand for technically trained men has increased very greatly. We are short of geologists; we are short of engineers; we cannot get enough surveyors. The opportunities for young boys passing the Senior examination today and deciding what career to follow are very great indeed. We therefore find that a smaller percentage of students now undertake training for the teaching service compared with 10 or 15 years ago, when the present opportunities in other fields did not exist.

I shall tell the House what there previously was in Mackay in the way of education facilities. The first high school there was built by a non-Labour Government in 1913, and that Mackay State High School remained the only secondary school in the whole of the Mackay district till 1957. Can anyone truthfully say that the demand for the training of young boys and girls did not increase during all those years?

**Mr. Graham:** Name one other district in Queensland that had additional facilities prior to 1957.

**Mr. CAMM:** That is just what I am saying. It is all the more to the discredit of the Labour Government that it condones a policy under which, from 1913 to 1957, it was prepared to accept that no other district in Queensland, as well as Mackay, was deserving of additional educational amenities for the children.

I ask the hon. member to look at the present amenities in Mackay. That same high school has been turned into a wonderful college, with equipment for engineering, woodworking and electrical tradesmen. There is a splendid new high school in Milton Street that is capable of catering for many times the number of students it was possible to house in the old building. There is a new high school at North Mackay which hundreds of students are attending, a new high school at Proserpine, a new secondary department at Calen, and a new high school at Sarina. For 40 years Labour was prepared to accept the view that one high school was all that was needed in the Mackay district. Hon. members opposite must be talking with their tongues in their cheeks when they criticise the Minister for Education, because

they know that similar expansion has taken place over the length and breadth of Queensland.

**Mr. Hanlon:** And Australia.

**Mr. CAMM:** Admittedly it might have taken place all over Australia, too; but the people of Queensland should be full of praise for what has been done to encourage students to undertake higher education and for what the Government has done to provide the facilities for that education.

**Mr. Houston:** Weren't you satisfied with the Minister's speech yesterday? Do you have to come in and support him?

**Mr. CAMM:** I do not think this can be reiterated too frequently.

**Mr. Houston:** I think you protest too much.

**Mr. CAMM:** The Department of Education has a wonderful record in Queensland. The truth always hurts.

During this debate the hon. member for Norman was very critical of the Main Roads Department for its handling of resumptions made necessary by the implementation of the Wilbur Smith plan of freeways and expressways through the city of Brisbane. He was concerned mainly with what has happened in the Woolloongabba area; that is natural, because it is in his electorate. In reply to a question I gave him certain figures, which he endeavoured to misconstrue to his own advantage and to the detriment of the Main Roads Department. His criticism, I believe, stems from a complete lack of knowledge of the resumption procedures that have been in existence for many years in Queensland.

The Department of the Co-ordinator-General is responsible for the resumption of land for these roadworks in Brisbane, and the resumptions are made under the State Development and Public Works Organisation Acts and the Public Works Land Resumption Acts. These Acts set out in detail how the resumptions are to be effected. The Department of the Valuer-General is responsible for the valuing of all properties and for assessing the amount of money that should be paid as compensation. Property officers attached to the Main Roads Department confer with the dispossessed persons and, for the payment of compensation, take into consideration such matters as severance, disturbance, and injurious affection. These conditions cover a very wide field, and if an owner is not satisfied with the amount of compensation offered by the department, he can appeal to the Land Court for a further assessment. In respect of all resumptions by the Main Roads Department over the last 12 months, only one owner has sought the judgment of the court and he received an amount far lower than he had claimed. I think that indicates that the resumption

principles adopted by the Main Roads Department give a very fair return to the landholders whose properties are being resumed.

**Mr. Houston:** Was the amount of the judgment more than the amount asked for?

**Mr. CAMM:** I cannot tell the hon. member that offhand. It was far less than the amount claimed.

**Mr. Houston:** Was it less than was asked for?

**Mr. CAMM:** It could have been a bit more; I am not sure.

**Mr. Hanlon:** What did it cost the landholder to go to the Land Court?

**Mr. CAMM:** Seeing that only one person has been to the Land Court, I did not bother to find out.

The officers of the department have a responsibility to see that the traffic flow in the city of Brisbane is maintained at a reasonable level. At the same time, they are concerned also with the disbursement of public money and every care must be exercised to ensure that this is done in a manner that is fair and equitable both to the people affected by resumptions and also to the taxpayers of Queensland who, after all, are the people who contribute the money that is paid in compensation when we resume properties.

Naturally, many people will be concerned at the disturbance they are caused by having to move from a place where perhaps they have spent many years of their lives, and I assure this House that I personally, and the officers of the Main Roads Department, have every consideration for these people. I have spoken to many people who will be affected by these resumptions. They have come to my office and have spoken to me on the telephone, and I have endeavoured to allay their fears by explaining fully just what these resumptions entail. I will explain it to hon. members.

A notice of resumption is first sent to the property-owner concerned, and after 30 days a proclamation is issued resuming the land for the Crown. Technically, the land must then be classed as resumed land even though no compensation claims have been considered. In my reply to the hon. member for Norman on 10 August, when he asked how many properties had been resumed and what compensation had been paid, I said that 44 properties had been resumed and that compensation of \$113,553 had been paid. Of course, with his lack of knowledge of resumption principles, he then divided the 44 into this amount and came up with the figure that \$3,000 a property had been paid.

**Mr. Bromley:** You would not give me the individual amounts that had been paid.

**Mr. CAMM:** The hon. member's opinion is based on false premises. He asked how many properties had been resumed and how much compensation had been paid, and I gave him the answer. His calculation was made on false premises, because the amount paid bore no relationship whatever to the total value of the 44 resumed properties.

**Mr. Bromley:** Of course. Anybody can see that.

**Mr. CAMM:** Then why did the hon. member divide the total amount by 44?

**Mr. Bromley:** Because you would not give me the individual amounts.

**Mr. CAMM:** Actually, the amount I quoted applied only to six properties, one on the Riverside Expressway and five on the Story Bridge Expressway, advances on some other properties, and payment for the replacement of an existing Government building.

**Mr. Bromley:** Why didn't you give me a full answer the first time?

**Mr. CAMM:** I do not have to supply the hon. member with brains. He asked how many properties had been resumed and how much compensation had been paid, and I gave him the answer to that question.

**Mr. Hanlon:** Don't forget that the public get information from Ministers' replies, and they are entitled to assume that your reply was open to that interpretation.

**Mr. CAMM:** If the public want to get information by means of a question asked by the hon. member for Norman and the way he construes the answer to that question, then he should take a few lessons on how to ask his questions. I can give him an answer, but I cannot give him the brains to enable him to ask a proper question or to construe the answer to his question.

As a matter of fact, since the hon. member asked his question negotiations have reached the stage where compensation for 19 properties on the Story Bridge Expressway has been settled. This compensation amounts to \$287,900, being an average of \$15,153 per property.

**Mr. Bromley:** Why didn't you give me that answer?

**Mr. CAMM:** If the hon. member had been honest and fair in reading the answer, and if he had read it carefully, he would have noticed that in the same answer I said that the estimated cost of acquisition of properties for freeways and expressways for Stage I was \$8,620,000. I also indicated that the resumption of 334 properties would be required for the expressways and freeways. Why did the hon. member not make that division? If he had divided that number of properties into the figure that I gave as our estimate of the cost of resumptions, he would have come up with an average

of \$19,900 per property. I draw to the attention of the people in the hon. member's area how anyone can be misled through a lack of knowledge on the part of someone who, in this case, I feel was only trying to obtain some cheap political advantage.

The report prepared by Wilbur Smith and Associates following the Brisbane Transportation Study recommended a system of freeways, expressways and major street works to cater for the over-all transport requirements of the area to the time, estimated as 1981, when the population of the city would reach 1,000,000.

I notice that the Leader of the Opposition is looking at the questions. I will tell him what the question was. He will find it in Votes and Proceedings.

**Mr. Houston:** Of course I will.

**Mr. CAMM:** As such, the plans contained in the report did not purport to be the final working plans, or plans intended to detail property requirements, for the future expressways or freeways. They were simply intended to indicate the feasibility of the various proposals as the basis for preparation of over-all estimates of costs and as a basis on which detailed planning could be done.

It has been stressed from the outset that, following a decision to proceed with any of the recommended works of the Transportation Plan, detailed surveys and designs would be necessary, and such would take into account any changes which had occurred in the area, or in traffic patterns or other factors having an influence on the matter.

Following the detailed survey of the area involved in the construction of the proposed South-east Freeway, a very comprehensive brochure was distributed to every owner whose property will be required for resumption. Copies of the brochure were sent also to owners of properties situated in close proximity to the selected route of the freeway in order to acquaint them with the exact location chosen for the road.

Detailed particulars were included in the brochure outlining the procedure for the acquisition of properties, stating when the properties would be required and giving information regarding compensation and when settlement of compensation could be made.

Information was also contained in the brochure advising people that if they required further particulars they could ring a telephone number in the Main Roads Department.

I might mention at this stage that the Right Hon. the Lord Mayor of Brisbane wrote to me on 15 August, 1967, about the brochure. This is the text of his letter—

"Thank you very much for letting me have a copy of the brochure delivered to all landholders in the vicinity of the proposed route of the South-east Freeway.

"May I compliment you and your Department on its preparation. I do not think anyone could ask for any more clear outline of the proposals."

I must pay tribute here to the work that has been done by a committee formed in the Woolloongabba area under the chairmanship of a Mr. McKenzie. I believe that this committee was formed as the result of a meeting arranged by the Federal Liberal member for the area, Mr. Don Cameron. I believe he received many requests from residents of the area to form an organisation which could approach the Main Roads Department and obtain information from it to give to the people who will be affected by the building of this freeway.

**A Government Member:** The Federal member did a very good job.

**Mr. CAMM:** He did indeed do a very good job.

Officers of my department have been to some of this committee's meetings, at the specific request of the committee, and these officers have answered in detail many of the questions that have been concerning the people affected by the South-east Freeway.

This committee is doing a job for the area in a logical and sensible manner. Its members are not just sitting there creating a clamour and causing embarrassment to officers who are charged with the implementation of this scheme and who themselves possess a sympathetic attitude towards the people that this road will displace. I might add that I have conferred with the executive officers of this committee.

I feel, too, that I must reply to some criticism from the hon. member for Wavell. I want to say now that I join with many other hon. members of this House in expressing my regret that he has seen fit to take the course of action that he has, and that he has criticised an administration of which he has been a member for some 10 years.

The hon. member criticised the transfer to local authorities of some traffic-control responsibilities. The decision to hand over to the Brisbane City Council and other local authorities certain traffic-control responsibilities in respect of roads under their control was a logical one. It was not done specifically to shift the responsibilities, financial or otherwise, from the Government to the local authorities, but rather to decentralise control and to enable councils to apply their local knowledge to the installation of traffic facilities on roads designed and built by them, such installations to conform to uniform standards laid down by the Government in the light of experience it had gained.

As local authorities are responsible for the designing of their own roads, including items such as drainage, kerbing and channelling, pavement thickness, etc., it is logical that the installation of traffic-control

devices should be included as part of the over-all design of their roads and streets. Just as the pavement of a roadway provides the running surface, the traffic-control devices provide the roadside furniture for the safer control of traffic.

The Government has set the standards for traffic-control devices, it established the means of financing traffic works done by councils, including payments from a Traffic Engineering Trust Fund, and it provides technical advice to councils on traffic engineering matters whenever they seek it.

The standard of traffic signals erected in Queensland is amongst the highest in the world and is in keeping with good traffic engineering practice. A reduction in the standard would not effect any appreciable savings in costs, but cheaper installations could, because of reduced visibility and recognition by drivers, result in increased road hazard.

The money from the Traffic Engineering Trust Fund is distributed to local authorities. It was established with portion of the increased driving fees. We allocate \$240,000 a year to local authorities for the provision of traffic-control facilities. Of that sum, \$120,000 goes to the Brisbane City Council. The rest of Queensland—every other city and town—shares in the other \$120,000.

I refer also to the hon. member's criticism of the spending of money from the Main Roads Trust Fund. Surely he knows that, under the Main Roads Act, these funds must be divided as evenly as practicable between the three main roads divisions of this State.

Section 30 of the Main Roads Acts, 1920 to 1965, states—

"In the expenditure of the moneys legally available in each year for the purposes of this Act, it shall be the duty of the Commissioner to see that as nearly as is practicable an equal amount is expended in each of the three Divisions of the State."

Surely a compliance with these conditions could never be termed "criminal". His criticism appears to show a complete lack of knowledge of the purposes for which main roads funds are collected.

**Mr. Dewar:** It would not be hard to change the Act.

**Mr. CAMM:** The hon. member for Wavell had 10 years in which to offer suggestions—as a matter of fact he has had 17 years in this Chamber—but he offered no suggestions to change the Act.

Main roads funds are collected for the purpose of permanent construction and maintenance of the gazetted roads system of Queensland. These roads consist of high-ways, developmental roads, main roads and secondary roads in this State. The Main Roads Department is not responsible for building or maintaining streets in any city of Queensland, nor does it contribute to the

building of local authority roads in the State. However, the various local authorities are assisted by way of subsidy from the Government. There are 24,500 miles of gazetted roads and over 100,000 miles of dedicated roads under the control of local authorities. Therefore, 20 per cent. of the roads in Queensland is under the control of the Main Roads Department, but this 20 per cent. carries 80 per cent. of all the traffic that flows in this State.

In constructing and maintaining highways, naturally some work is done in city areas, because highways continue through all the major cities of our State. Some of the cities are also served by main roads leading in from other directions.

The hon. member for Wavell referred to the expenditure of an amount of \$4,471,902 by the Main Roads Department on permanent works and maintenance on roads in Brisbane over the past 10 years. In doing so, he completely ignored the fact that money was spent from other funds administered by the Government. Expenditure on road works in Brisbane over the past 10 years is as follows:—

	\$
Expenditure on declared roads from Main Roads Funds—	
Permanent works and maintenance .. .. .	4,471,902
Advances from—	
(1) Commonwealth Aid Fund .. .. .	1,431,055
(2) Road Maintenance Fund .. .. .	2,984,820
(3) Traffic Engineering Trust Fund .. .. .	120,000
Treasury Subsidies—	
Road, street, and bridge works .. .. .	5,775,085
Urban Roads Construction Fund .. .. .	848,613
	\$15,631,475

In addition, a considerable amount was spent by the Traffic Commission on traffic engineering works in Brisbane.

It can be truthfully said that in Queensland, with its diversified development, every road that can be built is of importance to the State and, when a road is built in a particular locality, it is not built just to serve the people in that locality. It is to provide a means of communication for the transport of goods and produce from the point of production to the areas of market or consumption.

I do not claim that we are happy with the rate of road construction, either in country areas or in the cities. However, I can assure the people of Queensland that the members of this Government are satisfied that we are spending the funds available to

the Main Roads Department in a manner which we believe will be to the greatest benefit of the State as a whole.

**Mr. Hinze:** Are not considerable sums allocated for work under the Wilbur Smith Report in the next four or five years?

**Mr. CAMM:** I am coming to that.

Intelligent people in Queensland realise that we cannot impose a greater burden on the taxpayers of Queensland to provide the financial and also the physical resources required to build every road that appears necessary to the individual. We are somewhat at a disadvantage compared with other States of Australia when we examine the amount of motor vehicle registration fees collected per mile of declared road under the control of the Main Roads Department. Whilst the figure for Western Australia is not known, the other States collect the following registration fees per mile of declared road—

	\$
New South Wales .. .. .	1,225.6
Victoria .. .. .	1,702.5
South Australia .. .. .	1,457.5
Tasmania .. .. .	1,556.6

The comparable figure for Queensland is \$642.2 per mile of declared road.

I want to make it clear that the need for an improved roads system in the Brisbane area has been recognised by the Government. There have been some innuendoes by speakers in this House that I, as a Country Party Minister, am not vitally concerned with the traffic problems of Brisbane. Nothing could be further from the truth. Brisbane is the capital of Queensland and, as a Queensland, I am very interested in the provision of adequate roads to cope with the ever-increasing demands of motorists and transport operators. Any delay experienced by workers, and the hold-up of transports in Brisbane, must cause an increase in the overall costs of the production of this State, whether it is primary produce being marketed through the port of Brisbane or a manufactured article imported or fabricated in this city.

(Time, on motion of Dr. Delamothe, extended.)

**Mr. CAMM:** I thank the Minister for Justice, and the House, for granting me an extension of time.

I can assure the people of Queensland that this coalition Country-Liberal Government is desirous of attending to all road problems in Queensland, whether they be in country or city areas. Surely it must be appreciated that the building of roads from the country to the city areas must be of immense benefit to the cities themselves. Can anyone deny that the building of a bitumen road along our coastline has benefited Brisbane, or that the building of a bitumen road from



Longreach through the West to Brisbane has meant a greater flow of people and merchandise from the country to the city?

Even in Brisbane there are many roads under the control of the Main Roads Department. I have here a comprehensive list of them, although I do not propose to go through them all. I refer, for example, to part of the Bruce Highway; part of the Pacific Highway, part of the Cunningham Highway; and part of the Mt. Lindesay Highway. There is also a section of 5.1 miles of the Lockyer-Darling Downs Highway.

In main roads, there are—

	Miles
South Coast .. .. .	4.7
Capalaba .. .. .	7.4
Gympie .. .. .	7.3
Clontarf .. .. .	6.8
Brisbane-Toowoomba ..	3.0
Coopers Plains-Rochedale ..	6.4
Salisbury (connection road)	0.8
Brisbane-Mt. Lindesay ..	9.2
Brisbane-Mt. Nebo ..	2.0
Moggill .. .. .	9.7
Brookfield .. .. .	5.6
Waterworks .. .. .	3.3
Samford .. .. .	6.4
Aspley-Clear Mountain ..	2.5

Then there are some secondary main roads—Upper Mt. Gravatt-Capalaba, Kingston, and Enoggera Waterworks-Mt. Nebo. Admittedly it is not enough; but these roads were gazetted in Brisbane over the years and the Government understood that further roads would have to be constructed in Brisbane.

When the new road plan was adopted in 1963 it was recognised that a new approach would have to be made to the matter of construction and maintenance of major roads through the city of Brisbane. Consequently, a firm of consulting engineers was engaged to conduct a transportation study and to recommend where freeways and expressways should be constructed. The result of the investigations was examined by the Government and a modified version of Stage I was adopted to provide a beginning for the building of a complex system of freeways and expressways. This will mean that an additional \$37,550,000 will be spent in Brisbane in the next five years, during which time further consideration will be given to implementation of other stages of the report.

The construction of roads recommended in further stages of the report will mean that more money will be spent in the city of Brisbane in the next 10 years than has been expended from Main Roads funds since the department came into existence in 1922. Does the hon. member for Wavell advocate a policy under which the bulk of the money collected for Main Roads purposes should be spent within the environs of Brisbane? Surely he must realise that

industrial and rural development would not take place without an integrated road system throughout the State.

On his assumption that because a big proportion of Main Roads funds is raised in the south-east portion of Queensland, 20 per cent. of it should therefore be spent in the Brisbane city area, would he also say that because \$1,000,000 is collected at Mt. Isa in royalty, it should be spent in that town; or that all the royalty from Moonie should be spent in that area; or that because the railways make a profit in the Northern Division, all that money should be ploughed back into that part of Queensland?

**Mr. Hanlon:** Your main roads money goes into a special Main Roads fund, whereas royalties go into general revenue.

**Mr. CAMM:** I am just talking about the principle that money should be spent in the area in which it is raised.

**Mr. Hanlon:** They are two different funds.

**Mr. CAMM:** I admit that they are two different funds. But if one adopts the principle for one fund that money should be spent in the area in which it is collected, one should adopt a similar principle for other funds. The \$2,000,000 that it cost to construct the bypass at Beenleigh was not spent there for the benefit of the people of that town. The huge amount of money that has been expended in providing a four-lane highway from Ipswich to Brisbane was not spent solely for the benefit of the people of Ipswich. The cost of providing a bypass at Redbank could not possibly be related to the money collected in that area. All these roads are vital to the development of industries in this part of Queensland. What is the good of having first-class four-lane highways, expressways and freeways in city areas if the products so vital to industry and the livelihood of the people in the city are in transport vehicles that are bogged out in the black-soil plains through lack of good roads, or stranded in the bull-dust west of Charleville?

The hon. member for Wavell has been very specific in his utterances, in that he no longer associates himself with the coalition Government. One must deduce from that that these thoughts are entirely his own and do not reflect in any way the opinions of members of the Liberal Party who have worked so harmoniously with the Country Party in this coalition Government over the past 10 years to bring Queensland to a stage of development that has resulted in unprecedented prosperity for the citizens of Queensland.

**Mr. GRAHAM (Mackay) (4.20 p.m.):** In associating myself with the mover and the seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and with the expression of loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen, I also associate the electorate of Mackay.

To my way of thinking, the Opening Speech that was delivered by His Excellency on Tuesday, 8 August, would not entuse other than those who have been fanatical supporters of the present Government during the 10 years of its administration. Despite the claim that this Government has placed Queensland in the forefront of the Australian States, despite the industrial expansion that has taken place in Queensland, this State still has the highest ratio of unemployment in the Commonwealth. There is more industrial unrest in Queensland than in any other State, and there has been more industrial unrest here in the last two years than in any previous year. Without a shadow of doubt, that industrial unrest is the result of discontent in industry caused by the neglect of this Government, which is sectional in its approach to matters concerning the people.

This has meant an unending number of approaches by the trade-union movement to the Industrial Commission for improved wages and conditions in an effort to obtain some justice for the workers in industry. Despite this, continual attacks are being made by the Government on the income of working-class people by the lifting of price control and other factors, yet at the same time we find the profits derived from industry in Queensland are rising to unprecedented heights. The dividends being paid to shareholders of companies are ever on the increase.

One should not wonder, then, that discontent extends throughout the length and breadth of Queensland as a result of the actions of this Government. I know that the Government has made certain claims relative to industrial expansion in Queensland. We do not deny that there has been a certain amount of industrial expansion, but unless the Government can achieve a state of balanced economy all its efforts in industrialisation will fall far short of its aim.

Many things have been said in this debate, and I should have thought that the Minister who has just resumed his seat would have made some mention of a matter that is of vital concern to the people of the Mackay district. I refer to the decision of the Government to either lease or sell the Mackay abattoir. Although the Minister must be a party to that decision he has remained silent, and I cannot help but feel that that is because he does not want Press publicity at the present time on the reasons for the Government's decision. It is not something new; it has been working up for a long time. I have here correspondence going back to November, 1966, showing that 12 months ago the Government had the idea of disposing of the Mackay abattoir. One wonders at the reasons therefor.

I asked a question of the Minister for Primary Industries yesterday and he gave me a rather garbled reply as to why the Government arrived at its decision. It hinged mainly on the fact that during the last two years the works have operated at a loss to the order of \$250,000. We do not deny that the board has been operating at a loss, but the works have only been going for two years and it is not unusual for a new venture to suffer losses in the initial stages of development.

I repeat, one wonders why the Government has been so anxious to put these works on the market. It has been because of pressure from outside interests and the unending attacks of the hon. member for Rockhampton South. I can go back to the hon. member's speech in November, 1966, when he strongly advocated that the Mackay abattoir should be closed. At that time he urged for the disposal of the abattoir because it was in competition with private enterprise. He said that the late Hon. E. Evans was opposed to the creation of the abattoir. I deny the truth of that statement, because on many occasions, in conversation with Mr. Evans, he indicated that he had a lot to do with the choosing of the site and the ultimate decision to erect the abattoir. In November, 1966, and again in recent weeks, the hon. member for Rockhampton South has made statements as to why the abattoir should be sold.

**Mr. Camm:** Are you saying he advocated that it should be sold, or closed?

**Mr. GRAHAM:** He advocates its disposal, anyhow.

One wonders at the reason for the haste. These works have only been operating for two years. I admit that they have shown a loss in that period, but figures can be produced to indicate that other abattoirs have shown a loss. I refer to the 1966 report of the Queensland Meat Industry Authority, which shows that other abattoirs incurred losses in their workings.

If it is good enough to close the Mackay works, why has the Government not undertaken to close the others? I suppose it is only a matter of time before it will. Rumour has it that the Brisbane works are "on the board" already, to be disposed of when the time is opportune. I know that this Government is entirely opposed to abattoir boards and would like to pass the facilities over to private enterprise. When this is done, as it will be, the facilities will be given to some company on a silver platter. Those fortunate enough to be members of the company will get a "rake-off."

I am not the only one who is making a strong protest against the disposal of these works. In due course, following a public meeting to be held in Mackay tomorrow night, the Minister will receive very strong support of my protest, not only from the Mackay City Council but also from other organisations within the Mackay

area, as well as members of his own party. According to Press reports, the Mackay branch of the Country Party has already added, and is prepared to continue to add, its support to the protest lodged with the Government in this matter.

When we consider the difficulties that the Mackay Abattoir Board has been faced with since its inception, it is not surprising that losses have been incurred. It makes one wonder whether there was a deliberate attempt by those responsible to bring about the present state of affairs. Has the Mackay Abattoir Board received the full support of those who should have been responsible for its being a profitable venture? Has it received the support of those associated with the grazing industry? Because of the method of cattle disposal and because of the neglect of this Government in failing to provide road access to Mackay, the Mackay Abattoir Board has been placed at a great disadvantage in receiving and killing cattle in sufficient numbers to make the abattoir a profitable venture.

I have before me a report submitted to the Mackay City Council by a member of the Mackay Abattoir Board, setting out reasons why the decision of the Government should be questioned. Admittedly there has been a drought in the area surrounding Mackay, which to some extent has limited the number of cattle available. However, that alone is not a sufficient reason for the paucity of the number of cattle going to the abattoirs. Other factors are involved which permit the grazier to sell on the highest market. The lack of road access to Mackay perhaps makes it more profitable for those purchasing cattle in the Mackay hinterland to rail them to other centres. Consequently, the Mackay Abattoir Board has been unable to maintain a sufficient killing rate to make the venture profitable.

If these works had been established immediately upon the creation of the board in 1952, I believe that the cost of the buildings would have been infinitely less.

**Mr. Camm:** You said "1952."

**Mr. GRAHAM:** The board was established in 1952.

**Mr. Camm:** Why didn't your Government build the works?

**Mr. GRAHAM:** For the very reasons I intend to outline. We did not build the works because of the actions of certain people who were involved. At the time, certain bodies, including members of the Minister's party, were opposed to the works and did everything possible to prevent them from being built. Certain people tried to prevent the building of the works and they threw every spanner they could lay their hands on into the fray to prevent the establishment of the works. Consequently, the building programme was delayed. But for certain agitation, in which

I took part, I believe the works would not have been built and operating by 1964. The Minister knows as well as I do that the delay was caused because everyone wanted the works in his own area. Certain people in Sarina wanted them in Sarina and someone else wanted them elsewhere.

**Mr. Camm:** Why couldn't the Labour Government make up its mind?

**Mr. GRAHAM:** It was not a matter for the Government. It was a matter for the board to determine where the works should be established. The board had authority, and the Minister knows that as well as I do.

**Mr. Camm:** Why are you blaming this Government?

**Mr. GRAHAM:** I am blaming this Government for wanting to dispose of the works without giving them a fair and reasonable trial. The Minister knows as well as I do that the disposal of this abattoir to private enterprise at the present time will cause a loss to the Mackay public. The Minister knows that once any project is placed in the hands of a monopoly, it will determine what the charges and costs will be. The Minister knows as well as I do that when private enterprise is operating purely as a monopoly, prices can rise and the consuming public invariably suffers.

**Mr. Row:** Doesn't that apply to Rockhampton?

**Mr. GRAHAM:** No, it does not apply to Rockhampton, because there are two works there. Perhaps it applies to Townsville, but it will apply to Mackay.

**Mr. Camm:** Does it apply to Bowen?

**Mr. GRAHAM:** I suppose it applies to Bowen, but the Merinda works have been established for 30 years. If the Government were to give the Mackay Abattoir Board the same opportunity to establish itself, I do not doubt for one moment that, with the passage of time, it would function successfully and would show a surplus. Other abattoir boards are operating at a surplus, and there is no reason in the world why the Mackay Abattoir Board should not do the same.

One of the main reasons for the board's running at a loss is the huge over-capitalisation of the works. In the initial stages of the board's activities it was to be a central killing works, but because of pressure from those who thought it would be better to establish it as an export works the board was committed to tremendously higher expenditure, running into almost \$2,000,000.

**Mr. Camm:** You are talking a bit of sense now.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** I do not understand that interjection.

The Mackay Harbour Board incurred heavy expenditure in providing freezing facilities at the outer harbour. In the event of the sale of these works to private enterprise, will the harbour board freezing facilities be used or will they represent money that has been spent by the harbour board uselessly?

The Government has acted hastily in this regard. The board has not had complete management during the last 12 months because it has been unable to get a permanent manager. It has been managed by delegates from the Metropolitan Public Abattoir Board. These and other factors have been responsible for the board's being in its present position. I do not think anyone would deny that the meatworks are capable of meeting the requirements of the local and export markets, provided they can get the cattle to kill. Consequently, the Government should alter its intention to dispose of the works and let the board carry on for a further period to see if it can overcome the loss. The Government should pay heed to the approaches that will be made.

Mr. Peter Bell, the spokesman for the grazing industry, agrees that the Government has taken a retrograde step. He believes that the Government has made a regrettable decision in offering the Mackay abattoir for sale. Who advised the Government that the step it has taken was justified or was the correct one? Did it arise from the agitation of the hon. member for Rockhampton South, or of departmental officers? Did the Government seek advice from those who could give it, or did it get advice from one or two individuals who might have an axe to grind? I raise my protest, and raise it strongly, that the action that the Government intends to take in selling the abattoir is ill advised.

The Minister for Mines and Main Roads tried to make capital out of education facilities in Mackay. The president of the Queensland Teachers' Union was reported in yesterday's "Courier-Mail" as saying—

"Education is as basic a necessity to the future as power, water and natural resources."

That statement coincides entirely with my own line of thought. Despite the Government's claim that educational facilities have been improved, the Government has been more than neglectful. If it has been responsible for implementing a progressive educational policy, would it be in its present predicament? Does the Government believe that the provision of spacious new buildings is sufficient to establish a progressive education system? Is the provision of buildings the end-all in our education system, or are there other essentials that should come first? The palatial buildings the Minister for Mines and Main Roads speaks about will be of no use unless the Government can create harmony and contentment in the

teaching staff. The progress and development in education claimed by the Government is paramount in every other State. I do not deny that we have a new high school in Mackay, a new high school in North Mackay, and additional facilities at Mirani, Calen and Proserpine—I admit those things; I would be foolish if I did not—but despite all that spending on education in Queensland we still spend much less per capita than the other States.

**Mr. Chinchen:** In your opinion, is cost the only test of educational standards?

**Mr. GRAHAM:** No, certainly not. If cost figures and buildings were the only factors, it would be a progressive education system. If the creation of new high schools here and there was the test, yes, it may be a good system. But of what use are palatial buildings if there is discontent within the department and a shortage of teachers?

After the Government has spent a great deal of money in training teachers and paying them allowances during their courses, what happens? Many of them leave the teaching service, not only because salaries are inadequate but because of the general conditions within the department and the over-all loss of privileges. While that situation continues, how can the Government justify its claim that it has reached a peak in education?

I admit that there has been increased expenditure on education; and there will be further expenditure on it as the population grows and, with it, the demand for education, which is the inherent right of every child. The Government can claim no credit for these things, as all that it has done is meet a responsibility of Government. Credit cannot be claimed for something that involves a degree of responsibility. Education is a matter for the State Government, and it has had to provide the facilities required by an increasing population. Unless the teaching service can be made happier and more contented, in the over-all situation the Government has failed.

I have another point to make concerning education. Whilst, I admit, thousands of dollars have been spent on the provision of school buildings, parents and citizens' committees are being bludgeoned into providing necessary amenities for them. I believe that all parents have an interest in the welfare of their children, and most are prepared to make some contribution towards making their children's school lives happier. The Government is now demanding more, more and more from these committees. Although I know that the money that is raised is subsidised, I believe that the whole cost of school necessities should be borne by the Government. Because school committees are prepared to work hard, should they be required to do the whole job?

**Mr. Carey:** Don't you think parents and citizens themselves are anxious to give more freely?

**Mr. GRAHAM:** Yes. The average parent is ever-ready to assist so that the school lives of children may be happier, but that does not justify the Government's expecting—and demanding, in many cases—that committees be responsible for almost everything.

**Mr. Carey:** They are now getting swimming pools and better playing fields and ovals.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** I know. If the Brisbane City Council and the Mackay City Council can provide swimming pools for the people, why cannot the Government do the same thing? I know that in Mackay members of school committees have to work their fingers to the bone to get a few dollars towards building a swimming pool. All credit must go to parents and citizens' committees, and very little to the Government. All this prating by Government members about what is happening within the Department of Education does not go down with me. I believe that the Government has failed miserably in this field. If things were as hon. members opposite claim, there would not be the present discontent within the teaching service.

I conclude my comments on education at that point and turn to some of the many other problems in this State about which hon. members on this side of the Chamber are concerned. Let me deal briefly with the sugar industry.

The Minister for Mines and Main Roads read from the pages of "Hansard" what I had said about the increase in the price of sugar on the Australian market. I do not retract one word that I said then. I say again that I believe the Government has neglected entirely the interests of the consuming public. It has bent over backwards—the Minister for Mines and Main Roads admitted this—to meet the demands of the sugar industry. I am well aware of the difficulties that the industry has experienced; I am not unmindful of its problems. It is true that the industry was in a predicament to some degree, and I agree entirely—I said it before, and I repeat it—with what the Government has done to assist those in the industry who needed assistance as a result of the low export price and the drought.

However, I was opposed then—I still am opposed—to the method the Government adopted in increasing the price of sugar for Australian consumption. It did that overnight, without making any public statement about its intention to increase the price. One would think that there would have been some sort of public statement by the Government that it intended to approach the Federal Government on the matter. One would think that representatives of the sugar industry would have announced that they were going to press the Government for an increase in the price of sugar. The Government took the same line on that occasion as the Federal Government did in increasing postal charges.

In "The Courier-Mail" of Monday, 19 June, this statement appeared—

"The retail price of sugar will rise by 1½ cents per lb. throughout Australia today."

**Mr. Carey:** Your Federal leader supported the rise in the postal charges.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** Many people supported the rise in the price of sugar. Perhaps I was not greatly opposed to it, either. But I was opposed to the way in which the Government announced the increase. I ask hon. members opposite this question: what did this increase do for the wholesalers and retailers who were holding large stocks of refined sugar prior to 19 June? The hon. member for Albert might have been one of them.

**Mr. Carey:** That is not correct.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** Thousands of tons of refined sugar were held by wholesalers and retailers, and those people were given a nice little hand-out of about \$75,000 by the Government on 19 June. I have a report here that one wholesaler in Mackay held 101 tons of refined sugar on Sunday, 18 June, and on Monday, the 19th, he received an additional 1½ cents for every 1 lb. of sugar he had in stock. He was gracious enough to ring up all his retail customers on the Monday morning and say, "You can have another 100 lb. of sugar", or, "You can have another five bags of sugar", so that they could capitalise on the increase.

Does the Minister think that is a right and proper thing to do? Does he not think that the consuming public has some rights in the matter? Does not the Minister think that the consuming public should have had some protection? Was it right for Mr. Nicklin and his Cabinet to sit tight until Monday, the 19th, and then announce that the price of sugar had gone up 1½c a lb.?

**Mr. Camm:** I think the announcement came from Canberra.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** It says in "The Courier-Mail"—

"The retail price of sugar will rise by 1½ cents per lb. throughout Australia today.

"This follows a \$26 increase in wholesale prices announced yesterday by the Premier (Mr. Nicklin)."

I do not think Mr. Nicklin comes from Canberra.

**Mr. Camm:** No, but the increased price was announced in Canberra.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** That does not justify the present Government's taking the consuming public for a nice little ride. If the Minister was as concerned about the man who eats the sugar as he is about the man who grows it and the man who manufactures it, it might be all right. It is the man who eats the sugar who has my regard.

**Mr. Camm:** I would eat as much sugar as you.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** But the Minister does not buy it. I suppose he gets it from the mill at mill prices. Like Tom Newbery, he would get a bag at the end of every season so that he would not have to buy it.

All this claptrap and the shedding of crocodile tears over the sugar industry make me a little sick. Despite the fact that there has been a fall in export prices, and despite the fact that the industry has been going through a difficult period, there are people in the Australian political field—I refer to a statement made by the Minister for the Interior—who are quite easy about the sugar industry in Australia; they are sure it can compete with the world and that nothing much will go wrong. The Minister for the Interior says he believes the industry will come out of its present predicament, and I think so, too.

Nobody knows better than the Minister for Mines and Main Roads and the hon. member for Mirani that the over-all loss of profit at the end of last year was considerably less than at the end of the previous year. When the export price of sugar went to astronomical heights there was no appeal to reduce the consumption price; those engaged in the industry took the extra profit and put it in their pockets. They bought new houses and big, new motor-cars and extra machinery and equipment to reduce taxation, but as soon as the price went down they squealed loud and long.

I have as much concern for the sugar farmer as anybody else has; I have as much concern for the primary producer in all fields as anybody else has. But I am also concerned for the people I represent, the working-class people. This Government's approach to everything it puts its hand on shows that its only concern is for its own supporters. That has been evident throughout its 10 years in office, whilst at the same time it has neglected to do anything that might improve the lot of people in the lower-income group.

An increase of 1½c a lb. in the price of sugar or \$1 more to educate his child is of very little concern to the man on \$10,000 a year, but it is of tremendous importance to the man in the lower-income group, especially when he is faced with recurring periods of unemployment. One has only to take the figures issued week after week by the Commonwealth Department of Social Services indicating the extent of unemployment in Queensland to know that there is tremendous hardship and poverty in our own State. In Mackay and Sarina there are people who are impoverished because of unemployment. What chance is there of overcoming the unemployment position in our district? Can either the Minister for Mines and Main Roads or the hon. member for Mirani say how we can overcome this

unemployment position, recurring year in and year out, about which the Government does little or nothing?

I raise these protests because I believe the time is long overdue for the Government to stop its sectional approach to the many problems that are of great importance to the people of Queensland. The Government has to devise ways and means of achieving progress and development, not only in the metropolitan area and in larger cities such as Townsville and Rockhampton but throughout the State, by encouraging the establishment of industries at those places where unemployment is increasing year after year.

**Mr. Carey** interjected.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** It is all very well for the hon. member for South Coast to interject. He has plenty of "dough" in his pocket. He is not concerned about the little man; he does not care two hoots about him. He verifies what I have said. There are members of the Government who have no concern whatever about the man on a low income.

Is it any wonder that in Queensland today there is so much discontent and urging for better conditions and more stability for the wage-earner? Until this Government approaches the problems associated with the development of the State on a wider basis and brings about more contentment in industry, the State will not progress. There is discontent in the Department of Education; because of Government policy there is considerable discontent in the Railway Department; we see it in outside industries; we see it in the building trade; we saw a big strike at Collinsville because of discontent in the coalmining industry. While these things are happening we cannot say that Queensland is progressing the way it should. We cannot say that Queenslanders are happy, contented people while there is so much discontent. On Tuesday, university students tried to demonstrate on a matter of some importance.

**Mr. Camm:** Did you support the strike at Collinsville?

**Mr. GRAHAM:** Whether I supported it or not is not the point; the fact is that there was a strike. The point is not whether I supported the action of the tramway employees the other morning or whether I support the activities of the Queensland Teachers' Union, whose members are prepared to down tools. That is not the point. The whole point here is that unless we look at the substance of these things we are getting a distorted view. That is what is happening. The Government has not a clear picture of these things. The Premier was not concerned at my remarks about the sugar industry. The Minister for Primary Industries is not concerned about the employees of the Mackay Abattoir Board. The Minister for Mines and Main Roads is not concerned about the discontent in many industries in Queensland.

I leave it at that. Although I support to the full the expressions of loyalty to our gracious Queen, I cannot in any way enthuse about the past or present activities of the Government.

**Mr. KAUS** (Hawthorne) (4.59 p.m.): I join with other hon. members in congratulating the hon. member for Mulgrave and the hon. member for Chatsworth, who respectively moved and seconded the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and I associate the people of Hawthorne and myself with the message of loyalty to Sir Alan and Lady Mansfield.

At this stage I should like to congratulate the new hon. member for Roma, Mr. Tomkins. I know he will be a very competent and capable representative of the people of the Roma electorate.

During the past week much has been said in this House concerning many matters. I wish to deal with one matter that I believe is important to Queensland and Australia as a whole. I should also like to deal with another matter that is of particular importance to the people of the Hawthorne electorate. My complaint concerns a traffic problem and the criminal neglect in the failure to install pedestrian traffic lights at the Morningside shopping centre and on Wynnum Road near the convalescent home and the ferry crossing. In the last few years there have been many deaths on these sections of Wynnum Road. Two sections are involved, one near the convalescent home in Norman Park and the other the shopping centre at Morningside. I have received numerous complaints about these traffic hazards and I condemn the Brisbane City Council for neglecting the people of Morningside and the Norman Park section of Wynnum Road by exposing them to these hazards. Admittedly there are pedestrian crossings, but they are not enough. Lights should be installed for the safety of pedestrians, mainly pedestrians in the Morningside shopping centre and the Norman Park section of Wynnum Road.

The overhead street lighting is insufficient and should be improved, and the crossing at the Morningside shopping centre should be investigated.

The following article appeared in the "Telegraph" of 1 November, 1966—

"The Council of Brisbane Progress Associations believes that because of poor street lighting many people are using pedestrian crossings with a false sense of security.

"It is investigating the city's pedestrian crossings to establish the most poorly lit, and the most dangerous."

I must be fair, because I know that in Morningside one or two additional lights have been erected. However, many places have missed out completely.

The article continues—

"It also has called on its members to suggest a method of improving pedestrian-crossing safety.

"An article in 'Progress News', a monthly publication by the council, says that in many cases pedestrian crossings are invisible to oncoming motorists."

That is a fact. Motorists do not see them although there are signs at least 50 yards before the crossings; they are hard to see.

The article concludes—

"People using these crossings under such circumstances do so with a false sense of security.

"It said the council had passed the problem back to member associations so that a complete list of the worst crossings could be obtained.

"Already some associations had made suggestions for improvement.

"These included warning 'cats eyes' set in the road and flashing lights similar to those used in some southern States and New Zealand."

I should also like to add the comment that illuminated signs should be erected at pedestrian crossings so that motorists can see them at night-time. This would also apply to crossings on main roads.

**Mr. Miller:** Do you think reflectorised paint should be used on pedestrian crossings?

**Mr. KAUS:** I think that is the only answer. The sooner it is used, the safer the crossings will be.

Hawthorne would be the only electorate in the metropolitan area without pedestrian or traffic lights. I sincerely hope that the local alderman will receive the benefit of some of the subsidy that the Minister announced the council gets yearly. I hope that some of this subsidy will be allocated for these purposes.

**Mr. Hanlon:** The subsidy is only a bag of shells compared with the work the council has to do. That is the trouble.

**Mr. KAUS:** Yes, but they have overlooked Hawthorne.

**Mr. Sherrington:** How long has this problem existed?

**Mr. KAUS:** For years.

**Mr. Sherrington:** Why didn't the Government, through the Traffic Commission, do something to alleviate it?

**Mr. KAUS:** I can only say that it is now the council's responsibility to the electors of Hawthorne.

I shall now comment on the recent tour of the North that I made with other hon. members and express to the Minister in charge of the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs my appreciation for allowing me the opportunity of seeing what

a worth-while job is being carried out by him and the officers of his department. The tour covered virtually all aspects of the department's activities from Cairns north. What I saw has given me great heart for the future of North Queensland and has given me confidence that the Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders who look on this area as their home are fiercely proud that they are Queenslanders, and are determined to participate to the fullest in the development of this part of our State.

We called at Weipa on the way and, although the Aboriginal reserve at Weipa South is only a small area of some 400 acres, it is flourishing under the able management of Mr. Trevor La Brooy. The Aboriginal residents are settled in new, three-bedroom homes, and their interest is well evidenced by the cleanliness of the homes and their surroundings. This is commendable. New homes are being built.

We were fortunate to be present when the Department of Education's new school at Weipa South was opened. It is probably one of the finest buildings in Queensland. It is constructed of bricks made from bauxite, and an adequate area and adequate facilities are provided for the children who attend. It is staffed by trained Department of Education teachers, so the children do not lack educational opportunities.

Many of the Aboriginal men at Weipa are employed in bauxite-mining activities and receive the full mining award wage, which is paid direct by the company to the men. Certainly some spend too much of their income on alcohol, but is that not a characteristic of all Australians, irrespective of origin? This is a matter for concern, and will probably be overcome only by the work of more welfare and guidance officers in the field, as departmental finance permits. It is indeed heartening to see these Aboriginal men working alongside other Queenslanders in the development of this natural and valuable mineral field.

At Weipa there functions a very efficient pre-school training centre. It is interesting that this centre is staffed by an Aboriginal woman of Weipa who was trained at the kindergarten centre at Brisbane. The work she performs fits the youngsters to progress to primary school the following year.

From Weipa we moved to the Torres Strait area and for the first time I met Torres Strait Islanders on their home ground. I am not talking about a cricket match, either. They look on this area, the gateway to Australia, as the birthright of their race. The men wrest a living from the dangerous waters of the sea. They consider themselves masters of Nature's forces. When one sees the hazardous weather conditions under which they work and live, one is proud that these Islanders are loyal and respected fellow-Australians who deserve nothing but praise.

Thursday Island, approximately 20 miles from the tip of Cape York, is a normal town and the administrative headquarters for the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs. The Department of Education has established both primary and secondary schools there, and the Catholic Church conducts a primary school. I might add that the primary school at Thursday Island is one of the best that I have seen anywhere in Queensland.

The economy of Thursday Island depends primarily on the pearling industry, particularly the culture of artificial pearls. Live mother-of-pearl shell is produced by the pearling fleet and sold to the various pearl-culture companies. It is interesting to note that the Islanders themselves provide the vast majority of the work-force engaged in fishing for the pearl shell and working the pearl-culture farms. In addition, they own quite a number of very efficient pearling vessels. Their ownership of vessels can only be taken as an indication of their progressiveness.

The Government has certainly responded well to its responsibility in giving departmental encouragement in the area. On the island are hospitals, including general, maternity and tuberculosis complexes. The staff establishment includes four medical officers and more than 20 trained nursing sisters, together with nursing aides and other staff members.

A mantle of safety is provided over the whole of Torres Strait through the radio-network service of the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs, which for efficiency is second to none in Australia. This radio service maintains communication between Thursday Island and all inhabited centres scattered throughout the islands as far south as Mitchell River and Mornington Island, in the Gulf of Carpentaria. Those centres can be linked in direct voice contact with a medical officer virtually at will, so that medical advice and guidance is available to those in need almost as speedily as it can be obtained by telephone in Brisbane. A visit to the hospitals leaves one with a feeling of confidence in the well-being of the patients.

An interesting highlight of the visit to Thursday Island was the Torres Strait College, which was established by the Government in 1963 for the accommodation of a cross-section of student boys from the outlying islands of Torres Strait. These boys, potential leaders of the future, live in at the hostel and attend the normal primary and secondary schools at Thursday Island to extend their education and advance their backgrounds and progress in accordance with their abilities. It is not only the brightest boys who have been selected for admission to the college, as an endeavour has been made to admit as wide a cross-section of the population as possible. They are all good types of lads.



For the girls, the department supports a similar number with similar background environment in normal boarding schools and girls' hostels in southern areas, particularly at Herberton and Charters Towers.

A visit to the islands, particularly the northern peninsula reserve area at Bamaga, which is managed by Mr. Rob. Yarrow, gives one a close insight into the customs and manner of living of Islanders and Aborigines. I left the area with a feeling of stimulation. At Cape York, more than 1,000 Aborigines and Islanders now inhabit the area between the Jardine River and Cape York itself. The reserve pulsates with life and activity. The sawmill, working at top efficiency, pours out all the building timber needed for housing and governmental requirements for the entire area. Prefabricating workshops ensure that no wastage occurs, and pre-cut frameworks are shipped to the centres where Islander gangs are speedily erecting units.

Another field of endeavour is the pastoral industry, and many hundreds of cattle are depastured and provide all of the meat needed in the area. Considerable progress has been made in pasture improvement work, and all the necessary background experimental cultivation work has been completed. One can now see many hundreds of acres of reasonably good country being cleared and sown to improved pastures, and it does not require a visionary to look into the future to realise that very soon the full benefit of earlier and current developments will be reaped.

Here, only 19 miles south of Cape York itself, flourishes a manual training section, and there is no doubt that the young men of Bamaga are being given every opportunity to gain the necessary understanding and knowledge of both woodwork and tinsmithing. The Department of Education has accepted responsibility for the primary schools and has appointed energetic young teachers, who are doing a remarkably good job.

Extensive experimentation has been carried out in both pig raising and poultry farming, with reasonable results. Small crops are grown and find a ready market at Thursday Island as well as in the Bamaga area, and other crops of grain, cassava and cotton have produced satisfactory results.

Hon. members also took the opportunity of visiting a number of the outlying islands of Torres Strait, and it is indeed gratifying to a member of this House to observe, on landing at each of the islands, the deeply ingrained sense of loyalty amongst all sections of the island population. I was proudly heartened by the sight of the Australian flag flying over residential areas and by portraits of Her Majesty occupying a place of honour in the public halls and council offices.

We were greeted by the Islander councillors, all of whom expressed profound appreciation to the Government for the work being carried out in the interests of the Islander race. Each of these islands is a township of relative size based on populations ranging from 40 to 50 people to in excess of 600. Irrespective of the density of population, each island has radio communication with Thursday Island, as well as a school, medical-aid post or hospital, store, public hall, and numerous conventional-style dwelling-houses. After a personal visit, one very quickly loses any misconceived notions of primitive people living in the stone age and becomes aware that the Islanders and the Aborigines residing in this most northerly section of the State live in traditional Queensland circumstances and environment and are fiercely proud of their participation. They have a tremendous pride of race and preserve many of their finer cultures in both song and dance.

That all of these things have come to pass must truly reflect a humane and understanding ministration to the needs of the people; but paramount in my mind is the fact that the people themselves have accepted, and are continuing to accept, a major part of the responsibility for their own progressive development and well-being. Their spirit of self-reliance and the ability to use this spirit is contributing to their achieving the goals set by the progressive policy of the Government, as administered through the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs.

Many of the things that I saw I found impressive—impressive in themselves, and particularly impressive in the light of their meaning for the future. The island and Aboriginal councils, for example, are well worthy of special mention, for it seems to me that these bodies are the beginning of valid local government throughout the areas. They look after most of the day-to-day administration required by any group of people who live together in a society, and they perform their duties creditably. These councils are democratically elected bodies; they have the respect of their electors and it is in this process, which is unique to Queensland, that the basis for assimilation and the objectives of the Government are to be found.

**Mr. BYRNE** (Mourilyan) (5.21 p.m.): I rise to speak on a matter that concerns my area, one that I regard as of utmost importance.

**A Government Member:** Your swan song.

**Mr. BYRNE:** Irrespective of the fact that it might be my swan song, perhaps I might be able to bring to the notice of Queenslanders some things which are taking place in North Queensland and which, in my opinion, should not take place.

Prior to going on with that matter I want to express, on behalf of the people of Mourilyan, their loyalty and devotion to

Her Majesty and the hope that she will have a very long reign. To Sir Alan Mansfield, a very fine man, and his good wife, I extend the very best of wishes. He fills his position with dignity and distinction. He is very dignified and, with it, very pleasant. Everyone must have been somewhat thrilled at Government House the other afternoon to see the Governor and his good wife mixing with the people and passing the time of day with them. We are very happy to have a Governor of Sir Alan Mansfield's calibre, and we wish him a long life.

Dealing with the sugar industry, there are always before our minds, as hon. members generally know, the difficulties that the farmers have had to contend with and have endeavoured to surmount. Many of them have not been successful in their efforts and have gone to the wall. From what was a once booming industry, we now have an industry in which it is difficult for anyone to survive unless he is in a big way and is able to harvest his cane by mechanical processes, and has sufficient money to tide him over a difficult period.

I feel that the sugar industry has been let down the drain, particularly by the Federal Government; and I have not very much confidence in our own Government in its approach to this industry. I have expressed that opinion on many occasions. I do not think the Government has been awake to what has been going on. We have been led up a blind alley, and in consequence many of our people are suffering today. No doubt the Government is hoping for the best.

Even Mr. John McEwan is hoping for the best. In reply to Dr. Rex Patterson he said—

“It is better than even money that the negotiations will succeed.”

When questioned by Dr. Patterson, he said—

“The Government expected that negotiations for a new international sugar agreement would be held next April.”

and he then said that it was a better than even-money chance that the negotiations would be successful.

Judging Mr. McEwan on his record over the years, I am not one of those who laud him to the highest. I believe he is a fine class of gentleman, but I would not choose him as negotiator for me. The best he can offer is an even-money chance and I have not much confidence in him.

The article from which I am quoting goes on to say—

“Dr. Patterson also asked what progress had been made in the negotiation of a sugar agreement between Australia and Japan.

“Mr. McEwan said he had tried to arrange this and was confident of getting it in the context of the Kennedy Round talks.”

All those things are in the future. Over the years that have passed when we were confronted with difficulties we have been made promises about this and that, and cane farmers have been exhorted to stand up to these things and told that they would succeed in the end. How can Queensland cane farmers stand up to these things? Many of them will not succeed; some have already gone to the wall.

It seems peculiar to me that the Federal Government has completely taken over the sugar industry, to the extent that our organisations are playing only a secondary part. It is time that the Queensland Government got busy and made its presence felt by fighting for the sugar industry. We cannot carry the industry on when we are relying primarily on the Federal Government to tell us what we are going to do. The Federal Government is doing all the negotiating; the Queensland Government is doing nothing at all.

**Mr. Armstrong:** When the industry makes representations, both Governments are involved.

**Mr. BYRNE:** If the hon. member compares the amount of authority the Queensland Government has in the negotiations with the authority of the Federal Government, he will find that the Federal Government has all the say and the Queensland Government none. The Queensland people have been promised that this and that would take place but Mr. John McEwen is still the top dog, and he tells us what is happening. Our Queensland people cannot tell us. We expect our people to tell us something about these things, but they are not able to. We do not know where we are. Labour members in the Federal Parliament asked the Minister for Trade what was happening in regard to the sugar industry and what was likely to be the outcome of the negotiations surrounding the international agreement. The Federal Government can tell us these things, but our own people do not seem to be able to tell us.

**Mr. Chinchin:** It is an international agreement, you know.

**Mr. BYRNE:** When is it going to come about?

**Mr. Chinchin:** You cannot expect the State to negotiate on an international basis. It is a job for the Commonwealth Government.

**Mr. BYRNE:** We have had one. When are we going to get the next one? Our people have fallen down very badly. The trouble with Queensland is that we have no Forgan Smiths or Ned Hanlons today. There are many hon. members here who can remember the negotiations back in 1949 and 1950 when the late Ned Hanlon demanded that he should go overseas and represent the sugar industry. He brought back a deal the like of which we have never seen since.

There are other matters about which I desire to speak. I should say that the Tully River land is perhaps the most sought-after land in the whole of Australia. The value per acre there would compare favourably with the value of land in any other part of Australia. Today banana land in that area is worth anything from \$400 to \$600 an acre. Sales are taking place at very high figures. The Government is putting up two separate blocks of 1,000 acres at an upset price of \$18 an acre. Instead of giving the young man or the small fellow an opportunity to get the land at ballot, it is making him bid at auction in competition with people who are regarded as millionaires in the sphere in which they operate. I refer to King Ranch and the tea-growing people. The Government gave King Ranch 34,000 acres at \$2 an acre and 17,000 at \$10 an acre. I keep on mentioning this because I think it was wrong. At the time I pointed out what was going to happen. I said it would not be long before another huge deal took place—that somebody else would come into the industry and get more of the land for nothing. That is what has happened. Some 4,000 acres were granted for tea-growing.

**Mr. Hughes:** Didn't they prove something?

**Mr. BYRNE:** Local people can prove it, too.

**Mr. Hughes:** You need the capital.

**Mr. BYRNE:** They wanted 4,000 acres for tea-growing.

At 5.30 p.m., under Standing Order No. 17—

Motion—That the Address in Reply be adopted (Mr. Armstrong)—agreed to.

## SUPPLY

### CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEE

**Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN** (Landsborough—Premier): I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.”

Motion agreed to.

## WAYS AND MEANS

### CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEE

**Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN** (Landsborough—Premier): I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.”

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.31 p.m.