

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 17 SEPTEMBER 1968**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

**TUESDAY, 17 SEPTEMBER, 1968**

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

**ASSENT TO BILLS**

Assent to the following Bills reported by Mr. Speaker:—

Audit Acts Amendment Bill (No. 2).

Constitution Acts Amendment Bill.

**ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF ISIS**

**DATES FOR BY-ELECTION**

Mr. SPEAKER: I inform the House that the dates in connection with the issue of the writ for the election of a member to serve in this House for the electoral district of Isis will be as follows:—

Issue of writ—14 October, 1968;

Date of nomination—23 October, 1968;

Polling day—16 November, 1968;

Return of writ—13 December, 1968.

**QUESTIONS**

**ROAD FATALITIES**

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

(1) For the year ended June 30, 1968, and in each of the months of July and August, 1968, how many people were killed in road accidents?

(2) How many of them were (a) drivers of vehicles and (b) drivers of vehicles involved in single-vehicle accidents?

Answers:—

(1) "Period	Persons Killed
Year ended 30-6-68	476
July, 1968	48
August, 1968	33"
(2) "(a) Period	Drivers of Vehicles Killed
Year ended 30-6-68	200
July, 1968	21
August, 1968	15

(b) The information in the form the Honourable Member seeks is not readily available and it will take some time before it is. I have made arrangements for the information to be sent to the Honourable Member when it is ready."

**WILBUR SMITH RECOMMENDATION ON MANLY-LOTA RAIL LINK**

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

Did the Government accept or reject the recommendation in the 1965 Wilbur Smith Report regarding future discontinuance of passenger services on the Manly-Lota railway line, and has any such decision been specifically advised to Wilbur Smith aimed at further consideration in relation to the transport survey now being undertaken? If not, why not?

Answer:—

"The recommendation in the 1965 Wilbur Smith Report in regard to passenger services on the Manly-Lota railway line was not implemented. In Press statements and in letters in reply to enquiries, my predecessor and I have clearly stated that action to discontinue such services was not contemplated. I refer the Honourable Member to the Answer to a Question which he asked in the House on Wednesday, September 4."

**TERMITES IN IMPORTED ENCASED TIMBER**

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

Further to his Answer to my Question on September 11, concerning termites in imported encased timbers, if the material has to be destroyed by fire, is it carried out by the quarantine section before the goods are released, or is an order served on the consignee to carry out the destruction at his place of business?

Answer:—

"If encasing timbers of a container are ordered to be destroyed by burning because of insect infestation, the imported goods enclosed are removed from the container before they are released by Her Majesty's Customs. The encasing timbers are then destroyed by burning under Plant Quarantine supervision."

**OPPORTUNITY SCHOOL, MT. GRAVATT EAST**

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

Have plans and specifications been drawn up for a new Opportunity School to be built by the Department on the reserve held in Newnham Road, Mt. Gravatt East? If so, will this additional Opportunity School, which is urgently required on the southside, receive favourable consideration in this financial year?

Answer:—

"Plans and specifications have not yet been prepared for this proposal. The project could not be afforded a sufficiently

high priority to enable the work to be included in the Loan Works Programme for the 1968-69 financial year."

REPORT ON RE-ORGANISATION OF  
MILK INDUSTRY

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

(1) Will he emphasise that the report on the re-organisation of the milk industry in Queensland is only the opinion of two officers of his Department and is not necessarily supported by any Government Member?

(2) When is it proposed to give effect to any of the proposals submitted by his officers?

(3) Will he correct that part of the report which stated that the South Coast Co-operative Dairy Association, which has a market distribution arrangement with Pauls Ltd., is a subsidiary of Queensland United Foods?

(4) For the benefit of interested parties, who are Messrs. S. W. Ivers and C. P. Hamilton, how long have they been attached to his Department and what are their qualifications?

*Answers:—*

(1) "This report was prepared at Cabinet's request in relation to an application for the issue of an additional wholesale milk vendor's licence for the Brisbane milk district. It was evident that the granting of even one such additional licence would have major repercussions on the existing arrangements for the supply of pasteurised milk for Brisbane. The report consequently was sought with a view firstly to the collation of all relevant information, and secondly to bring forward suggestions from the Marketing Division of my Department as to what course of action might desirably be taken in relation to the orderly marketing of milk. Before taking any action on the suggestions contained in the report, however, Cabinet has accepted my recommendation that it be first released to enable the many interested parties the opportunity to express their views. I am quite confident that this procedure offers the best means of finding a constructive basis for future action. I would assure the Honourable Member that no precipitate action is intended in this matter and that ample opportunity will be allowed to organisations and others to formulate their views and communicate them to me."

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

(3) "I cannot find the reference to which the Honourable Member refers. I think he may have misinterpreted paragraph 7.6. on page 14 which refers to Pauls Ltd. (and not the South Coast Co-operative Dairy Association as being a subsidiary of Queensland United Foods.)"

(4) "Mr. Ivers has been with the Department of Primary Industries since 1934. He has been a dairy adviser in various centres and immediately prior to his joining the Division of Marketing as a marketing officer in 1965 he was a senior adviser in dairying. He is a Bachelor of Commerce of Queensland University and also holds the Diploma in Public Administration. Mr. Hamilton is an honours graduate in agricultural science from the University of Queensland and a Gatton diplomate. In addition he will be completing requirements this year for the degrees of Master of Agricultural Science and Bachelor of Economics. Prior to joining the Department in 1965 as an agricultural economist in the Division of Marketing, he was engaged in post-graduate research in agricultural economics at the University of Queensland."

SUPPRESSION OF NAMES OF MINORS  
BEFORE COURTS

**Mrs. Jordan**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Justice,—

In view of the publicity given in the Press to the name and school of a thirteen-year-old Ipswich boy charged with stealing in the Criminal Court, Brisbane, on September 11 and the apparent failure of his legal representative to ask that his name be suppressed, will he take the necessary action to ensure that the names of minors involved in such circumstances are not published?

*Answer:—*

"The Ipswich boy referred to was indicted on four charges of burglary in the Supreme Court and was convicted on his own confession. 'Burglary' is breaking and entering a dwelling-house at night-time with intent to commit a crime therein. It is a serious offence. The maximum punishment for the offence is imprisonment with hard labour for life. The boy had no legal representatives at the proceedings but his father was present. There is legislation in respect of the matter raised by the Honourable Member. It is contained in section 138 of "The Children's Services Act of 1965" of which the Honourable Member appears to be aware. Under this section, it is left to the discretion of the Court as to whether it will direct that a report of the proceedings shall not reveal the name and school of the child. The Children's Services Act is administered by my colleague, the Honourable the Minister for Health."

SPEECH CORRECTIONIST, IPSWICH  
STATE SCHOOLS

**Mrs. Jordan**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) In view of the large number of children receiving the services of speech

correctionists, when will the speech correctionist be replaced at the primary schools in Ipswich, including the Brassall State school?

(2) As the previous speech correction teacher left to be married but was anxious to continue in this work and was refused, is it departmental policy not to employ married women teachers in this specialist field?

Answers:—

(1) "The vacancy caused by the recent resignation of one of the two speech correctionists in Ipswich will be advertised shortly in the daily Press."

(2) "As women teachers working as speech correctionists resign from the service their places are being filled by speech therapists who have completed a three-year course of professional training at the University."

#### EMERGENCY TEACHER TRAINING SCHEME

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

(1) Are secondary teachers, trained under the Government's eight weeks' emergency scheme, receiving little instruction on their one day a week at the Teachers' College beyond receiving lectures on departmental regulations?

(2) (a) What syllabus has been laid down for them, (b) what staff has been allocated to them and (c) will they receive any examination at the end of their period at the college?

Answers:—

(1) "Teachers in the special secondary group attend Teachers' College on two days each week. Lectures on the Regulations of the Education Department, Records and Returns, and Administrative Procedures are given in no more than six lectures out of the course of fifty lectures in General School Method, which is one of the several subjects of the course."

(2) "(a) A syllabus similar to that for the normal secondary students of the college has been prepared by the lecturers involved. This includes three special-method subjects for the arts section of the group, which include English, French, German, History, Geography and four special-method subjects from the Science section, Chemistry, Physics, Biological Science and Mathematics. The other subjects in the course are General School Method, Theory of Education and Psychology. In the two days at college each week, the arts group attend lectures for twelve periods out of fourteen and the science group the full fourteen of the college time-table. (b) A specialist member of staff in each subject has been allotted. (c) Yes."

#### SUPPLY TEACHERS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

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

What information regarding teaching qualifications is sent to principals of secondary schools regarding supply teachers in such schools?

Answer:—

"A notice concerning the appointment of supply teachers was included in the February, 1968, issue of *The Education Office Gazette*."

#### GOVERNMENT AID TO NON-STATE SCHOOLS

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

(1) What (a) subsidies, (b) payments and (c) grants, etc., are currently paid or offered by the State Government to non-Government schools in Queensland?

(2) What was the value or amount of each of these for the years 1965-66, 1966-67, and 1967-68?

Answers:—

(1) "(a) Subsidy is available to non-Government schools on the purchase of film projectors, radiograms and television receivers. (b) and (c) Non-Government schools are assisted by payments made on account of the following:—Tuition fees for secondary students; a special grant to school authorities on the basis of enrolment. Grammar schools receive annual endowment and are assisted with loans, which are subsidised to the extent of 40 per cent. of the cost of the particular project. Independent schools other than Grammar schools receive interest grants on building loans incurred by them, up to a maximum 6 per cent. for a period of five years on the original capital, reduced by one-fifth each year. Non-Government schools benefit indirectly from the student allowance, text-book allowance and remote-area allowance paid to the students eligible to receive them."

(2) "Amounts paid in subsidies, grants, etc., to non-Government schools—

—	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68
	\$	\$	\$
Subsidy on radiograms, film projectors and television receivers ..	2,200	3,201	3,146
Tuition fees ..	927,778	1,033,193	1,420,325
Special grant to school authorities	..	147,115	523,310
Endowment to Grammar schools	164,400	164,400	164,400
Grammar school loans .. ..	103,650	103,697	108,857
	(including \$86,753 subsidy)	(including \$88,369 subsidy)	(including \$97,527 subsidy)
Interest grants to Independent schools other than Grammar schools .. ..	..	39,493	106,729"

## HEADACHE POWDER ADVERTISEMENTS

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to a series of advertisements for a headache powder containing phenacetin carrying the general theme that the powder might be taken with "confidence"?

(2) In view of medical evidence that phenacetin can cause fatal kidney disease, does the advertising constitute a breach of the Factories and Shops Act relating to false and misleading advertising?

*Answer:—*

(1 and 2) "The Director-General of Health advises that the headache powder in question, which is apparently Vincent's A.P.C., is phenacetin free. Furthermore, the present ingredients of that headache powder are not known to cause kidney disease. Consequently, the Question asked by the Honourable Member is false and misleading, and not the advertisements to which he refers."

## CROWN LAND IN GOLD COAST AREA

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

(1) What is the extent of Crown land in the Gold Coast area and where is it located?

(2) How much Crown land in the area has been disposed of in the past ten years?

(3) In what manner has it been disposed of?

(4) What is the total revenue obtained by the Government as a result of the disposal of Crown land in the area in the past ten years?

*Answer:—*

(1 to 4) "The information sought is not isolated in the records of my Department. The extraction of such specific information in respect of the period mentioned would entail considerable investigation and cost: the matter would require, at least, the attention of several senior officers for some weeks on a full-time basis. They would have to be relieved of important routine duties or paid overtime. Whilst it is easy for the Honourable Member to criticise the standards of replies to Questions in this House, Ministers have a very definite responsibility to ensure efficiency and economy of Government administration and in the exercise of this responsibility, I am not prepared to authorise that the staff resources of my Department be deployed on the extracting of the information sought, the purpose of which is not apparent to me."

## SUPERANNUATION CONTRIBUTIONS BY PUBLIC SERVANTS CALLED UP FOR NATIONAL SERVICE

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

What is the total amount of arrears of superannuation contributions debited against Government officers who have completed National Service and resumed duty?

*Answer:—*

"The amount of arrears of contributions payable by employees who have resumed duty after entry upon National Service is \$4,140.66."

## SEALED PAVEMENT, BRUCE HIGHWAY

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

(1) What was the total amount of sealed road existing on the Bruce Highway on June 30, 1957?

(2) How many miles of new road on the highway were sealed from June 30, 1957, to June 30, 1968?

(3) What amount of widening and resealing took place during the period and what were the costs involved for both?

*Answers:—*

(1) "At June 30, 1957, 775 miles of the Bruce Highway were sealed."

(2) "Three hundred and sixty-seven miles."

(3) "These figures are not available. The costs of widening and resealing are included in expenditure during the period of \$38 million on permanent works and \$10 million on maintenance respectively."

## SEALED PAVEMENT, CAPRICORN HIGHWAY

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

(1) What was the total amount of sealed road on the Capricorn Highway on June 30, 1957?

(2) How many miles of the highway have been sealed or are in the process of being sealed since June 30, 1957 and what is the cost involved?

*Answers:—*

(1) "At June 30, 1957, 125 miles of the Rockhampton-Barcaldine road were sealed."

(2) "A further 92 miles have since been sealed, and 20 miles are in the process of being sealed. Separate costs are not available, but these would be included in some \$6 million expended on permanent works and maintenance on this road from July 1, 1957 to June 30, 1968."

## DEFICIENCIES IN SCHOOL CLASSROOMS

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

(1) Has he considered the views expressed through the Teachers' Union that inadequate heating, cooling, sound-proofing and lighting in many schoolrooms constitute a health hazard to children?

(2) Has the Department any schedule of classrooms which are considered as deficient in those requirements?

(3) Is any survey made of them or is it left to teachers, parents and citizens' associations or other interested persons to bring the matters to attention by way of individual example?

(4) Is there any arrangement for average winter and summer temperatures in classrooms throughout the State to be recorded with a view to the provision of any necessary aids for cooling or heating or at least priorities for them?

(5) How many classrooms are equipped with (a) fans, (b) heaters or some such aid to mitigate extremes of temperature?

(6) What is the Department's response to the legal responsibility of a parent to send a child to school, if attendance is withheld on the grounds of alleged threat to the health of the child in conditions of a particular school?

*Answers:—*

(1) "My attention was directed to this statement, but I am not aware of classroom conditions in State schools which constitute a health hazard to children."

(2) "All classroom accommodation in use is considered to be of reasonable standard."

(3) "Classrooms are designed for use as such and, in planning, factors concerning ventilation, lighting, heat insulation and sound transference, etc. are considered. Periodic inspections of all buildings are made by supervisors employed by the Department of Works. Moreover, district inspectors of schools draw to my Department's notice any classroom improvements they consider desirable."

(4) "Arrangements are made for temperatures in schools to be checked as circumstances require. Schools in certain areas of the State qualify for the installation of heating apparatus."

(5) "It is not the practice to provide fans for classrooms. For heat insulation, reflecting material is incorporated in building construction. The Department of Works has advised that statistics as to the number of classrooms equipped with heaters are not kept."

(6) "The legal responsibility of a parent concerning a child's attendance at school is clearly set out in the State Education Act of 1964. Any claim that a child's health would be endangered by attendance at a particular school would be investigated immediately."

## BRISBANE CITY WATCH-HOUSE FACILITIES

**Mr. Donald** for **Mr. Bennett**, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

(1) Has he ever inspected and examined Brisbane City Watch-house?

(2) Will he do so on a Friday or a Saturday evening in order to fully appreciate the conditions there?

(3) What facilities are available for members of the public to interview relatives?

(4) Are parents unable to see their children at the watch-house before Court in the morning?

(5) Are there any facilities for the public waiting to see relatives at the watch-house?

(6) Will a central breathalyser room be constructed at or near the watch-house so that members of the public, who have recorded under .08 and are to be discharged, can avoid going through some police station or watch-house and also avoid loss of time?

*Answers:—*

(1) "No."

(2) "Yes."

(3) "I am advised that there are no special facilities available at the watch-house for members of the public to interview relatives."

(4) "I am further advised that parents of children under 17 years of age are invariably allowed to visit such children at the watch-house; and, depending upon circumstances, parents may also see children over 17 years of age."

(5 and 6) "No, not at present. However, provision of such facilities is presently being considered in the planning of the overall project for the Law Courts, which includes the construction of new watch-house facilities."

## ALLEGED PASSING OF FORGED CURRENCY BY POLICE OFFICERS

**Mr. Donald** for **Mr. Bennett**, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

(1) Has his attention been drawn to an article in the *Sydney Sunday Mirror* of May 26, wherein it was alleged that Commonwealth police were investigating allegations that senior officers of the Queensland Police Force had been involved in passing forged \$10 notes?

(2) Has any such investigation been conducted into the conduct of the officers? If so, who were the officers involved?

(3) Have any of them been in trouble with the Queensland Police Force before and have any adverse comments been passed on them by Queensland Judges?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "A departmental investigation is being conducted at the present time and, until this is completed, it would be inappropriate to mention names of any of the persons involved."

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

#### POLICE COMMISSIONER'S COMMENT ON COURT SENTENCES

Mr. Donald for Mr. Bennett, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the claims made by the Commissioner of Police and reported in *The Courier-Mail* of August 8, 1968, "I am sorry to say that a lot of sentences are somewhat mealy-mouthed" and "I am sorry to say that often the Courts kiss offenders and let them go."?

(2) What action has he taken to prevent the Commissioner of Police commenting on the conduct of the Courts and in relation to cases where the Commissioner has not heard all the evidence?

(3) Will he consider the propriety of a person in the office of Commissioner of Police making castigatory remarks about Judges and judicial officers and the conduct of our Courts?

Answers:—

(1) "I have read the report referred to."

(2 and 3) "No such action is considered necessary."

#### OPTICAL SERVICES, MACKAY HOSPITALS BOARD

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

Further to his Answer to my Question on September 11 regarding the supply of optical services to the Mackay Hospitals Board,—

(1) Has the Board accepted his direction that the contract of Trevor Henderson & Co. be accepted?

(2) As Trevor Henderson & Co. only intend to make bi-monthly visits to Mackay, will the needs of the aged residents of Mackay and district, to whom this optical service will mainly apply, be amply protected as they will generally have to wait up to eight weeks for attention?

(3) As the present optical contractor to the Mackay Base Hospital offers a daily service, will he agree to a continuation of the service?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) "The matter of acceptance of a contract for optometrical services at Mackay Hospital is currently the subject of discussion between the Board and this Department. It is anticipated that a decision will be made shortly."

#### GOVERNMENT AID FOR DEAF CHILDREN IN NORTH QUEENSLAND

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

(1) Consequent on his Answer to my Question on March 28, did a deputation representing the North Queensland Parents of Deaf Children's Association recently wait upon him to stress what they consider to be preferential treatment being afforded by the Government to deaf children in the Brisbane area as compared with that offered to North Queensland children similarly afflicted?

(2) If so, will he advise the House in as much detail as possible what is being done for these children in Brisbane and how far the Government is prepared to assist those in North Queensland so that Honourable Members can then fully assess the position?

Answers:—

(1) "No deputation has waited upon me for the purposes indicated in the Question. However, a deputation representing the Committee for the Investigation of Facilities for Deaf Children in North Queensland was received on August 13, 1968. This deputation presented a submission and asked for sympathetic consideration of the three recommendations contained in it. The recommendations were: (a) That oral pre-school facilities be established in Townsville; (b) that a primary annex be established in Townsville and incorporated into a normal educational centre; (c) that increased parent guidance be made available in North Queensland."

(2) "The Queensland School for the Deaf, which is a residential school located in Brisbane, provides educational facilities for deaf children from all parts of the State. The Department of Education meets all costs involved in educating children from the age of four at the school; this includes the full payment of accommodation and food expenses of residential pupils. In addition, the Government works in close co-operation with the Association for the Pre-school Education of Deaf Children. This association provides the buildings, transport services and costs associated with non-professional staff at the Pre-school Centre for the Deaf in Brisbane, whilst the

Department meets professional costs and supervises work carried out. Parents attend the Pre-school Centre to receive training in assisting their children. As indicated to members of the deputation on August 13, the Government is prepared to assist in the operation of a pre-school for deaf youngsters in Townsville under exactly the same conditions as apply to the operation of the Pre-school in Brisbane.

MR. PAUL GERBER, LECTURER IN  
LAW, UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to an article in *The Courier-Mail* of September 9 in which Mr. Paul Gerber, described as a law lecturer at the University, is reported as giving a legal opinion on an important matter contrary to that held and expressed in the same article by two barristers?

(2) Is he aware that the Premier in a subsequent Press statement in the same newspaper indicated that the two barristers were right and Mr. Gerber was wrong?

(3) What salary and/or other emoluments does Mr. Gerber receive from the University, by whom was he appointed as a law lecturer, and what precautions were taken by the appointing body to determine whether his legal knowledge was commensurate with the position to which he was appointed?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "The Premier's comment was a general statement of the facts of the case."

(3) "I am advised by the University—  
(a) Mr. P. Gerber, Senior Lecturer in Law, receives the standard salary of \$8,750 per annum. He is not in receipt of any other emoluments from the University. Mr. Gerber's appointment was approved by the Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of a selection committee which included the president of the Professorial Board and the Dean of the Faculty of Law. He was interviewed in Brisbane prior to his appointment. (b) Mr. Gerber is a graduate in law at the University of Melbourne and a confidential report on his qualities and qualifications was obtained from the Dean of the Faculty of Law in that University."

ACCOMMODATION FOR EDUCATION  
SERVICES, MARYBOROUGH

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

In view of the statement in a letter to me from his Department that the establishment of the Maryborough School of Arts building as an education house was

worthy of consideration when money was available, will he reconsider my request as Adult Education, Regional Director's Department and other educational groups urgently require additional suitable space for expansion of educational activities?

Answer:—

"I shall have an investigation made of the accommodation needs of educational services at Maryborough."

ESTABLISHMENT OF TEACHERS' COLLEGE,  
MARYBOROUGH

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

Will he favourably consider the establishment of a teachers' training college in Maryborough in view of the city's central position in the densely populated statistical region of Maryborough and in order to encourage decentralisation of population?

Answer:—

"The number of students from Maryborough and district at the teachers' colleges indicates that the establishment of a teachers' college in Maryborough is not warranted."

COMPULSORY THIRD-PARTY INSURANCE  
FOR POWER-DRIVEN BOATS

Mr. Donald for Mr. Hanson, pursuant to notice, asked The Treasurer,—

(1) As power-driven boats, now so popular on our waterways, are required to be registered and licensed, is there any requirement for a compulsory third-party cover for these vessels?

(2) Is a voluntary cover available from the State Government Insurance Office?

(3) In view of the likelihood of serious injury and the possibility of exposing people to extreme financial hardship through their inability to recover just compensation, has any move been made to institute a compulsory form of cover?

Answers:—

(1) "No."

(2) "Yes."

(3) "The matter has received preliminary consideration and there are a number of real difficulties. However, it is my own belief that some such scheme is essential and the matter is being pursued."

TEMPORARY PLATFORM SHELTER, BALD  
HILLS RAILWAY STATION

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

In view of the great inconvenience being experienced by train travellers at Bald Hills railway station since the station buildings

were destroyed by fire, will he consider placing a temporary shelter on the platform to protect travellers against summer rain?

*Answer:—*

"This request is being examined."

#### NEW POLICE BUILDINGS, MT. ISA

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

(1) Has any survey been made of a site for a complete new police complex at Mt. Isa?

(2) If so, have any plans and specifications been drawn up or are they in the course of preparation for the construction of a new police station and single men's quarters there?

*Answers:—*

(1) "Site particulars have been obtained for the planning of new police buildings at Mt. Isa."

(2) "Plans and specifications for the erection of a new police station are in course of preparation. It is proposed to remove and re-site the existing single men's quarters and to provide new quarters at a later stage of the development on the site."

#### COMMONWEALTH DAIRY INDUSTRY REHABILITATION SCHEME

**Mr. Donald** for **Mr. R. Jones**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Primary Industries,—

(1) What is the latest information regarding the proposed \$25 million rationalisation plan for the dairying industry which was announced by the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry?

(2) When will the scheme be implemented?

(3) Will dairy farmers, who have sold their farms in good faith subsequent to the announcement, participate in the scheme and be reimbursed retrospectively?

*Answer:—*

(1) "I refer the Honourable Member to my reply to the Honourable Member for Burnett on August 28 last. I have no further information."

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

(3) "The effective date from which the scheme is to operate is a matter for determination by the Commonwealth. However, there would be little ground to support a claim for retrospective payment unless it could be clearly shown that the decision to sell and the terms and conditions of sale had in fact been influenced by the Commonwealth announcement."

#### RATIONALISATION PLAN FOR MARKETING OF PINEAPPLES

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

As the pineapple direction has to be suspended in order to implement the pineapple rationalisation plan, will new canners or existing canners be able to enter into contract direct with growers?

*Answer:—*

"In the event of the pineapple direction becoming inoperative, there would appear to be nothing to prevent new canners, or existing canners who are not bound by contract to obtain their pineapples from the C.O.D., from contracting direct with pineapple growers who are not subscribers to Northgate Cannery."

#### APPOINTMENT OF CLERK OF THE COURT, DIMBULAH

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

As the duties of the Clerk of the Court are at present carried out at Dimbulah by police officers in addition to their police duties and as there is a constant need for the services of a Clerk of the Court there, will he consider making an appointment?

*Answer:—*

"Action has been taken already by me in this matter. I personally visited Dimbulah Police Station when visiting Mareeba for the Cabinet meeting held there on July 8 last. Following my visit I arranged for an inspection to be made of the records of the Clerk of the Court at Dimbulah and inquiries pursued as to the position by the Under Secretary and the Administration Officer of my Department, when visiting North Queensland on other duties. A report by these officers was submitted last month. Representations on the matter of this appointment have been already received from other sources."

#### POLICE CONSTABLE'S RESIDENCE, NORMANTON

**Mr. Wallis-Smith**, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

In view of the historic and tourist value of the original buildings at the rear of the police constable's residence, Normanton, and the need for extensive repairs to the residence, will he consider the provision of new accommodation in an area opposite the present residence?

*Answer:—*

"The necessity for the erection of a new residence at Normanton Police Station is at present under consideration, and the location of any new building to allow the retention, if warranted, of original buildings will be examined."

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY; MINISTER  
FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (11.26 p.m.): I desire to inform the House that in connection with the visit overseas of the Minister for Industrial Development, His Excellency the Governor has, by virtue of the provisions of the Officials in Parliament Acts, 1896 to 1965, authorised and empowered the Honourable Gordon William Wesley Chalk, Treasurer, to perform and exercise all or any of the duties, powers, and authorities imposed or conferred upon the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Development by any Act, rule, practice or ordinance on and from 15 September, 1968, and until the return to Queensland of the Honourable Frederick Alexander Campbell.

I lay upon the table of the House a copy of the Queensland Government Gazette Extraordinary of 12 September, 1968, notifying this arrangement.

Whereupon the hon. gentleman laid the Government Gazette Extraordinary on the table.

## PAPERS

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

Report of the Agent-General for Queensland, for the year 1967-68.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

The Supreme Court Act of 1921.

The District Courts Act of 1967.

The Magistrates Courts Acts, 1921 to 1964.

The State Electricity Commission Acts, 1937 to 1965.

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

The Water Acts, 1926 to 1967.

The City of Brisbane Market Acts, 1960 to 1967.

The Wheat Pool Acts, 1920 to 1957.

The Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Acts, 1926 to 1966.

The Meat Industry Act of 1965.

Regulations under—

The Stock Acts, 1915 to 1965.

The Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Acts, 1926 to 1966.

The Fruit Marketing Organisation Acts, 1923 to 1964.

## ADDRESS IN REPLY

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—SIXTH ALLOTTED  
DAY

Debate resumed from 12 September (see p. 396) on Mr. Pilbeam's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, on which Mr. Houston had moved the following amendment:—

"Add to the question the following words:—

"However, it is the opinion of this Legislature that, due in great measure to your advisers having failed to exploit Queensland's resources in the interests of the people of the State, the position has been reached wherein our medical services, education, law enforcement, road safety projects and many other essential State responsibilities have failed to keep pace with the developments demanded by the technological and other advances of a modern society.

"This failure is continually frustrating the great efforts and enthusiasm of the State's Crown employees.

"The administration has failed lamentably to give Queenslanders the opportunity to share in the developmental returns from this State's natural resources and, while making available the cheapest possible fuel and minerals to foreign countries, it demands only negligible royalties in return.

"Through the deliberate policy of soliciting and allowing uncontrolled overseas exploitation of our most readily accessible national assets, the administration is placing in jeopardy the future economic development of heavy industry within this State.

"Failure to maintain Queensland's advantage in decentralisation is reflected in a declining population in all but the capital and a few isolated pockets. This has been brought about by failure to provide local opportunity for the natural born of the areas concerned and lack of incentive to attract migrants to this State.

"We desire to inform you that for these and other eroding and inhibiting attitudes in the social, industrial and civil liberties fields, this Government no longer possesses the confidence of the people and this House."

**Mr. LLOYD** (Kedron) (11.43 a.m.): In supporting the Opposition's amendment, which constitutes a motion of no confidence in the Government, I had intended to spend a great deal of my time in replying to the Premier and the Treasurer. However, in the light of an article which appeared in "The Australian" of today's date, much of the necessity for doing so has disappeared. In that press report, foreign investors were

given a warning by the Federal Minister for National Development, Mr. Fairbairn. Alan Ramsey reported—

“The Federal Government is determined to tighten up on foreign investment in Australia which makes no attempt to introduce local partnership.

This was the clear warning behind a strong attack made yesterday by the Minister for National Development, Mr. Fairbairn, on unidentified foreign companies now operating in the mining, processing, oil and vehicle fields.”

It has taken a long time for Federal Ministers to become aware of the real dangers which face the Australian economy and which have escalated over the past 20 years. In reply to the Leader of the Opposition, the Treasurer said that he was concerned only with Queensland's development. His words indicate that whilst he is concerned only with Queensland's development (as the Premier also said) he does not consider that what is happening at Weipa, or Moura-Kianga, or at any of the other mineral fields in Queensland, will have an impact on Australia's economy.

Our amendment to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply indicates that we are concerned, as are many members of the public, including economists, that representatives of the various State Governments in Australia, have travelled the world begging people in America and other overseas countries to come here and exploit our natural resources, and to take over complete ownership without any Australian equity or participation.

These mendicant Premiers and Cabinet Ministers from all States of Australia are in continuous competition for overseas capital. It might be said that no prostitute, could offer as much as many of these representatives of the various State Governments, street-walking throughout the world, have offered in roads, harbours, buildings and, in many cases, Government loans and Government guarantees, as an enticement to overseas capital to take over complete ownership of Australia's mineral and land resources.

Many of the things that have happened during this period are comparable with what happened 40 years ago, when there was competition among the various State Governments and Premiers on overseas money markets for public borrowings. There was intense competition among the States at that time to such an extent that interest charges imposed by overseas investors, money-lenders, banks and financial institutions were so great that it became necessary for all States of the Commonwealth to join together in the Financial Agreement of 1928, which gave the Commonwealth Government direct control over total governmental borrowings on overseas money markets.

A similar position has been reached at present, except that it is not public borrowings that Premiers and Cabinet Ministers, representatives of State Governments, are running

around the world trying to entice; rather is it the private capital investor, private industry and the large overseas monopoly company that they are trying to tempt and lure with offers of generous concessions, franchises, housing and the expenditure of money from the public purse. It has been said by representatives of the Government, including the Premier, that we have in Queensland a joint Government-private industry partnership. It is a partnership that is lopsided, one-sided and loaded in favour of the overseas investor and overseas industry. Many of the services required by the people of Queensland are inadequate at present because of the necessity for this Government to reach an agreement with an overseas company to build houses and harbours, and provide money from loan funds—money which, to a large extent, would normally be diverted to the construction of hospitals and houses in many areas of the State, the building of harbours and the provision of water supplies, irrigation and dams, and electricity power.

At the moment Queensland, with the third largest population of all the States, has only 10 per cent, of Australia's electricity output, while Tasmania has 11 per cent. Tasmania is a State with no greater budgetary capacity than the City of Brisbane, yet its electricity power output is as great as, if not greater than, Queensland's. That indicates clearly that since 1958, the obsession of this Government to attract overseas capital for the exploitation of our natural resources has reacted violently against the best interests of the people of this State and of our future industrial development.

I think that Weipa would be one of the most glaring examples of this obsession on the part of the State Government. It says that if it did not provide these concessions the overseas companies would not come here. It claims that there is not adequate capital in Australia to exploit these resources. I reply in this way: in 1958 an agreement was reached—and it was ratified by this Parliament—to develop the bauxite deposits at Weipa. That was done three years after the discovery in 1955 of these immense deposits of bauxite, amounting to 2,000 million tons.

That agreement was brought before the House by the then Minister for Mines, who was praised in the Press as “Strong Ernie” and who carried on and had implemented many of the agreements which had been reached by the previous Labour Government. In exchange for the very generous concessions offered by the Government, including the granting of hundreds of square miles of land in Cape York Peninsula for a peppercorn rental, the company was to construct a harbour, build a new town, provide many facilities for the Aboriginal population, and undertake an immediate investigation into the provision of not only an alumina refinery but eventually an aluminium plant. Those things were to be provided in return for the concessions granted by the Government.

Within a few years of Parliament's ratification of that agreement, the Government, by Order in Council, entered into several other subsidiary agreements with the company under which some \$3,000,000 was to be paid to the company for work that it had undertaken in the construction of a harbour at Weipa. A further sum of \$4,000,000 was to be spent by the Treasurer in building the harbour and providing navigational facilities, and \$4,000,000 was to be spent in the construction of a township. Certainly it is expected that some of that money will be repaid to the Government over a period of between 15 and 40 years, but the very impact of that expenditure on Queensland's budget, which already suffered from an inadequacy of loan funds from the Australian Loan Council, was sufficient to react violently against works of great importance for the health and education of Queenslanders, such as the construction of university buildings, high schools, hospitals, and school science laboratories, all of which are provided from State loan funds. The provision of those things has been restricted by the Government's obsession that unless such concessions are made overseas companies will not come here to exploit our resources.

Turning to the agreement reached with Amoco, we find that the total cost of reclaiming land at Bulwer Island, amounting to \$1,800,000, was paid by the Government from State loan funds, and, in exchange, Amoco was to build a refinery and receive 500 acres at Bulwer Island for a period of seven years at a rental of approximately \$8,000 a year. The return to the Government during the first period, at 3 per cent. on the capital cost of reclamation of the land, alone, would be \$54,000 a year, not the peppercorn rental of \$8,000.

Other concessions granted by the Government to Amoco were the agreement to purchase from it all its petroleum requirements over a period of years, the halving of harbour dues on the importation of crude oil, and the abolition of harbour dues on the exportation of refined products. They were concessions that the Government said it was necessary to grant, otherwise the company would not have built a refinery here.

On the other hand, Ampol were able to build another refinery on a turn-key basis. In other words, they did not need any foreign capital at all to construct an Australian refinery at the mouth of the Brisbane River. They borrowed the necessary capital from the Australian banking system, and they brought in, on a turn-key basis, the Bechtel Corporation to construct the refinery and teach our technicians the necessary know-how to operate a refinery. The capital is available in Australia to exploit the resources that we own.

The Moura-Kianga railway line is, I believe, another prize example of the Government's obsession in this direction and of its failure to protect the natural resources of

the people of Queensland against take-overs by overseas capital. In the first place, Thiess-Peabody were in a 50-50 partnership. Certainly, Thiess is an Australian company, and it held the mining lease. Peabody had the machinery, such as the draglines and other equipment. Then Mitsui, which no doubt had the shipping, came into the picture and took 28 per cent. of the shareholding previously held by Thiess Bros., which was temporarily embarrassed financially at the time. The point has now been reached at which, instead of an immense inflow of capital to Australia from that project, all we have is several draglines that have been brought in by Peabody and the franchise that Mitsui has for the purchasing of the coal.

The cost of the housing at Moura is also being met by the State Government, and as at 30 June, 1967, it had paid in excess of \$19,000,000 for the development of the Moura railway line. Under the agreement the company was to contribute half the total cost, and that amount was to be placed in Commonwealth Government bonds on which the company was to receive the interest. However, while as at 30 June, 1967, the State Government had paid \$19,000,000 from the Loan Fund, the company had placed in escrow not more than \$4,600,000; so the 50-50 basis of partnership does not seem to apply to any great extent in that case.

All the money that has been expended by the Government of Queensland up to the present is money that rightfully belongs to the people of this State and that normally would have been diverted to essential loan and developmental works; yet neither the Government nor the people of Queensland hold an equity in any of the projects that I have mentioned.

**Mr. Walsh:** That money would have built more schools and more classrooms.

**Mr. LLOYD:** It certainly would. As the hon. member for Bundaberg said, it would have built more schools, more universities, and more classrooms; it would have enabled the Government to implement more irrigation schemes and build more dams; and construction of the huge power-stations needed to produce bulk electricity could already have been begun.

As at 30 June, 1967, about \$40,000,000 of loan money has been spent by the Country-Liberal Government in providing services and facilities for overseas companies that can well afford to meet much of the cost of the work themselves. Why should it be necessary for the people of Queensland to pay for the construction of houses on the project at Moura-Kianga? Money is being spent for that purpose at Mt. Isa and other places in which previously it was not spent. Mount Isa Mines Limited spent all of the money that was needed to implement housing schemes in that area, and, under an agreement entered into some years ago by the Labour Government, it was not necessary

for the people of Queensland to meet the cost of building the town at Mary Kathleen or to meet the total cost of building two dams to provide permanent water for the township of Mary Kathleen and for use by the mining company.

**Mr. Walsh:** Or at Mt. Isa, either.

**Mr. LLOYD:** Mount Isa Mines Limited required no assistance from the Government as an enticement. It even built its own dam.

Let us look at the history of Queensland Alumina Limited—a \$103,000,000 project. In the first place, the impression was given that the idea was to attract overseas capital to this country. Certainly, from a national point of view, a great deal of overseas capital did come here; but it originated from a consortium of banks in the United States of America. The American banking system financed the construction of the alumina refinery; not one penny of capital was brought to Queensland by Pechiney, Alcan, Alcoa, Comalco, or Kaiser Aluminium. Not one of those companies placed one penny of their own capital in that investment. When we look at the lax taxation laws of this country, we see that, from five to eight years after the beginning of production, the taxpayers of Australia will be meeting the cost of interest charges imposed by the American banking system.

Things of the type to which I have referred have created concern in the minds of the people of this country.

**Mr. Walsh:** The Western Australian Government is not building homes for the mining companies.

**Mr. LLOYD:** It is not necessary. The mining companies in the Hamersley Range and at Port Newman are building their own harbours and railway lines.

The Treasurer said the other day that it is a much better economic proposition for the Government to own these railway lines. This may be so, but I have yet to see an overseas company that enters into an agreement with a nation as reputedly dignified as Australia is, and that would not enter into some agreement whereby the company itself could operate, over a period of years, a railway line, the ownership of which would then revert to the Government. These types of agreements between other nations of the world and overseas companies with capital to invest are world-wide in their scope. At the present time, attractions—lures—are being offered by this Government, and in some cases by other State Governments in Australia, to Japanese capital to invest in this country under the enticement that they will have complete control of the natural resources that they are exploiting.

Every politician is elected to this Parliament as a trustee for the community; to protect, as far as possible, the natural, and national, assets that the country possesses at any one time—to protect them for posterity

and retain the community ownership in them. To do as this Government and other Governments in Australia are doing, participating in this practice of selling the ownership of these assets overseas, is grand larceny on a gigantic scale. It is taking away from the community and future generations the ownership of much of the minerals and the land that rightfully belong to the people of this country.

There is no indication at all of this Government's intention to carry on any new policy which might be put forward by the Federal Government, as was stated by Mr. Fairbairn yesterday. There is no intention by this Government to insist on an Australian equity, enabling the Australian shareholder to participate in the ownership of these companies and in their industrial activities here. There is no indication that this Government, if it does as it did in the case of the Thiess Peabody Mitsui company—it gave them a Government guarantee of \$1,400,000 with the Bank of New South Wales to enable them to carry on with some working capital—will insist that that money will be part of the Australian participation in the shareholding in the enterprise itself. Where it is an Australian asset that is at risk it is right that this should be done. This is not an isolated case of Government loans and Government guarantees being advanced to these companies.

It will be found that even in places such as Mexico, an under-developed nation, Asarco, the very company that controls Mount Isa Mines Limited, was forced by the Mexican Government to lodge 50 per cent. of its shareholding with the Government because the Mexican shareholders would not take up the shares when the Government insisted that this should be done. Because the capital was not available in Mexico at that time, the Government insisted that 50 per cent. of Asarco's holdings in Mexico should be deposited until the money was available and Mexican shareholders could take up that portion of the ownership.

Speaking about Japanese capital coming into this country, in Japan there was the tightest control possible over foreign capital participating in any of its manufacturing industries or any of its mineral or other industries or assets. Up till 1963 Japan held a very tight control over the outflow of dividends and profits, royalty payments and all those invisible debits that are creating such a stranglehold on the Australian economy. At that time there was very strict control by the Japanese Government, and, in 1963, when that control was freed, it insisted that before any overseas capital could enter Japan it must only be by permission of the Government and that 50 per cent.—in some cases 60 and 70 per cent.—of the ownership of the industry involved must be retained by the Japanese share market.

Since the end of the war Japan has grown to such an extent industrially as to become one of the greatest industrial nations of the world, one of the largest shipbuilders in the world and the largest exporter of many textiles and

many motor-vehicle components. That was only done by a directly opposite approach to that of the Queensland and Australian Governments. Japan borrowed from overseas the money that was required, she purchased the patents and the machinery, and then imported the necessary technologists and created the industries. Japan has progressed to such an extent that it is now one of the greatest industrial nations of the world. Why wouldn't the Japanese come here? Why wouldn't the people of any other country come to Australia? No restrictions are placed upon them.

The speech by Mr. Fairbairn typifies what occurred two or three years ago when Federal Ministers, including Mr. Gorton and Mr. Sinclair, begged overseas companies to allow the Australian shareholder some ownership of their assets. They begged the overseas companies, but gave no thought to introducing some restrictive measure to enable the Australian shareholders to participate in the ownership of the companies' assets.

This is a matter of tremendous public concern, but the Treasurer dismissed it as being of no importance. He calls members of the Opposition "knockers". This has become a habit of members of the Government over recent years. On every occasion when the hon. member for Toowoomba West, Mr. Duggan, and I have raised the matter of local participation in the development of Queensland's natural resources we have been called "knockers" for criticising the Government. If the Government's definition of a "knocker" is somebody who tries to protect the natural resources of this country against foreign ownership, then I, and all other members of the Opposition, would be proud to be called a "knocker".

The Treasurer will find his own reply in the White Papers that are issued continually by the Federal Government. The most recent White Paper concerns the balance of payments for the year 1967-68, when Australia's trade balance showed a deficit of \$240,000,000. That amount does not sound very great when it is only the difference between Australia's imports and exports, but the seriousness of the situation can be realised when the deficit on current account is studied. This is arrived at by an adjustment of invisible debits, which is, to a great extent, the property income payable to shareholders and companies outside Australia. It is seen that the net deficit of \$840,000,000 brought Australia's deficit on current account during that period of 12 months to \$1,000 million.

Australia could balance its payments during that period only by having a net capital inflow of \$1,159 million. In other words, only by a complete balancing of its trading, money transactions, transportation costs—all its payments—and by allowing unfettered rein to \$1,159 million of overseas capital to come into this country can it show a credit of \$100,000,000. This influx of capital

was mostly by means of a portfolio investment of \$500,000,000 to \$600,000,000 coming into Australia and naturally taking advantage of the discoveries of nickel, petroleum, and all the other natural resources that the overseas investors want to exploit. Some \$280,000,000 was accountable by direct investment. These figures are not accurate, but they represent the approximate net capital inflow to this country.

Let us study the balance of payment figures for the past five years. We can see the accelerated pace at which Australian ownership of industry, land and mineral resources in this country is being lost to overseas companies. The loss has accelerated particularly during the last five years. Ninety-five per cent. of Australia's petrochemical works, 97 per cent. of its pharmaceutical works, 95 per cent. of its oil-refining industry, and 36 per cent. of its manufacturing industries, is foreign-owned. Australians hold the remainder. Federal members of Parliament, and even Federal Cabinet members, are becoming very much concerned at this state of affairs.

**Mr. Walsh:** It makes one wonder who won the war.

**Mr. LLOYD:** It is the most unconscionable paradox of all times. I am grateful to the hon. member for Bundaberg for his comment. When one considers the integrity of the Government that managed to withstand the impact of belligerent aggressors and physical invasion of this country so well from 1939 to 1946, and compares it with the paradox of the present submissive Government in allowing economic invasion to take complete control of this country, one realises what a tragedy this is.

The growth in overseas ownership of this country's assets can be well realised by comparing trade balances over the past five years. I have already referred to last year's balance of payments credit of \$100,000,000, which was realised only by a net capital inflow of \$1,159 million. The figures for the past five years show that our trade balance was in deficit to the extent of \$17,000,000. That means that we imported goods to the value of \$17,000,000 more than we exported. In the five years our current account deficit, totalling the gigantic sum of \$3,442 million, represented mainly payments to overseas investors and companies of property income in invisible debits of \$2,188 million. By way of comparison, in the period of 22 years from 1946 to 1968 payments to overseas investors totalled only \$5,200 million.

The rate of increase in the five years is also indicated by the fact that property income totalled \$2,188 million and net capital inflow totalled \$3,612 million. We balanced our books by selling assets to the value of \$3,612 million, which gave us a net credit balance of payments for the five years—so far as overseas balances were concerned—of about \$150,000,000. I emphasize that we

obtained that credit only because the overseas ownership of Australian resources grew by a net capital inflow of \$3,612 million.

Surely all hon. members realise from those figures that it is time that the Federal Government, and leaders of the State Governments also, developed an awareness of the importance of this matter. It cannot be idly cast aside in favour of Queensland's development, especially when we realise that in Canada an inflow of American capital in 1946 was welcomed, but only 12 months later, when a royal commission was appointed to consider the matter, it was discovered that about 64 per cent. of Canadian industry was owned by the United States of America. Today, the United States Government is trying to intervene politically in the export of Canadian wheat to Red China. Not only is there economic intervention in the ownership of Canadian industry, but, because of its tremendous influence and wealth and its ownership of Canadian industry, the United States Government is now attempting to interfere in Canada's political life. This could happen in any community where such a position is reached.

Some time ago the United Nations introduced the turn-key system, and it is about time that the Australian Government and the Queensland Government tried to use this system of internal development. India already insists on a 50 per cent. local equity in industrialisation by overseas companies. The turn-key operation has been used with large power plants. Again, much of the development in Chile has taken place on the basis of the turn-key operation. Some American engineering companies operate on this basis. They hire out their services and obtain a licence for a number of years. At the end of the period, after developing the industry, using the profits, and training local technicians to operate the plant, the industry is handed over either to a local company or to the local Government.

The other day the Premier referred to the benefits which Queensland had gained through the freeholding of land. Let us consider how the pastoral and grazing lands of this country were originally developed. Overseas companies came to this country and obtained special leases over hundreds of square miles, terminating on a certain date, by which time they had developed the country as well as the industry. Then local participation took over and, as the former Minister for Lands said, we had the owner-driver system in operation in the pastoral and grazing industries.

What was this but a turn-key operation in which the capital and technical know-how of development were attracted to this country on a temporary basis? On the termination of the special leases everything had to be handed over to local industry, which by then had gained the necessary experience.

This could have been put into operation in many other avenues of Government development of which the Treasurer and the

Premier have been speaking so glibly. I reject the claim that there is no capital available in Australia, particularly in Queensland, to develop these industries. I believe that the money is here and that Australians are trained sufficiently to enable them to gain the experience to carry on those industries.

After all, if B.H.P. can establish an all-Australian industry for the production of manganese on Groote Eylandt, why is it not possible for other Australian companies to do the same at Weipa, Moura-Kianga and other places in Queensland and in Australia? At least the Federal Government has insisted that the Australian capital market shall have a 50 per cent. participation in Gove. Already the scare tactics are abroad that several Australian companies might find difficulty raising the necessary finance to participate in that venture to the extent of 50 per cent. I do not believe this. I believe that the decision by the Federal Government is a realisation that something must be done on an Australian-wide basis.

It is useless for the Treasurer to come into this House and reject our argument and criticism that the Government is spending so much money unnecessarily on overseas companies and to claim, as an argument against our suggestion, that he is thinking only of Queensland development. The price posterity will have to pay for the development he intends is far too high. The price that must be met in 20 or 30 years' time must be met by another generation. Unfortunately, in an effort to make immediate political gain, State Governments in recent years have attempted to say, "Look at what we have done. We have developed the bauxite deposits at Weipa. We have developed the coal deposits at Moura-Kianga. This could never have happened if it were not for what we have done."

The Government believes that this is of some immediate political gain. Evidently what happens in 20 or 50 years' time does not concern any member of the Government at present. But the people of Queensland and the people of Australia will develop an acute awareness of the real dangers confronting us on an international level. As a book issued by the Federal Government on the Australian economy warns: if at any time the level of undistributed profits or the amount of capital coming into Australia falls to any extent, the whole of Australia's economy could be endangered. This is the position that has been reached after 22 post-war years. Other countries have developed without giving away their natural assets. We have almost reached the point of no return where, unless there is immediate Government intervention, spread over a transition period of five or 10 years, we will be confronted with a serious economic crisis in another 20 years' time if there is the same acceleration of growth in overseas ownership of Queensland and Australian industries.

There is a saturation point somewhere at which the provision of overseas capital will cease. We cannot determine the financial policy of the United States Government or the Government of the United Kingdom. There has been a decrease, from \$136,000,000 in 1958 to \$102,000,000 in 1968, in the level of undistributed profits being held in Australia and used for expansion purposes by overseas companies. That is an immediate indication that some degree of saturation has been reached. Companies are refusing to allow anything but obsolete equipment to come to Australia, and they are also refusing to allow subsidiary companies in Australia full rights to export in competition with the parent companies in the United Kingdom or the United States.

It is time that all Governments in Australia, not only the Federal Government, took a firmer stand and, instead of one State competing against others with the lure of immense sums of Government money to carry out works which should be the responsibility of the companies, examined the whole situation very carefully. The Premier and the Treasurer cannot continue to concern themselves with Queensland only, as whatever happens in this State happens also on an Australia-wide basis. The impact is felt through the whole Australian economy, and, if the Government continues to take from loan funds the money that is necessary to build such things as houses, bridges and harbours for companies, the standard of hospitalisation must deteriorate, as it has done in Queensland in the last 10 years, and other things such as education and housing must also suffer. The people are being deprived of these essentials in order that the Government may assist overseas companies, and, if this trend continues, I am afraid that there will be a rapid deterioration in the level and efficiency of all services in this State.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. TOMKINS** (Roma) (12.23 p.m.): On behalf of those in my electorate and myself, I should like to express allegiance to Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II, and also to acknowledge the very good work that His Excellency the Governor, Sir Alan Mansfield, and Lady Mansfield are doing on her behalf in Queensland. I thought that Sir Alan's Opening Speech was extremely good. It contained many references to Queensland and its future, on which I, for one, do not share any gloomy views. Queensland is a State on the go, and I believe that the policies that the Government is pursuing will ensure that such a state of affairs will continue.

I also wish to refer to the most regrettable passing of the late Premier, the Honourable J. C. A. Pizzey. It was indeed unfortunate that a man with his background and training to lead the State should have been taken from the scene just when he was, as it were, getting going very well. He was an extremely able man, one who made a study of all the departments under his administration. He was

very helpful to private members, including me, and I am indeed sorry that he has passed on.

I take the opportunity, also, to extend my congratulations to the new Premier, the Honourable J. Bjelke-Petersen. I believe that he is a man who is destined to do a first-class job for this State. He was born on the land and has had a lot of experience in land matters. He has also had to battle his way on the land, and that experience must stand him in good stead in the difficult times that he must face in his office as Premier. I have every confidence that he will do a first-class job, and I certainly wish him well.

I also congratulate the new Minister for Works and Housing, the hon. member for Gympie, Mr. Max Hodges, on his elevation to the Ministry. He is a man who has worked into the position very easily, and I am quite sure that, as time goes on, he will do a very good job.

I congratulate the mover of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, the hon. member for Rockhampton South, Mr. Pilbeam, and my colleague Mr. Mike Ahern, the hon. member for Landsborough, who seconded the motion. I propose to make some comments later on the speech of the hon. member for Rockhampton South, but I found both his speech and Mr. Ahern's very interesting.

In his Opening Speech the Governor said—I shall quote from it—

“My Ministers advise that—

“A remarkable transformation in land usage and settlement is occurring in the State, every new block thrown open for selection being eagerly sought;

“Introduction of freeholding, modern land clearing and farm equipment, development of new legumes, grasses and pastures, ability to use formerly unproductive land and the success of the Fitzroy Basin Scheme, a project unparalleled in scope and magnitude which is exciting land men throughout Australia, are responsible for the mounting demand for land;

“Areas totalling about 4,000,000 acres are being designed for sheep and cattle production and Crown estates in 44 centres are being developed for residential, industrial and business purposes.”

I believe that those words show in some way what is happening on the land in Queensland, and I think that the measures to which His Excellency referred will lead to greatly increased production in this State.

This is the first opportunity that I have had of congratulating publicly the hon. member for Condamine on his becoming Minister for Lands. I believe that he, too, has worked into his portfolio extremely well. He is a man of the land, and obviously it is not very difficult for him to accept ministerial responsibility in a portfolio such as this. He has seen fit to visit various parts of the State—he has been to North Queensland;

he has travelled down the coast and out to the Far North-west; and recently he has been to the Channel Country—and I believe that a Minister for Lands should do that. In my opinion, it will become evident as time passes that he is administering the Government's land policy in an effective way.

Earlier in the debate I was interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Barcoo relative to the opening of Area III of the brigalow lands development scheme. As far as I can see—I have looked through the conditions carefully since the hon. member for Barcoo spoke in this debate—in Area III, in which the areas are larger and in which the department requires a landholder to have \$36,000 in cash or readily convertible assets, or \$10,000 in cash or readily convertible assets plus backing by a close relative for the balance of the \$36,000, the conditions are fair enough. It is very difficult country. The former Minister for Lands is in the Chamber, and I am sure that he would agree with me when I say that far more backing would be needed in that area because of the difficulty of the terrain. Obviously, the blocks in Area III are not straight-out brigalow land, as were the blocks in Areas I and II; consequently, it will be more difficult to carry out the conditions.

I believe also—and this is the point made by the hon. member for Barcoo—that the decision to allow landholders in under the conditions laid down in the special qualifications and conditions will assist with the settlement of the area. Most landholders will not leave a property to enter a ballot; but if they do in this instance, they have to sell their property within a period of 12 months, or within such a period as is decided by the Commission. I think that is fair enough, and I believe that the person who does that will make a very good landholder in the brigalow area. After all, he has had experience on his own block, and I cannot see anything wrong with the proposal. I think that a person who does that is fairly game, anyhow.

Last year in my maiden speech I referred to the Government's freeholding policy, and I am pleased to see the number of landholders who have taken, and are taking, advantage of this policy. The one complaint I made then—it dealt with the valuation of timber for the purpose of freeholding—still stands. Delay is still being experienced by some landholders in getting valuations from the Forestry Department. This delay is frustrating to the landholder and should be avoided if at all possible. Now that freeholding is extending farther west, and to larger areas, timber valuations in many cases will be very much higher.

This leads me to the method I suggested last year, namely, that the landholder should be able to exercise an option in the matter. I believe that if a landholder does not want to buy his timber at the time of freeholding, he should be able to have his freeholding case dealt with and the Crown should reserve to itself the timber standing on the land in

the same way as it reserves to itself mining and mineral rights in a freehold conversion. To my mind the reservations would be consistent with minerals, mining, and so on, and if a landholder, at his option, wishes to do that, I think he should be allowed to do it. I have also done some checking with the United Graziers' Association on this policy, and that body also supports it. I hope the time will come when the two departments involved will get together and work this matter out.

A period of about 15 years should be allowed for the Crown to get the timber off the place, after which it would become the property of the landholder, and I should like to see the Minister for Lands and the Minister in charge of the Forestry Department confer on this matter and achieve more uniformity. It could be that control of the Forestry Department should revert to the Lands Department so that one set of officers can handle both valuations. This is something that could be looked into. If one department handled the two matters, expedition in valuing would be a much simpler matter.

**Mr. McKechnie:** The suggestion is that it should be at the option of the landholder?

**Mr. TOMKINS:** Completely at the option of the landholder.

Another matter I should like to touch on is the aerial baiting of dingoes with "1080" poison. Personally, I think this is a very good scheme. I have seen it in action. I have had it done on my own property and I think the results are good. My experience, and that of other people to whom I have spoken, suggests that after aerial baiting the only dingoes we will see will be dead ones.

The practice is for the Co-ordinating Board to send out an officer. The landholder provides the meat and does the mixing, and so on. There is one point, however, that I should like to put to the Minister for Lands, and perhaps to the Co-ordinating Board in particular, because I should not like to see this scheme jeopardised by what I believe could be something that needs correction. I refer particularly to aerial baiting in small areas. I have here a letter from a person who has a sheep property adjoining a cattle property, and it is alleged in the letter that aerial baits were dropped right up against the house. In fact, in the words of the letter, it killed all this man's sheep dogs, fowls, and so on. I questioned the person on whether he saw the plane go over and he said "No", but he felt it must have, otherwise the dogs would not have died.

I also did some checking up with the local veterinary officer and he said that it could have been "1080", but he could not be definite, because recently hepatitis has been very prevalent amongst dogs and dingoes. It could be that this person is on the wrong lines, but I suggest to the board that aerial baiting in very closely settled areas should cease. I believe that in closely settled areas

the baits should be put out by a man on horseback, on a Landrover, or something like that. They could then be put out where it is known that the dingoes are. I would not like to see this sort of thing go on and defeat what is a really good scheme.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** A grazier I know lost two of his dogs and picked up eight baits along the road, indicating that the baits came from the air.

**Mr. TOMKINS:** That could be so. That is why I make the point that aerial baiting should be carried out only on the larger properties. With some of the bigger properties it is necessary to do it by air, for example, to get the baits into the ranges and near waterholes in the ranges. I think aerial baiting is the most satisfactory method in those circumstances.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** The important questions are: who decides where these baits are to be dropped? Should notice be given to graziers?

**Mr. TOMKINS:** I agree with the hon. member for Barcoo, but a property-owner could hire an aircraft to fly over his property and he may not know exactly where his boundary fences are from the air. This is one weakness in the scheme, and it is why I suggest that in the smaller areas aerial baiting should be dispensed with.

About two weeks ago I was fortunate in being able to accompany the Minister for Lands, the Chief Commissioner of Lands, Mr. Gordon McDowell, and the hon. member for Gregory on a trip to the Channel Country and far western areas. It was a very pleasant trip, because the country everywhere was in first-class condition and the people we met were in a very happy frame of mind now that they no longer suffer from many frustrating years of drought. I believe that, given a few more years, these areas will once again produce fat cattle in large numbers.

After this trip I came to three conclusions. The most important one is the value of the beef roads that have been constructed recently to enable stock to be brought out as fats, thus saving long droving trips, and also, more importantly, the future value of the beef roads in getting stock out of areas as they become drought-stricken. Generally, more beef roads should be constructed to make various areas more stable. Unless beef roads are constructed to afford people living in the remote areas of the State the same opportunities as those given to people in areas adjacent to the coast, primary industries cannot function efficiently in the remote areas.

A matter that does not directly concern this Parliament is the introduction recently by the Federal Government of more realistic taxation measures. A scheme of drought bonds has been introduced, which will have the effect of encouraging a landholder facing drought to sell some of his stock as a drought-relief measure. The funds so provided could

be used to purchase drought bonds, which would not be taxable until the funds are subsequently used for re-stocking. I propose to say something more about that in a moment because it is a very important matter.

Another important conclusion that I came to related to the value of shire councils in towns like Thargomindah, Windorah, Jundah, Bedourie and Boulia. It is there that local government can be seen at its best. The councils in those areas have built hotels, hostels for school children, cafes, picture shows, and in Boulia even a butcher shop. Were it not for the dedication of the shire councillors none of those towns would be in existence. The shire council is responsible for the town. Of course, the councils have been helped by the State Government in making available subsidies for necessary amenities. These subsidies have made it possible for the councils to offer the services that are provided. However, where councils have to provide cafes, picture shows, hotels, etc., the Government should consider making them a non-repayable grant.

Take the case of Boulia. It is a well-set-up town, and the council deserves credit for what it has provided. The town's one need now is sewerage, but the provision of it would be quite beyond the resources of the council, even if a subsidy were provided. In a case such as this the Government should make an "isolation" grant, for want of a better term, to encourage people to stay in the Outback and not be caught up in the drift to the cities.

I congratulate the hon. member for Gregory on his representation of his electorate. I feel that his electorate owes a lot to him for the work that he has carried out.

Returning to my own electorate, I see a lot of local-authority work at first hand. Last Saturday it was my pleasure to go to Miles, where the R. J. Simmonds Bridge was opened by the Minister for Lands. I felt that only a handful of people would attend the ceremony and that it would be quite a staid affair. However, to my surprise, at least 500 people were present. That made me realise how highly people think of somebody who does something for his district.

Councillor R. J. Simmonds has lived in the Miles district since 1924, and he has been connected with virtually every type of public activity in Miles. Over the years he has been honorary secretary of the Miles and District Hospital Board, a member of numerous church committees, an official of the football club, jockey clubs, and St. Patrick's Race Club, and from time to time he has owned land and fattened cattle. In an endeavour to provide entertainment for the public of Miles and district, he operated the Rex Theatre for many years. The new Catholic school and presbytery are the result of considerable time and energy given to these projects by him. He was elected to the Council of the Shire of Murilla and served for nine years as a councillor before being elected chairman of

the council in 1958. He has served nine years as chairman of the council, and has again been re-elected with a record majority. During his term as deputy chairman great development took place throughout the shire following the construction of roads. In addition to this most necessary work, water was reticulated in the towns of Miles and Dulacca.

Since Mr. Simmonds' election as chairman of the council the shire has developed rapidly. It is considered that without his persistence and ability as an organiser, the civic centre at Miles, of which every citizen is now so proud, may never have been constructed. A certain amount of opposition was advanced to this project, but Mr. Simmonds realised the need for it and in due course proceeded to have it erected. He met the same type of opposition to the building of a swimming pool, but when a poll was forced upon him the district voted overwhelmingly in favour of it. In due course the pool was built.

Councillor Simmonds is the type of man who, in my opinion, deserves the greatest credit, and he is little different from some of the shire chairmen in the area represented by the hon. member for Gregory. When such good work is performed by people, I believe that it should be recorded. I also believe that that is why so many people attended the bridge-opening ceremony last Saturday.

I referred earlier to drought bonds for farmers, and I should now like to read a short extract from the recent issue of "Queensland Country Life" and to make some comments on it because I think it is very important to all primary producers.

The article reads—

"Opposition is mounting among parliamentarians from rural electorates towards the Government's proposed drought bonds scheme.

"The opposition stems from the Government decision to limit drought bond subscribers to graziers in 'arid areas' of Australia.

"In the Senate, Senator J. J. Webster (CP, Vic.) said the farming community would welcome insurance against the possibility of being put out of business in time of drought.

"But it appeared that the drought bonds would not be available to all producers." I share those views, but I believe that this scheme can be applied to primary industries other than the livestock industry. I should like to give my views on this matter as I see it from the point of view of the wheat-growers. They certainly do not live in arid areas, but in the last four years they have been arid more often than not. This year, I am pleased to say, the wheat-growers look like having an extremely good crop, provided that there are no calamities such as hail storms, and so on. However, if a grower has a very good crop and enjoys a good return he will be caught in a tax spiral, although next year he may have a low income. I

suggest—and I am sorry that the Treasurer is not in the House—that this problem could be overcome if it were possible for wheat-growers to buy what I prefer to call "primary-producing bonds". Supposing that a producer's gross income reaches the figure that he could reasonably expect from his property—it could be \$10,000, \$15,000 or \$20,000, depending on the size of his property—he could elect to put the extra into "primary-producing bonds" to be held at the Federal Treasury until he required them. For example, this year he could have a very good crop and a good income, and next year he could strike a drought and have no income; he could then get that money back. This is a type of income insurance or income levelling, and I believe that the primary producers should be entitled to it; no more, no less.

I should like to think that the State Treasurer will raise that point of view in his submissions to the Federal authorities. The idea is supported by many thinking people in Victoria, and I agree with the Victorian thinking because I do not think that it is possible to say that one particular area is arid; there comes a time, even on the best of country, when an area can be arid.

**Mr. Bromley:** Isn't there some sort of levelling scheme operating now?

**Mr. TOMKINS:** The income from the sale of livestock can be spread over five years. That is one scheme. But I think it goes deeper than that. That scheme could be of assistance in some cases. I believe that the primary producers are entitled to this. No matter what happens the income fluctuates, and if it can be ironed out it will be of benefit to the whole community. There is no suggestion in anything I have said that the primary producer is trying to dodge taxation; this is purely and simply a method of evening it out. I feel strongly on this subject and I hope that notice is taken of what I have said.

I turn now to a transport matter. The road transport system has come under fire in this debate. For example, the hon. member for Warwick had a good deal to say about the 25-mile limit. I agree with what he said. There is no doubt in my mind that the exemption from tax payable on goods or stock transported in competition with the railways being limited to 25 miles creates an imposition on people living in country areas, because most journeys there are well in excess of this distance. The position arises that when goods or stock are transported more than 25 miles in competition with the railways, the whole journey attracts the full tax. For instance, stock loaded at Injune and transported to Roma attract no transport tax because there is now no competition with the railways. But if they are transported from Injune to Roma and then for more than 25 miles along the railway line, tax is payable on the whole journey of 85 miles or more. There are many anomalies associated with

this tax, and I have carried out some research into discovering ways and means of devising a better method.

I find, for example, that in the year 1966-67 State transport fees not only from goods and stock but also from passengers travelling in trains and other means of transport amounted to \$4,927,000. The cost of collecting this amount is not known to me, but it must be considerable, taking into account the army of transport police engaged in spot checks and the administrative staff required for such an operation. I find also that in the same year some 252,983,000 gallons of motor spirit and 98,293 gallons of automotive distillate were sold in Queensland, a total of 351,276,000 gallons. That is purely automotive fuels and does not include any heating fuels.

A quick calculation shows that an increase of slightly less than 1.5c a gallon would bring in the same amount of revenue, and to my mind this sort of tax would be much more acceptable than the present one. I know that there are many difficulties to be overcome. One is that this would be an excise tax and could be levied only by the Federal Government and that this might be difficult to implement. However, the State Transport Ministers meet twice a year with the Federal Minister for Transport and I would like to think that they would have a look at this matter. I believe that each State would face the same type of problem as we do. Every State has this tax where there is competition with the railways.

I believe that if the States went into this matter and made a joint approach to the Commonwealth, and the Commonwealth in turn was prepared to remit the tax to each State in proportion to the gallonage sold in that State, that would be a much better way of collecting revenue than the present method, which has many anomalies. In short, the Federal Government would act as a collector for the States. As I indicated earlier, there is no suggestion of including any fuels used for industrial heating or lighting purposes. In other words, it would be purely a tax on the use of motor vehicles.

It is interesting to note that in the Northern Territory, where no tax is imposed and very large transports are used, including prime-movers with two trailers, stock are carried at the rate of 60c a truck-mile, whereas in my electorate I know of no transport operator who for the same service charges less than 80c. That is one result of the imposition of this tax.

I also know—and this is a fairly good point—that Federal Aid funds are returned by the Federal Government to State Governments from an excise tax on fuels, so that it should not be very difficult to advance this method further. I hope that the Minister for Transport will take notice of that point and see if something can be done about it. I am quite sure that it would be a much more acceptable method.

I said earlier that I was going to make some comments on the remarks of the hon. member for Rockhampton South in moving the adoption of the Address in Reply. I said that he made an excellent address. He covered a wide range of subjects, and he is well qualified to deal with them. He dealt at length with the meat industry, in particular the agreement in Rockhampton between the District Abattoir Board and the two meatworks operators, namely the Central Queensland Meat Export Co. Pty. Ltd. and T. A. Field Pty. Ltd. I agree that his summing up of the position there was factual, but I must comment on this forecast of his—

“I suggest—and I think history will bear me out—that eventually the export trade in Queensland will be handled by private-enterprise works and that the building of abattoirs will be confined to local killing only.”

I hope history proves him wrong. I am one who believes that to obtain real competition in the meat industry it is necessary to have butchers and meat operators at public abattoirs competing against these firms who operate their own works. For years the meat industry suffered from lack of competition due to shortage of killing facilities in Queensland, and it was only in 1956, when the Brisbane Abattoir increased its killing capacity to a 33-butcher gang, that real competition developed. Before then, cattle and sheep were often disposed of at giveaway prices because of a shortage of killing facilities in this State.

I believe it is imperative that the Metropolitan Public Abattoir at Cannon Hill be allowed to kill for both the domestic and export markets. Many meat operators there originally started on a domestic kill and then developed their business to kill for export, and they have given real service to the industry. Without the use of a public facility they would never have been able to get off the ground. They pay killing fees to the abattoir and have been able to compete successfully against the larger firms who operate their own works. History has shown quite clearly that monopolies can control this industry, and I believe that it is the smaller meat operator, or the butcher operating at a public facility, who provides the real competition that is so vitally necessary.

This brings to my mind the fact that the Brisbane abattoir has been given an extension of time before it is to be rebuilt, and I understand that it will be maintained as it is for the next 10 years. This again raises the question of where it is to be rebuilt. I should like to think that the Minister for Primary Industries and the members of the Queensland Meat Industry Authority are at this time considering what the future holds for the Brisbane abattoir, including where it is to be built.

**Mr. Davies:** Where do you suggest?

**Mr. TOMKINS:** I think a site away from the waterfront should be chosen. I do not believe it is necessary to build on the waterfront nowadays. Much export meat goes away in cartons, which can easily be carried to the point of loading. I should like to think that the Brisbane abattoir will be allowed to keep going for the 10 years for which its life has been extended and that, in that period, the authorities will find a suitable site for a new abattoir somewhere between Brisbane and Ipswich. I cannot suggest such a site at the moment, but I believe that the abattoir should be established where the rail service will be equal to that now provided and where there will not be any disadvantage to producers.

**Mr. Aikens:** Do you think that Roma would be a good site?

**Mr. TOMKINS:** No, I do not. Roma is too far west. It must be closer to the centres in which most people live. The Roma meatworks does a good job, but it is absolutely essential, in my opinion, that the Brisbane abattoir should remain in the metropolitan area.

Somewhere along the line the Government will have to provide a meatworks that can be used in times of peak, which could come much sooner than one might think. Hon. members must remember that Areas I and II of the brigalow lands development scheme cost about \$14,500,000, and Area III is even more extensive. It should be remembered, too, that there is substantial private investment in the cattle industry.

**Mr. Aikens:** It is only chicken-feed to what they are spending in Papua and New Guinea.

**Mr. TOMKINS:** I am referring to the cattle industry.

In the next five years, given fair seasons, there will be a remarkable increase in Queensland in the number of stock available for slaughter. I believe that the Brisbane abattoir will play a very important role in this slaughtering, and the authorities must face up to that fact. All the figures show that within the next 10 years many more stock will be available than ever before, and although I am the first to admit that the present killing facilities are adequate, I am sure that they will be inadequate within a few years. As I said earlier, I hope that the authorities will look for a new site and then take active steps to design and build a plant.

**Mr. Kaus:** Do you think that there will be a five-day kill at the abattoir?

**Mr. TOMKINS:** Of course there will be a five-day kill. I would be the first to admit that, because of the continuous drought that the State has experienced, cattle numbers are down; but it is only a matter of time before the pendulum swings the other way, and we must be prepared for that time.

For the benefit of the critics who say that the Brisbane abattoir should not be rebuilt, let me point out that it was bought from

Swifts in 1931 by the Moore Government by means of debentures. I have been informed—I am sure that this is correct—that it has not cost the taxpayers of Queensland one penny. In other words, it has financed itself from killing fees, the sale of by-products, etc.; it has financed its own expansion. I will go further and say that if the abattoir is built on another site and the present site is sold, the money received from that sale will just about finance the building of a new abattoir.

In my opinion, it is very important that a new abattoir should be built in the metropolitan area. Meat is one of the State's best exports; the cattle industry is one of the key industries of this State. I believe that all possible steps should be taken to ensure that the development of the industry continues and that it is not restricted in any way. If the Government does that, it will be doing the right thing—and it usually does the right thing.

The amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply indicates to me that the Opposition does not think that the State is progressing. I picked up a newspaper at home recently which shows that, no matter what one might think, at least in some areas of the State things really are moving.

The newspaper says—

"Millions being spent in Roma district's development.

"Roma and district is humming with development worth millions of dollars.

"Increased spending by local authorities, a stepped up oil search programme, more government expenditure and a steady expansion of private enterprise are contributing towards unprecedented growth in the district."

**Mr. Aikens:** What are you quoting from. "The New Idea"?

**Mr. TOMKINS:** No, "The Western Star"; it is a very good paper, too.

It continues—

"Roma, with its great diversity and resilience, is enjoying boom conditions. Years of drought and near drought conditions have been countered with the district's ability to diversify its primary production. With Roma as an increasingly important commercial and government centre, indications are that all sections of Roma and district will continue to play a vital part in the economy of the Commonwealth."

And so it goes on. There is nearly a whole front page of it. It covers the funds being spent on the search for oil and gas, and so on. It shows how the wheat industry has developed. It also shows the spending of the Roma Town Council on sewerage extensions and so on, and also the spending by the Bungil Shire Council. Altogether it is a fairly good story.

**Mr. Bromley:** Is it as good as "My Brother Jack"?

**Mr. TOMKINS:** I have not read "My Brother Jack", so I cannot say. But this story is a very good one. Amongst other things, it shows what the council out there is doing about providing a new sports ground.

**Mr. Aikens:** Will this speech of yours appear in the paper?

**Mr. TOMKINS:** I hope so.

Another interesting point is that the number of people registered as unemployed at Roma is six, a drop of four on last year's figure. The number of vacancies is quoted as four. These figures all add up to a fairly good story. The article goes on to list the new improvements in the district.

Before I conclude, I should like to refer particularly to one point. The article says—

"Carnarvon Tourist Lodge nearly completed at Carnarvon National Park (Stage 1)."

This is virtually a new industry for the district. Previously this sort of thing did not happen in our territory. The safari led by the Minister for Labour and Tourism in 1965 was responsible for this development.

(Time expired.)

[Sitting suspended from 1.4 to 2.15 p.m.]

**Mr. INCH (Burke) (2.15 p.m.):** I rise to speak in support of the amendment so ably moved by the Leader of the Opposition and seconded by the Deputy Leader, the hon. member for Townsville North. The fact that the Treasurer was drawn into this debate at an early stage, in an effort to try to offset the telling effect of the submissions made by the Leader of the Opposition and his Deputy, indicates that the Government is alarmed and upset by their exposure of the weakness of its legislative measures and of its mismanagement of the affairs of State.

This is further evidenced by the fact that the Premier himself has found it necessary to enter the debate, no doubt because he considered that the Deputy Premier's efforts to reply adequately to the criticism from the Opposition benches had failed lamentably. To the best of my knowledge, I do not recollect a Premier having previously to defend his Government during an Address-in-Reply debate, and there can be no doubt about the effectiveness of the criticism by the Opposition when the head of the State has found it necessary to rise in his place and attempt to defend the actions of his Government. Might I add at this stage that the Premier's efforts failed as lamentably as those of the Deputy Leader of the Government in reply to the Opposition.

Under legislative measures introduced by this Government, vast coal resources are being handed over to companies to be exploited in the interests of overseas investors and for the development of foreign industries,

while the Government receives a mere pittance in return for this valuable commodity. It receives 5c a ton royalty, for which it is apparently so eager to settle as a pay-off from these companies for the so-called development of our mineral resources. A more apt phrase would be to term it the "wholesale rape" of these natural resources.

**Mr. Tucker:** They have turned Queensland into a supermarket.

**Mr. INCH:** My word they have!

Apparently this Government is unmindful of the fact that our coal and mineral deposits, huge as they may be, are not unlimited, and are also wasting assets. Once removed from the ground they can never be replaced, for there is no regenerative process by which they can be restored. So, eventually, in the years to come our seams of high-grade coking coal will be exhausted as the result of the rapacious exploitation that can be expected from those countries and companies who require and are obtaining a cheap source of supply to expand their own internal industries. This will react to the detriment of future generations of Queenslanders.

The Treasurer, by a statement made during his reply to the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition during this debate, said—

"As far as I am concerned, and as long as I occupy the position I do, I will sell Queensland on the basis on which it has been sold over recent years and we will develop this State."

This statement gives a significant indication of the Government's intention to continue with its willy-nilly divestment of the natural resources of this State on terms that are reminiscent of the flour and tobacco hand-outs given to Aborigines as the price for allowing their land and its resources to be exploited in years gone by. We have seen what has happened to the generations of these people since then; they have been pushed farther out into the wilderness, or given a piece of land on which even a jack-rabbit could barely exist.

Queenslanders of the future will curse the capriciousness, arrogance and stupidity of a Government of the past—that is, the present Country-Liberal Government—which, as we know from its past and present actions and the statement made by the Deputy Premier, is determined, in exchange for a minimal amount of royalty, to allow the plundering of these mineral resources to continue unabated, without care for, or thought of, the future economic requirements of our own industries, which we will depend upon to contribute to the future prosperity of our State and the well-being and employment of generations of Queenslanders to come.

The Government is adopting a give-away policy and is endeavouring to cloak it under the guise of development, but whatever development of our mineral resources has

taken place, or is taking place, has been in the interests of overseas investors and the build-up of foreign industries. The time must surely come, if it has not already arrived, when the weight of foreign investment in this country will dictate the policies of Governments.

During his speech the Leader of the Opposition raised the subject of housing. This gives me the opportunity to stress again the lack of State rental homes in Mt. Isa and the urgent need for the provision of this type of accommodation to serve the ever-increasing number of persons who are obtaining employment in the various business and industrial enterprises that have developed in recent years as a result of the expansion of the mining industry in that town. It is reasonable to assume that, as this industry expands, an increasing number of new business enterprises will be attracted to the area, along with a large increase in population. Although a number of these people will obtain employment with Mount Isa Mines Limited and, by the careful husbandry of their finances, will eventually be able to purchase their own homes, there will be many who will have to turn to other avenues of employment in which a lesser wage is paid, and, consequently, the opportunity to save for the purchase of a home while raising and educating their families becomes virtually nonexistent.

A great deal has been said about the need for decentralisation of industry to retain and encourage the growth of population in the northern and western areas of the State and to aid in their development. With this, I heartily agree. But it must be remembered also that, along with the more affluent section of these communities, these persons in the low-income bracket should have an equal opportunity of housing their families in decent homes. This could be achieved if the Government made available a greater percentage of rental accommodation at a rental within the means of those people.

Unfortunately the Government fails to realise the worth of these people in the community and the part they are playing in developing these remote areas. It fails to understand that even if these people are performing the most menial task they are entitled to the right and the sanctuary of a decent home for their families and not some cramped, substandard shack or dwelling for which they will be charged an exorbitant rental. Despite my previous canvassing of the needs of these people in the low-income bracket, apparently the Government is still prepared to construct homes only for purchase or to pander to the interests of big business by making a large percentage of Housing Commission homes available to these concerns on a guaranteed-rental basis.

However, it must be conceded that, in some instances, although these industrial enterprises enjoy the benefit of guaranteed-rental homes constructed by the Housing Commission, not all of them have placed the total responsibility on the Government of providing homes for the number of people who have been attracted to, and have gained employment in, the particular areas of operations. If it had been a case of waiting for this Government to shake off its lethargy in this respect, the operations of the mining company at Mt. Isa would have been curtailed to some extent and development would have lagged far behind the development that has taken place up to the present day.

I realise that, because of the acute shortage of housing, the company was forced, and is still being forced, by circumstances to construct a number of homes in order to obtain and retain a fairly stabilised work-force to carry out its expansion programme. This is evidenced by the company's decision to construct a further 150 homes for purchase by its employees and the construction in Railway Avenue of a \$1,000,000 multi-storey project containing 100 two-bedroom, air-conditioned flats designed for young married couples. However, while these projects will make a worth-while contribution to the housing shortage of the company's employees, they will in no way alleviate the present shortage and need for rental accommodation of those persons not directly engaged in its industry. The Government has failed these people in this regard, and it is high time that steps were taken to remedy the existing unsatisfactory position.

While I am on this subject of the Government's failure to provide adequate housing for all sections of the community, I would especially draw the attention of the Minister for Transport to the disgusting state of the departmental homes in which the railway fettlers at Duchess and their families are housed. During a recent visit to this centre I made a personal inspection of four out of seven of these houses, and in each instance I found them to be in a deplorable state of repair, with the tenants depressed by the conditions under which they are living and rearing their young children. These dwellings have remained unpainted for years; they are weather-worn and ravaged by white ants to such an extent that the end wall of one of them cannot be nailed to the bottom of the framework because of the white-ant-eaten state of the wall-plate and studs.

Windows need to be replaced or repaired, and shades over the windows are falling off because the frames to which they are attached have been destroyed by termites. Gaps run the full length of the divisional walls within some of the residences, and most of the flooring in the rooms and on the verandas has deteriorated to the stage where it constitutes a danger to the tenants.

One woman has already suffered painful injuries as a result of a floor giving way beneath her. In another of these homes I saw a hole in the bedroom floor over which a mat and a sewing machine had been placed in order to hide the condition of the floor, and to prevent children from inadvertently stepping into the hole or onto the surrounding weakened section, possibly sustaining injury to their limbs.

Spaces between the top of the outer walls and the roof-overhang and between the bottom of the doors and the floors of these dwellings allow the cold wind and rain to beat in, adding still further to the discomfort of the occupants. Kitchen facilities are primitive; there are no sinks in any of these premises; interiors are dark, and the rear walls of stove recesses in some of these premises are loose and need to be replaced with walls in which a window is fitted to provide light and ventilation. Bathrooms are equally primitive; there is no water laid on; there are no bathtubs; and the floors are rotted and need to be replaced. Waste water from washtubs that have outlived their useful purpose and need replacing is drained onto the open ground a few feet away from the houses, creating exceedingly unpleasant conditions.

In a sense it can be said that to some extent fettleers are lured into applying for the vacancies that occur in this centre by the department's present false advertising to the effect that water is laid on to these houses. True it is that pipes are laid from the nearby tank to the homes, but at present there is no windmill or pump on the well that supplies the tank. As a further example of the bungling ineptitude of the department and its "don't give a hang as long as we get the men" attitude, it recently sent a mill and tower—a second-hand one, I believe—to replace the one that collapsed some years ago. But unfortunately for the fettleers and their families the tower base of this mill does not fit the foundations installed for the original one, so the replacement is still lying there and heaven only knows when the water will again flow through the pipes. Even the tank itself is full of holes; it hasn't held water for the past two years. That will give hon. members some indication of how the Railway Department is neglecting its employees in that area.

Such are the scandalous and intolerable conditions under which these Government employees and their families are housed at Duchess. The whole position cries aloud for instant remedial measures by a Government which appears to be concerned more with channelling the profits from this line into other avenues than with improving the lot of its employees who work and live under the harsh conditions experienced in the far-western areas.

Housing and living conditions such as these are degrading and demoralising. They are an indictment of the department and of a Government which prescribes a set standard of accommodation and conditions under

which employees of other industries are to be housed yet, to suit its own ends, blatantly ignores the standards laid down by the Workers' Accommodation Act. The housing and living conditions of these employees can no longer be ignored or tolerated, and immediate steps must be taken to correct the present position in this regard.

Having dealt to some extent with the housing conditions of a section of railway employees at Duchess which, I trust, will command the immediate attention of the Minister for Transport, I now want to touch upon another matter included in the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, that is, hospitals and health services, and bring to the notice of the Minister for Health the need for his Department to take over the Dajarra Bush Nursing Centre and convert it into a small hospital by adding two rooms to the present structure and thereby provide extra accommodation for two male and two female beds. Financing of this nursing centre has now become too heavy for the committee as the avenues for raising the money necessary to maintain the service are limited mainly to donations from a small number of properties in the surrounding district and the Dajarra Hack Race Club, membership subscriptions, surgery fees and Government aid by way of subsidy, which in 1967 amounted to \$984.

This centre charges a surgery fee of 75c a visit for patients who subscribe to membership at the rate of \$4 a year, and a service fee of \$1 a visit is charged to non-members. The amount received by way of membership subscription in 1967 totalled \$100, which indicates that only 25 persons out of a population of approximately 450 in Dajarra and the surrounding district are subscribing members of this centre. This is not surprising, as nearly 90 per cent. of the population are Aboriginal or coloured persons, most of whom cannot even pay the fee of \$1 a visit, let alone the membership fee of \$4, and this large non-paying section of the community places a heavy strain upon the service rendered by this nursing centre as these people cannot be refused medical care and attention simply because of their inability to pay the required fee.

There would be a number of occasions when these people, after receiving attention from the sister-in-charge for some minor ailment and being given medicines to take at regular intervals to overcome their illnesses, return to their homes and neglect to take the medicine or to carry out the instruction given to them, and in due course their slight ailments develop into serious illnesses. Consequently they have to be transported to the base hospital at Mt. Isa, in most instances by the Royal Flying Doctor Service. This is borne out by the fact that of the 25 flights made by Dr. Tim O'Leary, of the Royal Flying Doctor Service, 13 were made to transport emergency cases of accidents or illness, and I should say that

at least 80 per cent. of the patients transported to Mt. Isa Hospital would have been medical cases.

In a number of instances the calls on the service of the Royal Flying Doctor may possibly have been avoided had sufficient accommodation been available at this nursing centre, to which patients could have been admitted and placed under the care and strict supervision of the sister-in-charge for the period of time necessary to recover from their minor ailments. Provision of this extra accommodation is beyond the financial resources of the committee, however, and, as I have already mentioned, the upkeep and maintenance of this centre has now become too heavy for the people administering its affairs. They have done a wonderful job in maintaining this service to the residents of Dajarra and district over the years and deserve the highest praise for their untiring efforts in this regard. However, there is a limit to what can be done through communal service and the necessity has now arisen for this centre to be taken over and operated by the Government to ensure a continuance of a very valuable service to the residents of this area. I know that the committee desires the Minister to take this action, and I trust that he will give every consideration to the proposal.

The foregoing matters that I have mentioned briefly illustrate the manner in which the Government is mismanaging the affairs of this State, to the detriment of the present and future generations of Queenslanders. Other members of the Opposition have exposed many other facets of maladministration on the part of the Government and have also effectively dealt with the replies of Government members who have attempted to rebut the charges contained in the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, which I fully support.

I conclude by making an earnest appeal to the Ministers concerned to give favourable consideration to the matters that I have raised this afternoon.

**Mr. KAUS** (Hawthorne) (2.35 p.m.): I wish to make my contribution to the debate on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Opening Speech of His Excellency the Governor. Once again on behalf of the Hawthorne electorate I take the opportunity of congratulating Sir Alan Mansfield and Lady Mansfield on the remarkable job that they are doing in this great State of Queensland in representing Her Majesty. Sir Alan has travelled to many parts of the State and has learned much about Queensland and its people.

I also wish to associate the people whom I represent in this House with the motion of condolence that was moved and duly carried following the death of the Honourable J. C. A. Pizzey. I say of the late Jack Pizzey that Queensland people are grateful that he passed this way in his lifetime.

I should like to congratulate my parliamentary leader, the Honourable Gordon Chalk, on a job well done as Premier in the caretaker Government. I also congratulate the newly-elected Premier, the Honourable J. Bjelke-Petersen; I know that he will do a great service for Queensland, as his colleagues before him have done. I also congratulate the Minister for Works and Housing and the Minister for Lands on their elevation to Cabinet rank. I wish them both well.

I also congratulate the mover of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, the hon. member for Rockhampton South, and the seconder, the newly elected member for Landsborough, whom I wish well in his parliamentary career.

To the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply there is before the House an amendment, moved by the Leader of the Opposition and seconded by his deputy, expressing no confidence in the Government. Although I was not going to comment on it, in cricketing terms the Leader of the Opposition seemed to me to resemble a blind umpire with his guide dog. He was without any real encouragement or assistance from his deputy, who did a lot of barking without really making any impression on the House. The hon. member for Chatsworth, in his contribution to the debate, amply covered the points contained in the amendment, as also did the Treasurer when replying to the seconder of the amendment.

The subject on which I have chosen to speak today was mentioned in part by the hon. member for Sandgate in his contribution to this debate. I shall probe a little deeper the problem of water pollution, which is beginning to develop in lakes, creeks and rivers as a result of the industrial expansion that is proceeding in Queensland today.

Our river systems serve many ends. They are used for drinking water, water for agriculture and industry, hydro-electric power, fishing, navigation for commerce and pleasure, bathing and swimming, and as scenic areas that attract tourists. At the same time, they are indispensable outlets for city sewage.

Pollution of water means the introduction or presence of deleterious substances not naturally present in water.

**Mr. Tucker:** What was that word?

**Mr. KAUS:** If the hon. member wants to know what it means, it means poisonous. From his contributions to debates in this House, I think he has a poisonous mind.

From the health point of view, pollution may be chemical or bacteriological. It must always be remembered that we cannot live without water. Man can live without clothes, without shelter, and even for some time without food. Although without water he soon perishes, not all water helps him survive. If it is contaminated, then he may also die before his time.

As I said earlier, man cannot live without water, and it should be remembered that the lack of fresh water must also hinder the development of cities, industries, and agriculture. Hon. members have seen a recent example of that in the drought that has affected this State.

If one attempts to peer into the dimness of pre-history, one finds that more than 10,000 years ago man began to settle in the long valley ribboned by the Nile. Sustained by the life-giving river, the land prospered and, in the fourth millennium before Christ, burst into splendour under the first of the Pharaohs and, in a splendour outstanding in the ancient world, flourished for 27 centuries. Hon. members could probably see some of that splendour on the screen of one of the city's cinemas today.

The words are those of Lionel Casson, and it was he who recorded that it was under the first of the Pharaohs that an extensive network of canals was built for irrigating areas bordering the Nile, while at the same time a system of dykes was built reclaiming vast areas of arable land. In effect, that is what we are doing today with the costly dams that are now being built.

Indeed, the material wealth of civilisation depended almost wholly on agriculture made possible by irrigation. There is little available in these writings on health, other than the emphasis that it was the water of the Nile which made the great civilisation possible. No mention is made, for example, of malaria, but it is likely that the vast systems of canals and dykes upset the previous balance of ecology and so greatly increased the incidence of this and other similar scourges which have plagued the lives of those who lived in these areas even up to the present time.

We then come forward a little further, to the fall of the Roman Empire. World history is regarded as entering the dark or dirty age. Much of the knowledge of water works and drainage works was lost, and for centuries man lived in communities in which the nearest drain or ditch served for the disposal of human excreta and the nearest well or watercourse for the supply of drinking water. Again during these years pestilence and famine kept population growth-rates to a very low figure, and, indeed, in 1348 the great plague, or Black Death, probably the most devastating epidemic ever known, killed half of the population of Europe. It was not until the time of the Industrial Revolution in Great Britain that a significant increase in growth-rate manifested itself.

Prior to appreciable industrial development in the early 19th century, most people in Great Britain lived in villages, the location of which was determined very largely by availability of adequate water supplies, and there appears to have been little water-borne disease in those days. Industrial

development changed all this, in that it brought great numbers of people into cities where their health was impaired by pitifully inadequate water supplies. Even as late as the 19th century, much disease was caused by the often unbelievably foul water supply and the total inadequacy of water supply for cleaning the people and their surroundings.

The greatest outbreaks of disease were the great cholera epidemics in 1849. However, not only did cholera, typhoid fever—we had an outbreak of typhoid in Queensland recently—and dysentery, the so-called water-borne diseases, exact their heavy toll of human life, but so also did typhus and diarrhoea, enteritis groups which are diseases of filth—filth which existed because of the inadequate water supply.

Up to date we have been wonderfully successful in the control of so-called water-borne diseases. With modern design and control of water supply systems, and modern treatment methods of sewerage and water, coupled with the establishment of standards, we have virtually eliminated epidemics due to disease. Today, attention is being focused on still other factors that influence the quality of water supply, and consequently, health. I might point out that bacteria do not persist indefinitely in water unless the water contains a good deal of organic matter, such as animal manure. This could pollute our river systems in country areas where there are feed lots for cattle. This has happened in America. As far downstream as 40 miles, this pollution has been known to kill fish.

Another problem today is the infective hepatitis virus, which is causing great concern at the present time. As hon. members know, there have been mild epidemics in one or two of our schools. As this virus cannot be grown, its survival in water is not definitely known, but it appears to survive for a few weeks in supplies such as wells. There is, however, no evidence whatever that suggests that modern treatment, which includes coagulation, filtration and chlorination, does not remove the virus. In the past, it has been suspected that certain outbreaks of hepatitis have been spread by water and by eating shell-fish of various types.

Reference has been made to the success of workers in the field of water treatment in the control and destruction of disease of microbial origin in water supplies. Increasing urbanisation and industrialisation, however, are now threatening many water supplies with increasing amounts of organic matter. A vast array of new toxic chemicals from industrial activities and agriculture are loading many rivers beyond their self-purifying capacities and many are receiving large amounts of critical nutrients—nitrogen and phosphorus—by way of today's conventional waste-treatment plants. They are also receiving greatly increased quantities of pesticides, contained either in waste from manufacturing or in residue from their use and greatly increased

amounts of detergents and other difficult substances by way of industrial-waste discharges from industry. Today the waters of the bay and the river on which this city stands, as well as others in Queensland, and especially the local marine life, are subject to the effects of industrial activity.

Some of the more devastating effects of marine pollution are now well known. For instance, only recently we have had a tainted-fish problem. This has been bobbing up every now and again, and to my knowledge it has not yet been solved although the Department of Fisheries has the matter in hand and is endeavouring to find a cause.

I attended a function recently and was talking to several fishermen. They were complaining that they had caught mullet in Moreton Bay, and that most of it was tainted. For them, it was simply a waste of time and labour. I asked them what they thought was the cause and they said it was coming from treatment plants at the mouth of the river. It is from detergents that are passing through the plants. As hon. members know, most of the detergents are petroleum by-products and the fishermen claim that it is only surface fish such as mullet and tailer that are tainted. They say that a few odd bream that eat oysters off the bank are affected, but that none of the deep-sea fish are tainted. This could be so; I would not know.

Another problem that occasionally arises is that of oil pollution. This costs owners of boats moored in the river a lot of money in maintenance, painting and coating their boats with lead. One section of my electorate fronts the Brisbane River, but this problem does not arise only in my electorate. I know that in the electorate of the Leader of the Opposition there is an area that also fronts it. I am sure that boat-owners, wherever they are, are faced with the same problem and with the cost of maintaining their boats.

Australia is not alone in this problem. Every country in the world is faced with it. I refer particularly to America. An American senator, Gaylor Wilson, estimated that the cost of repairing present water-pollution damage and preventing further damage in America would be about \$1,000 billion. That is a fantastic amount. Of course, America has more problems than Australia has because it is more highly developed than this country is. Senator Wilson outlined some of the present-day results of pollution, such as the destruction of the waters of the Great Lakes, the pollution of beaches, and the mass killing of animals and birds. A woman in New York is reported to have said, "We Americans are ankle deep in sewerage, shooting rockets at the moon". That could be so. We have not polluted our waters to the extent that the Americans have, but to a greater extent is industry using Australia's coastline. On secondary projects undertaken in Queensland in the last two years the huge sum of \$472,000,000 has been spent. This figure

reflects the gathering momentum of Queensland's industrial growth. Of course, this is contrary to what members of the Opposition say. Remember my previous remarks that industry needs fresh water, but what happens to it after it is used by industry?

Let me examine this problem of used water. This applies as well to the everyday use of the common cause of pollution—the household detergents. They have caused plenty of problems in America. In some of the American apartment houses that are seven storeys high, when a person turns a tap on to flush out the waste he still gets the suds up from the detergents. We do not want that to happen here.

There are many groups of detergents, but, as I said before, most are derived from petroleum products. They can be introduced into streams by household-waste water that finds its way into the streams. These streams are used by man and by animals. Let us call it today the "detergent mess"—too many suds or too few, cleaner, whiter clothes; too many dirtier rivers and too much polluted drinking water. These are the problems that we must face. There is the problem of many new pollutants about which we know little as to their effect on streams, their possible long-term effect on our health, or the ability of present-day treatment methods to effect their removal or breakdown. The common detergents break down very slowly in water, and some appear to persist for years. In fact, some may even find their way into our underground supplies. Detergents have been found in underground water in a few places in Queensland, but the concentration of the detergents in those supplies is extremely low.

There is little evidence to suggest that household detergents are harmful to man, but of course it is desirable that they should not be present at all. The detergent most used in Australia, and the best known of the persistent organics in municipal and industrial wastes, is the anionic surface active agent, Alkyl Benzyl Sulphonate, more commonly known as A.B.S., which is being produced in ever-increasing quantities by oil refineries, and which is a constituent of most household detergents and industrial agents. The chemical is not only not removed by filtration, but it is also very resistant to biological breakdown. In fact, degradation takes place only over long periods, and seldom completely. This is causing concern to the authorities.

It is essential at this stage to improve sewage and trade-waste treatment methods so as to ensure the removal or breakdown of all potentially dangerous constituents before effluents are discharged into streams. I should like to go further and challenge industry to give more consideration to the effect that the wastes from new products or new industrial processes may have on water environments. I express the view that particularly persistent and toxic chemicals should not be disposed of by way of the public waste-disposal system. I believe that

industry should establish regional burial grounds for such wastes so that they will neither damage the waste-water convenience and treatment systems nor the receiving waters.

Many countries, including the United States of America and Great Britain, have made the use of biodegradable detergents compulsory. These detergents break down very much quicker than the household detergents commonly used in Australia.

To the housewife, detergents mean cleanliness and ease of work, but to the various authorities I would say that they mean dirtiness. I therefore ask the Government to introduce legislation to control the sale of non-biodegradable detergents and to get advice from the National Health and Medical Research Council on appropriate controls that might be necessary to achieve uniform action in the States and Territories. Such action is necessary, as I believe it is most necessary and desirable to ensure that the greater use of these detergents both in the household and in industry does not develop to the stage that public health is impaired.

**Mr. COBURN** (Burdekin) (2.59 p.m.): It is my intention this afternoon to deal with certain aspects of the sugar industry and to place before the House the problems that this great industry is facing—and will continue to face in the future—unless a satisfactory and effective international sugar agreement can be arrived at. I must confess that I am not able to decide on just what is an economic price for sugar. For reasons that have been publicly expressed by the chairman of the Queensland Cane Growers' Council and other leading figures who represent sugar-cane growers and millers in Queensland, it has been decided that it is in the interests of the industry not to reveal to the public the cost-of-production figures. So I am forced to gain my information on what may be an economic price for sugar from the statements that have been made by leading members of the sugar industry who are men of integrity and on whose word, I am sure, we can rely implicitly.

It has been stated from time to time that \$86 a ton for No. 1 Pool sugar is still not sufficient to make its production and manufacture economic. Some go as far as to say that the price should be up in the high-\$90 bracket.

For the purposes of discussion I shall use the figure of \$86 a ton as being the economic price that has been accepted by the leaders of the industry, although they claim that that is the minimum which to them is still not high enough to be satisfactory.

It has always been my opinion that the sugar industry, while the International Sugar Agreement was operating, was probably the most highly and comprehensively organised industry not only in Australia but in the world. Every aspect of production, manufacture and marketing was covered. No

organisation was more comprehensive than that which controlled the sugar industry. Some of the finest legislation passed by the Queensland Parliament related to the sugar industry, and that legislation can be attributed to the various parties that have occupied the Government benches during the years.

The Central Sugar Cane Prices Board was established with very wide statutory powers to control important aspects of the production and manufacture of sugar. Years ago it was made mandatory by legislation that no sugar-cane for manufacture into sugar could be grown on land until that land had been assigned, by the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board, to a particular sugar mill. Each mill has an allotment, stated in tons of sugar, that it is able to manufacture and that it is assured will be acquired by the Sugar Board each year. Those mill peaks are approved by the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board. Each farm is allotted a farm peak in tons of sugar-cane. The aggregate farm peaks equal the aggregate mill peaks. To cater for some of the conditions over which neither growers nor millers have any control, a margin of  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. of the mill peaks was allowed. When the sugar is manufactured it is acquired by the Sugar Board, which is responsible for marketing it.

For many years the Commonwealth Government has imposed an embargo on the importation of sugar to Australia, with the result that every pound of sugar used in Australia is made from sugar-cane grown in Australia. The Commonwealth Government, by statute, also guarantees a specified price for all sugar consumed in Australia.

In addition to this great protection, further protection is given to the sugar industry by the Commonwealth Government through the imposition of tariffs, import duties and export duties on artificial sweeteners. The recommendation of the Tariff Board in April, 1967, for an effective reduction in the duty on cyclamates, dulcin and saccharin was not accepted by the Commonwealth Government. It preferred to keep that protection for the sugar-producer and not to make the reduction suggested by the Tariff Board.

The present price of home-consumption sugar is \$141 a long ton. The home market is the most stable of the industry's markets, and the most stable source of the industry's income. It is an ever-expanding market and has increased by 87,000 tons of sugar in the last 10 years. Figures that I have show that home consumption in 1936 was 359,337 tons and in 1966, 30 years later, it was 644,184 tons. Those figures show that it is an ever-expanding market and the best and most stable market that the industry has.

The home market represents, however, a much smaller percentage of the total production at present than in 1963. In that year mill peaks aggregated 1,235,600 tons. Today they aggregate 2,165,900 tons, or nearly 900,000 tons of sugar, more than in 1963.

Of the 1967 crop, which is the latest one for which figures are available, home consumption represented 27.5 per cent, and total exports represented 72.5 per cent. The United Kingdom and United States markets represented about 21 per cent. of the total production, and sales on the free market were about 50 per cent. of it. The free market is the troublesome market for the sugar industry today. If therefore we attempt to make any worth-while estimate of the future prospects of the Queensland sugar industry, we must turn our attention to those factors that influence the marketing of our export sugar, some of which is sold under agreement at a negotiated price and some—at least 70 per cent. of exports—on the free world market.

What are these factors? I would say that they are—

1. Sugar stocks held by exporting countries, and the relationship of consumption to production;
2. Devaluation of the pound sterling;
3. The British Commonwealth Sugar Agreement;
4. Britain's application to join the European Economic Community, commonly known as the Common Market;
5. The International Sugar Agreement;
6. The European beet crop, and Cuba's sugar production.

In addition, we must also include and consider one internal factor, namely, the industry's obligation to repay loans and interest totalling \$24,000,000.

Let us take these in order. The statutory position in regard to world stocks, production, and consumption, appears to be more favourable now than it has been since the great expansion undertaken by Australia and many other sugar-producing countries following the price of £105 sterling a ton for sugar in 1963—the highest it had been in 40 years.

In November, 1967, the International Sugar Council adopted the first estimate made by its statistical committee of the net import requirements of the world markets in 1968, amounting to 16,500,000 tons. It is generally considered by reliable authorities that the world sugar-stock position has improved materially and that this improvement should continue. That is a very important factor, particularly when it prevails on the eve of the discussions relative to the International Sugar Agreement. It is also declared that production will fall slightly behind consumption and, consequently, there will be some reduction in stocks—also a good trend. It is even thought that before the end of the year the level of stocks should not be burdensome by any reasonable assessment.

Noted authorities on statistics relative to the sugar industry, Messrs. Hallmans and Ivanov, in a June, 1966, publication by the International Sugar Council, analysed some

interesting statistics on the production, consumption and stocks of raw sugar. They stated, with proof, that for those years when, on an average, stock levels were at their lowest, prices were at their highest, and conversely. Messrs. Hallmans and Ivanov have established a definite relationship between stocks and sugar prices. As the statistical position is now more favourable than it has been for some time, it is thought reasonable to predict that the price for raw sugar in the free world market should remain at about its present figure or even show an improvement. However, the statistical position could be altered adversely by the Cuban sugar crop and by bumper European beet crops—two factors that have traditionally exerted an important, though unpredictable, influence on market prices. Statements have been published that the Cuban authorities aim at a production of 10,000,000 tons of sugar by 1970. If this could possibly be achieved, it would be an unbalancing factor in the statistical position and would be catastrophic in so far as world prices are concerned.

The second aspect with which we are concerned is the devaluation of the pound sterling. On 19 November, 1967, the British Prime Minister, Mr. Wilson, announced that the pound sterling would be devalued by 14.3 per cent. Australia did not follow this example: it decided not to devalue the Australian currency. Before devaluation, the pound sterling was worth \$2.50 Australian; now it is worth only \$2.143 Australian, which means that it is 36c less in value than it was before devaluation.

The effects of devaluation of sterling have been partially offset until the end of 1968, as sugar contracts negotiated in sterling were covered by forward-exchange currency contracts with the Reserve Bank. It was estimated by the authorities that the sugar industry stood to lose up to \$600,000 from the 1967 crop, up to \$6,300,000 from the 1968 crop, and up to \$8,900,000 in 1969 and subsequent seasons, unless compensatory payments were made to the sugar industry by the Commonwealth Government. A committee composed of Mr. A. C. B. Maiden, Secretary to the Department of Primary Industries, as chairman, Mr. M. W. O'Donnell, Deputy Secretary to the Treasury and Sir Alan Westerman, Secretary to the Department of Trade and Industry, was appointed to consider the immediate problems of devaluation in the rural industries by examining losses from devaluation considered to be demonstrable and unavoidable, and to make recommendations direct to the Cabinet, through the Prime Minister, for action regarding them. Estimated losses that would accrue to the sugar industry were compiled and submitted to the Right Honourable the Prime Minister by Queensland's Acting Premier, the Honourable G. W. W. Chalk. This information, I understand, was made available to Mr. Chalk by the sugar organisations.

The action taken by the Commonwealth Government, following the committee's report, was that the Commonwealth Government would reimburse the sugar industry to the extent of \$6,800,000, the amount that it was considered that the sugar industry had lost as the result of devaluation of the pound sterling by the British Government.

The amount that the Commonwealth Government gave to the sugar industry of Queensland in compensation for the loss on devaluation of the pound sterling was almost identical with the figure that was presented by the Acting Queensland Premier at the behest of the sugar organisations, and a good deal of satisfaction was expressed to the Government by the leaders of the sugar industry for that action.

To me, the future seems to be very much in doubt. At the end of this year we have again to negotiate with the British Government for a price for sugar for the quota that we supply to Britain. We will negotiate that price on the devalued pound sterling, and whatever figure we arrive at will be the figure that we can arrive at with the pound as it is now. Whether a claim to the Commonwealth Government for further compensatory payments for loss by devaluation could be sustained in those circumstances is very doubtful. Consequently, to me it seems that we will not be able in the future to look for further compensation except for sugar that we sell in the world's markets on sterling currency, and even then the argument could be that this is based on the pound as it was ruling at that time. The compensation previously payable was paid because a price had been negotiated which would be sustained up till the end of 1968, and so a case could be presented which could be upheld in its fullest. But just what will happen, and what attitude the Commonwealth Treasury will take in regard to further compensatory payments in view of the circumstances that prevail, is anybody's guess.

Dealing with the British Commonwealth Sugar Agreement, the most significant feature of the successful conclusion of the British Commonwealth Sugar Agreement discussions in London, which ended on 16 November, 1966, was that this agreement was extended for an additional year, to 31 December, 1974. This maintains the 8-year projection of the agreement. The agreement was always regarded as an 8-year agreement, and since its inception in 1951 the British Government has not failed each year to renew the agreement for another year in order to keep the projection of eight years. However, during the talks in London last year agreement was reached not to discuss the extension of the British Commonwealth Sugar Agreement for another year in view of the application by the British Government to join the European Economic Community, commonly called the Common Market. Now there is only a 7-year projection because the British

Government has lodged an application for admission to the European Economic Community.

The negotiated-price quota of 335,000 tons guaranteed under the British Commonwealth Sugar Agreement will be operative until 31 December, 1968. The negotiated price for this quota, which was fixed in 1965 and is to apply until the end of 1968, is £Stg.43 10s. Under the former currency that was equal to \$A108.75, and under the devalued currency it is equal to \$A93.22, which must be considered to be well in advance of the cost of production.

A new price will need to be negotiated for the years 1969-70-71, and this pricing arrangement will be made next month. Because of the decreased value of the pound sterling, the negotiated price, if it is to be as valuable as it was previously, will have to be not less than £Stg.50 15s., which will make it \$108.22 a long ton, and it will then remain equal to its value before the £Stg.43 10s. was devalued. What the price will be in view of the present financial position of the United Kingdom is again a matter of conjecture. We judge Britain's economic position today to be much less sound and less stable and less solvent than it was in 1965. Only the other day it was necessary for Britain to borrow \$2,000 million from the World Bank to keep its economy sound. At the beginning of next month Australia will have to negotiate with a British Government in that financial position to try to obtain a price that will be as good as the price that was negotiated with it in 1965. To me that seems to be a very difficult position indeed.

Let me turn to the possible effect on the Australian sugar industry of Britain's entry into the European Economic Community. Australia, Mauritius, the West Indies, Jamaica and British Guiana are all sugar-exporting countries that are given preferential treatment by Britain under the British Commonwealth Sugar Agreement, and they are all very concerned about the possibility of Britain's entering the Common Market. It is almost certain that such an event would result in a decrease in Commonwealth exports to Britain. It would almost assuredly interfere with the operations of the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement after 1974. We are safe until 1974, because we feel that the British have always been people to honour their obligations and we have no reason to doubt that that will continue to be their attitude.

When the British Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Harold Wilson, announced on 2 May, 1967, the intention of the British Government to apply to join the European Economic Community, he referred to "Highly important Commonwealth interests—for which it is our duty to seek safeguards in the negotiations". In this regard he mentioned, particularly, Commonwealth

sugar-producing countries whose needs are at present safeguarded by the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement.

**Mr. Hanlon:** He would be talking more about the less developed countries rather than us, according to his later remarks.

**Mr. COBURN:** He did say that Britain had to safeguard the interests of the sugar-producing countries with which she had agreements, and we were one of the countries with which she had agreements. I cannot visualise a British Prime Minister, knowing the importance that the British attach to honouring agreements, breaking any agreement under any circumstances.

**Mr. Hanlon:** I did not say they would break it, but I think they are more concerned about under-developed countries than they are about us.

**Mr. COBURN:** Britain has given greater consideration to the developing countries than to Australia. She has given them about £Stg.1 10s. a ton more than she has to what are classed as the developed countries. However, I do not think there has been any differentiation between the undeveloped and the developed countries so far as honouring the agreement is concerned.

Let me refer to the statement made by the Foreign Secretary, the Right Honourable George Brown, when presenting Britain's case to Ministers of the six members of the Common Market, in July, 1967. He stressed the importance of the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement and said, "For sugar, as you know, we have an agreement with the Commonwealth sugar-producers which runs until the end of 1974. The commitment we have under the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement is a contract which we must fulfil." Those are his words. They are very reassuring and I do not think there is any danger of our being forced out of the British market under the terms of the quotas and negotiated prices before 1974.

But what will happen after that if Britain joins the Common Market? Probably there will be an obligation on her to get her sugar from the countries that are signatories to the Common Market agreement. In our own Parliament the other day we had a Dutch parliamentarian representing sugar interests. He said that the sugar authorities of Queensland could never hope to break into the Common Market in the supplying of sugar. If such a situation is to apply if Britain becomes a member of the European Economic Community, it will have a very adverse affect on the Queensland sugar industry. The British market for our export sugar has always been particularly stable, and it is generally the most remunerative of our export markets. Should this market be lost through the failure to guarantee quotas and price because of Britain's being

accepted as a member of the European Economic Community, it will be a severe blow to the Australian sugar industry.

I now come to the matter of the loans that have to be repaid. Some members of the sugar industry thought it was very good policy to get these loans to carry the industry over a difficult period. Others foresaw that there would be a day of reckoning, and that the position would be aggravated by the fact that the loans would have to be repaid. During 1966 the sugar industry sought, and was granted, Federal Government assistance to cover financial requirements for the marketing of the No. 1 Pool of the Australian sugar crop. A repayable grant of \$19,000,000 was made available for this purpose. This grant added \$8.56 a ton to the No. 1 Pool sugar price. In 1967, the following year, because of the desperate situation of the world price of sugar, the Federal Government agreed to lend up to a further \$15,000,000, which also would have to be repaid by the industry. But because of the increase of approximately 1½c a ton in the wholesale price of refined sugar on the Australian market and a slight increase in the world price, only about \$4,000,000 of this offered loan was required. This loan added \$1.65 a ton to the No. 1 Pool price. In accordance with the conditions of the loan from the Rural Credits Branch of the Reserve Bank, the loans were used to assist in the marketing of sugar from the 1966 and 1967 harvests. Each loan was for a term of 12 months, and repayment was guaranteed by the State Government. This is how the loans were negotiated.

The Sugar Board declared its inability to repay the \$19,000,000 and the \$4,000,000 on the due date, and, by arrangement, the Commonwealth Treasury lent the State Treasurer enough money to meet the guarantee. The State Treasury is obliged to repay the loan from the Commonwealth Treasury, plus interest as from 1 July, 1970, in 10 equal instalments. By agreement between the State Treasury and the Sugar Board, the board has undertaken to repay to the State the amount of Reserve Bank loan, plus interest, in such amounts and at such times and in such manner as will enable the State to make payments to the Commonwealth. The payments to the State Treasury will be by way of an appropriate charge on the proceeds of the 1970 to 1979 seasons. The interest rate would, I think, be just in excess of 5 per cent., which means that the annual repayment will be about \$2,900,000.

The position has arisen that the sugar industry now has loans and accrued interest amounting to \$24,000,000 to repay in the 10-year period from 1970 to 1979. The Rural Credits Branch first of all made the money available, repayable after 12 months, and there was interest due on that, which accrued to about \$1,000,000, so that the \$19,000,000, the \$4,000,000 and the

\$1,000,000 mean that we have to pay back \$24,000,000 at the rate of somewhere about \$2,900,000 to \$3,000,000 a year.

Instead of increasing the price, as the loans did, this will decrease the price of the No. 1 Pool sugar, on a production equal to that of the 1966 harvest and sold at the same average price of that No. 1 Pool sugar, by about \$1.30 a ton. So that instead of \$8.60 going on, \$1.30 will come off, making a difference of almost \$10 a ton in the price of sugar. Repayment of the loans will certainly depress the price of No. 1 Pool sugar, in the period from 1970 to 1979.

Now I come to the most vital aspect of the organisation of the sugar industry—the International Sugar Agreement. Great importance is attached to the negotiation of an effective—I repeat “effective”—international sugar agreement that will provide an adequate outlet for Australia’s sugar with improved export returns. “Any” agreement is not what we are seeking. We could get an agreement, I suppose, at a price, but unless we can get an agreement that is satisfactory and will give us stability and the certainty of a price better than that which we have received up to now, it will not be worth entering into one at all. The type of agreement that we are looking for internationally is an effective one that will be satisfactory. To my mind, unless it is possible to maintain at least the present mill peaks and be assured of participation in increased world consumption in the future, no agreement could be considered satisfactory.

The quota provisions of the 1958 International Sugar Agreement were suspended at the end of 1961, when a United Nations sugar conference failed to reach agreement on future export quotas. There still is an international sugar agreement, but it is without the economic provisions that it contained up to 1961. Since that time the 1958 International Sugar Agreement has continued in existence, but without any economic provisions. The International Sugar Council has continued to function and has served a most useful purpose in the collection and dissemination of statistics and information; in providing an international forum for co-ordinated sugar discussions; and, more recently, in giving impetus and direction towards the achievement of a new international sugar agreement.

Conferences with the aim of including economic provisions in the International Sugar Agreement have been held from time to time, but without success. That does not give much hope for the future. The most recent conference, convened in Geneva on 17 April of this year by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, adjourned early in June without reaching agreement on quotas and a minimum price for sugar on the world markets. That was a serious blow to the sugar-exporting countries. It means that they will be obliged to continue to accept the London daily price for

sugar which, as experience has taught us, is subject to frequent and substantial fluctuations. Since 1963 these prices have fluctuated between £Stg105 and £Stg12.25 a ton. The London daily price as stated in today’s “Courier-Mail” is £Stg16 15s. a ton, equal to \$A35.90, or \$34.10 below what those in the sugar industry say is cost of production.

In my opinion, sugar-exporting countries will have no stability or security in marketing their sugar in the free market till they achieve an international sugar agreement that will guarantee satisfactory quotas and minimum prices to sugar-exporters. Without these economic provisions the countries exporting sugar will be subjected to booms and slumps, which is good to neither the exporter nor the importer in the long term.

That is the position with which the Queensland sugar industry is faced. It is a great and important industry and one which makes a tremendous impact on the economy of this country and gives employment to thousands of people directly and indirectly. I am sure, therefore, that it is our most fervent hope that something good will come from the International Sugar Conference which is to be resumed next month. Hopes are based on the fact that Dr. Raul Prebisch, Secretary-General of U.N.C.T.A.D., who has interviewed representatives of exporting countries, considers there is still hope of concluding a satisfactory international sugar agreement. I sincerely trust that his hopes and aspirations are achieved in the very fullest.

(Debate interrupted.)

#### DISTINGUISHED VISITORS

MR. NEIL MARTEN, M.P., and MR. JAMES WELLBELOVED, M.P. (Great Britain)

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Before calling on the next speaker, I ask the House to excuse me for breaking into the proceedings; normally such a happening takes place much earlier in the day. It is my very pleasant duty now, on behalf of the Legislature, to welcome to our Assembly two United Kingdom members of Parliament from the House of Commons. Our two friends are on a sugar fact-finding tour. Apart from welcoming them to our Assembly, I express on behalf of all members the hope that they will have a pleasant visit not only to this Parliament but also to Queensland and that they have taken due notice of our friend from the North who has just resumed his seat.

I trust, gentlemen, that your visit will bring pleasure and profit not only to yourselves, but also to our State.

**Honourable Members:** Hear, hear!

ADDRESS IN REPLY

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

**Mr. AIKENS:** (Townsville South) (3.41 p.m.): Unfortunately, because of the ravages of influenza, my whispering-baritone, mellifluous voice is not what it usually is. Last

week, Mr. Speaker, if you will remember, I could only make sounds that approached a sort of hideous, whispering gurgle, and some of the ribald and brutal remarks that were made by members of the Opposition hurt me very much indeed.

Let me say first that I welcome the presence in the Chamber of the two eminent gentlemen from the British Parliament. I remember that in about 1946 I spoke to a man from the British Parliament—I think his name was Lord Robinson—and those, of course, were my unregenerate days; now I live only for penitence and atonement—and he walked out of the House, after my speech, rather white-faced and goggle-eyed. I hope that these two gentlemen will not leave the Chamber today in a similar state.

Although I will not be able to speak for as long as Standing Orders permit me to speak, I wish to deal with a subject that I think is of great importance to this Parliament and to the people of Queensland. I refer to the problem of hoodlumism, hooliganism, loutism, or vandalism, whichever one prefers to call it. In my opinion, only about 10 per cent. of the teenagers in Queensland can be classed as louts, hoodlums and vandals. But, unfortunately, because of the publicity they receive, and because of the licence that the law allows them, they are bringing discredit on all of the teenagers in this State. Consequently, when one hears people speaking about teenagers and their problems, and their sins of omission and commission, one must bear in mind that they are speaking not of the 90 per cent. of ordinary, average, decent teenagers but of the 10 per cent. that one might call the riff-raff of teenagers in Queensland today.

This Parliament is responsible for many of the monstrous things that are being done, said and perpetrated by this 10 per cent. of hoodlums, louts and vandals among the teenagers. I think it was in 1965 that this Parliament, to its eternal disgrace but acting with the very best of intentions—hon. members know that the road to hell is paved with good intentions; they know the old saying, "God protect us from our friends"—prompted by a number of long-haired and stupid psychologists, mainly from the university, and by a desire to do good—there is no greater menace on this earth than a do-gooder—thought it would try a new approach to the problems of teenagers. I do not recall the name of the Bill—I have forgotten it; it is painful enough for me to remember the purpose of it; I think it was the Children's Services Bill—but it dealt with the problem of the louts and hoodlums, male and female, who were being brought before the courts and given publicity for their various sins of omission and commission. When I look back, I think how stupid we were at the time.

As I recall it, the Bill was introduced by the present Minister for Labour and Tourism; but with the eternal reshuffling of Cabinet responsibility, the responsibility for the administration of the Act has now been bundled

onto the shoulders of the Minister for Health. I ask hon. members to bear in mind that one is still a child, according to the law, till one is 17 years of age. This is despite the fact that many of the people concerned are fathers, some are actually married, some are notorious drunks, and some are dangerous menaces on the roads.

When these louts or hoodlums are arrested—and unfortunately they are arrested all too rarely—they are taken before a court which is, in effect, a Star Chamber or secret society. The father of the lout or hoodlum, or loutess or hoodlumess, is allowed in the court. I am not too sure whether the louts are allowed any legal representation. They probably would be worse off if they are, if the legal representation they could have in the court is anything like the legal eagles we have in this Chamber.

**Mr. Bennett** interjected.

**Mr. AIKENS:** My God, you're back! This is the hon. member's third appearance here in five weeks, and I have not the slightest doubt that he will celebrate his appearance in this Chamber by making a scathing denunciation of someone in high places in the hope that he will get headlines in the Press and that the people will read it and say, "There's no doubt about old Colin Bennett; he is doing a great job in Parliament." Then he will go home and ring up the Fire Brigade and the ambulance and everybody else to come round to his place at some ungodly hour of the early morning, and then run to the Press and tell them that some crackpot is doing it. But it does not matter what the crackpots do, he will boast in the Press that he is still determined to go on and be the fearless and forceful member he always has been.

**Mr. Bennett:** You're the crackpot.

**Mr. AIKENS:** For goodness sake run away and ring up the Blue Nurses or Meals on Wheels and get them to run out to your place at 2 o'clock in the morning and then give a statement to the Press that you are being persecuted for your fearlessness and your political philosophy.

When these louts and hoodlums are brought before the court they are brought before it in absolute secrecy, but I will tell hon. members what happens because I have seen some examples of it recently. There was a case of two hoodlums who were caught by the proprietor of the Regent Theatre in Townsville pulling big sheets of fibrolite off the toilet facilities. He got the police, and the police took them, presumably, to the watch-house. Naturally, the police had to handle them with kid gloves. They have to take them to the watch-house holding them between thumb and forefinger, because if they grasped them by the upper arm as they would any other lawbreaker they would be charged with assault.

These two hoodlums to whom I refer were the most unkempt and disreputable louts I have ever seen, and that was the last anybody heard of the matter. When they went to court, if they did go to court, on the Monday, they went in secret and no-one was allowed in. Nobody knows what happened to them because our law provides that the conduct of the court must not be in public and the proceedings must not be published. The Press is not admitted. Therefore nobody knows what happened to them.

On the following Saturday night I went along to the Regent Theatre, as I do when I have the opportunity to go on Saturday night anywhere at all except to the public functions that I have to attend, and there was one of these louts with an admiring group of louts and loutesses around him. They were standing there with their eyes open and their ears flapping like African elephants, listening to him tell the story, from his point of view, of what happened when he was in court.

It went something like this, and I will try to give it exactly as I heard it. He said, "When I walked in, the policeman put his hand on my shoulder and I turned to him and said, 'Take your dirty hands off me, you big mug copper'. The magistrate from the bench said, 'Yes, take your hands off that boy, Mr. Policeman, or I will deal with you.' Then I said to the magistrate, 'And as for you, you dirty mug, I just want to let you know where you get off.'" He went on with this sort of stupid story because no-one could say him nay; no-one could deny him because the court proceedings were held in secret. I had not the slightest doubt—I have not the incredibly low opinion of the Police Force that is held by the hon. member for South Brisbane; I know that there are some rotten apples in the barrel but that all the apples in the barrel are not rotten—that the policeman would take him by the arm and say, "Get in the dock", or "Sit at the table", and would lay the charge against him. And knowing the magistrates of Townsville to be decent, reputable members of the magistracy, I have no doubt that the magistrate would deliver a lecture to him and also impose some form of punishment upon him. However, none of that appeared in the Press.

The hon. member for Ipswich West objects to the names of these young criminals being published. I do not believe that there is such a thing as a juvenile delinquent. I agree with Edgar Hoover and with the administrators of New Scotland Yard that there are no juvenile delinquents—there are only young criminals. I agree that they should be called such and should be treated as such. If the name of the young criminal is not to be published, there may be some reason for that. I know the reason that was oleaginously given to hon. members when the Bill was introduced, that is, that if the name of the young criminal is published it may be used to his detriment later on. It was said that it was possible that if he did reform and applied for a job or tried to

join an organisation someone could say, "I saw his name in the Press many years ago as having been brought before the court and punished for some act of hoodlumism or vandalism". It was said that that, shall we say, childish indiscretion—I cannot imagine some of the things done by these great big louts of 16 years of age as being childish indiscretions—might be held against the boy. I am prepared to run along with that sentiment, although I think it is a mealy-mouthed attitude—I am prepared to run along with those who consider that the name of the young criminal should not be published—but why on earth can't some details of the actual offence be published so that people may know that the police took action and that the magistrate did his job and that some punishment was inflicted?

In the particular case relative to the Regent Theatre—and I could name dozens and dozens of others—why shouldn't we be able to pick up the paper on the day following the Magistrates Court hearing and read that two young offenders had been charged with vandalism at the Regent Theatre on the Saturday night, and so on, and that the magistrate had said so-and-so and imposed such-and-such a penalty? Then we would know, and the whole world would know—and, what is more, the associates of the young hoodlums and louts would know—what happened in the court and that they had been punished.

**Mr. Coburn:** It would be a deterrent to others.

**Mr. AIKENS:** As the hon. member for Burdekin says, it would be a deterrent. But instead of that, the law as it stands on the Statute Book and is administered incites and encourages hoodlumism and vandalism because today these hoodlums and vandals go before the court and nobody knows what happens in the court. They are then able to come out of the court and vaingloriously boast and lie about what they said and did in the court.

**Mr. Bennett:** According to you there must be a terrific number of hoodlums in Townsville.

**Mr. AIKENS:** As I have said, the hon. member for South Brisbane has only just arrived. If he had been here when I commenced by speech he would have heard me say that not more than 10 per cent. of our teenagers can be classed as hoodlums, louts and vandals. But that 10 per cent. is drawing odium and disrepute on the other 90 per cent. of teenagers, who, in the main, are decent, ordinary, average kids. It is the 10 per cent. of the teenagers, the hoodlums, that I am against.

I can understand the attitude of the hon. member for Ipswich West—I can understand the attitude of the A.L.P. on many things—in objecting to the publication of the name of the young thief who broke and entered

places several times and stole a quantity of goods. If he had been over the age of 17 years he would undoubtedly have gone to gaol—that is, of course, if his parents were not in the upper social bracket. We know that our superior courts reek with social snobbery and that it is not a question of what a person does that brings punishment on him; it is a question of who he is and what particular social group he belongs to.

**Mr. Bennett:** Who is castigating men in high places now?

**Mr. AIKENS:** I am not castigating men in high places; I am merely stating the plain, incontrovertible facts.

The hon. member for Ipswich West said that the name of this young thief should not be mentioned. There may be some reason why his name should not be mentioned. I remind the hon. member for Ipswich West—and even the hon. member for South Brisbane with his limited legal knowledge cannot deny this—that if this young thief had been the victim of a foul sex monster and murdered, his name would have been broadcast throughout the length and breadth of this land from the very moment the crime was discovered. Whereas the name of his attacker, if his attacker had been under 17 years of age, would not have been mentioned until the case came before the Supreme Court.

I brought this matter up at one time and I hoped that I would receive the assistance of members like the hon. member for Ipswich West and others in order that this practice might be stopped. Hon. members will recall the case of the little girl Pugh, who was six years of age and who was going home from school at Bowen. She was raped and murdered by a lad named Maltby. She was six years of age and Maltby was then under 17 and therefore legally a child. The little girl's name was broadcast over the length and breadth of this land from the moment the crime was discovered. The name of the victim was not suppressed. The name of the little victim has always been published but the name of the rapist and the murderer was, under the law, religiously suppressed until he appeared before the Supreme Court. Then, and only then, could his name be published. The hon. member for Ipswich West condones that sort of thing; she condones the publication of the name of an innocent little victim but objects to the publication of the name of a young criminal.

**Mrs. Jordan:** I did not say that.

**Mr. AIKENS:** If the hon. member does not object to it, for God's sake let her stand up and say what she means. She has had me puzzled ever since she came into this House. I respect her as a woman, but I would say that as a politician she is the biggest flop ever to be elected to this Chamber.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Smith):** Order!

**Mr. AIKENS:** I really believe that some of the punishment imposed on these vandals should be the public replacement of the damage. For instance, in the case of the louts who ripped down the sheets of fibrolite from the toilets—and they are doing such damage every day—the magistrate should have ordered them—or their parents if they themselves have no money—to pay for the replacement of the articles they damaged—and to replace them.

**Mr. Hughes:** They should do the work themselves.

**Mr. AIKENS:** That is the idea. They should do the work themselves; they should replace the damaged material themselves from money from their own pockets or from their parents' pockets and actually do the work of replacement themselves. Until we have such public exhibitions, and until we stop pandering and kidding to the 10 per cent. of louts and hoodlums among our teenagers, the position will become indescribably worse.

I am glad that the hon. member for South Brisbane is in the Chamber and I am glad that you, Mr. Smith, are Deputy Speaker, although your position circumscribes you in interjecting, and also in your contribution to the debate, until you leave the chair.

While I am referring to hoodlums and louts, here is a case in point. A cafe proprietor in the North Ward area of Townsville remonstrated with a group of these "legal" children; they are all 15 or 16 years of age—just under 17 years of age—and one who is 17 has a motor-car that he drives. These louts went along and ripped down his cafe signboard. He could not get anything done about it. He knew they had ripped it down, but when he complained to the police, who did their usual efficient job, they could not get anywhere because he could not prove which of them had ripped it down. The cafe proprietor rides a motor-scooter, and one night he was riding along on it in Eyre Street, which is a very busy and well-lit street, when these louts went past in a car. One of the louts threw a tin of paint all over the cafe proprietor as he was riding along on his motor-scooter. His trousers were ruined, and some of the paint got onto the engine of his motor-scooter and ruined it. He can do nothing about it. None of the louts can be prosecuted; not one of them can be brought to court, even in secret, because no-one can prove which lout in the car threw the paint. If the legal eagles know of any solution to that problem, I would be pleased to hear it. I went along to the Inspector of Police and asked that a prosecution be launched. He said, "Tell me which lout threw the paint and we will launch a prosecution". The Inspector also told me that in Brisbane there were some louts on the

roadway throwing clods of dirt at passing trams. One of the clods of dirt struck a tram passenger in the eye, with the result that he lost the eye. No action could be taken against this group of louts because it could not be proved which of them threw the clod of dirt that was responsible for the loss of the tram passenger's eye.

I know that the Criminal Code provides that if this group of louts had been robbing a store and if, for instance, the watchman of the store had come in and one of the louts had shot and killed him, every member of the group would be brought before the Court on a charge of murder, because the murder would have been committed by that group when its members were committing a criminal offence. There was a case, as a matter of fact, of a group of criminals robbing a warehouse. The alarm was given. The police raced to the warehouse and the thieves ran away. The policemen caught one thief and he was in the police-car that was chasing the car that contained the rest of the thieves. Shots were exchanged between the two cars, and a policeman in the pursuing car was shot. The police-car caught up with the other car. All the thieves in that car, and the thief who was in the police car, were charged with murder.

Why can't we have something like that with the group of louts to whom I have been referring? The police know the boy who threw the paint. He is a lovely little fellow! He is the sort of chap that our law specifically protects. He is indeed a nice little bloke! I have no doubt that his relatives are very well connected with the A.L.P., because that is the sort of thing that A.L.P. members apparently believe in. I would not mind betting that his father is a member of one of the A.L.P. branches in Townsville. His father offered the cafe proprietor \$10 towards the cost of a new pair of pants. Everyone knows that today a decent pair of underpants cannot be bought for \$10.

So there are some cases of louts getting away with law-breaking. All they have to do is to get into a car, and while they are in the car in company they can commit any offence at all and the law is powerless to deal with them. I repeat that even if it were possible to pin-point the lout who threw the tin of paint, he would be taken before the court in secret and would be dealt with in secret, and no report at all of the court case would appear in the Press. Consequently he would be able to boast to his friends about what he said to the police and to the magistrate and what the magistrate did not say to him.

And so I appeal to the Government. I know many rank-and-file members of the Government who are just as much concerned as I am about the way this piece of legislation and its administration have misfired, and how it encourages and incites this 10 per cent. to be worse louts and

hoodlums than they are. It is about time we faced up to our responsibility in the matter, because the decent people of Queensland are suffering and the 90 per cent. of decent teenagers are being branded and besmirched by the actions of the irresponsible 10 per cent.

I should like to make some constrained, restrained and temperate remarks about the editorial in today's "Courier-Mail". I propose to take to Mr. Bray some extracts that I am about to quote, that is, if that eminent gentleman is still managing director of "The Courier-Mail", and I will challenge him to publish them tomorrow morning, or some other morning, so that the readers of that paper can judge between the mental outlook of the writer of today's editorial and what he defended.

I do not know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how far I will be allowed to go. I know that this Parliament works under a particularly peculiar law. If I were to say something of my own volition, as a member of Parliament, I would quite naturally be rebuked and if necessary dealt with under the Standing Orders. I feel sure that the hon. member for Ipswich West would again take a hasty "powder" and leave the Chamber. However, if I read or quote something, I can apparently get away with it.

I have here some extracts from "My Brother Jack". The leader-writer of "The Courier-Mail" made sneering references to the hon. member for Gregory. I think he is a man whom we hold in the highest regard. He brings to this House dignity without arrogance and elegance without ostentation, and, like the hon. member for Flinders and one or two others, he is a true-blue Westerner. At least I would say that he is in all respects a manly man. I can apply that term, I suppose, to many other members of this House. For the editorial-writer of "The Courier-Mail" to make sneering and slighting references to the hon. member for Gregory and to say that this is the sort of thing that any 16 or 17-year-old boy or girl should not only be allowed but encouraged to read is indicative of the leader-writer's mental attitude. I quote from page 57 of "My Brother Jack"—

"The W.C. was clogged . . . The stupid old goat, (the plumber) unscrewed the outlet pipe, and was looking up the pipe to see the cause . . . I shot up to the top dunny, like a rat up a rope, had a bog, and pulled the chain . . . It was the bloody beautiful bull's eye you ever seen . . . The old bastard copped the lot, all over his face . . . The lot, bumfodder and all . . . Jesus; was he rotable . . ."

It continues in that strain through pages 62, 63, 64 and 65, and at page 66 reads—

"I got an attack of coopay crouch . . . What's that? Well; it's when you're with a sheila in the front seat of a coupe, and you find that you've buttoned your waistcoat to your flybuttons . . ."

"He would show me the contraceptives he always carried, and explain the technical difference between Sphinx brand and Black Cat . . .

"He would lecture me on the effectiveness of seawater as the only remover of semen stains from one's trousers . . ."

This appears at page 115—

"The first sheila he goes out with, he'll either pick up a dose, or he'll get her up the duff, or end up a tonk."

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr. Smith): Order! If the hon. member considers it necessary to read this material to the House, I think he should have done the House the propriety of bringing in the book from which he is reading, not an extract which cannot be verified. The source of it is unknown to the House, and I call upon the hon. member to restrain himself and refrain from reading any further quotations unless he is using the document in question.

**Mr. Bennett:** Your reputation for mis-quoting is well known.

**Mr. AIKENS:** As a matter of fact, I have been assured on the very best of authority that these extracts were taken from the book by the hon. member for South Brisbane. However, I will say that I appreciate your viewpoint, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and, to be quite candid, I think that I have said enough. I do not wish to labour the point. I can, however, assure you of the authenticity of these extracts. I think I have said enough to make my point. But I do want to say this: if that is the sort of thing that the leader-writer of "The Courier-Mail" endorses as fit literary food for 16 and 17-year-olds, God help "The Courier-Mail".

**Mr. Hughes:** It is literary garbage.

**Mr. AIKENS:** It is.

**Mr. Coburn:** They wouldn't even publish it in "The Courier-Mail" themselves.

**Mr. AIKENS:** No. Those extracts, and many other parts of "My Brother Jack", are plain, undiluted filth—the sort of thing that we would expect to hear from a gang of foul-mouthed, filthy-minded louts congregated on a street corner or behind a shed or lavatory. Yet this is the sort of thing that is defended.

I made some fairly exhaustive inquiries and I found that there are two editions of this book. One is a hard-backed, expurgated edition which, of course, costs a fair amount of money. The students were told to buy "My Brother Jack"; they were not told to buy the hard-backed, expurgated edition. The hon. members for Bundaberg and Burdekin have told me that students were simply told to buy "My Brother Jack". Consequently, they went to the booksellers and bought the

paper-back—the lurid, soft-covered edition of "My Brother Jack"—and these are the things that appear in it.

**Mr. Walsh:** Those extracts are not from the paper-back edition.

**Mr. AIKENS:** Aren't they? Are they from the hard-back?

**Mr. Walsh:** Yes.

**Mr. RAE:** I rise to a point of order. Actually, they are from the paper-back, too.

**Mr. Walsh:** It does not say so on the circular.

**Mr. RAE:** The one I gave the Premier to read did have in it the passage that was read by the hon. member for Townsville South.

**Mr. AIKENS:** The fact of the matter is—and I intend to finish on this point, Mr. Deputy Speaker—that these foul, filthy extracts, endorsed and, shall I say, "encomiumised" by the leader-writer in "The Courier-Mail", and probably condoned by the managing editor of "The Courier-Mail", did appear in the book "My Brother Jack" that is freely and openly on sale and that is being purchased today by the young boys and girls of Queensland.

**Mr. Coburn:** And advertised by the fact that it has been chosen as a test piece by the Board of Secondary Studies.

**Mr. AIKENS:** That is so; boosted by the fact that it has been selected as a test piece for the Senior examination next year.

**Mr. Walsh:** By the Board of Secondary Studies.

**Mr. AIKENS:** Yes, by the Board of Secondary Studies.

The hon. member for Gregory deserves every praise from this Chamber and from the people of Queensland for raising in this House the question of this filthy book, in order to protect children and young people from reading it.

I ask this question, too: what is the Literature Board of Review doing in allowing this sort of book to be openly advertised and sold? If there was any suggestion that there was a photograph in the book of a half-naked old "crow", the Literature Board of Review would be down on it like a ton of bricks. It would brand it as reprehensible and not fit for publication and would ban it; yet this sort of thing is allowed.

Again I say to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that although I do not think you are very much of a chairman, I am very much in accord with the action you have taken in saying that I have read enough.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr. Smith): Order! In deference to the Chair, the hon. member will withdraw that remark and apologise.

**Mr. AIKENS:** Very well; I will withdraw and apologise. I frequently have to do that, of course.

**Mr. Bennett:** You are a parliamentary bodgie—that is the way you are acting.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. Bennett:** Well, he is!

**Mr. AIKENS:** Will the hon. member for South Brisbane ring up the Blue Nurses and ask them to go out to his place at 2 o'clock in the morning and then run to the Press and report it?

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. AIKENS:** The point I wish to make—I hope that the Leader of the Opposition and the more or less responsible members of the A.L.P. will listen to what I say—is that quite recently there was a public demonstration and a public protest march in Brisbane. It was led by the usual group. There was Senator Keeffe, Senator Georges, Brian Laver, prominent Communists, and all the usual weirdy-beardy group from the university—the emancipists, as they call themselves—and they were demonstrating for the right to hand out pamphlets in the street without approval and without authority. I ask the people of Queensland what they would think if this group, with the full support of those prominent Labourites—and bear in mind that Senator Keeffe is the President of the Federal Executive of the A.L.P.—did that. Apparently it is not actionable. The police are not going to take any action against the filthy things in “My Brother Jack” that I have read out this afternoon; the Literature Board of Review is not going to take any action against the filthy things that I have read out. I assume, therefore, that they could all be printed in a pamphlet, and these prominent members of the A.L.P., with their political blood brothers, the Communists and the weirdy-beardies from the university, want the unrestricted right to go out onto the highways and byways of Queensland at any time of the day and force such pamphlets into the hands of decent men, women and children walking in the streets. That is what they protested for; that was the real reason for the march and, if I can, I am going to read as much of this as I possibly can over the television screens of Townsville at the next State election. I know I will not be able to get very far because I will not want to embarrass the television company, but this is the sort of thing that the A.L.P. leaders believe should be printed in pamphlet form and pushed into the hands of every decent person who walks the footpaths.

**Mr. Porter:** What is your complaint at the moment? Are you suggesting that this book should be banned for adult sale?

**Mr. AIKENS:** No, I am not suggesting that it should be banned for adult sale, but I really believe that there is a vast difference

between scratching at someone's back and tearing it. I do not know that there is any more broadminded and tolerant person than I. I do not believe that anybody should tell me what I should or should not read. My main objection is first of all that this book should have been selected as one for study and for text purposes for our school students, that it should have been defended as such by the leader-writer of “The Courier-Mail”, and that the members of the A.L.P. Executive believe that this sort of filth should be printed in pamphlet form and pushed into the hands of any unwilling person—man, woman or child—who walks along the street. That is why I object. If the book is on sale and I buy it, then I buy it of my own volition and with my eyes open. To be quite candid, I do not mind well-written salacity. I do not mind some of the old classics; they are particularly good. I think it was the hon. member for Kurilpa who once got up here with a great armful of books. He was talking about pornography and produced a big volume of Rabelais. He had not read it, of course, and when he was half-way through I said, “Hand it over to me and I will read you the story of the fellow with the nine-inch ‘knocker’.” That was the first time he had ever heard of that. But that is the attitude. I don't mind these books being on sale if adults buy them, but I do object to the scurrilous attack—the real sneaky, oleaginous, sarcastic attack—that was made on the hon. member for Gregory by the leader-writer for “The Courier-Mail.” I object to the fact and I am going to pinpoint it—that this is the sort of stuff that can be printed, because apparently it offends no law. The police are not going to take action; the Literature Board of Review is not going to take action; so it can be printed in pamphlet form without any danger of prosecution by anybody and, having been printed in pamphlet form, the leaders of the Labour Party believe that it can and should be pushed into the unwilling hands of every man, woman and child who walks the footpaths of this State.

**Hon. R. E. CAMM** (Whitsunday—Minister for Mines, Main Roads and Electricity) (4.18 p.m.): In entering into this Address-in-Reply debate, naturally my main object is to oppose the several clauses in the amendment that was moved by the Leader of the Opposition and supported by members of his party. The Address-in-Reply debate is usually taken as an opportunity for members to bring to the notice of this House the many difficulties and problems associated with their own electorates. It also provides an opportunity for any member to discuss any matter referred to in the Governor's Opening Speech, and, as the Governor's Opening Speech contains reference to past activities of the Government and gives an indication of intending legislation associated with Government administration and consequential development of Queensland, then the debate can cover a very wide field indeed. But many members on the Opposition side have taken the opportunity in

this Address in Reply to criticise the Government for its policy on the encouragement of overseas investment for the development of industry, more especially the mining industry, and to criticise also the returns, or the benefits, that this State receives from those industries.

It is true that much of the mining activity in Queensland at the present time is financed from overseas sources.

In replying to the amendment I will endeavour to prove to members of the Opposition that the development of Queensland's mining industries was brought about by the infusion of overseas capital and that it has been of immense benefit to the people of Queensland.

I want to make my position clear, and I am sure that my opinion is shared by all hon. members on this side of the House: I would like to see these industries financed from Queensland or Australian sources; make no mistake about that. Every encouragement is given to Australian companies and to Queensland companies to invest in the further development of this State, whether in mining activities, in pastoral activities, or in agricultural activities. Unfortunately there does not appear to be enough capital—risk capital, it might be called—in Australia to finance these enterprises. Many opportunities have been offered to private enterprise to take part in the development of this State. Take the Thiess-Peabody-Mitsui organisation. Thiess Bros. was a contracting firm that had found coal, proven quantities of coking coal, had established a market in Japan, and had then found that it had to go outside Australia and encourage overseas sources to provide the capital for this enterprise.

It was rather revealing to read in "The Australian" on Saturday that a consortium of companies comprising three or four of the richest companies in Australia will have trouble in finding sufficient finance to retain its equity in the company that will develop the bauxite deposits at Gove. The reserves of bauxite at Gove have been proved, the methods of mining and treatment are known, and the marketing arrangements appear to be satisfactory, but still there is a doubt whether sufficient money can be raised by reputable companies in Australia to retain a 50 per cent. equity in this venture. From the account in "The Australian" it would appear that the Australian equity could be only 40 per cent. If money is not available for an undertaking that is actually proved, where do members of the Opposition think that money is available for the risk enterprises associated with exploration in Queensland and the proving of its mineral resources?

The history of mining in Australia indicates that overseas assistance has been the pattern in developing many mining industries, and that after they become established Australian equity is obtained. I could go on and

mention many of these enterprises. Broken Hill South, B.H.P. itself, and Mount Isa Mines Ltd. are examples. Primarily those companies were financed by overseas companies, and today they have a large Australian equity. Many hon. members on this side of the House and I feel that, instead of allowing our minerals to lie in the ground, every encouragement should be given to any company that abides by the laws of this State and the provisions in the Mining Act to come to this State, so that Queensland can share in the many benefits associated with the development of this State. Many benefits accrue to this State other than those derived from direct participation in financing the development of its industries.

**Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt:** If that had not been done many people whose livelihood was mining would have been left out of work.

**Mr. CAMM:** That is so. Will anyone deny that the establishment of the alumina industry at Gladstone has not been of benefit to the people of that area? Will the hon. member for Port Curtis deny that the foreign money that goes over his bar is as good as the money paid to the Australian workers in that town? Did he refuse the money of the men operating the off-shore rig when they came to his hotel to spend it? Did he reject their money because it was overseas capital? Does he subscribe to the theory that it is all right for these companies to come to Queensland and spend a million dollars, and on some occasions \$2,000,000, on exploration work as long as they get nothing in return; that, having found some worth-while project, they are to be denied the benefit of development of it? Do Opposition members think it is all right for these companies to come here and spend millions in prospecting and then, when there is a prospect of profit for them, be refused the opportunity to develop what they may have found?

The spending of \$100,000,000 in any country must have some effect on its economy, and in a country such as Australia the spending of such a sum has a profound effect on industry throughout the nation. Much of the steel work and the fabrication of the steel work for the building of the alumina plant at Gladstone was done in Australia. Eighty-five per cent. of the money spent on that establishment was spent in Australia, for the benefit of Australian industries, and for the benefit of Australian workers.

**Mr. Hanson:** You are building up industries in other countries in the world with your own Government's capital. That is our argument.

**Mr. CAMM:** The importance of many of these minerals has been known for many years. If we go back through the records of the mining journals we find reference to the bauxite deposits at Weipa; if we look at the Powell-Duffryn report presented after

the last war, we find reference in it to the huge coal deposits in the Bowen basin. Many of the areas which are now being proved as having good coking coal were proved, and were referred to, in the Powell-Duffryn report.

Besides the capital that these overseas companies bring to Australia, their executive men bring with them a wealth of knowledge which, sometimes, we do not possess in Australia. Many of these companies take on Australian personnel and train them in mining techniques and problems associated with large-scale development. After an industry has been in operation for a number of years it is often controlled by Australian managers and staffed by Australian workmen, all of whom receive very good remuneration.

Let me examine some of the developments which could be coming into the area represented by one of the greatest critics of overseas financing, namely, the hon. member for Port Curtis. Let us consider some of the development on which we are working, and which we are striving to bring about. It ill-behoves him to come here and criticise the activities of this Government; these people are only human and, if they read in the papers criticism levelled at their enterprises, or contemplated enterprises—

**Mr. HANSON:** I rise to a point of order. I want to say quite frankly that I have not levelled criticism at the overseas company that came into my electorate. I have not done that, but I have levelled criticism at this Government for its ineptitude in not encouraging and advancing further the particular industry.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr. Smith): There is no point of order.

**Mr. CAMM:** I am pleased to hear that the hon. member does not criticise any overseas company that has come into his electorate. That is understandable, because I know he relies on them for his immediate livelihood. The Comalco plant for the treatment of bauxite is already established in his area. Coal export facilities have been provided; Murphyores are to establish a mineral-sand plant, and A.C.F. and I.C.I. will soon be manufacturing sulphuric acid from the pyrites from Mt. Morgan.

In the near future we hope to build a huge power-house in that area and, with cheap electricity, it is expected that we will be able to encourage further industry. The huge salt deposits at the mouth of the Fitzroy River could be used in the manufacture of caustic soda. The by-product of caustic soda, chlorine, which is so valuable in the manufacture of plastics, will also be in abundant supply. But many of these products rely on the building of this huge power-station. We hope that we will have a nickel refinery and even an aluminium refinery in that area.

We always hear the cry from members of the Opposition that we cannot have overseas capital in Queensland and that we must keep overseas capital outside otherwise too much of the profits will be taken away from the people of this State. How else could we justifiably encourage these people to come here?

I have mentioned on several occasions in this House that many great benefits other than royalty payments come to a State from the development of these mining enterprises. Each and every one of the Opposition speakers criticised the Government on the low royalties received on many minerals.

**Mr. Hanson:** We even divided on it.

**Mr. CAMM:** I know. Members of the Opposition are together on this. I bring to the notice of the House some royalty provisions that might astound the Leader of the Opposition if he goes back into history far enough. The hon. member for Salisbury quoted some figures from the Annual Report of the Under Secretary for Mines. I do not quite agree with the figures, but it is only a matter of a few million dollars and I might have made a mistake.

**Mr. Sherrington:** They were taken from your own report.

**Mr. CAMM:** I do not agree with the figures the hon. member presented. He might have made a mistake in addition and so might I. He indicated that from 1956 to 1968 some \$1,400 million—

**Mr. Sherrington:** You don't know the figures now.

**Mr. CAMM:** Well, I have got \$1,400 million. The hon. member mentioned \$1,234,751,186 as the value of all minerals mined between 1956 and 1968. That was the figure he quoted. I think that is a wonderful indication of what this Government has done towards the development of mining in this State. In 10 years the value of minerals was \$1,400 million. The hon. member went further and said that the royalties received in that period totalled \$4,248,889. That applies only to minerals. Oil and coal are separate. I shall deal with coal as I go along. As a matter of fact the oil royalty in that period was \$2,218,808. Bear that figure in mind. Royalties amounted to \$4,248,889 since 1956. That royalty was collected on minerals in this State.

**Mr. Houston:** A shocking amount.

**Mr. CAMM:** A shocking amount?

**Mr. Houston:** It should be twice as much.

**Mr. CAMM:** I did a little research and went back to the previous 10 years. I found that the value of minerals was \$328,000,000. I admit that there was a war on but from the end of the war, from 1946—

**Mr. Houston:** How much were we allowed to export?

**Mr. CAMM:** Nobody was stopping the export of coal at that time. It amounted to \$328,000,000. This was not coal. I said earlier that this applies to minerals, not coal, and that I would deal with coal later.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Smith):** Order! There are far too many interjections from members of the Opposition.

**Mr. Hanson:** We are only trying to be helpful.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The hon. member for Port Curtis has been one of the main interjectors. I ask him to please restrain himself.

**Mr. CAMM:** As I was saying, the vast amount of \$4,248,889 was collected as royalty. I did a little research and found the value of minerals exported in the previous 10 years, and I repeat, this is not coal. I searched through all the records of the Department of Mines to find out how much royalty had been collected by the previous A.L.P. Government. Can any member of the Opposition tell me how much royalty was collected from these minerals that were valued at \$328,000,000?

**Mr. Houston:** \$30,000,000?

**Mr. CAMM:** Not one penny was ever collected by the A.L.P. prior to 1956 for any minerals mined and exported from this State. In spite of that, hon. members opposite come in here with all the hypocrisy that they can muster and accuse the Government of giving away the minerals of this State. For 30 years their Government never collected one penny in royalties on all the minerals produced in this State. How then can they have the effrontery to say to the people of Queensland, "The Government is giving our minerals away."? By its enlightened policy of encouraging companies to come here and assuring them of a fair return on their investments, the Government has established in Queensland a mining industry which is becoming the envy of the other States.

**Mr. Sherrington:** You are misleading the House.

**Mr. CAMM:** I am not misleading the House. If the hon. member for Salisbury thinks that I am misleading the House, I point out to him that I am talking about minerals now, not coal. I shall deal with coal now. It is true that there have been variations in royalty rates over the years. In January, 1948, the Labour Government introduced a new scale of royalties. I concede that at that time there were in the Labour movement in Queensland many men who were genuinely interested in the development of this State. They were responsible people who set out to attract industry to Queensland. They were working towards the development of the Blair Athol coal field, and they were not obsessed with the philosophy that seems to prevail in the

A.L.P. today that as soon as anyone looks like making a profit he has to be jumped on. In the eyes of the A.L.P., it seems to be a crime for anyone to earn a profit.

In 1948 these were the royalty provisions that were brought in by the Labour Government—

For the first 1,000,000 tons in any calendar year—6d. a ton.

For the next 1,000,000 tons in any calendar year—3d. a ton.

For each ton thereafter in any calendar year—1d. a ton.

That amendment was proposed in view of the large-scale development likely to result from it and the stimulus that would be given to operations, at Blair Athol, and the royalty rates that I have just mentioned operated irrespective of where the leases were situated. Irrespective of the distance from the coast and the rail haulage involved, they were the royalty rates that prevailed. They did not apply to Blair Athol only. In view of that proposal, it was considered equitable that similar rates of royalty should be imposed in respect of coal obtained from mining leases in other parts of the State.

They were the royalty conditions in force when the present Government assumed the Treasury benches. They were also the royalty provisions that prevailed when the companies presently mining coal applied for authority to prospect. When they came to take up their leases, does the Leader of the Opposition think that the Government could have repudiated immediately an agreement made under the Coal Mining Act and said, "Now that you have decided to mine, you will not pay only one penny a ton after the export of 2,000,000 tons; you will pay 6d. a ton."?

**Mr. Houston:** How much did they export?

**Mr. CAMM:** Before Thiess Peabody Mitsui had exported 1,000,000 tons the Government had re-negotiated terms with them. The new royalty provisions were introduced when the company was re-negotiating the responsibility for building the railway line, and they provided that every ton of coal that the company produced and exported would attract a royalty of 6d. At the same time I wrote a letter to Utah Development Co., the other big mining company, and told its representatives that before the company exported 1,000,000 tons of coal, I would introduce into this House amendments to the Coal Mining Act that would necessitate its paying the same rate of royalty—6d. a ton—for every ton that was shipped.

Under a Labour Government, when a lease was negotiated the rent condition was 1s. an acre. The Country-Liberal Government increased it to 10s. an acre. I will tell the House what that means. The Country-Liberal Government increased royalty by 500 per cent. It may not sound much, but when one is dealing in millions

of tons of coal, 500 per cent. represents a lot of money. It increased rental by 900 per cent., which is a big increase in any man's language.

**Mr. Houston:** What was the price a ton of coal in those days?

**Mr. CAMM:** It does not matter what the price was. I am replying to the hon. gentleman's statement that the Government was not receiving equitable royalty payments from these overseas companies. That was the hon. gentleman's claim; he was not interested in the price of coal.

**Mr. Houston:** You are not, either.

**Mr. CAMM:** The hon. gentleman accused the Government of not acquiring sufficient royalties from these companies.

**Mr. Houston:** That is right; we say it again.

**Mr. CAMM:** Let us see what the position is. Under the old provisions, when exports reached, say, 4,000,000 tons a year, the Government would have been collecting \$80,000 a year; under the present royalty rates, the Government is collecting \$200,000 a year. For a lease such as Utah Development Co. has at Blackwater, it would have been paying \$3,000 a year rent; now it will be paying the Government \$30,000 a year. Does not the Opposition think that that is a big enough increase for any Government to saddle a company with after it had knowingly entered into an exploration under the old provisions relating to royalty?

**Mr. Hanlon:** Mr. Evans said that it would have crippled them if they had operated under the Act relating to coal mining.

**Mr. CAMM:** What is the hon. member talking about?

**Mr. Hanlon:** When he introduced the Thiess Peabody Agreement in 1962, he said that they would revert to the Coal Mining Act if they did not abide by the agreement. He said that would cripple them, and he used that as justification for the agreement.

**Mr. CAMM:** Thiess Peabody Mitsui is the only company mining coal in Queensland that is operating under a franchise agreement. Utah Development Co. is operating at Blackwater under the Coal Mining Act. What is the hon. member talking about—it would cripple them?

**Mr. Hanlon:** Thiess Peabody were, too, until the 1962 agreement.

**Mr. CAMM:** A new agreement was negotiated with Thiess Peabody Mitsui because of the responsibility for building a railway line from Moura to Gladstone. The company could have operated quite successfully under the provisions of the Coal Mining Act—it was up till then—by sending coal through Rockhampton, as Utah Development Co. is at present. However, the

franchise agreement was negotiated, and it carried with it responsibility for building the railway and also for financing other installations at the port.

**Mr. Hanlon:** Gordon Chalk reckons it is profitable for the Government, the way you are doing it.

**Mr. CAMM:** Of course it is.

**Mr. Hanlon:** According to him, it was an onerous obligation on the company.

**Mr. CAMM:** It is profitable for the Queensland Government.

**Mr. Hanlon:** What are you talking about? They had to build a railway line.

**Mr. CAMM:** I said that the company had to finance the building of the railway.

**Mr. Hanlon:** That is the same thing.

**Mr. CAMM:** When the Government negotiates another franchise agreement farther north, it also will embody the responsibility for financing a railway line to Mackay.

The Opposition suggests that the Government is squandering the State's reserves. I assure them that any new franchise agreement will carry with it the responsibility to ensure that, before the company exports great tonnages of coal from the State, ample reserves are left in the ground.

**Mr. Houston:** What agreement have you got with Utah now?

**Mr. CAMM:** Utah is restricted at the present time to Blackwater and to the export of 100 million tons of coal out of a lease that has been proved at immeasurably more than 100 million tons. That is all they have, permission to export 100 million tons of coal.

**Mr. Houston:** What freight are you charging?

**Mr. CAMM:** I do not know. That is for the Railways Department. They entered into a contract. The hon. member tried to get that from the Minister for Railways and he was told it was confidential information.

**Mr. Houston:** How do you argue it is a pricing concern?

**Mr. CAMM:** On the figures that the Railway Department issue every year. The railway estimates will be coming before Parliament and the hon. member will be able to look at them.

Now I want to get away from the coal because I think I have adequately squashed any claim by the Opposition of inadequacy of our royalty requirements. Just to summarise the matter, on minerals there was no royalty whatsoever paid in this State prior to 1956.

**Mr. Houston:** How many were operating for export?

**Mr. CAMM:** Mt. Isa was operating at the time, as were Mt. Morgan and Cracow. All those mines were operating for many years. For coal, this Government has increased royalty provisions by 500 per cent. and rent provisions by 900 per cent. Now I want to get on to—

**Mr. Houston:** Get onto something you know something about.

**Mr. CAMM:** I will. I will get onto sugar, and impart a little bit of knowledge to the Leader of the Opposition, because if ever I have seen a misleading, untruthful statement or an indication of a complete lack of knowledge of the sugar industry, it was a recent report in "The Courier-Mail" of a statement by the Leader of the Opposition. However, I will get onto that in due course.

Very shortly, the Premier will be going overseas to participate in negotiations which could lead to an international sugar agreement. I do not want to say anything here that might jeopardise the prospects of that agreement but I will say that for the over-all good of the sugar industry it would appear that an international sugar agreement is desirable.

**Mr. Houston:** When did you wake up to that fact?

**Mr. CAMM:** I remind the hon. member there are still many people in the sugar industry who hold the view that an international sugar agreement at any price would not be acceptable to the industry. An international sugar agreement based on a fair return to the sugar-grower would be all right, but not at any price. However, any suggestion that this agreement could mean a reduction in the present aggregate of mill peaks, without a worthwhile increase in the price of sugar, certainly would not be very favourably received by many sections of the industry. I would say that I have the utmost faith in the delegates who will be going overseas to negotiate this agreement. I have been acquainted with them for many years and I am quite happy that the Premier is going over with such good men, men with a wonderful knowledge—a lifelong knowledge—of the sugar industry. There are local issues associated with the marketing of this year's crop and that is what I want to talk about, in relation to the Mackay and Proserpine districts.

In this article in "The Courier-Mail" the Leader of the Opposition is reported as saying—

"First the industry was told that the Sugar Board would take the whole of the crop. Then without warning came the announcement last week that it would take only 20 per cent. above peak of the crop. This caused panic in the industry."

I want to say here and now that that is completely untrue. At no time has the Sugar Board indicated that it intended to acquire

the whole crop offering in Queensland and I will give the House the history of what has happened.

In Mackay in the last five or six years we have produced well above our peak quota. The farmers of Queensland have been requested to grow their peak tonnages on the basis that proof of ability to grow that tonnage would help—and I am sure it would—in the negotiations for an international sugar agreement. If we cannot prove that we can grow the sugar, how can our advocates justify a claim for a worth-while increase in our overseas markets?

For many years the Mackay area was able to fill the shortfalls of the mills in the northern part of the State. I say that in no derogatory sense of the northern mills, because they suffered from bad climatic conditions in the last five or six years. The Mackay area has not had good seasonal conditions—some mill areas suffered from drought—but it was able to fill the shortfalls of the northern mill areas.

The Sugar Board, which is responsible for the marketing of the sugar manufactured from the whole of the available crop, generally makes an announcement as to how much sugar can be marketed. The board, as the marketing agent, advises the mills and the growers of the amount of sugar that can be acquired in the forthcoming year. Bear in mind that at the present time there are some very low world-market prices for sugar. In May, 1967, the board advised the industry that the acquisition would not be less than the aggregate of mill peaks, in effect, that the aggregate of mill peaks would be acquired in 1968. This was reaffirmed by the board members at the industry conferences in March 1968, the Australian Sugar Producers' Association Ltd. conference and the Queensland Cane Growers' Council conference. In early July the estimates of all the mills in Queensland indicated that 2,500,000 tons of sugar would be manufactured, and the board then advised the mills that it was expected that this tonnage could be marketed. The board did not say that it would acquire that amount of sugar, but said it was expected that it could be marketed. Under the proclamation the board meets its obligation if advice is given to the mills by 30 September of each year as to the percentage of mill peaks to be acquired. The board is not obliged under the proclamation to advise the mills until September of how much sugar it will acquire.

**Mr. Houston:** Many people thought the lot would be taken.

**Mr. CAMM:** No, they didn't.

**Mr. Houston:** Yes, they did.

**Mr. CAMM:** They were ill-informed. The Leader of the Opposition must have been telling them.

The mills enjoyed a wonderful crushing season, and towards the end of August it could be seen that some mills would be

reaching their peaks plus their share of the 2,500,000 tons. The board could see that it was desirable to notify the mills so that they could acquaint the growers with the amount of sugar that could be manufactured. Consequently on 19 August an announcement was made that 2,500,000 tons of sugar would be accepted for marketing, and also notice was given that a further announcement would be made relative to any additional tonnage available. A tonnage of 2,500,000 is 270,000 in excess of mill peaks. It represents a remarkable achievement by the State marketing agents and the Sugar Board to be able to say with certainty in August that they had sold 270,000 tons more than the aggregate of Queensland's mill peaks. The estimates kept rising, and today there are about 2,600,000 tons available, which is 300,000 tons higher than any previous production. Now the Sugar Board has the very difficult task of marketing this sugar without jeopardising the prospects of harvesting at least the mill peaks for 1969.

There was great concern in the Mackay district, where the peaks are only 558,000 tons and a production of 762,660 tons was offering. For some mills that amounts to 134 per cent. of their mill peak. Naturally representations from the Mackay mills were made to the board to make a further acquisition over 120 per cent. of mill peaks because some growers would soon have to be told to discontinue harvesting.

The Government does not dictate to the Sugar Board how much it should take. The board is a statutory body elected by the growers and the mill-owners, and the Government elects the chairman. The Sugar Board met, and further notification was given to the mills that 127 per cent. would be acquired. This was conveyed following a board meeting on Thursday, 5 September. That was the day before the Premier went to Mackay. I was up at the Goonyella coalfields with the Utah Development Company, but I knew when I got back to Mackay on Thursday night that the Sugar Board had advised the sugar industry in Mackay that it would accept 127 per cent. of mill peaks. The Premier, in the course of his remarks to the sugar industry, which had tendered him a luncheon, said how gratified and how pleased he was that the Sugar Board had decided to acquire 127 per cent. of mill peaks. It had nothing whatsoever to do with me.

**Mr. Houston:** It was quite a coincidence.

**Mr. CAMM:** Of course it was a coincidence. What the hon. member had to say is not a coincidence. If what I saw in the Press is the hon. gentleman's considered opinion I repeat that it shows either a complete lack of knowledge of the workings of the Sugar Board and the acquisition of our sugar crop, or the hon. gentleman is participating in cheap political propaganda to get something for himself. He may be trying to belittle the Premier or the

representative of the Mackay district. He can please himself which way he takes it; he either made a fool of himself or else he is a little bit of a rogue.

I now wish to turn to the conservation of our mineral resources in so far as it relates to the exploitation of the Barrier Reef and the precious stones in Queensland. We have been criticised frequently about our lack of appreciation of the need to conserve these minerals, but I defy any member of the Opposition to bring to the notice of the House any occasion on which I, since I have been the Minister, have granted a lease, to any people or any company, which would jeopardise our Great Barrier Reef. As a matter of fact I refused an application for a lease on Ellison Reef for coral mining. I have also excised an area of 30,000 acres to preserve the Agate Creek field for the small prospectors. Recently I excised 150 square miles of the Anakie sapphire field for the benefit of the small prospectors. The hon. member for Barcoo was good enough to introduce a deputation to me and point out that the people in that area felt that this area should be reserved. I also reserved a certain area from within the lease of a company mining limestone at Rockhampton. I defy any member of the Opposition to bring to the attention of this House any occasion on which it can be shown that I was lax in my administration concerning the preservation of these worthwhile tourist attractions.

**Mr. Sherrington:** What legislative process is there to guard the Barrier Reef?

**Mr. CAMM:** Me!

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. CAMM:** My remark can be ignored; there is plenty of legislation.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH** (Tablelands) (4.59 p.m.): I support the amendment so ably moved by my Leader and so ably supported by my Deputy Leader. There is no doubt that they had very good reasons for moving the amendment because now, more than ever before, we are presented with daily instances of the very things that those two hon. members referred to in their speeches. Before proceeding to deal with some matters that I intend to discuss, I wish to express my loyalty and devotion, and that of the people of my electorate, to Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II. I ask His Excellency the Governor, Sir Alan Mansfield, to convey these sentiments to Her Majesty.

This session of Parliament seems to be a special session for many speakers to try to down-grade or destroy other people. I do not know why. I think it could be said that it is a sort of training ground for next year's election. While this is going on, the people whom we represent are suffering. Those who practise these tactics are thinking more of themselves and their mates and of getting on side or being on side all

the time, with the possibility of gaining some result next year. The embarrassment they cause to hon. members in this Chamber can be refuted, and often it is refuted. I intend to touch on some of these points later. The people I am concerned about are those outside who do not have a chance to refute statements with the same degree of publicity that members in the Chamber have.

As I said, the people who are suffering are those we represent. The people who generally attract this sort of attention are possible candidates. We had the spectacle of a violent accusation lodged by the hon. member for Townsville South against an A.L.P. candidate in next year's election. I shall continue to show this Chamber how unfortunate it is to have members stooping to this type of attack when they are supposed to be Australian citizens representing other people.

First of all, the hon. member's attack on members of the Labour Party has been answered in a personal explanation by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I shall deal with this in a little more detail. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition (the hon. member for Townsville North, Mr. Tucker), the hon. member for Toowoomba East (Mr. P. Wood) and the hon. member for Sandgate (Mr. Dean) were my guests. I invited them to see part of my electorate, but only after I had contacted the Minister controlling the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs and receiving his blessing to go, if I may use that phrase, saying that the more people who hear about this, the better.

**Mr. P. Wood:** We appreciated your invitation.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** I say here and now that all along the line the managers, the councillors, the chairman of the council and the newly appointed public servants were very grateful for our visit. I have letters and telegrams to prove that assertion. What is more, there are four members of this Parliament who now have an intimate knowledge of 800 people in an area that can be reached only by aeroplane. Is there any other area in Queensland where this applies? We could not leave Edward River by boat because the tide was out, and would have been out for another week. Do hon. members realise that? We could not go by road because, if we left Cairns at 6 a.m. and drove most of the time, we would arrive at Edward River, if we were lucky, at midnight the following night, such is the state of the road. There is no means of transport to Mitchell River other than by aeroplane. The road from Mareeba to Mitchell River is 360 miles long, so that again it is almost impossible for a party of such a size to go to Mitchell River in a conventional vehicle. We wanted to go to both places, so we flew.

I warn any Opposition member who wishes to go there that accommodation is not free. A charge is made for it, and I hope it always will be. Anyone who goes to the Gold Coast or to Mt. Isa to see people at those places has to stay at a hotel or motel and pay for his board. There are at the Mitchell River and Edward River Aboriginal communities the same type of people as are found anywhere else, and we should be only too pleased to pay accommodation charges. It is an illusion that accommodation is free at the Mitchell River and Edward River communities.

In his efforts to embarrass members of this House, the hon. member for Townsville South stooped a little lower when he tried to discredit Mr. Doug. Lloyd, the A.L.P. candidate for Flinders at next year's election.

**Mr. Davies:** Is he a teacher at one of the church schools at Charters Towers?

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** He taught at the school at Mitchell River in Grades 4 and 5 as a Bachelor of Arts for the princely sum of £1 a day, or £365 a year. That gives some indication of his outstanding qualities. He offered his services to the Government when it took over the community, and all that he wanted was an assurance that he would be considered. He was not given that assurance, so he sought employment elsewhere. That is why he is at Charters Towers now.

**Mr. Davies:** Which school is he at?

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** All Souls Church of England school. He is still teaching there, and he hopes by next year to be a Bachelor of Education.

**Mr. Davies:** Then his reputation must be all right.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** It is excellent. His only redress following the attack made upon him by the hon. member for Townsville South was to answer it by letter in the Press, and I intend to place in "Hansard" the contents of that letter. In time to come no-one will remember what appeared in "The Northern Miner," "The Townsville Daily Bulletin", or "The North Queensland Register", but "Hansard" will always be there. Next year, Mr. Lloyd will be sitting here and thus will be able to defend himself. I am now going to show what sort of a person he is. His letter to the newspaper reads—

"Sir,

"I refer to the report published in the 'Townsville Daily Bulletin' (23-8-68) of remarks made by Mr. Aikens in State Parliament.

"Mr. Aikens' allegations concerning me are manifestly false. In the interests of accuracy, I shall state a few of the relevant facts.

"I have never at any time been to the Edward River community and I have never,

there or anywhere else, made any of the statements or threats attributed to me by Mr. Aikens in his reported speech.

"I have lived at Mitchell River and there assisted Mr. Wallis-Smith in his campaign for re-election as member for Tablelands. To use the word 'stooge' of a person who gives open and legitimate service to the party he supports reflects on nobody but the person who uses it.

"Of approximately 116 votes recorded at the Mitchell River community alone 15 of these were cast by white European staff members. Mr. Aikens conveniently omits to mention the surreptitious methods I supposedly employed to persuade these folks to vote for their trusted representative and personal friend.

"The Australian Labour Party is justly proud of its record in social services and it is patently absurd to suggest that I, as a person who subscribes to its principles, would threaten anyone, black or white, with the loss of the social service privileges my party stands for. To label it more claptrap would be charitable of me.

"Indeed, anyone who knows me at all will quickly inform Mr. Aikens that it is completely foreign to my nature to threaten or intimidate anyone for any reason.

"No, Mr. Aikens, try as you will, you will find no shady dealings in the last Mitchell River poll, because there were none. Of course, I can speak only for the Labour Party."

Breaking off there, I point out to hon. members that at Doomadgee Mission the hon. member for Burke received one vote and the Country Party candidate 14.

The letter continues—

"But don't be disappointed if the result is precisely the same next time.

"Why don't you accompany Mr. Wallis-Smith on a pre-election tour of these two communities (if you could now muster the courage) or, better still, spend Christmas on Mitchell River settlement, as he himself has done. It will be hot and uncomfortable but you could sit under a mango tree and watch Mr. Wallis-Smith filling in for the postmaster, who might be on leave; or serving behind the counter in the store; or helping someone catch up with his correspondence lessons.

"While you sit under your tree, ask the locals (they are friendly people and will forgive you your errors) to explain why they ignored the A.L.P. How-to-Vote card and exercised their own mature independent judgment of the candidates who stood. And while they speak to you, listen carefully, for you will not hear the term 'belonga' used in their conversation at all. It can best be classified as an Aikensian corruption of a pidgin word not, fortunately, used by the people of this region.

"My character and integrity will bear any examination—provided, of course, that the investigator genuinely desires to reach an unprejudiced and truthful conclusion.

"I am conducting my campaign on clear-cut political issues and I positively refuse to be drawn into personal vilification. The political affairs of this State will be much better served by the former methods than by recourse to inaccurate, abusive statements such as those contained in this parliamentary speech.

Doug Lloyd,

A.L.P. candidate for Flinders."

**Mr. P. Wood:** Do you think that the hon. member for Townsville South would work at Mitchell River for £1 a day?

**Mr. Armstrong:** He worked for less under a Labour Government.

**Mr. AIKENS:** I rise to a point of order. In reply, I would say that I worked for less under a Labour Government. This man was branded publicly as a liar by the Minister for Native Affairs.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The hon. member for Tablelands.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** I might as well clear up the "liar" business, because it is a very contentious point. The hon. member for Townsville South has come to the last little hole in the net to get out. He says that Mr. Lloyd had been branded a liar by the Minister for Labour and Tourism.

**Mr. Aikens:** So he was.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** Let me say that Mr. Lloyd was at Mitchell River when I arrived there at Christmas to spend a fortnight, after which I went on to Edward River for a fortnight. I offered my services to the superintendent, who had invited me there. The mission was under the control of the church at that time; it had nothing whatever to do with the Minister for Aboriginal and Island Affairs. I am an Anglican; it was an Anglican mission. I am the member representing these people, and they did have a vote. Does the hon. member know the reason for my going there? I brought to the notice of the late Honourable J. C. A. Pizzey the fact that there was a shortage of staff at the mission because people were beginning to move out when they knew that the Government was going to take it over. The late Mr. Pizzey replied that he had not had any word from the bishop to this effect. I offered the services of my wife and myself to the bishop, who was only too pleased to allow me to go there and be used in whatever way I was needed most. This is what happened.

**Mr. Armstrong:** Good dividends.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** If the hon. member who is interjecting could have seen me at Edward River later on, building the picture show! These people had never seen pictures in their lives. I worked with a group of eight or nine men who worked willingly and untiringly so that the remainder of the 260 people could enjoy the first pictures they had ever seen. I am proud to say I was there when the first film arrived and saw

the delight that these people showed. They went back four nights in a row to see the same picture—a very old silent picture. These are the sort of people some hon. members do not understand and whom they are trying to ridicule. For the hon. member for Flinders to say that in Charters Towers the A.L.P. threatened Aborigines is another untruth that could be filed along with the many untruths uttered by the hon. member for Townsville South.

**Mr. Aikens:** Which untruths? They did it in Townsville.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** The untruths I am referring to are the untruths I have heard since I have been here—thousands of them. There is hardly room in "Hansard" for them, but because they are sensational the Press up there gives them headlines—the big word headlines in the northern papers with the word "stooge" in reference to a man who has set out in the letter that I have read just what he did. Yet he is labelled a "stooge".

**Mr. Lonergan:** You would be an authority on that; you would know.

**Mr. AIKENS:** I rise to a point of order. I call the attention of the House to the letter written by Mr. Lloyd to "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" about the hon. member working behind the store and post office. He used the present and the future tense; he did not use the past tense.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** This is another little bandying of words. Apparently that last hole has been closed up and the hon. member is trying to jump the fence, because this man Lloyd is beyond reproach. If the Minister wants to be realistic, if he wants to be a Minister who rises above the rut that he is getting into, then I suggest that he send a wire to any of the councillors who were there and ask them to state their opinion of Doug Lloyd's integrity. However, I do not think the Minister will do it. He is slipping down to the bottom of the ladder. I will prove that right now by quoting from the answers given to questions only last week. At the end of the answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Townsville North, the Minister concluded in this way—this is worth repeating—

**Mr. Aikens:** Don't get excited. Keep calm.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** I will not get excited. The hon. member cannot excite me. That is what hurts him. The Minister concluded on this note—

"The time of this House could more profitably be devoted to matters of public interest than to answering in long detail such questions as this, which obviously are aimed at assisting the hon. member in mounting his campaign—worrying enough for him, no doubt—at the next elections."

On the same day, I asked a question and in the original answer, a copy of which I

have here, I received virtually the same comment, but in this instance it was crossed out.

**Mr. Sullivan:** I took pity on you.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** It is crossed out, so the Minister did not tip it onto me. This is what he said—

"In respect of this question, I reiterate my concluding remarks to the hon. member for Townsville North and suggest to him also that he has some ulterior motive in using this House in accumulating information obviously required for electioneering purposes."

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The hon. member is not in order in debating any section of the answer to a question that does not appear in the records.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** Very well, Mr. Speaker, but I will retain this copy of the answer, because it is very good evidence.

**Mr. Aikens:** Were you at the meeting in Cairns last week with Freddie Thompson and the Communists?

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** No. I was there with Mr. Penridge. The hon. member can use the privilege of this House to ask if Mr. Penridge is a Communist, and he will probably get the answer.

It has been said that this is not the right sort of thing to do because it is electioneering, but in the "Tablelands Advertiser" of 28 August, 1968, under the heading "School for Karumba" this article appears—

#### "School for Karumba"

"Following a recent visit to Karumba during which he had discussions with representatives of Craig Mostyn & Co. and local residents, Mr. M. Borzi made representations to the Minister for Education the Hon. A. R. Fletcher, to have a school established at Karumba. Advice has now been received from the Minister to the effect that he has given instructions to have a school established as soon as possible."

Let us hear the story about the Karumba school. On 27 September, 1967, I asked the Minister for Education—

"In view of the report on the survey of prawn areas in the Gulf of Carpentaria by a committee representing the State Department of Harbours and Marine, the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry and the C.S.I.R.O.,—

(1) Has any investigation been made into the possibility of providing a school for Karumba children?

(2) Has any land been set aside for the purpose?

(3) Will he urgently consider establishing a school there?"

The Minister's answer was—

"(1) Although no application has been received, the Regional Director of Education, Longreach, advised recently that he

would, at an early date, investigate the need for the provision of educational facilities at Karumba.

"(2 and 3) Upon receipt of the Regional Director's report consideration will be given to the necessity for acquiring a school site and establishing a school."

Then came the Press report that there was no school and that this was holding the place back. In view of that, on 25 July, 1968, I sent a telegram to the Minister for Education and received a reply reading—

"Temporary accommodation school Karumba not now available stop Alternative arrangements being made."

On 22 August of this year I asked this question concerning the school—

"(1) In view of his assurance that a school would be established at Karumba Lodge and his later advice that this arrangement has been cancelled, will he indicate the actual reasons for this cancellation?"

"(2) Will he urgently consider the provision of permanent schooling facilities at Karumba?"

On 28 August I asked—

"Further to his Answer to my Question of August 22 relative to the establishment of a school at Karumba:—

(1) Where will the school be located?

(2) When is it intended to commence building the school and the teacher's residence?"

The Minister's answer was—

"(1) On Crown land in the town of Karumba near the intersection of Carron and Yappar Streets.

"(2) The Department of Works has under urgent consideration the provision, as soon as possible, of a prefabricated two-classroom building, one room of which is to be fitted for classroom purposes and the other for teacher accommodation."

And so the story goes on. On 12 September I followed the matter up with this final question—

"In view of his Answer to my previous Questions concerning the establishment of a school at Karumba and as a teacher has been appointed, when will the school be completed?"

The answer was—

"It is expected that the new school building will be available for occupancy at the commencement of the 1969 school year."

The telegram that I received was the result of word that no accommodation was now available at Karumba; it had been promised by Craig Mostyn & Co. at the Lodge. As hon. members are aware, Craig Mostyn acquired the Lodge from Ansett and no room is available there. In the first instance, according to the report in the Press, Craig Mostyn told Mr. Borzi that they would provide a room and that they would also provide accommodation for the teacher at a nominal

rate. However, when the Government gave Markwell Fisheries a block of land alongside, Craig Mostyn withdrew both offers. That is why the children of Karumba are still without a school.

**Mr. Sullivan:** What is wrong with giving Markwell Fisheries a block of land?

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** Not the slightest thing, but there is a lot wrong with being blackmailed by a company that first says, "You can have it", and then says, "You cannot have it". That just proves how this company can pull the wool over the Government's eyes. The Government would have been quite satisfied to let these children be taught at the Lodge, which is absolutely impossible.

**Mr. Sullivan:** Are you saying Craig Mostyn blackmailed the Government?

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** Dear, oh dear! I said, "Don't be blackmailed by anyone", and the Minister said, "What is wrong with giving them a piece of land?" If the giving of a piece of land makes them withdraw the offer the Government should not have anything to do with them.

So much for Karumba. I would point out that this is not an isolated instance. I turn back to 1966 and read a Press cutting from that time—

"Herberton State School Works

"The Minister for Works and Housing (Mr. J. Bjelke-Petersen) has advised Mr. T. V. Gilmore, Country Party candidate for Tablelands, that following his representations tenders will shortly be called for earthworks at the Herberton State School."

This is the season that I referred to—the season of the un-Australian approach to competition. The desire to win is so great that the Government will stoop to anything. That is why I support whole-heartedly the amendment moved by my Leader and seconded by my Deputy Leader and their bringing these matters to our attention.

I see that the hon. member for Townsville South has returned to the Chamber. This brings me to a person whom I have not defended today but who should have been defended by the Minister for Justice, who I understand was in the Chamber when the accusation was made that there were numerous irregularities at the poll. I refer to the returning officer, who has no chance whatever of gaining any redress. Why was no investigation made by the Minister for Justice as a result of a question directed by the hon. member for Townsville South to the Minister for Lands, to see if everything was all right, to see whether I had been in the post office, whether I had been in the store or whether I had done this and that? It came from a man who speaks untruths, yet the Minister said he would make an investigation.

**Mr. Aikens:** You were snooping on the Abo's mail.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** The hon. member has used the word "Abo". That shows that he does not know these people; he would destroy and decry anyone.

**Mr. Houston:** That is what the hon. member for Flinders calls them.

**Mr. LONERGAN:** I rise to a point of order. This is the first occasion in 11 years on which I have risen in this Chamber to a point of order. I resent the accusation of the Leader of the Opposition—

**Mr. Houston:** I am not speaking.

**Mr. LONERGAN:** I don't give two hoots whether you are or not. I resent the accusation that I refer to Aborigines as "Abos".

**Mr. Houston** interjected.

**Mr. LONERGAN:** I would not expect anything better from the hon. member.

At 5.30 p.m.—

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The time for the allotted day has expired. Under the provisions of Standing Order No. 17 I propose to allow the hon. member sufficient time to complete his speech.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This very efficient and worth-while officer of the Department of Justice, the clerk of the court at Atherton, can now be held up to ridicule by anyone who reads "Hansard". I send out my 36 copies of "Hansard" to my electors, and I get a few more from other hon. members. I should say that at least 50 copies of "Hansard" are sent out to the area. This is not good enough. This man should be defended by his Minister, and I look forward to hearing some defence of him. It is over two years since the election, and if at this stage—in the middle of the night, as it were—we have to stand for this person stabbing us in the back and cannot get at him, it is time we gave the game away.

Here today we heard him trying to embarrass the hon. member for Ipswich West. I think that we were all ashamed to be in the Chamber. He said, "I respect her as a woman, but as a member she is the worst flop ever to enter this Chamber". What a shocking thing to say about one of our members. At that time I expected Mr. Deputy Speaker (Mr. Smith) to rise to his feet. I do not think that we should take this sort of thing.

People say to me, "I saw the member for Townsville South. Thank goodness there is only one." I say this again: have a look through "Hansard" and see what is there—sensation after sensation, vilification of anyone and everyone. I was not very long in Parliament when the then Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Toowoomba West, made an excellent speech on apprenticeship in Queensland. On the same day the hon. member for Townsville

South made a speech condemning two people in the Bank of New South Wales because they played up with some old ladies. When the paper came out, what did we see: headlines about an M.L.A.'s accusations against bank officers, but not a word about the apprenticeship system in Queensland. This is what he thrives on. He can be seen on the balcony having afternoon tea. He might have his own friends, but they can always be picked. They are the people he feeds stuff to, to get it into the paper. I am not going to split straws or get drawn into an argument with the hon. member for Townsville South. But for goodness sake, why must we put up with that? Mr. Deputy Speaker rose today and asked him to make his speech more temperate. His speech on the Aboriginal Relics Bill, which appears in "Hansard" of 12 September, 1967, was a typical example of what we have come to expect from him. It was an awful statement. I will not even read it.

**Mr. Aikens:** I paid them a compliment.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** The hon. member paid them a compliment! The words he used were, "Putrid, filthy, slobbering, absolutely rotten". "Rotten" describes his speech. It is time we took a stand among ourselves to raise the dignity of this House.

I am afraid that there is a season of "Do whatever you can now to gain advantage later on". In adopting this theme, after completing his answer to a question, the Minister for Lands was lowering himself, and I ask him, as the Minister controlling Aboriginal Affairs, to find out for himself, not through his department, what sort of a man Lloyd is. He will be suitably impressed by him.

**Mr. Sullivan:** I should not be interested in Mr. Lloyd. I am Minister for Lands and control Aboriginal Affairs. I am not concerned with what he is doing.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** It is no concern of the Minister? The Minister said that he is only Minister for Lands and controls the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs. I have been asked why these Aborigines do not get out from under the Act and take their places in the community. I know the answer. Quite often there is a good deal of delay. An instance I have in mind dragged on from 27 February, 1968, to 9 August, 1968. A man named Claude Solomon came to see me and asked "to get out from under the Act". This is the type of expression they use; they do not know that they now have to ask to be removed from the list of assisted persons. They say, "Get me from under the Act. I want some money in my hand." I wrote to the Minister on 27 February, and this is portion of the reply that I received—

"Mrs. Solomon and the children are still living on the Malanda Reserve and it has not been possible to interview Mr. Solomon due to floods.

"Whilst Mrs. Solomon and the children continue to reside on the reserve, it is not possible to grant this request."

Malanda is not in my electorate, and I took this to be the gospel truth. But on 1 August I received a letter signed by Robert L. Atkinson of the Cashmere Pastoral Co. Pty. Ltd., Glen Ruth Station, Mt. Garnet, which read—

"Dear Sir,

"I have Claude Solomon working for me and he advises that he spoke to you earlier in the year regarding his removal from the Certificate of Entitlement. His identity No. is C.381.

"It would be appreciated if you would take the matter up and speed up the above named exemption as it was January of this year when exemption was first applied for.

Yours faithfully,

Robert L. Atkinson."

I then wrote to Mrs. Solomon, C/- Post Office, Malanda, saying—

"I have received a letter from Mr. Atkinson of Glen Ruth Station, asking me to hurry along the removal of your husband's name from the list of Assisted Aborigines.

"I had written to the Department early in the year and received a letter from them on the 27th February saying that they would not consider releasing Claude whilst you still lived on the Reserve.

"I would like you to let me know as quickly as possible if you can find somewhere else to live and tell me the address so that I can write to the Department and advise them that you are now not living on the Reserve.

"I have advised Mr. Atkinson about this but I expect that Claude is out there and may not be able to answer my letter and that is why I am writing to you."

Apparently Mrs. Solomon cannot write, as she had a man named Tom English write to me saying—

"On behalf of Mrs. Claude Solomon I have to advise you that she was asked to leave the local settlement over six months ago and since then she has been living at Jaggan.

"Mrs Solomon would also like to thank you sincerely for your efforts in fighting for her freedom and that of her husband."

Here is a case in which she was asked to leave, the Minister was not aware of it, and exemption was refused.

It is shown over and over again that not enough interest is taken in these people and that they are not treated as ordinary Queenslanders. The Premier may call them Queenslanders and the Minister for Lands may call them Queenslanders, but for goodness sake let them act instead of merely using words.

(Time expired.)

The House adjourned at 5.38 p.m.