

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 14 NOVEMBER 1968

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 14 NOVEMBER, 1968

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

QUESTIONS

CONTROL OF COOLANGATTA AIRPORT

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

In the event of any apparent failure of the Gold Coast City Council to successfully negotiate for control of Coolangatta Airport, will he before any conclusive decision is arrived at intercede to ensure its control is vested in Queensland by Queenslanders?

Answer:—

“The information concerning control of the Coolangatta Airport, contained in the Parliamentary Answer of November 8, outlined the position as it now stands. In the light thereof, I regard the Honourable Member’s Question as being purely hypothetical and not requiring an Answer at this juncture.”

MATHEMATICS PAPER, SENIOR EXAMINATION

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

In view of concern expressed by parents and candidates that the Senior Mathematics examination paper was too difficult, will he make a statement to the House setting out the factual position of the subject in relation to the syllabus and whether or not it requires greater knowledge this year than in previous years?

Answer:—

“The University advises that syllabus changes in Senior Mathematics I came into effect this year, but these were only changes of material, not increases in quantity. In the examination papers, the questions on the new material (statistics) were relatively easy, and have not been criticised, but questions on the permanent material (algebra) have been criticised as being too hard. The examiners realise that the second paper, although within the syllabus, was more difficult than usual and they will make due allowance for this in their marking. Thus no greater knowledge or skill than usual will be needed to obtain the various grades.”

INQUIRY INTO ALLEGED SMUGGLING AT BRISBANE PRISON

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

Concerning suggested smuggling at Boggo Road Gaol, why was the Comptroller-General of Prisons, Mr. S. G. Kerr, instructed to take personal charge of the

investigation in preference to setting up an inquiry by a person not in any way connected with the gaol administration, particularly as the suggestion has been made that people outside the gaol may be involved?

Answer:—

“*The Prisons Acts, 1958 to 1964*” provide that subject to those Acts and subject to the direction of the Minister, the Comptroller-General of Prisons shall have the care, direction, control, and management of all prisons. Among other duties particularly specified in those Acts, the Comptroller-General is required to inquire into all complaints respecting the conduct of prison officers and other persons charged under those Acts with duties in relation to a prison, all complaints alleging any abuses in relation to the control and management of a prison, and all complaints alleging any wrongful act or omission respecting the enforcement in relation to a prison of any provision of those Acts. The Comptroller-General of Prisons therefore is the proper person to conduct any initial inquiry into such a matter. Future action to be taken, if any, will depend on the Comptroller-General’s report of the result of that inquiry.”

LIMESTONE CROSSING, MT. GARNET

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

(1) Is he aware of the unsatisfactory state of Limestone Crossing, Mt. Garnet?

(2) As there have been two fatalities there and as there are 70 residents, including at least 20 school-children, who use the road, will he take urgent action to have the danger eliminated before the next wet season?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) “The Honourable Member should make his representations to the Local Authority concerned.”

NON-SUPPLY TO TOWNSVILLE STUDENTS OF TABLES FOR SENIOR MATHEMATICS PAPER

(a) Mr. Hanlon for Mr. Tucker, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) Is he aware that 110 Senior students from Townsville High School, Christian Brothers School and St. Patrick’s School, Townsville, who sat for the second paper of the Maths. I examination at the Townsville Technical College were not supplied with special curve tables necessary to answer one of the questions of the paper, due to the misinterpretation of instructions forwarded by telegram?

(2) As the students have been disadvantaged by a genuine mistake, will he, after consultation with the University

authorities and his perusal of the letter forwarded by the Principal, Townsville State High School, setting out the full facts of the unfortunate case, make a public statement to allay the fear and worry of the young students that no allowance will be made for the mishap?

Answers:—

(1) “Yes.”

(2) “A University spokesman states that the Chief Examiner in Mathematics I will definitely take this into consideration when the papers are being marked.”

(b) Mr. R. Jones, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the difficulties experienced by students on November 8, in Part 2 of the Senior Mathematics I examination paper?

(2) If so, will he intercede as did his predecessor in the controversial 1967 Senior Physics examination paper?

Answers:—

(1) “Yes.”

(2) “See my Answer to the Question asked by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.”

ALLEGED ASSAULT OF UNIVERSITY EMPLOYEE IN CITY WATCH-HOUSE

(a) Mr. Murray, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

(1) Has his attention been drawn to an article in *The Courier-Mail* of November 13 in which Senator Keeffe made charges that a University employee, John Conn, was assaulted in Brisbane watch-house on October 25 after taking part in a demonstration in Queen Street?

(2) Did Conn at any time lay a complaint to the Police Department in connection with the alleged assault?

(3) Has Conn yet appeared in court in connection with the charge for which he was arrested? If so, did he complain to the magistrate or make any statement or complaint at the time concerning his alleged treatment?

Answers:—

(1) “Yes.”

(2) “No.”

(3) “No. He forfeited his bail.”

(b) Mr. Armstrong, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

Has his attention been drawn to an article in *The Courier-Mail* of November 13 of allegations of Queensland police brutality contained in a letter to Senator Keeffe, which he read in the Senate, has

the Senator paid him the courtesy of first contacting him on the alleged brutality or has he any knowledge of the matter?

Answer:—

"Senator Keeffe has not contacted the Honourable the Premier or me, as Acting Premier, on this matter and I doubt whether this ever entered his mind. It is quite obvious that he and Mr. Conn are attempting to gain some political advantage for the latter, seeing he is the endorsed A.L.P. candidate for Ryan at the next Federal Election. Until I read yesterday's Press report of Senator Keeffe's statement in the Senate, I had no knowledge of the subject. However, I have asked the Acting Commissioner of Police for a report and when it is received consideration will be given to its contents."

APPOINTMENT OF SOCIAL WELFARE
WORKERS AT CITY WATCH-HOUSE

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

Following his inspection of the city watch-house recently, is there scope there for the appointment of a roster of social welfare workers to give assistance in certain cases in which police may not have the time or may not be appropriate for the purpose? If so, will he consider the matter?

Answer:—

"I am unable to state what conclusions the Honourable the Premier came to following his inspection of the city watch-house, but I shall be happy to bring the Honourable Member's Question to the notice of the Honourable the Premier."

"PETERS DAIRY DESSERT"

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

(1) Is there a product known as "Peters Dairy Dessert" on sale in Queensland?

(2) Who manufactures it?

(3) Have officers of his Department's dairy research laboratory analysed the product? If so, what is the (a) moisture content, (b) fat content and (c) protein content in casein equivalent?

(4) Does the product contain any milk fat or does it contain all coconut oil?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "Peters-Arctic Delicacy Company Ltd., Boundary Street, West End, Brisbane."

(3) "Yes. (a) 63.7 per cent. moisture; (b) 8.1 per cent. fat; (c) 4.7 per cent. protein."

(4) "The product contains no milk fat. All of the fat is assessed to be coconut oil."

ADDITIONAL LAND AND CLASSROOMS,
NUDGEES STATE SCHOOL

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

(1) What area of land is being acquired for addition to the Nudgees State School grounds and what is the cost of the land?

(2) How many new classrooms are planned for the Nudgees school, when will construction commence and will the classrooms be available for the commencement of the 1969 school year?

(3) Will he consider the installation of combination blackboard and cupboards in classrooms where necessary at the school?

Answers:—

(1) "Three acres. Eight thousand dollars."

(2) "One additional classroom. Although the date of commencement of construction is not known at present, it is anticipated that additional accommodation will be available for the commencement of the 1969 school year."

(3) "A report will be obtained on the furniture available in the classrooms in question and consideration then given to the installation of this equipment."

APPLICATIONS FOR LICENCES, AIR
POLLUTION COUNCIL

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

(1) How many applications for approval were made to the Air Pollution Council during the twelve months ended September 30, 1968?

(2) What was the industry of each of the applicants and what were their names?

(3) In the terms of the survey conducted by the Air Pollution Council, what are scheduled and non-scheduled industries?

Answers:—

(1) "Applicants had three months from August 1, 1968, to make application for licences under the Clean Air Act, and 28 applications for licences were received for the period ended September 30, 1968. To date, 80 applications have been received from industries in the proclaimed areas of Greater Brisbane and Ipswich."

(2) "The names of applicants and the industries concerned are as follows:— Amalgamated Chemicals (Qld.) Pty. Ltd., general chemicals; Ammonia Company of Queensland Pty. Ltd., ammonia; Ampol Refineries Ltd., petrol; Thomas Borthwick & Sons (Asia) Ltd., meat; Brickworks Ltd., bricks; Colonial Sugar Refining Co. Ltd., sugar; C.O.N. Pty. Ltd., non-ferrous metals; W. H. Craig & Co. Pty. Ltd., non-ferrous metals; Darling Downs Co-operative Bacon Association Ltd., bacon and meat;

Education Department—Yeronga Technical College, ferrous metals; Foundries Pty. Ltd., ferrous metals; H. G. Fredline & Co. Pty. Ltd., non-ferrous metals; General Motors Holden Pty. Ltd., cars; Grenac Foundry, ferrous metals; Harpic Products Co., non-ferrous metals; Harpic Products Pty. Ltd., non-ferrous metals; Intercolonial Boring Co. Ltd., ferrous and non-ferrous metals; James Hardie & Co. Pty. Ltd., asbestos cement; McIlwraith (Bulimba) Pty. Ltd., non-ferrous metals; Nightingale Chemicals (Qld.) Pty. Ltd., general chemicals; Oxley Brickworks Pty. Ltd., bricks; Provincial Traders Pty. Ltd., meat and margarine; Pump Distributors Pty. Ltd., ferrous and non-ferrous metals; Queensland Brewery Ltd., beer; Rocklea Lead Products Pty. Ltd., lead; E. J. Smith Ingots Pty. Ltd., non-ferrous metals; Southern Electric Authority of Queensland, electricity; W. Wallace, ferrous metals. Total, 28.”

(3) “Scheduled industries are those listed as scheduled premises in the Clean Air Act. The relevant section is as follows:—‘Scheduled premises’ are defined in the Act as ‘Any premises for the time being included in the Schedule to this Act’. The Schedule is as follows:—Any premises—(a) being used for—brick, tile, pipe, or pottery works; cement works; chemical manufacturing works; coal or oil gas works; metallurgical works reclaiming metal from scrap; metallurgical works smelting or converting ores to metal of any kind; an oil refinery; a sugar mill. (b) on which there is erected any—boiler or boilers consuming or capable of consuming either alone or in the aggregate more than one ton of coal per hour or its equivalent heat value based on the use of coal having a calorific value of ten thousand British Thermal Units per pound of weight; coke oven; furnace used for the melting of non-ferrous metals; furnace or cupola used for the melting of alloys of iron or steel. (c) on which any fuel burning equipment or industrial plant is operated by the Commissioner for Railways under ‘*The Railways Acts, 1914 to 1961*’.”

COST OF FELLOWSHIPS IN MEDICINE AND DENTISTRY

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

What is the cost to the State of a fellowship in (a) medicine and (b) dentistry?

Answer:—

“The cost of a fellowship at the present time is—(a) Medicine—\$7,498 for a fellowshipholder living at home. \$9,292 for a fellowshipholder living away from home. (b) Dentistry—\$6,244 for a fellowshipholder living at home. \$7,752 for a fellowshipholder living away from home. The figures are based on the

fees and allowances payable in respect of a single fellowshipholder. They would be increased if a fellowshipholder is or becomes married in the fourth, fifth or sixth years of the course in medicine or the fourth or fifth years in dentistry when he is entitled to receive the married rate of living allowance.”

STATE-WIDE VISIT BY DIRECTOR OF CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to an article in *The Courier-Mail* of November 13, wherein it was stated that the newly-appointed Director of Cultural Activities, Mr. A. J. Creedy, is planning to visit every possible centre of cultural activity in the State in a survey beginning early next month and requesting those interested in the visit and survey to write him to a Brisbane address?

(2) If so, will he ascertain if Mr. Creedy has any idea of the immense area of the State, the diversity of its population and the time that such a visit and survey, if they are to be worthwhile, will take?

(3) How is it proposed to publicise the visit in the northern and north-western parts of the State and also the request for letters from anyone interested?

(4) How long will Mr. Creedy spend in North Queensland, particularly in Townsville, and does he propose to meet all people in that area who are interested in what they consider to be cultural activities?

(5) Will he give a detailed statement as to what he and/or his Director of Cultural Activities consider to come within the scope of the phrase “cultural activities”?

Answers:—

(1) “Yes.”

(2) “Mr. Creedy has a very clear realization of the area of the State and the time such a survey will take.”

(3) “Through publicity media and anyone who is prepared to assist.”

(4) “No decision has been reached as to length of time. He naturally hopes to meet all who are seriously concerned in cultural activities in the area.”

(5) “While it is probably impossible to define cultural activities in exact terms, the phrase could be interpreted to include:—(i) the creation, composition, or design of all the creative arts of—literature, drama, music, dancing, sculpture, painting and stage design, and of those arts which combine all or some of these arts in more complex combination, such as opera; (ii) the performance; (iii) the appreciation of those arts by the members of the public.”

STORAGE OF BARLEY BY RAILWAY
DEPARTMENT

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

With reference to bulk barley stored in the Railway Department shed in Clifton yards,—

(1) Is bulk barley loaded direct from a shed to road transport vehicles for transport to or through Toowoomba?

(2) To what destinations is bulk barley forwarded from the railway yards, Clifton, by road transport?

(3) Is barley stored in railway yards for the Barley Marketing Board?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) "The only railway storage shed in Clifton is the goods shed, but no bulk barley is stored therein. Barley is stored by the State Wheat Board on behalf of the Barley Marketing Board in sheds owned by the State Wheat Board erected on land leased by the Railway Department. Bulk barley has been loaded from these State Wheat Board sheds to road transport vehicles for transport to Toowoomba, its destination being the Toowoomba maltings. This was due to the lack of facilities for the handling of bulk barley off rail at the maltings. However, facilities for handling bulk barley off rail have now been provided and future requirements will be received by rail. I am advised that the last road delivery of bulk barley to this destination from Clifton took place on or about August 14, 1968. Barley is stored by the State Wheat Board on behalf of the Barley Marketing Board on railway land leased by the State Wheat Board at many locations."

PUBLIC BIDDING AT MOTOR-VEHICLE
AUCTIONS

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

Further to his Answer to my Question on September 18 concerning public bidding at motor vehicle auctions, have the legal officers of the Registrar of Companies and Commercial Acts now considered the reports? If so, what recommendations have been made?

Answer:—

"The legal officer is not yet in a position to express an opinion as the overall matter is also being considered elsewhere in relation to certain legislation of the Commonwealth."

ELECTRICAL TRADESMEN, RAILWAY
DIESEL SHED, CLONCURRY

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

(1) Further to his Answer to my Question on November 6 in which he stated that two electrical tradesmen worked two hours each on Sunday, will he check the accuracy of his statement?

(2) Does not one man work from 5.30 to 8.30 a.m. and the other from 8 p.m. to 12 midnight on Sundays?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "The working as advised the Honourable Member on November 6, 1968, is the working which was introduced with the week commencing November 4, 1968, and was brought about by a limit of over-time working imposed by the Electrical Trades Union. Prior to November 4, 1968, the workings of the electrical tradesmen were:—6 a.m. to 4 p.m., and the other 3 p.m. to 1 a.m., Monday to Friday, with Sunday working 5.30 a.m. to 8.30 a.m. and 8 p.m. to midnight. The information given to the Honourable Member on November 6 was correct."

MEAT SUPPLIED TO WOLSTON PARK
HOSPITAL

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

(1) Has a complaint been made that meat being delivered to the main store at Wolston Park Hospital is not being weighed?

(2) Is the meat paid for according to weight?

(3) Who made the complaint?

(4) Was it investigated?

(5) Was the complaint justified?

(6) On delivery, is the meat placed in a refrigerator or is it delivered direct on the rail to the butcher's shop?

Answers:—

(1) "I am informed that a complaint has been made to the hospital management."

(2) "Yes."

(3) "The caterer and food supervisor."

(4) "Yes, at hospital level."

(5) "No."

(6) "I understand that the usual procedure is for meat to be delivered from the truck on to the rail, thence along the rail over that section of the rail which operates the scales. The weight is checked, then the meat passes further along the rail into the cold room. It has been the practice for the storekeeper or his representative to check all weighings."

CATERING STAFF AT WOLSTON PARK
HOSPITAL

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

(1) Has the caterer and food supervisor at Wolston Park Hospital complained about the signing of the time-sheet in the main kitchen and about the staff employed there?

(2) If so, what was the nature of the complaint and what action was taken on it?

(3) Did the complaint relate to the chief cook and second cook working on the same shift?

(4) Was a complaint made about the bread for the following day's meal being cut and buttered by 12.30 p.m. on the previous day?

(5) Has the chief cook dealt with the complaint and has he complained of the caterer's non-co-operation with the staff?

(6) Did the chief cook complain that the caterer has divorced himself from the kitchen since in or about the month of April, 1968?

(7) Has a direction been requested regarding the authority of the caterer and food supervisor to interfere in the management of the kitchen?

(8) Has the chief cook complained that the caterer and food supervisor's main object is to try to disrupt the harmony existing in the kitchen?

(9) If so, what does he intend to do about the matters?

Answer:—

(1 to 9) "I have been advised that the matters raised by the Honourable Member have been the subject of complaints. I am, however, unable at this time to Answer the Questions in detail. I am having enquiries made and as soon as I am in a position to do so, I shall inform the Honourable Member of the result."

IRRIGATION DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES,
MAREEBA-DIMBULAH IRRIGATION AREA

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

(1) How many employees are at present employed in the Mareeba-Dimbulah irrigation area by the Irrigation Department in (a) administration, (b) the workshop, (c) construction and (d) all other sections?

(2) Does the workshop section carry out repair and maintenance work for other Government Departments? If so, to what extent?

(3) Will he consider having the workshop provide all service and repairs for vehicles and equipment belonging to the various Government Departments in the district?

Answers:—

(1) "Employees—Administration, 17; Workshop, 14; Construction, 33; All other sections, 35."

(2) "Work is carried out for the Department of Primary Industries when requested on their motor vehicles and some farm equipment."

(3) "The Commission does not wish to maintain a workshop to serve all Government Departments and compete with private enterprise. Its main purpose is to serve the Commission's plant being used on current construction work and maintenance in the area. However, any special services required will be carried out for other departments if personnel are available."

ADDITIONAL PRIMARY SCHOOL, MAREEBA

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

Further to his Answer to my Question on August 29 concerning an additional primary school at Mareeba,—

(1) Has a site been chosen for the location of the school? If so, where?

(2) What is the present enrolment of the Mareeba State primary school?

Answers:—

(1) "Two sites recommended for this proposed new school are at present under investigation by technical officers of the Department of Works. Until the result of this investigation is known it will not be possible to indicate the specific location of the site which will be acquired."

(2) "809."

HIGH COURT JUDGMENT IN PROFES-
SIONAL NEGLIGENCE CLAIM

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

(1) Has he noted and have his officers studied any result of the High Court's judgment on November 11 relating to the duty of care in the giving of advice?

(2) As the judgment could give impetus to an increasing amount of professional negligence claims in Australia, is there, to his knowledge, any provision in the law for indemnity insurance relating to the duty of care and to the irresponsible advice sometimes given?

(3) If there is any provision for this eventuality, has any company engaged in this type of business and what are the number of cases for negligence preferred against professional men in the last three years?

Answers:—

(1) "Both myself and the Crown Law Office have noted the decision of the High Court given on November 11 last in the case of *Evatt v. M.L.C. Insurance Co. Ltd.* The decision follows a line of cases the principal one of which is *Hedley Byrne & Co. Ltd. and Heller Partners Ltd.* (1964) App. C. 465."

(2) "It is not considered the judgment would give impetus to an increasing amount of professional negligence claims in Australia. On the contrary it will have the effect of making a person more careful in giving advice when reliance is placed on his judgment. Insurance policies may be taken out covering the risk of loss caused by negligence. Insurances issued under the Motor Vehicle Insurance Acts are particular examples of this. Many professional men have insured themselves against losses incurred by their negligence. There is nothing to prevent an Insurance Company insuring a person against risk of loss incurred in giving advice negligently."

(3) "I have no record of the number of cases preferred against professional men in the last three years. As far as is known there have been very few. Claims could be settled without litigation."

AIR POLLUTION FROM MOTOR VEHICLE EXHAUST FUMES

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

(1) Has he read the report in *The Courier-Mail* of July 25, headed "Exhaust from cars—pollution problem", wherein the Queensland Director of Air Pollution Control was quoted as having said that Brisbane would have to think seriously on the problem of motor vehicle exhaust?

(2) If so, what action is being taken to control air pollution caused by motor vehicle exhaust fumes?

(3) What mechanical alteration is necessary to the average motor vehicle for the control of exhaust fumes?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "I am advised that many recent motor vehicles registered in this State are already equipped with positive crankcase ventilation devices for control of blow-by gases. The State of Victoria has ordered that all new motor vehicles must be equipped with positive crankcase ventilation by 1970. No action has yet been taken by the Air Pollution Council to require that these devices be fitted to new vehicles."

(3) "I am further advised that these devices are applied generally to new vehicles. It is considered neither practical nor economic to convert existing vehicles; other methods of controlling motor vehicle exhausts are still in the experimental stage."

SUBSIDIES FOR SCHOOL LIBRARIES

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

(1) Further to his Answer to my Question on November 7 regarding inadequate subsidy because of lack of support in poorer communities, what subsidy for (a) library books and (b) other purposes has the Education Department paid to the parents and citizens' association of Weipa South State School since its establishment in comparison with subsidies paid over the same period to Weipa North State School?

(2) What are the numbers of pupils enrolled at the respective schools?

Answers:—

(1) "(a) Library books—Weipa South, \$31.56. An amount of \$35.96 is held in credit for the school and will be subsidised by an equal amount on application by the head teacher. Weipa North, \$199.10. (b) Other purposes—Weipa South, \$1.20; Weipa North, \$4.35."

(2) "Weipa South, 105; Weipa North, 78."

WORKS OF ART PURCHASED BY QUEENSLAND ART GALLERY

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

Regarding the following purchases, detailed under (a) oil paintings, (b) water-colours, (c) sculpture and (d) prints and drawings, in the 1967-68 Report of the Trustees of the Queensland Art Gallery, (i) from where and what organisation, gallery or person was each of them purchased, (ii) did the trustees as well as the director view all of the acquisitions before purchasing, (iii) what was the cost of each item and (iv) on whose recommendation were they acquired?

Answer:—

"(i) It is not the policy of the Trustees to make public without permission, the names of private persons from whom gifts have been received or purchases made. Acquisitions by the Queensland Art Gallery for the Financial Year 1967-68, are as follows:—(a) Oil paintings—Russell Drysdale, *Mother and Child* (1963), purchased from Artarmon Galleries, Sydney, \$10,500; Elioth Gruner, *New England Landscape*, purchased from Artarmon Galleries, Sydney, (\$3,000 of this amount was donated), \$6,500; Sali Herman, *Ravenswood*, purchased from Artarmon Galleries, Sydney, \$4,000; Brian Kewley, *Cooktown*, purchased from Artarmon Galleries, Sydney, \$210; W. B. McInnes, *Market Scene in Morocco*, purchased from Leonard Joel auction, Melbourne, \$280; Sidney Nolan, *Spanish Boy*, purchased private

owner, \$500. (b) Watercolours—Enid Cambridge, *Country Orchard*, purchased from Leonard Joel auction, Melbourne, \$35; Donald Friend, *Wiyi's Garden, Bali*, purchased from Artarmon Galleries, Sydney, \$800; Donald Friend, *The Batik Market, Bali*, purchased from Artarmon Galleries, Sydney, \$800; Frances Hodgkins, *Fishing*, purchased from Leonard Joel auction, Melbourne, \$120; Tom Roberts, *The Sick Stockrider*, purchased from Leonard Joel auction, Melbourne, \$300; R. W. Sturgess, *Farmhouse*, purchased from Leonard Joel auction, Melbourne, \$170. (c) Sculpture—Web Gilbert, *The Bomber*, bronze, purchased from Leonard Joel auction, Melbourne, \$150. (d) Prints and Drawings—Sir William Dobell, *Mathias*, pencil drawing, purchased from Artarmon Galleries, Sydney, \$550; John Glover, *Van Diemens Land*, pencil drawing, purchased from Leonard Joel auction, Melbourne, \$60; Sir Arthur Streeton, *Festa et la Salute*, pencil drawing, purchased from Artarmon Galleries, Sydney, \$65; Lloyd Rees, *San Gimignano*, watercolour drawing, purchased from Macquarie Galleries, Sydney, \$350. (ii) No. In the great majority of cases the Trustees did view the works of art before purchase. In some cases, however, the Director was commissioned to purchase after Trustees had viewed transparencies or reproductions of the work of art concerned. Very occasionally the Director, on his own initiative made purchases later approved by the Trustees. (iii) See (i) above. (iv) The Director of the Gallery and/or the Procurement Committee.”

PAPERS

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

Reports—

State Fire Services Council, for the year 1967-68.

Land Administration Commission, including the Surveyor-General, Superintendent of Stock Routes and Rural Fires Board, for the year 1967-68.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Order in Council under the State Development and Public Works Organisation Acts, 1938 to 1964.

Regulation under the Fish Supply Management Act of 1965.

FORM OF QUESTION

Mr. LONERGAN (Flinders) having given notice of a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warn the hon. member that his question will need some revision before it is permitted to appear on the Business Paper.

SUPPLY

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE—ESTIMATES— NINTH AND TENTH ALLOTTED DAYS

(Mr. Smith, Windsor, in the chair)

ESTIMATES-IN-CHIEF, 1968-69

DEPARTMENT OF PRIMARY INDUSTRIES PRIMARY INDUSTRIES

Debate resumed from 12 November (see p. 1428) on Mr. Row's motion—

“That \$5,892,284 be granted for Department of Primary Industries—Primary Industries’.”

Hon. J. A. ROW (Hinchinbrook—Minister for Primary Industries) (11.29 a.m.): Firstly, I thank hon. members for their complimentary remarks relative to officers of my department. I must say that, during the 5½ years that I have been Minister for Primary Industries, I have found them to be particularly dedicated men, but it is gratifying to hear that fact recognised by hon. members in this Chamber. It is most interesting to know that we have officers stationed in 95 country centres and also 28 research stations throughout the length and breadth of the State, excluding the four research stations under the Bureau of Sugar Experiment Stations.

Much ground has been covered during this debate so far, and I propose to deal shortly with the various matters raised by individual members. At the outset, I should like to make some general remarks concerning rural industry as a whole. Quite a few hon. members stressed the importance to the State of our rural industries.

It is a fact that two-thirds of our State's gross income is derived directly from our primary industries, either in the raw or the processed form. This is a very large proportion, and it is obvious that anything that affects these industries will affect the State's economy as a whole. This is a point that is often overlooked by people when they criticise various primary industries. It is all very well to say that this industry or that industry is being subsidised, but the critics should stop and think of what would happen if we were not reaping the substantial benefits that flow to our State from these primary industries.

During the debate several hon. members raised matters relating to the Metropolitan Abattoir. It was quite apparent that there was considerable variance and difference of opinion on this subject. Personally, I should like to make it definitely clear that I believe there should always be a service abattoir in Brisbane. Over the years that it has been there, it has cost the Government nothing. It was bought by the Moore Government from Loan Funds which were repaid, and the funds from the abattoir itself have been such that there has always been enough in kitty to keep it going. It has served as a particularly good barometer in the price

structure for our graziers and other industries and also, I believe, for the 146 operators presently using the abattoir. There is no reason why they should have their operations interfered with.

I shall deal more specifically later with points raised by individual members. Quite a lot was made of the annual report of the Queensland Meat Industry Authority, particularly in regard to country slaughter-houses. I should think it would be very difficult to sustain any argument that some of the people of this State should have to put up with lower standards of hygiene than others. The argument that this was good enough for our grandfathers and thus should be good enough for us just does not hold water. Since grandfather's day great advances have been made in matters affecting human health. Nevertheless, I should like to stress that the Queensland Meat Industry Authority's report on the matter is the outcome of a detailed public inquiry by the authority, as required under the Meat Industry Act of 1965. The authority obtained the views of the people concerned and the various local authorities, and visits were made to all slaughter-houses concerned. I will touch on this matter again later.

Another matter that was dealt with by several hon. members was the sugar industry. The main concern was the International Sugar Agreement and its likely effect. It is, of course, quite true that the agreement still has to be ratified by the various countries concerned. I think there is undue pessimism on the part of some hon. members in this respect. This pessimism is quite out of keeping with the general thinking of major authorities throughout the world.

At Geneva, on 23 October, there was no demur from the 70-odd exporting and importing countries whose delegations were acting on their Government's instructions, so that it seems reasonably certain that the necessary percentages of exporters and importers will ratify the agreement. Already the London and New York terminal markets have responded vigorously to the outcome of the UNCTAD conference. The trade has been widely reported as expecting a gradual and continuing rise in quotations once the market has settled down.

The other matter that received quite an amount of general comment—all favourable—was the dairy pasture subsidy scheme. There is no doubt that this scheme is yielding great benefits to the dairying industry, and it is pleasing to note that it is strongly supported by members of this Committee. As I mentioned in my opening remarks, the Government will have paid out about \$700,000 under this scheme during its first two years of operation, and the addition of the 70,000 acres of improved pasture will make a very significant contribution to the soundness of the dairying industry in the future.

I turn now to some of the more specific matters that were raised by hon. members.

The hon. member for Townsville North raised the very important matter of the need to obtain markets for our rural products. I agree with his view that these industries need Government help in their search for markets. Both he and the hon. member for Sandgate mentioned rice in particular, and I am happy to inform them that our Marketing Division already has a study of world rice markets nearing completion. The division is also trying to evaluate market prospects for tea. Both of those commodities are new to Queensland and could prove to be promising North Queensland crops.

The hon. member for Townsville North raised the matter of irrigation in the Burdekin area. Of course, he is aware of the fact that some additional water will be available to the Burdekin area this year from the Eungella Dam.

I mention further that officers of my department, in conjunction with officers from the Commonwealth Bureau of Agricultural Economics and our own Departments of Lands and Irrigation and Water Supply, are currently engaged on the study of further development possibilities in the Bowen, Broken and Burdekin River Basins.

The hon. member for Warwick has some fault to find with service works. I would point out to him that most of these works were constructed at the request of local authorities and that the boards consisted of local-authority members. I should hesitate to believe that a shire council that wanted to initiate or build a central slaughter-house or abattoir for its local area should not be permitted to do so. Hon. members are, of course, familiar with the history of the Cannon Hill abattoir. I think I could say with some confidence that these works have done a wonderful job for the meat industry in Queensland and that this job is by no means finished.

Turning to future service facilities, I would agree that, if private abattoirs are available and willing to enter agreements similar to that applying in the Rockhampton District Abattoir area, many of our troubles relative to abattoirs would disappear.

The same hon. member also made some comments on the recently issued milk report. If I remember rightly, he asked to be excused for being parochial. In that regard he is probably in no different position from that of a number of other people who have been commenting on the milk situation in South-east Queensland. I believe that the Government has been very open in handling this matter. I have heard suggestions that the report should have been buried, but I do not believe that that is the way in which a problem like this should be tackled. We released the report, but I should like to make it clear that it has not been accepted by the Government. It has

been widely circulated to enable all—and I stress “all”—interested parties to express their views.

The hon. member for Tablelands raised the matter of butter imports into Queensland from the southern States during the past year. This was an unusual situation, caused by a combination of drought in the dairying areas of South-east Queensland and an outbreak of three-day sickness. There is the possibility that shortages of this kind can occur from time to time.

The hon. member also mentioned the Atherton potato industry and its co-operative association, and I entirely agree with his comments on that matter. The potato industry has become very efficient, and is producing the best-quality and best-graded potatoes in Australia. I join with him in paying a compliment to Mr. Alan Beattie, the present chairman of the association, who recently returned from an overseas trip.

With several other hon. members, the hon. member for Tablelands also mentioned the dairy pasture subsidy scheme, but he made particular reference to soil conservation. Soil-conservation problems associated with the sowing of dairy pastures are well under control. Applications are approved only on the basis of recommendation by departmental field officers, and the likely soil problems and necessary conservation measures are taken into account at the time.

The hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha, from a prepared speech, spoke at some length on the milk industry, and I presume that what he said represented his views. I was very interested to hear him say that no part of the industry or the public will support the milk report, and then proceed to tell us that various big factories, such as those on the Downs and at Booval and on the North Coast, supported it because of their sectional interest. It seems to me that a lot of the comment made stems from sectional interest.

On the problem of milk supplies from across the border, I would suggest that section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution operates both ways. There is no doubt, and never has been, that section 92 could make the control of milk supplies and prices very difficult, particularly in the Brisbane area.

I noted that the hon. member indicated that he had access to certain legal opinion. The whole matter of constitutional law is a very complex one, and I am not without recourse to opinion on it. The points raised by the hon. member are being considered, and I am certainly willing to have the matter re-examined. I assure the hon. member that the whole difficult question is being kept constantly under review, not only with respect to milk, but in other fields as well.

I thank the hon. member for Port Curtis for his kind remarks concerning the officers of my department. It is gratifying to know that others are aware of our accommodation problems in William Street. I can only say that I hope they will eventually be overcome. However, I feel that it will be a gradual process. Much has been done already by the transfer of some of our laboratories to Indooroopilly, Hamilton, Wacol and so on. Indeed, we have more elbow-room there now. Our Standards Branch should be out at Indooroopilly next year. That will make a big improvement in the facilities there. After I became Minister I often used to wonder how the girls worked in the seed laboratory. It looked as though some of them had to breathe in while the others breathed out. The provision of adequate laboratory facilities must have a much higher priority than the provision of office space.

The matter of nitrate in papaws, which the hon. member raised, is very difficult. It is true that there can be different concentrations in papaws from the same paddock, and even in papaws from the same tree. That applies to sugar-cane as well. Six or seven stalks of sugar-cane from the same stool can give six or seven different analyses. We have made a good deal of progress in our research into this problem, but we still have much more to do.

My understanding of the United States meat quotas is that the diversification scheme has been adopted by the Australian Meat Board for 1969. I have not yet received any firm details of the proposed percentages of export to be diversified between the United States and other markets. I have heard that it is 3 to 1, but I cannot confirm that. I do not know that I agree wholly that the United States hygiene standards are being used as a trade barrier although the imposition of these standards could well have a retarding effect. The imposition of such standards, of course, is not restricted to the United States. Most countries throughout the world are presently concerned with the improvement of hygiene standards in food preparation and handling.

Mr. Sherrington: Some of their standards are not the equivalent of those that we have here.

Mr. ROW: I know that.

The hon. member for South Coast outlined some effects of the problem that we face with resistant ticks, and he showed that he had a good appreciation of the problem, which is a very serious one. It has proved very difficult to contain the Biarra strain of tick. As the hon. member indicated, one of our major difficulties is getting staff to provide the necessary control over cattle movement and supervision of dipping.

We will continue to do our best to control this problem. We have made an approach to the Commonwealth for financial assistance, and we have the support of the Australian Agricultural Council. So far, we have not

received a reply from the Commonwealth. Like the hon. member, I should like to see an international dairy agreement. This subject has, of course, been raised in international circles but, to date, we understand that very little progress has been made.

I am grateful for the remarks about Mr. Sam Pegg, our Chief Herd Recorder. I am very pleased to say that, in today's Press, there will be a statement indicating that, at Sam's request, we have acquired a bull calf, out of Sunny View Little Princess 30th, which will go to our Wacol centre to be used for artificial-insemination purposes.

As to the comments of the hon. member for Belmont, I feel that I have covered the matter of the present restriction on the export registration of Cannon Hill quite fully in my reply to the question raised by the Leader of the Opposition in this Assembly last week. I can add little other than to say that I have been advised by the board that it expects to complete the requested alterations in about three weeks. It is expected that the restriction placed on the works' export registration will then be removed. In this event, the question of redundancy of staff will not arise. I do not know if hon. members are aware that similar restrictions, resulting in the loss of export license, have also been placed on export killing at Homebush in Sydney, and at two Victorian works. So we are not like Robinson Crusoe in this matter.

With regard to the extended life of the Brisbane Public Abattoir, the board made a very full report supporting its recommendations to extend the life of the present works for 10 years. This report, so far as the structural strength of the main slaughter-block is concerned, had the support of the Co-ordinator-General, who took into account the substantial strengthening work carried out by the board during the past five years.

All in all, I believe that the decisions taken by the Government in respect of Cannon Hill will prove to be very wise, both with respect to the livelihood of the many people directly dependent upon these works and also with respect to the grazing and meat industry as a whole.

On the subject of eggs, I mention that the fluctuating supply position in this industry always causes concern. Egg production is highly seasonal, and prices on the local market will automatically vary with supplies. It is true that eggs are put into pulp and cold storage, but the average housewife likes fresh eggs.

There is a good deal of confusion here. The big export surplus occurs in the flush season, and egg prices then are usually low. But the situation can change very quickly when the normal seasonal decline starts. The nature of the problem is well known to both industry and Government, and a committee of inquiry would serve no useful purpose.

The hon. member indicated that he was having trouble in obtaining a copy of the

Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Acts. I was able to place a copy on his table this morning.

Mr. Newton: Thank you very much.

Mr. ROW: The only point I make concerning the contribution by the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt is that an extension of the Metropolitan Public Abattoir area would not benefit Cannon Hill to any extent. Fourteen private meatworks now supply this area.

I point out that, at this stage, the recommendations put forward by the authority go only so far as to recognise the desirability, in principle, of the extension of the area. In this regard I feel that the authority would be in agreement with the hon. member's views that, as a next step, it should provide concrete recommendations. These should take fully into account the position of existing slaughter-houses, as regards either their closure or their attaining an acceptable standard of hygiene.

The point made by the authority regarding compensation relates to a deficiency in the present Act which precludes the payment of compensation.

These matters are presently under consideration. My own thought on this is that time will effect a gradual phasing out of the smaller slaughter-houses. Many of them are buying cattle from wholesalers and getting them slaughtered at public abattoirs or bigger works. I think this will remedy itself. These slaughter-houses, over a period, will gradually disappear. Some of them are not very wholesome—and I say that with due respect to those that are. Nevertheless, in the process of time, those that are unsatisfactory will be phased out. I point out, for example, Kilcoy supplies a good deal of meat to the Redcliffe Peninsula.

Mr. Houghton: It is good meat, too.

Mr. ROW: It is good meat, and it is a beautiful abattoir.

The hon. member for Sandgate raised several matters of interest. I might mention that I took up the matter of motor traffic in the Botanic Gardens personally with the Lord Mayor—I wrote him a personal letter—but, as the hon. member no doubt realises, it is purely a matter for the Brisbane City Council.

I was most interested to hear the hon. member's remarks concerning rice and tea. As I indicated earlier, these are promising North Queensland crops, and my department is doing a good deal of work on them. The hon. member will no doubt be interested to know that the Government guaranteed funds for a small rice mill for growers in the Burdekin area a few months ago.

I am pleased that the hon. member for Logan is happy with the efforts of my department at the Redlands Horticultural Research Station. There is little doubt that this station has already well repaid our investment in it and will continue to benefit the fruit industry.

I acknowledge the assistance given by the fruit and vegetable growers themselves to this research station.

The matter of imports of rural products from overseas countries is constantly under review. This applies not only to frozen beans but also other products. Quite recently I made representations to the appropriate Federal Minister on the question of potato imports. I am always prepared to take up such matters on behalf of industry.

As the hon. member for Logan indicated, the question of costs and commissions at the Rocklea markets is constantly under review, and I have no doubt whatever that I shall be hearing from him again. I believe that that matter is now settling down and that things are not going too badly. I was pleased to hear the hon. member for Carnarvon agree that that is so.

As usual, the hon. member for Toowoomba West displayed his good over-all grasp of some of our major rural problems. He is retiring from Parliament shortly, and I want to say that although we have different political philosophies, I have always considered him as a personal friend and have always held him in high regard. Whilst I could not agree with some of his comments, I certainly agree that the over-all problem of international marketing of rural products is one of the most serious problems facing our rural industries today. Unfortunately it is a very complex problem and, unlike the domestic market, it is not one over which we can exercise any direct control. It is purely a matter of supply and demand, and in most cases we are selling on a buyers' market. All that we can do is negotiate with the countries concerned. There can be no question of compulsion for, as hon. members are well aware, negotiations of this type do not always lead to success. We—and by that I mean Australia—have had some success with the international grains arrangement and the new International Sugar Agreement. Neither agreement gives us all that we would like, but one rarely gets all that one wants in this world. The real point is that we would be much worse off without these agreements.

Although there are no international agreements for most rural products, there are quite a few bilateral agreements. These give us quite a lot of protection. The U.K. butter-quota system is a case in point. I agree with the hon. member that every effort must be made to expand our export outlets for rural products at satisfactory prices.

I do not propose to comment on the other points raised by the hon. member. I believe that they were merely raised as illustrations of the basic export market problem. However, I should like to assure the hon. member that our Division of Marketing is constantly looking at over-all marketing problems.

I was pleased to hear the remarks of the hon. member for Roma concerning meat hygiene. I, like him, see no reason why

people in country towns should have to accept any lower hygiene standards than do people in Brisbane. I have noted his comments on small-scale abattoirs and will keep them in mind. The hon. member's support for the Metropolitan Public Abattoir is well known to me. As a matter of fact, he was one of the original members of the Queensland Meat Industry Authority.

I have asked the board to explore the matter of an alternative site for the abattoir in the light of possible future needs. The board has already taken some steps in this direction, and four sites have been considered so far. None of these has turned out to be completely satisfactory, but the matter will continue to be examined.

I was most impressed that the hon. member for South Brisbane has not only discovered the cattle tick but also the origin of the Brahman bull. He was, of course, perfectly correct in stating that the annual cost of ticks to this State is tremendous. It would be well in excess of the \$25,000,000 that he quoted. Unfortunately there is often a vast difference between theory and practice. With a cattle industry as big and as scattered as the one in Queensland, tick control is not an easy problem. The hon. member is obviously not aware that on many of our remote stations, where areas are large and the country is rough, it is often difficult to find all the cattle, let alone all the ticks. I do, however, appreciate his zeal, and I can assure him that it will be matched by the zeal of my officers in their continuous efforts to overcome this most serious problem.

I must compliment the hon. member for Carnarvon on his contribution. He devoted a good deal of contemplation and research to it. He has quite a wide range of primary industries in his electorate, and I think they all received a mention. On the subject of tobacco quotas, I can assure the hon. member that these will continue to be administered with due regard to the needs of the tobacco farmers themselves.

I hope that my earlier remarks on marginal wheat areas will not be misinterpreted. I was referring mainly to expansion into what were regarded as marginal wheat areas in some of the other producing States. Queensland has never had that problem so far. It produces high-quality bread wheats, which are in strong demand not only here but also overseas; in fact, Queensland gets a good premium for its higher-protein wheat. That is not to say, however, that it is unnecessary to exercise caution. As the hon. member mentioned, it will be necessary to watch farming practices, particularly in some of the newer areas.

I am fully appreciative of the need for better shipping services to the islands and South-east Asia for our rural products, particularly from North Queensland. It is a difficult problem. To operate a shipping service profitably, one needs adequate volume; and in the case of the North, one needs the

shipping first before one can get the volume. The problem appears to have no easy solution, but it will be kept constantly under review.

I noted the hon. member's view that the cattle tick is a mere amateur compared with the sheep blowfly. Frankly, I think they are both professionals. Only by continuing research and extension will we be able to cope with them both in the future.

The hon. member for Cairns referred to the Kamerunga Horticultural Research Station. This station provides a very useful central point for research into a number of problems affecting the region, and I was glad that he mentioned Ernie Stephens, who recently retired as the chief horticulturist. It is supplemented by work carried out on commercial properties in the area, and the joint programme gives very useful results. I will keep the hon. member's suggestions relative to expansion and irrigation in mind whenever research station facilities are under review. It is, of course, all a matter of priorities.

I have already commented at some length on sugar industry matters, but I must reply to the hon. member's remarks concerning the 1964 expansion. Let me make it quite clear that the sugar committee of inquiry made its recommendations only after thorough investigation, both at home and abroad, by responsible and experienced people. Submissions were made by producers in every sugar district, and the evidence was overwhelmingly in support of expansion. Admittedly, the increased production has presented us with some problems over the last few years; but I suggest that the hon. member stop and think of the tremendous contribution that the expansion has made to the economy of not only his own district but the State as a whole. Just where would we have been after the recent sugar talks if we had not had the production record to back us? I suggest that Australia would have had a basic free-market quota of only about one-third of what it has received under the new agreement. Under the agreement, Australia has a basic quota of 1,100,000 tons. This would be less by 10 per cent. if the price is at 3.5c a lb. If the volume of the crop had been equal to the volume in 1963 or 1964, this country would have had a quota of only about 300,000 tons. When one looks at Australia's quota under the new agreement, one must look also at price. The relatively small cut in tonnage will be far more than made up by the increase in price that we can confidently expect.

Finally, I thank hon. members on both sides of the Chamber for the contributions they have made to the debate so far. I again voice my appreciation, also, for their expressions of confidence in the staff of my department and their understanding of the importance of the rural industries in Queensland's economy.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Mulgrave) (11.59 a.m.): At the outset, I commend the Minister for giving to the Committee such an extensive explanation and report.

Mr. Sherrington: Was it an explanation, or an excuse?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The hon. member for Salisbury can make up his own mind; I have already made up mine.

The Minister gave hon. members a very good indication of the work carried out by various sections of the Department of Primary Industries, and I think that must bring home forcibly to hon. members in this Chamber, and to the people of this State generally, the great importance of primary industries.

It can be truly said that the primary industries still represent the working horse of Queensland and, indeed, Australia, in the field of overseas earnings. Every thinking person should have a fair understanding of the contribution that primary industries make towards the standard of living in this country. It is true that secondary industries are catching up, and I look forward to the day when we get some balance between these two sections of industry. Primary industries have to face all the vagaries of climate, pests and what-have-you, whereas secondary industries do not have this problem.

I should also like to congratulate Dr. Harvey on his report on the activities of his department.

Mr. Sherrington: Are you going to congratulate Jim Blake after Saturday?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I do not think there will be any need to.

Mr. Sherrington: You had better go up and have a look.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I have been up to the Isis electorate and I know exactly what is going on up there. However, I have only 25 minutes in which to speak on this occasion and I want to devote that time to some of the problems that we are facing.

Very often we see reports the whole of which it is difficult for us, as members, and particularly as country members, to read. They are thick volumes and we do not get a great amount of time to read them. But this report of Dr. Harvey's—

Mr. Sherrington: If you like to come over here we will explain it to you.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I wish the hon. member would keep quiet; I am sick of listening to him trying to explain things he does not understand.

Dr. Harvey has condensed his report, yet has touched on every phase of activity covered by his department in a form that we can understand and comprehend clearly. For that, I congratulate him. The services that his department renders in all fields of primary industry must also be commended. In fact, in relation to my own area, I have spent two

or three days trying to find something that I might bring forward by way of constructive criticism with a view to improving it in some shape or form, but I have not been able to do so. That will give the Minister some indication of what his departmental officers are doing in my electorate. Perhaps two or three years ago we used to get odd complaints, but it is quite a while since we have had any of those. The work of the department's officers in every field is greatly appreciated by those in our primary industries, at least in my area.

The Minister mentioned the potato industry, which is a very important one. I notice that in our dairying industry, whilst perhaps there are fewer suppliers, production is going up. The dairy pasture subsidy scheme has been playing a wonderful part on the Atherton Tableland—in fact, in all the dairying areas, as was pointed out by the hon. member for South Coast. This scheme has almost transformed the face of the land. Only two or three years ago one could drive through the Atherton Tableland and find possibly nothing but lantana and all sorts of other rubbish growing on some of the farms. Today, on a similar drive, one would find hundreds of acres of improved pastures, and the enthusiasm and interest that this has engendered amongst dairy farmers would be very hard to explain. Most of them have availed themselves of the scheme.

Another point that I think we should all remember when talking about this phase of the department's activities is the smoothness with which the scheme went into operation. Generally, when something new is being started various "bugs" and teething problems are encountered, and it takes quite a while to work these out. The scheme came into operation fairly soon after it was announced. The department was faced with some odd problems—and they were odd—but it overcame them and the scheme succeeded in working very smoothly from its inception. It has provided a great deal of help to the dairying industry.

I should like to commend the C.S.I.R.O. on some of the work that it has performed in the field of pasture improvement and the development of legumes. One of the difficulties that will face us, if it can be called a difficulty, is in the extension services. Although the young man who nowadays is coming into the industry is only too ready to hasten to the department for its advice when he is in trouble, there are still some who do not subscribe to that policy. Some of them think that, by virtue of their experience on the land, their knowledge is much greater than that possessed by a young officer—and some of the officers are young—who comes along to help them. On very rare occasions this type of farmer is critical of a departmental officer. He might say, "The officer is giving all his assistance to somebody else and never gives any to me", but when the problem is traced through to its conclusion it is found that in the early

stages the officer has gone along to assist him and give him advice but has found that the farmer is taking no interest in what he is endeavouring to do. It is only natural for the officer to lose interest in that type of man. It is the old story: anybody who is prepared to help himself will naturally get help.

I turn now to the poultry industry. Hon. members know that quite often complaints are made by northern people who are engaged in this industry. They complain that some of the southern operators receive rail concessions, which makes it very difficult for the northern operators to compete with them. In addition, there is the problem of water content of frozen poultry. In the last couple of years this problem has been brought to the fore. Some broilers are marketed with a very high water content, and that is undesirable because it is virtually playing a confidence trick on the housewife. I cannot see any difference between the water content of frozen poultry and that of milk. I know that there needs to be some moisture content in frozen poultry, but in many cases it is too high.

Poultry breeders in the North claim that the southern dealers who supply the North have a definite advantage over them, and they are not happy about that situation. I make it clear that this criticism does not apply to all broiler dealers and processors; some have played the game fairly. Of course, an excess amount of water is not always deliberately introduced into the product. Modern processing methods tend to result in high water levels, but I understand that the problem can be overcome to a great extent if adequate care and control is exercised over processing methods.

The industry itself is now somewhat concerned about the problem because of the unfair competition which occurs when one operator uses more water than another. I must say that, in order to maintain quality, some water is inescapable in frozen chickens. Excess water is the only problem. I understand that this problem is being looked at on an Australia-wide basis, and I sincerely hope that agreement can be reached in the very near future to overcome it, because we want more industries in the North, not fewer. Electorates other than mine are affected, such as Tablelands and Mourilyan, where poultry growers are finding this competition pretty hard to handle. Some housewives are also complaining about the high water content.

I return now to primary industries generally and the part played by them. There is so much general criticism of primary industries that the average man in the street believes that he is virtually carrying some of the primary industries by way of subsidies and other assistances. I have not the time to deal with this problem as it should be dealt with, and it is very hard to get comparable figures on the assistance given to primary industries and secondary industries. This morning I

wish to speak mainly about the industry that "cops" the most criticism, namely, the dairying industry. We are told from time to time that it enjoys a subsidy of \$27,000,000. Other small assistances are also brought fairly prominently to the attention of the public. Indeed, some southern experts have suggested that we in Queensland should discontinue this "inefficient" industry and buy our butter, margarine and so on elsewhere. I strongly defend the dairying industry.

It is not very hard to get figures to prove that the whole of our primary industries, and the tariffs, protections, subsidies and financial assistance that they enjoy, represent mere chicken-feed compared with the assistance that the secondary industries are enjoying in various ways, such as tariff protection. As I said earlier, it is pretty hard to work this out on figures, but the Vernon Committee, which looked closely at the Australian economic situation in 1961 and 1962, made an effort to do just that, and it presented some remarkable figures. I think the ratio was about 8 to 1 in favour of secondary industries.

We should make it crystal clear to the people of Australia that our primary industries are still the work-horses earning our overseas income, and that they are faced with ever-increasing costs. Whilst we appreciate the advice that we get from time to time from Ministers and departmental officers that we must become more efficient, I do not think any primary industry in the world exceeds the efficiency that has come into almost all our primary industries in the past few years. Some very fine officers are constantly looking at the many phases of the problems in reducing costs and increasing production, quality, and the like, but we cannot keep ahead of rising costs by these methods alone.

This problem, too, must be looked at on an Australia-wide basis, and the sooner we bring some sanity into our ever-increasing costs, the better it will be for every Australian. Our wages are rising constantly, I do not want anybody to gain the impression that I am against our people enjoying the best possible wages and standards of living—I am certainly not—but in many cases an increase in salary almost means nothing to a person on a high salary, and the only fellow who gets fatter and fatter is the Commonwealth Treasurer; he gets the rake-off.

One of my colleagues pointed out that we are not paying enough to our salaried officers and, as a result, are losing them. I agree with him. Constantly increasing costs do not help anybody. The only genuine increase in our standard of living can come from an increase in productivity without an increase in costs. In that way we naturally increase our profits, which should be shared among the community. We must find some way of stabilising costs. We in Queensland cannot do this alone; it must be done on an Australia-wide basis. Indeed, this sort of thing is going on all over the world.

Unfortunately, we do not have much control over that, but if the problem is looked at sanely from a national viewpoint we should be able to do something about it.

I should now like to deal with tea which, along with rice and other commodities, we can grow in North Queensland. I give full marks to Dr. A. P. Maruff, of Nerada, for what he has done. He has more than 100 acres under tea. It is really a sight to see. I was there with a Federal Minister and two Federal Senators last week. This man has done a remarkable job. He has got away from most of the orthodox methods of growing tea. He has no shade trees or anything else; in fact, he has lawn growing between his tea hedges. He has a mechanical plucker that he has been using for over 18 months. He is throwing his tea away in his efforts to perfect this machine. It could be said that the man is a perfectionist. He put in many years of study before he started to grow tea. I asked him why he ventured into this field, thinking that he perhaps had relatives in the industry or that he knew quite a deal about it. But he assured me that he knew no more about it than most people who drink it—and it is not a bad drink. He has now become an expert and receives inquiries from various parts of the world on some of his techniques.

Dr. Maruff wants a factory. He has already spent about \$300,000 or more, and a factory will cost a good deal of money. As the Minister probably knows, he is appealing to the Government to assist him. I sincerely hope that by some means or other we can help him overcome this problem and let him get his tea onto the market. The Minister has tasted Dr. Maruff's tea on more than one occasion, and no doubt he agrees that it is quite a good product. I should like the Government to do all it can to assist him.

I cannot let the occasion go without saying something about the sugar industry, although the Minister himself covered most of the ground. Surely nobody doubts the wisdom of the expansion in the industry. I have not been critical of the expansion, but I have been critical of the difficulties the industry has faced and the little assistance it has got from Governments. This is an industry that makes provision for its own research, and I should like to have time to speak about the work done by the Bureau of Sugar Experiment Stations. This work is financed entirely by the industry, with the exception of about \$14,000 which the Government gives each year. That was the allocation when the Act was first implemented, and it is still the same. The industry itself finds the finance needed for all types of plant-breeding research, and the workers in this field have done a remarkable job. I think that today 70 per cent. or 80 per cent. of the cane grown is made up of varieties developed here. Very much has been done for the industry in pest control, use of fertilisers, and many other types of

research carried out in various parts of the State, but the industry itself has paid every cent of the cost.

When we in this industry got into trouble, we did not receive subsidies or grants from the Government. We had to borrow, and it was on this score that I was critical because I knew that those in low c.c.s. areas, or with crops under the mill average, were not able to borrow enough. This position created great difficulties for newcomers to the industry. However, we are around the corner now. Although we cannot expect to see the price of sugar increase substantially within the next few weeks, I feel that once the recently reached agreement comes into effect, which will not be long, there will be a marked improvement. When it appeared that the Geneva talks were going to be successful, it will be recalled that in the first few days the price of sugar rose almost £Stg1 daily. It has been stationary now for some time.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: Do you think there will be a cut-back in production?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Of course there will be a cut-back in production; that is part and parcel of the deal. Production has to be reduced to 1,100,000 tons export on the free world markets.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: Will that be good for the growers?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Of course it will be good for the growers—and for the millers, too.

Mr. Houston: What guarantee have you that that will come about?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: If the hon. member had seen a copy of the London "Times" of 25 October, part of which I was going to read to the Committee, I think he would have a little more faith in what went on at Geneva than have some hon. members on his side of the Chamber. I think it fitting that I should pay a tribute to the Australian delegation, including the Deputy Prime Minister, our Premier, and their officers, and the leaders of the sugar industry who went with them and who no doubt did a tremendous amount of work behind the scenes.

I should like to go a little further and commend those who were charged by UNCTAD to go into this problem, because they carried out months and months of very difficult research. The point that I was trying to make following the interjection of the Leader of the Opposition was that the London "Times" believes that when the agreement comes into force it will in some respects be better than the previous International Sugar Agreement.

(Time expired.)

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (12.24 p.m.): There are two or three matters to which I should like to refer

in this debate. In the first place, I wish to refer to Queensland's trade, particularly with overseas countries. I think all will agree that the most important market for any commodity, whether it be from primary or secondary industry, is the home market. Unfortunately Queensland has not developed as a State in accordance with the great promise shown up to 1957.

Although the present Government boasts a great deal about decentralisation and increased population, the fact is that Queensland has not got its fair share of immigrants; in fact, the total number who have come here is less than that in other Australian States, and that is to be regretted. As a result, the expansion hoped for in home markets has not been achieved and producers have had to look for markets outside the State.

It is unfortunate that, although missions representing primary and secondary industries have been sent overseas, no permanent centres have been established for Queensland's overseas enterprises. I believe that a very large market is available in Indonesia, Malaysia, Taiwan, Japan, the Philippines, and perhaps Hong Kong and Singapore, if we can only get into it. We will not get into it with an isolated approach by one pressure group going there to sell a particular commodity. As I said in the Budget debate—I reiterate it because I think it is all-important—the State must set up trade commissioners in those countries. The cost of maintaining them will be repaid handsomely by the increased markets that become available. It is no good talking about expansion if there is nowhere to sell the products.

The hon. member for Mulgrave said that he hoped the new sugar agreement will be better than the last.

Mr. Armstrong: I did not say that. I was quoting the views of the London "Times".

Mr. HOUSTON: That is the trouble. Recently the Minister for Health quoted views held in other nations; now the hon. member for Mulgrave has quoted views from London. Let us give Queensland's views.

Mr. P. Wood: The trouble is that hon. members opposite haven't got any views.

Mr. HOUSTON: Their attitude is, "If you haven't got any views yourself, quote somebody else".

Mr. Armstrong: The views expressed by the "Times" coincide with those held by the Minister and myself. If the hon. gentleman had been listening, he would know that.

Mr. HOUSTON: The hon. member for Mulgrave has had his say; now I will have mine.

It cannot be denied that Queensland embarked upon an expansion programme in the sugar industry without any known additional markets. If there had been a known

additional market and the industry had then embarked upon expansion, the Government would have had something to boast about.

If my memory serves me correctly, in the days when the late Forgan Smith and Ned Hanlon were associated with sugar agreements, before any expansion was allowed they said in this Chamber, "We now have assured markets for additional production", and then called upon the growers to produce the goods. The Country-Liberal Government did not do that; in fact, it did just the reverse. Now an adjustment has to be made.

Mr. Armstrong: So did every other country.

Mr. HOUSTON: That does not make it right. We are too prone, under this Government, to follow somebody else. Queensland should be a leader in this field. The Government says, "This State leads." It does not lead. The only field in which it leads is in giving away its natural resources, and it certainly leads there.

I believe that the State should establish offices overseas in which prospective buyers can talk to someone representing Queensland. All hon. members know the value of personal contacts, and those who have had the good fortune to visit the countries to which I referred earlier know that the officers of the various Commonwealth Government departments who are stationed there will say quite openly, "It takes us a few months to understand the people. Once we understand them, we can talk to them and do business with them." In fact, the hon. member for Carnarvon can bear me out when I say that in Indonesia we spent some time with a businessman who said, "You have to understand the people to know their needs". I believe that that is so. There are markets there if we are prepared to spend the time, money and energy getting them.

It is true, unfortunately, that many of our potential customers have not the money with which to buy our products. One of the factors that makes the beef industry so complicated is the dominance of American beef in South-east Asia. If one goes to countries in that area, one buys American beef, not Australian beef.

Mr. R. Jones: And New Zealand.

Mr. HOUSTON: New Zealand lamb, but American beef. We do not know what those countries are going to buy or not going to buy, but the Americans are there already.

We must establish some long-term means of communication so that we will understand the problems of the people.

Mr. McKechnie: And a system of exchange, of course.

Mr. HOUSTON: That is right. This, I think, would naturally follow. However, I do not want to go into the fields of education and other things that can be tied up with this type of communication between nations.

We also found that outsiders did not understand the problems involved. I think it was at Singapore that an effort was made to switch the diet of waterside-workers. Because of the shortage of rice an effort was made to switch the diet of waterside-workers from rice to a flour-cake or biscuit type of meal in the morning. We would prefer the flour mixture to the rice mixture, but this was not the case with these people. They objected to the stage of nearly going on strike, and said that their bellies were empty too soon after having a meal of this flour-type diet rather than of rice. Of course, the authorities switched back to rice. I might interpose here that the employers of waterside labour in Singapore undertake to supply, as part of the terms of employment of waterside-workers, I think, breakfast and a bit of lunch. This is part of the income structure. However, they did not have this local knowledge and thought, as a result, that a change-over from one food to another would do the trick. So far as calory content is concerned flour might be as good as rice, but from the point of view of the local people it was a completely different story. My first point, then, is that we should get to understand these people.

There has been much talk about beef production and increased production in other fields—canneries, eggs, fruit, rice and so on—but we will not get markets for these products unless we get out and find them. If Queensland is to decentralise, if our irrigation projects are to be worth while, if we are to get the large irrigation schemes that we need for existing industries, we must also move to bring in new industries. The existing industries are not sufficient in volume to warrant the large irrigation schemes that this State needs, but with other industries commencing these schemes would be a good proposition. We have to take the over-all view, and first of all get markets for the products that we are not yet growing.

If one looks at the primary products that we are selling overseas—wheat, wool, hides, and some meat—these do not involve industries that have been created over the last two or three years. We in Australia as a whole, and Queensland in particular, have not come up for many years with a new primary industry for export purposes. As I have already said, I think we have to get our markets overseas first.

Mr. Porter: What State has come up with a new primary industry recently?

Mr. HOUSTON: As I said before, I am not going to spend 25 minutes arguing about other States. I always was, and still am, proud to be a Queenslander, and one thing I could always say until a few years ago was that Queensland led Australia in this field. Do not let us worry about other States. Queensland relies on primary products first and foremost, as other hon. members have said, and I do not disagree with them.

Mr. Porter: That is just gas-filled propaganda.

Mr. HOUSTON: Rubbish! Talking about being gas filled, the hon. member's bubble nearly burst when the Liberal convention got on to him.

Mr. Porter: I am still here.

Mr. HOUSTON: We will not go into that.

I now want to spend a few moments on the Brisbane abattoir. We have heard much about its loss of export licence, and it was rather comical to hear the two Ministers, one Federal and the other State, bandying statements backwards and forwards as to the reason. Our Minister said, "I am right." The Federal Minister said, "No, he is not right. I am." This would be comical if it were not so serious from the point of view of the employment of many people whose livelihood depends on this commodity. As I said, it would be like a comic opera but for the tragic fact that human livelihood is involved. I believe that the loss of the abattoir's export licence has been brought about primarily by the failure of the Government to understand the problem relative to the Brisbane abattoir.

On many occasions the Opposition has submitted that the abattoir buildings should have been rebuilt. As proof of that, I shall read some of the questions that have been asked and ministerial replies thereto, which will show that the matter was raised, not last week, and not last March, as the Federal Minister said it was, but years ago.

In volume 238 of "Hansard", 22 September, 1964, the following question was asked by the hon. member for Belmont—

"What was the number of (a) new buildings erected and (b) buildings remodelled and renovated at the Brisbane Abattoir yearly as from June, 1957-58 to June, 1963-64?"

He also asked what was the amount of yearly expenditure on new buildings and remodelling and renovations for the same period.

In his answer the Minister said that in 1963-64 the sum of approximately £49,000 was spent on remodelling and renovating the main block to bring it up to the requirements of the United States Department of Agriculture; so that as far back as 1963-64 the Government knew that the Brisbane abattoir required remodelling and renovation in order to retain its place as a supplier to the U.S. market.

On 7 October, 1964, the hon. member for Belmont asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

"Is it a fact that the Co-ordinator-General's Department is carrying out certain structural investigational work at the Brisbane Abattoir concerning (a) the whole of the killing floor and sub-floors and (b) the tank house building including all sub-floors and foundations?"

The Minister replied—

"The investigation has revealed a period of life subject to strengthening of supports, and removal of excessive loading, varying from five to twenty years for different sections of the buildings, which have degenerated to varying degrees according to age and different type and degree of usage. The Co-ordinator-General has recommended certain repairs, and work on the slaughter floor and canning building to give a life of five years has been completed. Work is nearly complete on the repair of the tank house, following the completion of which there should be no fear concerning the safety of this building for the next five years also. Thus adequate precautions to ensure the safety of the personnel working on the plant have been undertaken."

So at that stage, too, the Government knew that work was required on the building.

Then, on 25 August, 1966, I asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

"Did the Government as reported in 'The Courier-Mail' of December 4, 1964, decide to rebuild the Brisbane Abattoir? If so, what progress has been made?"

The Minister's reply was—

"The Government has taken a decision to build a works to replace the present public abattoir at Cannon Hill and the Metropolitan Public Abattoir Board has been requested to prepare design and cost estimates. These are now at the stage of being finalised and it is expected that they will be submitted to the Queensland Meat Industry Authority shortly."

I do not know how soon "shortly" is, but that was the Minister's reply on 25 August, 1966. We are still waiting for "shortly" to come along.

Then, on 10 August, 1967, I asked the Minister—

"Has any progress been made with the proposed re-building at the Brisbane Abattoir? If not, why not?"

The Minister replied—

"Extensive design, engineering and economic investigations have been carried out by the Metropolitan Public Abattoir Board as respects the various alternative ways in which the existing works can be replaced.

"In the main these ways relate either to the possible building of a separate complete new works or the building of separate new slaughter floors and some chillers linked to those sections of the existing premises which can be continued in use for some time. In the latter case the facilities continued in use would be progressively replaced as their useful life expires. These investigations are now approaching finality and it is expected the firm recommendations will be forthcoming in the near future."

Here again, we see "near future". That was back in 1967, and it is now the middle of November, 1968.

Let us face the facts. In my view, the board has no intention whatever of doing anything constructive or spending any worthwhile money at the Metropolitan Public Abattoir. The Government is letting this establishment roll along, hoping that something will turn up. If an overseas company, particularly if it was American, had wanted financial help, it would soon have been made available. I call on the Government to get on with the job, through the board, of building a new, modern public abattoir. I was pleased to hear the Minister say that he believed we should always have a service abattoir in Brisbane. But I do not want a token works; I want one that is sufficiently large and of good quality, and can be extended to meet the needs of the city.

Mr. Murray: You would throw all the private operators out. That is what you want.

Mr. HOUSTON: That is a lot of nonsense. When a Bill was introduced in this Assembly a couple of years ago, we were told that it would not interfere with the operation of the abattoir. We said that if the private companies were allowed to come into this field the Government would gradually try to kill this abattoir. After three or four years Government members are saying, "Look at the hundreds of thousands of dollars that have been lost each year; the State cannot carry these losses; get rid of the Brisbane abattoir." But for the election next year, that would happen. I do not doubt the Minister's honesty and sincerity, but I do say that the Government's policy is to let this facility gradually deteriorate so that it can accumulate facts to justify getting rid of it.

I am not now giving only my own views on this matter. What I am saying is based on facts presented in this Chamber from time to time. In 1965-66 the Minister indicated that the abattoir showed a surplus of \$170,837. That was a good working surplus which should have continued year after year, but, as I have proved from the answers given by the various Ministers, all we have are promises of, "Something in the future"; "nearly ready"; "in the future". Many other expressions were used, but all we got were words; there was no positive action.

In 1966-67 the facility showed a deficit of \$231,641 and, in the next year, a deficit of \$156,046. Those figures are contained in answers to questions; they are not mine. The losses have not been occasioned by the men working there, or by their inefficiency. As we know, the can-pack system was introduced, and certain other innovations resulted in fewer men being employed. I am annoyed when I hear people say that the only way to save money is to have fewer employees, or to reduce their conditions. That is a continuing attitude. They say, "If we are to save we must save on wages by reducing the number of employees." But the answers to

questions asked in this Chamber do not prove that, as I think my colleague the hon. member for Salisbury interjected. The through-put of cattle in 1966-67 was 152,884 head. In the year before the franchise was abolished the cattle through-put totalled 249,721. Where did the other cattle go? The Minister may say that there was a drought, or there were some other adverse conditions, but that is not the case. The killings of the other abattoirs around Brisbane and in nearby centres indicate where the cattle went to, as their killings rose proportionately.

The number of sheep and lambs slaughtered at the Brisbane abattoir decreased from 922,809 to 655,066. The number of pigs slaughtered increased by 10,000, but calf slaughterings decreased from 100,216 to 66,282. This trend has continued. In 1966-67 the number of cattle killed dropped to 133,361, sheep and lambs rose slightly to 782,595, pigs were approximately the same and calves dropped to 61,923.

The whole problem is through-put. The cost of servicing or processing the beast is worked out on a certain estimated through-put for the year. I do not want to go through the questions again to prove that this is not only my view. It is substantiated in the answers given by various Ministers. I do not doubt in any way the accuracy of the answers; nor do I criticise them. I am using them because I feel they were factual at the time.

As cost is based on through-put, naturally, if through-put is not maintained one of two things must be done: the charges must be increased, and this reflects on the price paid by the consumer, or the through-put must be increased. That is the answer. There cannot be an increase in through-put at an abattoir that is losing markets or will possibly lose markets. Once customers are chased away from a service abattoir—and this would apply also to a private abattoir—there is little chance of getting them back again. This is a worrying feature.

Let me now refer to the reasons given by various Ministers for the present problem at the Brisbane Public Abattoir. After a good deal of backing and filling, they said the trouble was that an inspector or inspectors allowed a contaminated beast to go through. I do not deny that this could have happened. The practice at the abattoir is to rush these things through and to cut down on the number of men employed. If an inspector sees something he is not happy about and has no time to check it then, he puts a card on it. If that card, which is hung on the hook, falls off, blows off, or is missed, the carcass follows the normal process. It is quite human that that could happen. I do not think it happens very often; but when it does, it is discovered somewhere along the line. In answer to a question, the Minister said that that meat does not get to the consumer, or to the overseas market. This is most important.

The man who caused all the trouble up here is a vet. I do not deny that. But let us take it as his opinion. In answer to other questions, Ministers have said that our standard of hygiene is pretty good. I have no fight with that, but I have a fight with the state of the abattoir building and the conditions under which the men work. They could, and should, be improved. To me, this is most important. The life of an industry in Brisbane and the employment of hundreds of men depend on this abattoir. The Government should build a new one.

(Time expired.)

Mr. PILBEAM (Rockhampton South) (12.49 p.m.): In my speech in the Budget debate I devoted some time to discussing the Queensland meat industry. Now that the Estimates of this department are before us, I propose to deal with this industry at greater length.

From time to time Rockhampton has been referred to as a "cow town". I accept this appellation as a compliment rather than as a term of degradation. Rockhampton, as the centre of an area with the greatest number of beef cattle in Australia within a 200-mile radius, has always been virtually a cow town. I am proud to say that our main industry, the beef industry, is now coming to the fore as Queensland's most important industry. Its exports account for the highest return of any industry to the State. For years the return from sugar was very high on the list, and I express the hope that it will again rise to great heights. Wool was for many years a very important export, but this industry has also fallen on not-so-fortunate days.

Figures that I shall quote show that the beef industry is having its day and, with improved pasture methods, the clearing of brigalow land, the provision of dams, the attractive prices offering in the United States, and improvement in grazier-management techniques, the prospects of beef continuing to prove our most important industry are very rosy indeed.

Figures taken from the 1967 Year Book show that in the year ended June, 1966, Queensland exported beef and by-products to a total value of \$152,500,000. In the same year, the total value of sugar, export and otherwise, produced in the State was less than \$115,000,000, and the total value of wool produced was just under \$91,000,000. These figures definitely prove that beef is the main primary product of Queensland, yet I venture to say that it invokes less attention and less publicity than any of our other major products. It appears that it is simply taken for granted.

It is interesting to note how this industry had its birth in Central Queensland. The first meatworks in Rockhampton were established in 1868 with a small boiling-down works at Laurel Bank, 10 miles inland from Rockhampton on the banks of the Fitzroy

River, and the whole plant was removed to its present site at Lake's Creek in 1877. In those days refrigeration was unheard of, and canning processes were still in their infancy. The original works were for the boiling down of carcasses for tallow and the salting of hides for export. Nothing at all was done about beef.

In about 1880 the company, which was then known, as it is now, as the Central Queensland Meat Export Co., made its first venture into the export of frozen meat. On 13 September, 1883, when, for the first time in Queensland's history, insulated rooms were filled with frozen cargoes awaiting shipment, the works caught fire and were almost destroyed. It is interesting to read the account of that fire in "The Morning Bulletin" of that day. The fire broke out at 1 o'clock in the morning, and a stockman was sent to Rockhampton to alert the fire brigade. The brigade came down the road in a truck, but when it was half way to Lake's Creek the wheels came off. Hoses were then put on a special train which was sent down to Lake's Creek, and the equipment arrived at 6 o'clock in the morning. "The Morning Bulletin" said, in its very conservative way, "By this time, needless to say, the fire had a very good hold." The plant was rebuilt, and was operative again after a period of 12 months.

The early experiments in frozen beef met with mixed success and the works had its ups and downs, changing hands several times. At the turn of the century the canning process had been perfected, and this works supplied large quantities of corned beef to the soldiers in the Boer War and also in the two succeeding world wars. I think it fair enough to say that it was much better beef in those days than is being canned at the present time.

It has been established beyond doubt that the C.Q.M.E. Company is the oldest-established meatworks in Australia, and it has undergone many difficulties in the course of its long life. I am happy to say that it underwent a \$3,000,000 modernisation programme in 1964 and is now one of the most modern and hygienic works in the country.

Mr. Aikens: Why is the hon. member for Rockhampton North so hostile to it?

Mr. PILBEAM: I would not say that.

The introduction of the new modern meatworks, the Fitzroy Abattoir, in 1964 marked a forward step in the meat industry in this district and helped to fill a gap caused by the closing-down of Swift's meatworks at Gladstone.

In the early days of the industry it relied solely on British breeds, but the introduction of the exotics has given the industry a very solid uplift. How far this trend has been established in Central Queensland is evidenced

by the fact that the State headquarters for the Brahman Cattle Society were established in Rockhampton this year.

One of the most unfortunate trends that has had to be combated in recent years—it is one to which I have referred on many occasions—has been the effort by this department and other interested people, particularly certain growers, to introduce district abattoirs into every part of the State. I must repeat again that these have not been a success, and every day fresh evidence is forthcoming to prove my contention that the future of the beef-export industry lies in competitive private-enterprise works. If district abattoirs are erected, they must be erected in areas in which they are necessary to provide hygienic killing for the local market, and then only if there are no private-enterprise works in the area that can undertake killing.

Almost every district abattoir in Queensland is running at a substantial loss. I have quoted the losses at Mackay and Brisbane—I do not propose to quote them again—and the latest report on the activities of the Brisbane abattoir clearly proves my point. It made a profit on the local trade but incurred quite a substantial loss on the export trade. That proves that local abattoirs may be necessary to provide hygienic local killing conditions, but they cannot compete on the export market with the highly competitive private-enterprise works, and they should not be asked to do so.

That conclusion has not been reached in Australia alone. America has long given away Government-financed abattoirs and is relying wholly on private enterprise. I shall read, for the information of hon. members, an extract from "The Pastoral Review" of 18 October, 1968, which gives some indication of the position in England. The article is headed "The United Kingdom Meat Notes. Abattoir Economics", and says—

"The meat industry here is particularly sensitive on this question of municipally-owned abattoirs. These seem often to be built more to reflect prestige on the local authority than as a commercial proposition, and the result is that many and possibly most of them in this country lose money and have to be subsidised from the rates. (Does this not have a familiar ring for Australians?—Ed.)"

Later the case is referred to in which the Norwich Corporation sold its district abattoirs, which were suffering a substantial loss, to a private-enterprise company. I think that bears out that other countries have come to the same conclusion as Australia is inevitably coming to now—that the answer to the increase in meat production lies not in district abattoirs but in private-enterprise works.

Mr. Aikens: Too much administrative dead wood.

Mr. PILBEAM: There is no doubt about that.

[*Sitting suspended from 12.59 to 2.15 p.m.*]

Mr. PILBEAM: No better example can be given of the increased efficiency of a private-enterprise works over a district abattoir than by comparing the works at Rockhampton and Brisbane. In Rockhampton we have private-enterprise works maintaining employment throughout the year. They were the only two works operating and exporting at full capacity last year. In Brisbane the abattoir showed a substantial loss last year.

I have heard many speakers explaining why losses were sustained at the Brisbane abattoir, and offering many excuses. The Leader of the Opposition did this just before lunch. The plain fact of the matter is that we do not have to make excuses for the private-enterprise works in Rockhampton; they are making profits. However, we have to make excuses for the abattoir in Brisbane.

Mr. Houston: They are not excuses; it is simply bad Government policy.

Mr. PILBEAM: They are still excuses. We do not have to make excuses for private enterprise works—under the same Government. Queensland seems to have suffered more than any other part of Australia through Labour's outmoded policy of socialisation. We have had—I say "had" advisedly—State stations and State butcher shops. We also had the British Food Corporation, although I am fair enough to say that this body pioneered the grain-growing industry in Central Queensland.

There is a tendency to continue to advocate these socialisation policies in certain directions, and I was pleased to hear my young confrere the hon. member for Warwick, and also the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt, attack the Q.M.I.A. policy for extending the Brisbane abattoir franchise area.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. PILBEAM: I know something more about it than hon. members opposite. Surely if the only argument in the favour of district abattoirs is to provide hygienic killing, this department, in collaboration with the Q.M.I.A., can evolve a small, economic, hygienic killing unit which would serve the industry and obviate the necessity for travelling cattle long distances on the hoof with an equivalent long return on the hook.

If profit is the aim, there is no way that one can convert an abattoir that is showing a loss into a profit-making concern by extending its franchise area. That is not the answer. The abattoir board with which I am associated, and which is relying entirely on killing services supplied by private enterprise, has submitted a case to the Q.M.I.A. for some better system of control at Canberra and for a reliable interpretation of the regulations. There appears to be no uniformity at all between Government veterinarians, and no standard interpretation of the requirements for an export works. I have seen that exemplified in Rockhampton, where a small works was closed down because of the requirements imposed on it by various visiting

veterinarians. Each one had a different interpretation of what should be brought into being to bring the works up to export standard.

Everyone is familiar with the recent trends in the trade, with the history of the loss in the United Kingdom markets and the increase in exports to the United States. We think it should be recognised by the authorities, both political and economic, that the importation of the type of beef that we send to the U.S.A. in fact helps the general market situation for the American cattlemen, because our leaner meat is used in conjunction with the fatter trimmings from the lot-fed beef that the Americans specialise in. This provides an ideal material for hamburgers and prepared barbecue sausages. The cattlemen's lobby in the United States has been most vocal and persistent, and in order to improve the situation, under a Bill passed by Congress in 1964, the Government of the United States of America proclaimed a global quota on imported meat. This Bill provides that quotas will not be triggered off, provided the overall imports are below the stipulated level.

As Australia supplies 50 per cent. of the meat imports into the United States, it is most important that the Australian Meat Board and the Australian Government, with the collaboration of the whole export industry, should agree on methods by which this country will regulate supplies to the United States without antagonising the Government of that country. This will leave the way open to negotiations for vital additional quotas.

These background facts are necessary to illustrate what has happened to our beef-processing industry. Although veterinary requirements have forced major changes in the meatworks, they have brought about a dramatic improvement in hygiene and methods of production, which has put Australia in a competitive position with other countries. Moreover, other countries to which we seek to export beef products are following the example set by the United States of America and are updating their requirements. Of course, the United Kingdom is a graphic example of this.

The problems that face us relative to the U.S. market highlight more than ever the need to diversify export surpluses to other countries, the most promising of which, in the Pacific basin, is Japan. The promotion of beef-eating in Japan requires special attention, because the Japanese are traditionally fish-eaters. I understand that the board is paying particular attention to this promotion. In the past, imports into Japan have been regulated by the Japanese Treasury, which allocated only a certain amount of money for meat imports. This policy is now being changed owing mainly to pressure from the Japanese people, whose incomes are rising and who have now acquired a taste for meat.

It is very important that in considering the cattle industry we also look at the export of beef through the ports. When we do that in

Central Queensland we naturally think of Port Alma, which last year exported beef to a total value of \$38,000,000. Unfortunately, that is not at all a lucrative undertaking for the port, because of the slow turn-round of ships, the very high labour content of the handling operations, the old types of ships that are being used and the necessity to build specialised ships for the trade and to introduce unit or container-cargo methods.

Some part of the cost to the industry has been recovered owing to the boning-out of beef, but this processing method has had an adverse effect on ports. With the taking out of the bone from the meat its weight has been cut in half with the result that the harbour boards receive only half the previous amount of harbour dues.

In the case of Port Alma, or any other port, it is necessary to add other compatible cargoes in order to make the port's operations economic. That is why it is such a tragedy that Central Queensland faces the possible loss of grain exports through Port Alma. It is a tragedy not only to the beef industry but also to the salt industry, which will not be able to share, with grain, the handling costs over the conveyor belt. At the present time the export of beef through Port Alma requires the payment in harbour dues of twice the amount that is paid in any other port in order to maintain the economy of the port. With the export of wheat this burden would have been lifted from the shoulders of the beef-producers. Do not forget that many of the people who produce beef in Central Queensland also grow grain. For that reason the Rockhampton City Council and the Rockhampton Harbour Board decided to make a joint approach to the Government to set up an impartial committee to hear evidence from both ports interested and also from all interested industries and determine which port could most economically export grain from Central Queensland.

It has been said that the time element comes into the matter, and here the advantage must lie with Port Alma. A large construction firm is presently working in that area and therefore would not need to impose establishment costs in order to construct grain-storage facilities, and by next February a bulk conveyor, which could handle all the grain of the Central Queensland area as well as salt, will be completed. On the element of time, therefore, the advantage must lie with Port Alma.

In case hon. members think that Rockhampton is being unreasonable in asking the Government to establish an impartial committee to deal with this matter—to settle it between the two ports—I draw attention to the fact that early in 1958 a similar request was made by the Gladstone Harbour Board when the Rockhampton Harbour Board sought to raise money to build the road to Port Alma and rebuild the port. That request for the establishment of a committee to determine the issue was granted. On that

occasion, ironically enough, the Gladstone Harbour Board chairman (who was then Mr. Martin Hanson, now a member of this Assembly) said that he favoured the appointment of a board of inquiry consisting of port officials from outside Queensland. He said that Gladstone had no fear of the result.

I am quite sure that no-one need have any fear of the result of setting up a committee such as this. The only result would be to establish, without prejudice, which port could most economically handle this cargo and other compatible cargoes that could pass through the one export point. I am certain that the grain people would not resent it. If they were right in their decision, the findings of this committee would only verify the fact that they were correct in their judgment.

I can see no argument against this proposal, because I feel that interests besides those of grain have come into the picture. If we are to work in the best interests of the development of the State and in the best and most economical interests of these primary products that have to be exported from Central Queensland, this is the way to do it. If such a committee is established and its determinations made known, I assure the Government that the Rockhampton people will be prepared to accept them without demur.

Mr. SHERRINGTON (Salisbury) (2.27 p.m.): In speaking on these Estimates, I wish to deal with a matter of some concern to the pineapple industry. Because of the fears expressed to the Opposition by persons closely associated with this industry, I feel that I have an obligation to raise this matter during the debate on these Estimates. I raise it because of a series of events in the industry following the action taken by this Government in the last six or seven years.

To canvass the matter in retrospect, I refer to the fact that in 1962 Cabinet appointed a committee of three, consisting of Mr. Lehane, Mr. Jones, and Mr. R. L. Murray as chairman, to investigate the alleged inequity of the Northgate Cannery agreement with respect to all growers. Following the investigations of this committee a report was submitted to the Minister in January, 1963.

This very pertinent statement appeared in the report—

“Whilst several of the persons making submissions belittled the value to the cannery of powers exercised by the C.O.D. under the Fruit Marketing Organisation Act, notably the power to direct the marketing of fruit, there was a stronger consensus of contrary opinion which the committee accepts as being correct.

“The cannery therefore should not be removed . . .”
I repeat that phrase—

“The cannery therefore should not be removed from the C.O.D. organisation.”

The report then stated—

“The committee has already expressed the view that the conditions of subscription set out in circular No. 8 should be honoured. This circular, however, did not hold out as an inducement to subscribers further benefits as determined from time to time.

“Because of the place that the cannery holds in the fruit and vegetable industry, the granting of additional benefits to subscribers could have upsetting and far-reaching effects and create a position of uncertainty. The cannery could thus be used by the fully-subscribed and over-subscribed growers as an instrument to further strengthen their position.”

I believe that the fears expressed in this report are fast becoming reality.

In March, 1964, the Government did amend the Fruit Marketing Organisation Act. It took Northgate Cannery from the C.O.D., a corporate body which acts as a commodity board—that is a very important aspect of this whole question because the C.O.D. was able to plan and direct the industry and to do all those things which it felt would bring greater benefit to the industry—and gave ownership and control of the Golden Circle Cannery to a new corporate body called the Cannery Board. The powers of this board were contained in the Cannery Agreement, which gave rights and obligations to growers who subscribed capital to the cannery.

I do not think that it is necessary for me to canvass subsequent events in complete detail, except to say that by Order in Council dated 17 December, 1966, the Cannery Agreement was amended to give subscribers additional powers to those contained in circular No. 8.

As the cannery has been operating for the benefit of subscribers in much the same way as any other public company operates for the benefit of its shareholders, it has had to pay income tax. It is obvious that the Cannery Board cannot legally be protected by pineapple direction. Because of this and because of action that has been taken subsequent to the setting up of the Cannery Board, that board intends to implement a two-pool plan for the handling of pineapples. No. 1 Pool will consist of fruit sold on the very economic home market, and No. 2 Pool will consist of fruit that is not covered by script and will be sold on the uneconomic export market.

The salient feature is that this is not an industry plan. I impress on the Committee that it is in effect a plan which the Cannery Board hopes to put into operation. Serious doubts can be cast on this plan. Legal opinion is that any individual, partnership, or limited company would have power or authority to do what the 1964 Act enables the Cannery Board to do. I believe that the Cannery Board has no power whatsoever to implement an industry plan.

As has been the case in other industries, such as the sugar industry, particularly since the war, the cannery has prospered because of organised marketing. I believe that this was achieved by pineapple direction and particularly by the various policies laid down from time to time by the C.O.D. There are serious and grave doubts whether such a plan can now be implemented by the Cannery Board. For instance, once direction has been suspended, there will be nothing to stop new canners, without a pineapple quota, buying direct from growers.

I also believe it to be extremely doubtful whether the C.O.D. can legally prevent canners who have a pineapple quota from buying direct from growers. For many years—I believe that most hon. members are familiar with this—an equalisation scheme has been in operation, and this, of course, operates in such a way that the canner who sells on the profitable home market subsidises the canner who sells on the unprofitable overseas market. When canners are buying direct from growers, they will not be compelled to contribute to the equalisation scheme.

Only recently the Minister indicated, in answer to questions asked in the House by Opposition members, that subscribers will have to sell all their fruit for processing to the Cannery Board. No doubt the board believes that other canners will not be able to buy fruit, as the majority of growers are subscribers. However, the Opposition believes—and, I believe, rightly—that subscribers with small quotas in No. 1 pool will have little difficulty in finding a way round this provision of the Cannery Agreement.

Assuming that the Cannery Board was able to control other canners and make the rationalisation plan work, time would show that growers with a small quota in No. 1 pool who left the industry would have their subscriptions bought by growers with substantial quotas in No. 1 pool, as this is the type of grower whose operations are mechanised and who would want to cut his costs by keeping his machinery operating. This is what happens in all industries in which mechanisation takes place, as it is not profitable to mechanise unless the machinery is kept operating. The whole success of mechanisation depends upon the amount of work that machines can be made to do.

Many of the growers with small quotas have other interests, such as dairying, banana-growing and vegetable-growing, and, when they cease pineapple-growing, they would not want to sell their properties. As time goes by, the larger producer will want to retire or sell out. As his business is based on pineapples, and possibly pineapples only, he will want to sell everything as a going concern and will wait for the right buyer. With such a large amount of finance involved in the subscription, plant and property, it is reasonable to expect that many of these properties will be bought by companies.

This is a very disturbing feature of what can develop because of the situation envisaged in the remarks that I have made. For instance, in the sugar industry the quota is assigned to the property, and if the producer wishes to leave the industry he sells his farm, home, machinery and quota as a going concern. In the plan of the Cannery Board, the quota is based on subscription only. It is because of this that we feel that there is room for grave doubt about what might happen eventually, because we feel that many quotas will be aggregated by companies.

Before the Minister authorises the necessary amendments to the Cannery Agreement, I believe that he should investigate every aspect of it to make sure that the rationalisation plan is possible, and I should particularly like him to investigate the practicability of introducing legislation for the establishment of a pineapple industry board, particularly with the authority such as was originally intended, and in fact held by the C.O.D., to organise the pineapple industry. I believe that the plan should provide for the stabilisation of the industry and should be similar to the scheme that operated successfully for so many years in the sugar industry, until the Country-Liberal Government made the blunder of introducing increased cane assignments. Inefficient Government has produced the present state of chaos in the sugar industry.

In my opinion, the Minister should investigate the pineapple industry in the light of the many problems in the industry to which the Opposition has referred from time to time. The Government is loath to take action until an industry gets into all sorts of difficulties, and I believe that a reassessment of the problems facing the pineapple industry is essential. I have already outlined to the Committee a series of events and the problems that may arise from them, and, if the Minister is not prepared to make a reappraisal of the industry, I call upon him to appoint either a royal commission or a parliamentary select committee to investigate it. An open public inquiry would enable people who have grave doubts as to where the industry is heading to place submissions before a commission or committee.

The Australian Labour Party Opposition fully supports, and always has supported, organised marketing. Hon. members on this side of the Chamber believe that, because of the facts that I have outlined briefly—I admit that it is only briefly, because I wish to deal with other matters in this debate—there is room for grave doubt about the possible future of the pineapple industry. We believe, too, that the future of the Northgate Cannery may be in jeopardy and that there is room for doubt that the Cannery Agreement will benefit the industry to the extent to which the Minister hopes it will. When a committee set up by the Government makes no bones about saying

that it thinks that the cannery should not be excised from the Committee of Direction of Fruit Marketing and the Government chooses to ignore that advice, as subsequent events have proved, it is necessary for the Opposition to raise the matter here. As I said, the Opposition fully supports organised marketing, and it does not want to see any industry in which a marketing scheme has operated reasonably successfully over a number of years—in spite of the problems in the pineapple industry, I think it could be said that its marketing scheme has been successful—reduced to chaos, and, if the predictions that I make are fulfilled, I have no reason to doubt that it will be.

Having said that, I now pass on to a subject that has become fairly topical and has attracted headlines in the newspapers several times in recent weeks. I refer, of course, to statements that have been made recently about the Botanic Gardens in Brisbane. I do this because some years ago—it is recorded in "Hansard", Volume 241 of 1965—during the debate on the Treasurer's Financial Statement I made a rather lengthy submission on the need for the City of Brisbane, as the capital city of the State, to have a Botanic Gardens more in keeping with its status. I do not want to recanvass all the arguments I raised in 1965, but I believe that the Botanic Gardens in Brisbane scarcely do us credit as a capital city, nor do they do us credit relative to our thinking of Botanic Gardens as such.

Mr. Porter: The Lord Mayor won't like that.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The moment the hon. member for Toowong suspects that there might be some disagreement between the Lord Mayor and me, he is in with both feet. Let me assure him that I do not care two hoots who the Lord Mayor of this city is—

Mr. Murray: Careful!

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The approach of this Government to the Botanic Gardens is a shocking indictment of our thinking about what the purpose of a Botanic Gardens is.

Mr. Porter: Do you suggest we should take over the responsibility?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: It is no use trying to turn this into a political issue. I believe that, in the light of experience in every other country in the world, we in Queensland are completely out of step in this regard. In some countries Botanic Gardens are controlled by the Government, and in others, such as the United States of America and some of the European countries, they are under the control of the universities.

Mr. Porter: We are out of step in every way in matters associated with the Brisbane City Council.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: It is no use the hon. member for Toowong and the hon. member for Clayfield, either separately or together, trying to blow this issue up into a point of disagreement between the Lord Mayor and me.

Mr. Porter: You want to lead the Lord Mayor up the "Gardens" path.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I am raising this matter again today, as I did in 1965. It is there for hon. members to read, and incidentally the attitude today is similar to what it was then. The response to my submission today follows the same pattern as it did then. Government members laughed then, and they are exhibiting the same attitude today. The reason for bringing the matter before this Committee is to try to establish in the minds of the members of this Parliament the right and proper purpose for which Botanic Gardens are intended. I believe that in Queensland the Government believes that the Botanic Gardens is nothing more than another public park. Nothing could be further from the truth or the real conception of Botanic Gardens. If hon. members care to read the submissions that I made in 1965, they will see that I quoted from an American journal which set out 10 basic reasons why Botanic Gardens are necessary. The first reason is the preservation of a country's native flora and fauna. Other reasons are: the introduction of new plant species; the introduction of plants from overseas; the proffering of advice to gardeners, and so on. The reasons are as many and varied as are the services to which a Botanic Gardens might be properly put.

Irrespective of this, the truth is that the area of the Botanic Gardens in Brisbane is totally inadequate. Quoting from memory, I believe it would not exceed 52 acres and I think the idea is generally subscribed to that any Botanic Gardens of an area of less than 150 acres is hardly adequate.

Mr. Porter: Putting motor roads through them does not help.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The hon. member for Toowong cannot get away from wanting to make the matter a political one. If it gives him any sense of satisfaction, I tell him that I do not agree with the principle of constructing motor roads through the Botanic Gardens. I do not care if he wants to use that against me on future occasions. I am trying to infuse into hon. members the need for providing modern Botanic Gardens.

A peculiar situation arises in Brisbane, where the Botanic Gardens do not come under the control or authority of a Government botanist. I do not want to decry the efforts of the Brisbane City Council officers who are responsible for their care and maintenance, but in every other country, whether Botanic Gardens are sponsored by a university or by a Government, they are cared for and controlled by a qualified botanist.

It is necessary to make a reappraisal of the control and care of the Botanic Gardens. If I wished to raise a matter for argument I would raise the handing over of control of the Brisbane Botanic Gardens by Parliament to a local authority.

Mr. Row: That was a long time ago; that was in 1922.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I am not interested in when it happened or who did it. I am finding fault with handing over a very vital part of our social life to the control of a local authority, which has neither the finance nor the assets available to develop the Botanic Gardens to the extent that they should be developed. No local authority should be asked or obliged to accept the responsibility of developing them when it also has to provide finance for the provision and maintenance of roads, sewerage, electricity, and other amenities. While the Brisbane Botanic Gardens, or those in any other city for that matter, remain the responsibility of a local authority, owing to the financial commitments of the authority they cannot be extended or improved to the desired extent.

(Time expired.)

Mr. MURRAY (Clayfield) (2.53 p.m.): The hon. member for Salisbury makes many excursions out into the fresh open air and wide open spaces in his pursuit of knowledge and his determination to preserve so much of what we should preserve in this State. I assure him that instead of laughing at him we agree with him on certain aspects of the matter of the Botanic Gardens. He would be amazed, and perhaps alarmed, at the extent to which we do agree with him on that matter. Let him pursue this thought; he will receive lots of support from us. It is seldom that he gets our support, but on this occasion he does, for what he said is very logical.

I now wish to make a few brief comments about the Department of Primary Industries and its work and responsibilities. The inside cover of its annual report depicts a photograph of two Africander bulls that are used in the department's beef-herd improvement programme at Swans Lagoon.

Mr. Tomkins: They are no good.

Mr. MURRAY: The hon. member for Roma says they are no good, but they appear to be beefy types and no doubt are highly productive. Since the report was printed they have been named "Marty" and "Russ". They seem to be bulls of a very good type.

On page 5 of the report there are some comments about new breeds of beef cattle, with particular reference to the Africander, the Zebu, Brahman, the Droughtmaster, the Santa Gertrudis, the Charollais and the Sahiwal. Of those, the Charollais is the only European breed amongst them. It has been available, like so many British breeds that

we have imported, for many years. In fact, it could have been imported in the same way as we have imported the other breeds.

I well remember, many years ago, Robert Kleberg commenting on this subject at King Ranch in Texas, U.S.A., when I was over there. He was making some observations to his local cattlemen colleagues concerning a recent trip to Australia. He said that he was rather amazed that Australian cattlemen had not used the Charollais to a greater extent. He said that we seemed to want to produce heavy, aged beef and he thought the Charollais would be ideal. However, I cannot believe that the Charollais will be a significant feature in future herd-improvement programmes in Queensland; I think the hon. member for Roma will agree with that statement.

All the breeds mentioned are of more recent origin than the Charollais, except the Zebu which, with its present peculiar characteristics, can be traced back to about 4,000 B.C. Again the hon. member for Roma will heartily agree. The Africander, the Santa Gertrudis, the Sahiwal and the Droughtmaster are all bred from the Zebu origins and crossings, and fixed with varying percentages of the Zebu blood.

I am not convinced that the Droughtmaster can be claimed to be a breed as such when we think of the establishment of a breed on world standards. I believe it has a fair way to go before we could say that, with all the genetic background and fixations that a breed needs, it can actually be regarded as a breed. However, that is not a pressing point. The point I wish to make is that the production of new breeds or types to suit different local problems and environments can best be done—I emphasise this—by the local cattleman himself, not by Government departments. The Klebergs, accidentally I might say, bred Monkey, the famous progenitor of the Santa Gertrudis. What Government department could possibly supply the breadth and depth of operations, and particularly the continuity of firm planning and decision-making, to remotely compare with the chain of events set in motion by the Klebergs of King Ranch when they chose Monkey as the type of cattle they wished to create as the most suitable for their own particular environment in the Gulf of Mexico? Perhaps the Soviet Republic could do it, but, thank God, we are not the Soviet. Please let us be realistic about this, and make the materials available to the area of decision-making that always produces results—in other words, the proven private-enterprise cattleman and breeder.

The Minister will recall that at Ingham the world famous animal geneticist, Dr. R. B. Kelley, O.B.E. (who the Minister will remember was with me at "The Orient", was for many years animal geneticist for the C.S.I.R.O.; and is now in retirement at Nambour), after being sent abroad by Dr. Gilruth to make a study of Asian type of cattle to see if they were suitable for Australia, and after making

a lengthy world survey, recommended in the late 1920's or early 1930's to Dr. Gilruth, who was in charge of the C.S.I.R.O. about that time, that for quarantine reasons the importation of Zebu cattle should be made from the United States, where at that time vigorous programmes of cross-breeding of Asian cattle with European breeds was being undertaken by private enterprise—which I stress. They called their graded-up, beef-type, pure-bred cattle Brahmans.

On a very limited budget, Dr. Kelley brought out in, I think 1932, 18 head of Zebu and one Santa Gertrudis which was a gift from the Klebergs of King Ranch. These were split up among a few graziers in Central and North Queensland who undertook not to dispose of their progeny without permission from the C.S.I.R.O. So the first significant cross-breeding commenced at that time in our tropical environment.

By about 1946, or after World War II, it was decided to give up control of these cattle, and from that time onwards the participating graziers were free to dispose of the pure-bred progeny. From the selections that they had from that importation, plus the addition of several more private importations, extraordinarily significant results have been obtained for all the world to see in our tropical environment, particularly with the freedom of supply and demand. This was very spectacular progress indeed.

Even as late as 1953, which is only a comparative few years ago, the Zebu Crossbreeders' Association was formed in Townsville by a few progressive cattlemen, supplying an organised body to promote cross-breeding and to reply to loud and very widespread criticism at that time, and continuing for a while afterwards, of anyone who dared to upset the status quo by using these "dreadful-looking" Asian or exotic breeds of cattle to destroy the beef-cattle industry in Australia. We know what has happened since then.

From that association that was formed in 1953 were formed the Droughtmaster, the Braford and Brangus Associations. The Santa Gertrudis, of course, were well catered for in their own association by the Kleberg-Rupert Clarke-Sam Hordern-Baillieu group. They had no problems, especially with "Women's Weekly" to look after them and to give them a fashion value. I mention these things because I think they are important.

Then, in the middle 1950's, the Sindis and the Sahiwals arrived in Australia. Again the Minister will remember that this was a reciprocal Colombo Plan gift from Pakistan. Again the whole operation was arranged with great difficulty and extraordinarily efficient improvisation by Dr. Kelley who organised an R.A.A.F. air-lift in DC3 aircraft from Pakistan to Papua, using Papua as a quarantine buffer.

These Sindis and Sahiwals came from a very high milk-producing strain. They hold their own with any herds in Australia. They can and could be used, and it was expected that they could be used in a dual-purpose role in beef production. They have now been in Australia for 10 years or more, and I plead with the Minister to do everything in his power to release the use of these cattle as widely as possible to everyone who seeks them. Many of the pure-bred progeny from the original importation were merely sent off for slaughter. Perhaps we may not be responsible for this here, but certainly it was done in New South Wales when these cattle were at Badger's Creek.

It would be tragic if either the Commonwealth Government or the State Government, or both, considered that they alone would plan the future use of these cattle perhaps ultimately to produce some new form of departmental breed. One can imagine the "Parkinsonian Reds", or some such name that one could give them.

If there are any restrictions on the supply of semen to any cattlemen who may request it for their herds—I do not think it matters very much what sort of herds they are—please remove those restrictions. If there are any pure-bred cattle available and they are surplus to departmental requirements, which should only be minimal, please make these cattle available, because again I stress that it is only in the hands of the enterprising cattleman who wants to deviate and experiment—and the history of animal production is nothing but a story and record of the success of men like this in the adaptation of stock to their environment—that we can really get worth-while results.

The Minister would serve the industry very well if he made sure that his Department does everything possible to supply the tools, the technology, and the fostering of markets, and, if he allows the cattlemen themselves to get on with the job, they will produce results.

I am not suggesting for a moment that the Department is idle. I personally have tremendous respect for the dedicated officers of all branches of the Department of Primary Industries. They are men who, quietly and conscientiously, and so very often under very great difficulties indeed, get on with the job. The loss of so many valuable graduates from the staff of the department is tragic, because of our inability to replace them. I do not think that bonding has ever been the answer; indeed, I believe it is objectionable. Unless we, in a modern progressive society, realise that departmental staff must be paid and rewarded at market value, we will continue to watch the annual drain of these essential people to the outside world. This is a problem that is not confirmed to this department but is common to others as well. Certainly, one that can be cited is the Department of Education. This merely demonstrates the extent to which Governments generally in Australia hide their heads in the sand. If we want departments to be

staffed by men of the high qualifications, integrity and dedication that we traditionally expect, they must be adequately compensated. It is the responsibility of Parliament to correct this disturbing situation.

I now wish to deal briefly with the ever-green problem of the financial position of rural industry. Australian rural industries—and those in Queensland are quite inseparable from those elsewhere in this country—are standing in complete disillusionment on the watershed of indecision. They have been pushed there, very reluctantly on their part, because I am sure I know which way they would like to go. I think most other hon. members do, too. It has been said by a number of hon. members who have spoken on these Estimates that our primary industries gave this nation the basic stability on which to build, and that stability was based, I should like to stress, on the exercise of individual enterprise, initiative and financial independence.

This is what the primary producer has inherited. He knows that the long-term interests of the industry will be better served if he can maintain this system. But the pressures upon him are almost unbearable—pressures which we could be excused for believing flow from a stream of decisions over the years based on short-term political expediency. They are pressures which seriously erode any determination that he may have to maintain his traditional system or way of life, and may in fact force him to accept the course of least resistance offered by the welfare State, with its so-called orderly, centralised control.

If Governments will not take integrated action to alleviate the problems in depth, who else can free the primary producer from the shackles of the cost squeeze in which he is caught? He certainly cannot free himself unless he sells and comes to the city to join the protection racket of tariffs and restrictive practices. The share market alone will no doubt give him 8 per cent. or 9 per cent. in interest and capital growth. When did the primary producer last see a return of 8 or 9 per cent. and capital growth? He has responded magnificently to the national calls to increase production, to export, and to use research and technology for greater efficiency.

Let us consider, in just a few short observations, what the primary producer has done. His increase in volume of production in the last 20 years—and it is a good period to look at, a significant political period—is 55 per cent.; his increase in gross value of production is 115 per cent.; yet—and here is the sting—his increase in net value of production is precisely nil. We should ponder those figures, because they are very, very important to us.

The increase in the gross value of production is approximately \$2,000 million over the 20 years, in spite of the fact that in recent years prices, except for most forms

of meat production, have declined. With an increase of \$2,000 million in gross value of production, every cent of it has been absorbed by rising costs and the primary producer is therefore no better off. These figures were compiled by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics; they are for all rural production, and they reveal a very distressing state of affairs.

I believe that our main fault is that we will persist in dealing piecemeal with the problems of the primary producer. It is true that his problems are fragmented throughout the whole wide field of Government administration. No-one would suggest that we can ever really solve the problems of primary industry any more than we can solve the problems of any other industry. Nothing stands still—the scene is ever-changing, and it changes rapidly—but we have no excuse for failing to alleviate, or at least attempting to alleviate, persistent trouble spots, and they exist. It is rather silly if one Government department hands out an umbrella when things are fine and another Government department takes it away when it begins to rain. And things of that sort do happen.

Why give a fertiliser subsidy and then cancel it out with an increased freight? Why sell wheat abroad and close down flour mills in country towns? Should we not sell flour at lower prices, as we do butter, on overseas markets? I do not know the answers to these questions—no doubt there are perfectly good answers to these and many other apparent anomalies—but I persist in suggesting that we should understand more closely both the short-term and long-term effects throughout the industry as a whole when we make decisions.

Where is the single nerve centre for the whole of primary industry? Where, for that matter, is there a nerve centre—an intelligence centre—for departments generally? We get a vast variety of Press statements emanating from numerous subdepartments of the Department of Primary Industries—and this is right—each struggling, quite properly, to maintain its place in the sun and hoping, perhaps, that it may get another clerk-typist in the next financial year.

If the Minister for Lands proposes a change in policy in Crown administration or perhaps termination periods of leases, just as an out-of-the-hat example, or the Minister for Transport decides on an increase of 10 per cent. in freight on a commodity, does the Department of Primary Industries prepare an appreciation for the Minister showing the full effects and ramifications for both the short and the long term and allow him to convince Cabinet that the change may perhaps be of greater cost than gain to the Government? It seems that we make the decision and then hope for the best. Then, when the protest meetings begin in country centres, we evaluate the strength of protest and act accordingly.

Too many primary producers have long given up the fight and seem prepared to remain shackled to the cost squeeze. We know that the wool-producer has to live with an annual rise in costs, in terms of the prices of the goods and services used in wool production, of 4.5 per cent., and that this is a rate of increase 25 per cent. higher than the rise in the Consumer Price Index. When we consider that a very large percentage of the goods and services used in wool production and marketing are not handled by the producer at all, he would have to increase his rate of productivity in his own operations a good deal higher than 4.5 per cent. to effectively offset price increase.

How much longer are we going to expect the wool-producer to exist or survive in this depressing, downward, circular situation in which he is caught? This is not common only to Queensland; it applies over the whole of the nation and we are caught up in it. Is it in the national interest for a traditional wool-grower producing, for instance, large lines of well-bred Merino wool to change over to beef or grain production? Too many, I believe, have already been forced to do so, and I suggest that this may prove to be a national tragedy.

If it is our role—and I have always believed it to be—to create and maintain a stable political climate in which economic national growth can forge ahead, if it is our philosophy—and I believe it is—to foster and maintain a system based on the exercise of individual initiative and enterprise, with financial independence, then we must give urgent consideration to ways and means of releasing the primary producer from the shackles of the cost squeeze so that he can get off the watershed of indecision on which he stands today and follow the course which he knows, and which we know, will be of lasting benefit to the nation.

Mr. CAREY: (Albert) (3.16 p.m.): I think everybody in Queensland recognises the importance of the Department of Primary Industries. We have all recognised for many years the fact that this State of Queensland is dependent on primary industries.

I know that many hon. members on this side of the Chamber would like to take part in this debate, which, as we all know, is limited in time. I have undertaken to confine my remarks to 15 minutes to enable the hon. member for Mirani to make his contribution on the International Sugar Agreement, and I do hope that hon. members on the Opposition side may also be able to get five minutes in which to make some contribution on this important department.

As we all know, this department covers all fields of primary industry—wool, wheat, beef, poultry, dairying, marketing and the plant industry, to mention but a few—and when one reads the report—I hope hon. members on the opposite side read it intelligently—one sees on page 2 that there are 37

directors and deputy directors associated with this department, under the jurisdiction of the Minister. I am informed authoritatively that some 2,000 persons are employed in his department. That is a wonderful record, and they are all doing a good job. Members of the Country Party are particularly keen to see that this contribution continues to assist in the development of the State of Queensland.

I want to run quickly through my main points, because I have restricted myself to 15 minutes. I contend that this portfolio, which I originally said was the most important in the State Cabinet, should be shared by at least two Ministers. I think there should be a Minister in charge of the animal section—

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. CAREY: I am not going to ask for your help, Mr. Dean. I can out-talk anyone on the Opposition side. However, I will not waste my time answering inane interjections. If they are intelligent interjections I will answer them, but as they are all speaking at once and are quite unintelligible I will not answer any interjection on this occasion.

As I was saying, there should be one Minister in charge of the animal section and another Minister in charge of the vegetable and plant industries section.

I want to congratulate our present Minister, the Honourable John Row, who has been a friend of mine since we came into this House together some nine years ago. I think he has done an excellent job in a most difficult portfolio. We entered this Parliament together and we have been friends for the full nine years. When one sees two fellows like Johnny Row, the short, and Carey, the long, still remaining friends after nine years, I think it augurs well for the continued administration of the Government under the Country Party-Liberal coalition.

Hon. members opposite realise, of course—the hon. member for Toowoomba West said so—that primary production in Queensland is worth \$861,000,000. That is a fantastic sum, and I come back to my assertion that one Minister should not be called upon to control so many departments and be required to spend all his time, even when he should be relaxing or playing bowls, keeping his nose to the grindstone in an endeavour to assist the State's primary industries. If hon. members stopped to think about what the Minister controls they would realise that he controls ticks, tulips, tomatoes, tobacco and tripe, as well as cattle, capons, cotton, chemicals, and many other items that are far too numerous to mention.

I wish to deal now with the problem of ticks, which are very prevalent in my electorate and in fact in all coastal areas of the State. It was a great thrill to hear

the hon. member for South Brisbane, who lives in a tick-free area, speak on tick infestation. I think he had pigeon lice and not ticks on him when he spoke, because I saw his friend and colleague helping him to stop scratching.

I ask the Minister to endeavour to get his department to provide community plunge-dips. The State's transport system is growing so quickly with the construction of modern freeways that cattle breeders and dairy farmers are not able to drive their cattle from one side of a road to the other. It is only right that the Government should recognise the importance of the dairy-cattle and beef sections of the industry and provide fully charged dips in individual farming communities. Ticks have got beyond the nuisance stage in the State, and we should all take notice of that fact.

One hon. member opposite said that the carrying of firearms on Sundays is completely prohibited. To a certain extent I agree with that prohibition, but I do not agree with the principle that a man who carries a firearm on his own property on a Sunday is committing an offence. A property-owner should be allowed to carry an innocent weapon like a 410-gauge shotgun so that he can eliminate snakes if they constitute a menace on his property. I ask the Minister to amend the relevant section of the Firearms Act to provide a property-owner with the right to carry a 410-gauge shotgun to defend himself against snakes. There are a great many brown snakes on my small property, situated on the Coomera River, and they are one of the most venomous species in Queensland. For that reason it is important that I have the right to carry a weapon with me on my farm without committing an offence.

Time does not permit me to deal in detail with any portion of the meat industry, but I want to touch briefly on the departmental report on milk distribution in the Brisbane area. As I said during the Budget debate, I want the dairy community in my electorate to realise that the report is one that has been handed to the Minister for discussion by Government members, who wish to be guided by the dairying industry on the decisions they should make on the implementation of any portion of the report. Personally, I cannot see much value in it.

The Federal Government recently agreed to set aside quite a substantial sum of money to enable dairy-farmers to extend their activities so that one dairy farmer could buy out his neighbour.

Mr. R. Jones: It was \$27,000,000.

Mr. CAREY: That is correct.

That sum was provided so that dairy-farmers could work on a bigger scale and the industry could become more profitable, although fewer people were engaged in it.

It appears to me that the Federal Government is telling dairy-farmers to increase their scope of operations, whereas the milk report is virtually asking them to reduce production. That must never happen in a State as big as Queensland.

Mr. Murray: How many snakes do you run to the acre?

Mr. CAREY: If the hon. member for Clayfield will speak to me later I will tell him exactly where the snakes are.

On page 7 of the milk report we find that those responsible for its presentation said that the present arrangement has worked well, and is still working well. I ask the Minister, "Why interfere with something that is working well?" If my friend here, who has a Mercedes Benz, finds that it is working well, he would not pull down the engine to see if it is all right.

I believe in orderly marketing, which we have at the present time. I have had long experience in retailing and I would say that this is the right time to throw this report out through the window—let it come up again in 20 years' time.

I will now resume my seat to give my colleague from Mirani an opportunity of taking part in this debate.

Mr. BROMLEY (Norman) (3.27 p.m.): This is a tremendously important debate, which is why everyone wants to take part in it. I want to spend some time dealing with the Annual Report of the Department of Primary Industries. Firstly, I congratulate Dr. Harvey and his departmental officers on presenting what is, to my way of thinking, a tremendously interesting, straightforward report that is easily understood. The dairying industry and all the other primary industries referred to in the report are tremendously important to Parliament and, naturally, they are of even greater importance to the primary producers themselves. The Australian Labour Party is very concerned, and has been for a long time, about primary industries, so much so that we, since 26 September, have had on the Business Paper, under the name of the hon. member for Barcoo, a notice of motion dealing with primary industries generally and the worries associated with them. Unfortunately that motion has not come up for discussion. Let us hope that the Government allows discussion on it, as it is tremendously important.

I congratulate the people responsible for editing the Queensland Agricultural Journal, a monthly publication that I read assiduously. I was particularly pleased with the cover on the current issue depicting a very good photograph of a young friend of mine, Tania Eltisheff, of Buranda, whose family I know very well. Her father, Paul, is an excellent photographer.

I pay tribute to the work of the C.S.I.R.O. as outlined in the Annual Report of the Division of Tropical Pastures. This report

is most interesting. It deals with so many subjects that I cannot possibly refer to them all in the few minutes allowed me this afternoon. It refers to brigalow lands, which are very important.

Some of the items in the annual report of this department call for detailed comment, as has been indicated by the speeches of hon. members in the last days. I wish to refer in detail to the dairying industry and the sugar industry, and to quote from various documents. First, I refer to a report of a review by the Institute of Public Affairs. It deals with the cost of production in various industries and with exports in those particular fields. There are some tremendously interesting articles in it. It speaks of the rising costs not only of those in the industry but also of those associated with it. Unfortunately, time does not permit me to go into details.

I propose to quote from another very interesting report. I dare say that many Government members have not read the 1968 Annual Report of the Bureau of Sugar Experiment Stations. It would be an eye-opener to some of them, particularly those who are tremendously interested in or concerned with the sugar industry in general. They should look at page 10 and read the summary of production and consumption figures and sugar values for the past 10 years. They are pretty worrying to me and also to the people in the sugar industry.

I know that this is a fact because not long ago I was in the Isis electorate, where I spoke to many people, including primary producers such as "cow cockies", cane-farmers, graziers, and those in other forms of primary industry. I spoke to dairy-farmers who are working on the roads for local authorities and on railway maintenance and who told me that the only reason they were working in those occupations was that unfortunately they were going broke and had to do this sort of work to keep their dairy farms going. In fact, the Annual Report of the Department of Primary Industries mentions the number of dairy-farmers who have gone broke over the past few years. The hon. member for Albert spoke about larger dairies. It is only natural that neighbours would buy up other properties on which a dairy-farmer has gone broke under this Government in an endeavour to make a living.

There are many matters that we must look at. The Leader of the Opposition spoke of the need for a South-east Asian common market for our goods. This would be one way of ensuring the survival of our primary industries and would earn a good deal of goodwill for Australia. This is most interesting.

As I said, I was recently in the Isis electorate. The cane-farmers there were tremendously perturbed at the state of affairs in the sugar industry. I do not care what the Premier or Mr. McEwen said on their return from Geneva. An analysis of their statements

shows that there is a big "if" in them. They said "if" this is a successful agreement, and "if and when" it can be rationalised.

Mr. Newbery: Give me some time and I will take the "if" out of it.

Mr. BROMLEY: I seriously hope that this will be the salvation of the sugar industry. But there is still a big "if", because the Premier and the Deputy Prime Minister said "if and when" this agreement is finalised. I should like to deal with details of this matter, but I want to tell the Committee about the cane-farmers that I spoke to in the Isis electorate. With the exception of two of them, they told me that over the past five or six years, or more, they have not earned a taxable income; in other words, they have not been paying income tax because of the state of the industry. Let us hope the industry picks up. I have my doubts about that. Considering the capital that these cane-farmers have invested in their properties, surely they are entitled to something more than a non-taxable income. We must give this a great deal of consideration.

Mr. Miller: What is your answer to it?

Mr. BROMLEY: I am trying to give the hon. member for Mirani some time to speak, but my answer is to bring the growers concerned into the scheme and allow their suggestions to be the basis for resolving the industry's problems. There must not be, as there has been in the last few years, over-production. One of the main things concerning me is the capital outlay of growers and the return that they will receive on their investment.

Mr. NEWBERY (Mirani) (3.36 p.m.): I thank the hon. members for Norman and Albert for giving me this opportunity to have the draft International Sugar Agreement incorporated in "Hansard". After I have read it, hon. members will see what benefit it will be to the industry.

I should like to congratulate the Minister on the presentation of his Estimates, and also thank and congratulate departmental officers generally for the wonderful job that they are doing. As a cane-grower and one with some interest in grazing, I know what the department is doing for the dairying industry and also the grazing industry in improving pastures in the hinterland and on the coast.

Before reading the proposed sugar agreement, I must express my sincere thanks, as one engaged in the sugar industry, to members of the delegation who went to Geneva and were able to obtain what it is expected will be a signed agreement. I refer to the Right Honourable John McEwen; the Premier of this State (Honourable J. Bjelke-Petersen); Mr. Wheen, of the Colonial Sugar Refining Co.; Mr. Pearce, of the Australian Sugar Producers' Association; Mr. Henderson, of the Queensland Cane Growers' Council; and others who accompanied them.

This is the draft of the proposed International Sugar Agreement as printed by C. Czarnikow Ltd. of London—

"The Agreement, the text of which was approved by delegates representing more than seventy countries, will be open for signature until 24th December, 1968, and instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval must be deposited by 31st December. The Agreement will enter into force on 1st January, 1969, if by that date Governments holding 60 per cent. of the votes of the exporting countries and 50 per cent. of the votes of the importing countries have signified their acceptance. The general concensus in Geneva was so much in favour of an Agreement that every confidence exists that adequate notifications will be made which will enable it to come into force at the beginning of next year. It is scheduled to remain in force for five years, but is to be reviewed before the completion of the third year.

"This Agreement marks an important step forward towards the orderly marketing of sugar in the international sphere. Safeguards have been added which will help protect the interests of both importers and exporters and the fact that the International Sugar Council will have the power to vary some of the provisions of the Agreement will give it added flexibility.

"It has been reported that important stock undertakings have been made by exporting member countries, which will provide a valuable safeguard for importing member countries should prices rise unduly. After setting aside supplies needed for domestic consumers and requirements under special arrangements, developed exporters as defined in the Agreement have undertaken that stocks at a date immediately preceding the start of their campaigns will not be less than 15 per cent. of their basic export tonnages, while for developing exporters the undertaking is in respect of a minimum of ten per cent.

"There is also a maximum limitation on stocks which will tend to control the weight of sugar that could overhang the market. Exporting members have the choice of either establishing a stock holding up to 20 per cent. of their crops in the immediately preceding year or of holding sufficient sugar for their domestic needs plus twenty per cent. of their basic export entitlements.

"The International Sugar Council price is calculated by taking the mean of the London daily price and the No. 8 spot price, each converted to U.S. cents per lb. f.o.b. and stowed in bulk in a Caribbean port. If the difference between the two prices is in excess of six points the ISC takes the lower price plus three points. As was the case in the previous Agreement, wherever reference is made to a 'prevailing price' being above or below an indicated figure, this condition will be considered to have been fulfilled if the average of the ISC price over a

period of seventeen consecutive market days is above or below the indicated figure and the price on the first and not less than twelve days within the period is also above or below it as the case may be.

"Should prices rise above 4.75c per lb. 50 per cent. of the minimum stocks will be released and offered for prompt sale to member importers. Should prices continue to rise and pass 5.00c per lb. the balance of the stocks will be released. If the price rises above 5.25c per lb., exporting members will give priority on commercially equal terms to importing members as against non-members.

"If, despite these provisions, the price rises above 6.50c per lb. importing members will have an entitlement to purchase sugar from exporting members among their traditional suppliers at 6.50c per lb. The tonnage which may be purchased within a quota year under these arrangements will naturally vary according to the time of year.

"Every attempt has been made to cover circumstances relating to quotas at varying price levels and this has inevitably led to an involved formula. It is reported that should the prevailing price be in excess of 4.00c the aggregate of quotas must not be less than 100 per cent. of basic export tonnages. Should it rise to 4.50c, quotas must not amount to less than 110 per cent. of basic export tonnages. Quotas become inoperative if the prevailing price exceeds 5.25c, but should it thereafter fall below 5.00c the aggregate of quotas must not exceed 115 per cent. of basic export tonnages. A reduction of five per cent. of basic export tonnages must be made should the price fall below 4.50c with a further reduction of five per cent. if it should drop below 4.00c. The aggregate of quotas must not be more than 95 per cent. of basic export tonnages if the price moves below 3.75c while if it moves to 3.50c or less the aggregate must be set at 90 per cent. of basic export tonnages. The above provisions may be varied by special vote of the Council, which may also, by special vote, reduce quotas to 85 per cent. of basic export tonnages if this is required in order to achieve the aims of the Agreement.

"The Council may use its discretion as to whether it should redistribute shortfalls, but in any case it may not make a redistribution when the price is below 3.50c per lb. When shortfalls are redistributed the following steps must be applied:

(a) Shortfalls must be redistributed pro rata to basic export tonnages until quotas in effect are raised to 100 per cent. of basic export tonnages.

(b) Of the balance, 20 per cent. must be redistributed among developing exporters.

(c) The remaining 80 per cent. must be redistributed among all exporters pro rata to basic export tonnages.

"It will be interesting to see how the Council handles the hardship fund which, we understand, has been established to cater for the particular difficulties of those countries which are heavily dependent upon sugar in their total volume of trade.

"It is understood that importing member countries will prohibit imports from non-members when the prevailing price is below the parity of 3.25c per lb. At prices from 3.25c per lb. upwards importing countries will limit their imports from non-members to their annual average of imports from non-members during the years 1966 to 1968. No restrictions will apply at any time when quotas are inoperative. This is a much stronger sanction against non-member countries than existed under the terms of the previous two International Agreements and it may act as an additional encouragement to exporting countries to adhere to the pact. Meanwhile the assurance of suppliers, particularly at high prices, coupled with a ceiling price of 6.50c per lb., which is offered under the Agreement, will also provide a valuable incentive to importing countries."

I again thank the hon. members for Norman and Albert for making some of their time available to me.

Hon. J. A. ROW (Hinchinbrook—Minister for Primary Industries) (3.45 p.m.): In the brief time at my disposal I will try to reply to as much as possible of what was said by the various speakers. The hon. member for Mulgrave, the first speaker this morning, commented on the good work being done on pastures by both the C.S.I.R.O. and my department. In this connection I might state that I have a liaison officer—an extension officer—now stationed at Townsville to ensure a full interchange of research results in this field in North Queensland. It is essential to get all this information out to graziers and to dairy farmers, and the extension officer has proved to be a very important person in this regard.

Concerning the poultry industry in North Queensland, I think the hon. member is well aware of the assistance I obtained for our egg producers in North Queensland when the C.E.M.A. plant was first established.

The problem of excess water in frozen poultry is now receiving attention. We recently discussed this at the Australian Agricultural Council in an endeavour to get uniform legislation amongst the States. South Australia is currently drafting a uniform Bill designed to stop this practice of marketing poultry with an excess water content. I was

interested to hear the hon. member's remarks on tea and the development of mechanical tea picking by Dr. Maruff of Innisfail and by the Mantons of Tully. I mention, of course, that this development, not only of tea production but also of mechanical picking, is based on work at our South Johnstone Research Station under the direction of Dr. Bert Grof. He has done a tremendous amount of work there on the development of tea. The industry is in its infancy, of course. Mechanical picking is going to be the difficulty, but Dr. Maruff is to be congratulated on the tremendous amount of work and money he has expended on it.

The Leader of the Opposition made quite a lengthy speech. I do not in any way disagree with his views that we need to expand our export markets for rural products. In fact, I stressed the need for this when I spoke this morning. Of course, I cannot go along with his suggestion that Queensland should start appointing trade commissioners all over the place. By the appointment of additional persons we would only be duplicating the work being done by the Commonwealth.

There is a need for further direct contact with importers on certain specific export problems. I believe this could best be achieved by visits of trade missions. I prefer visits by trade missions and individuals who, of course, would work in co-operation with the existing Commonwealth Trade Commissioners' services, to the appointment of additional trade commissioners.

The hon. member claimed that Queensland has not come up with a new export industry for rural products for a long time. I think his facts, with all due respect to him, are a bit astray in this direction. True it is that we have not come up with a very large rural export industry, but the barley and grain sorghum industries have expanded.

Mr. Houston: They have been going for donkeys' years.

Mr. ROW: Yes, but only in a very small way. They have become established, to a large extent, in recent years and they are now substantial exporters. Another one is the ginger industry. During the last few years, a very useful export trade has been built up in ginger. And rice is another promising one, particularly in the Burdekin Valley. True it is that we are not exporting it, but this year there is the promise of some 3,000 tons of rice in the Burdekin. It is another developing industry.

We have also moved into the island trade with potatoes and are looking for further outlets. In regard to the other point the hon. member made—the Brisbane abattoir—I appreciate his comments on that and I assure him that the decision to keep the present works at Cannon Hill in operation for a further period of ten years was taken on the basis of a very full report made by the board

to the Government, which dealt with many aspects on which questions have been asked in this Chamber. I emphasise my previous statements to the Committee that the Government has taken the decision to build works to replace the present works at Cannon Hill. As I indicated to other speakers, I am fully convinced of the value of service works at the present stage of the development of our State.

I know that the decision to defer the replacement of the present works for 10 years is a disappointment to the hon. member, but I point out to him that it is not desirable immediately to construct new works when the present works are still functioning quite effectively. The Co-ordinator-General of Public Works has examined them and has agreed that they are a usable asset and still worth many millions of dollars. An expenditure of \$8,000,000 to \$10,000,000 would be required to provide new works. I repeat my conviction that a service works associated with the metropolitan area is a necessity and that the decision to replace the works perhaps on a different site is a firm one.

Mr. Houston: I do not want a different site. Never mind going up in the mulga somewhere.

Mr. ROW: The decision was supported by the Queensland Meat Industry Authority.

The views of the hon. member for Rockhampton South on private abattoirs are well known to me. I remain convinced that service works have an important part to play in the development of the State. I would draw his attention to the fact that in the Townsville district service works were constructed purely as local works because private abattoirs refused to provide their facilities for that district.

I can well understand the disappointment of the hon. member for Rockhampton South at the decision of the State Wheat Board to export Central Queensland grain through Gladstone. I would stress to him that the matter is one for the industry itself and it has already made its decision.

Mr. Pilbeam: You don't care what it does to other industries.

Mr. ROW: I will not go along with the idea that the Government should dictate to the wheat industry.

Mr. Houston: Another split in the Country-Liberal Government.

Mr. ROW: Oh, no! We can agree to disagree.

The hon. member for Salisbury would like a change in the operation and administration of the Northgate Cannery and expressed certain fears about the ability of the cannery board to operate successfully its proposed pineapple industry stabilisation scheme. Of course, this remains to be seen,

as the scheme is not yet in operation. The proposal has been the subject of a properly conducted ballot among growers.

Mr. Houston: All growers?

Mr. ROW: Yes, all growers. I made certain of that. All subscribers, non-subscribers and fresh-fruit growers had a vote, and the over-all vote in favour of the scheme was 65.9 per cent. When I have time I will give the hon. member the break-up of the three separate ballots, but I tell him now that the over-all majority was 65.9 per cent., and I believe that we should accept that majority decision.

I have no disagreement whatever with the hon. member on the matter of Botanic Gardens. I think I mentioned this morning that I have taken up the matter of motor traffic through the Botanic Gardens with the Lord Mayor, but to no avail. The decision is out of my hands. It is many years ago that the Government—and I am not blaming any particular Government—gave away the control of the Botanic Gardens to the Brisbane City Council. I believe that the Government should be charged with responsibility for the Botanic Gardens and the cultivation and preservation of rare plants.

I listened with interest to the comments of the hon. member for Clayfield on tropical breeds of cattle. I know he has had a great deal of experience in this field because he was up in my area at the "Orient" and he had a very good stud there. I agree whole-heartedly with him that exotic cattle breeds can make a tremendous contribution to our cattle industry, particularly in the North. The question whether the Drought-master is a specific breed has been debated for a long time. There is no doubt that it is in the Stud Book, but the hon. member may wish to discuss the matter with Professor Francis, who may have some interesting thoughts on it.

On the release of tropical breeds of cattle, I mention particularly the Sahiwal and Sindi. At the Ayr Research Station we have the Sahiwal and the Africander, and at Gatton we have the Sindi. We are already releasing such cattle to graziers from our research station at Ayr, and I understand that the same thing is being done in conjunction with C.S.I.R.O., from Belmont. The hon. member referred to the need for co-ordination in approaches to rural industry problems. That, of course, is very real, and quite a few moves have already been made to try to achieve co-ordination.

I thank the hon. member for Albert for his usual cheery contribution, which engendered an atmosphere of pleasantness in the debate. Perhaps the alternative to his suggestion that I should divide my department in two would be for me to become twins, when there would be two of me in the Chamber. I think the idea of community dip-plunges could be extended a little further—I could think of a few other uses for them. We have

developed, as can be seen from the pictures in the report, a mobile spray-dip which will go a long way towards meeting this need.

The hon. member for Norman referred to the dairying and sugar industries. I have strong convictions about the sugar industry, having been in it all my life. I think the new sugar agreement will play a tremendous part in stabilising it. As hon. members know, I have been a cane-farmer all my life. I have been through the hard times of the depression in the thirties; I have been a cane-cutter and a wharf-lumper. There is not much that I do not know about this industry. I know that, in this industry, a great deal depends on the individual himself. With all due deference to some of the new growers, I have been surprised to find on visits to their properties that, although they have cane, they do not have their own vegetables, potatoes, fowls, and turkeys. It is the easiest thing in the world for a farmer to grow his own potatoes. I know that the local town has to be kept going but, nevertheless, the land is there to produce these necessities, to keep the family going. A lot of money can be saved by farmers who are battling, as I battled in the early days, if they become self-sufficient on their properties.

The hon. member for Mirani dealt at length with the sugar agreement. He is well versed in this industry, and well qualified to speak about it.

I am indeed pleased that most hon. members had an opportunity to participate in the debate. I think that the only exception was the hon. member for Landsborough. I am very sorry that this young man did not have an opportunity to speak, because he knows quite a lot about the diversified primary industries in his area. I am sure he would have liked an opportunity to advance the points of view of the diversified primary industries in his area.

I thank hon. members for their contribution to the debate. As usual, it was a fairly friendly debate, as politics do not enter into it to any degree. I am very grateful for the very kind remarks about the officers of my department. Dr. Harvey and the heads of the six divisions are dedicated officers and perform a tremendous amount of work; hours mean nothing to them. My officers in the 90-odd centres, and in the 28 research stations, all play a very important part in disseminating information to the farming community. I know that they are held in high regard. I am indeed delighted to be associated with them, and I pay them the highest compliment. Dr. Harvey, the head of the department, came from what I might describe as the quiet environment of a biochemist. He has done a splendid job with his officers. I am gratified by the remarks of respect from both sides of the Chamber for members of my department.

I once again thank all hon members who had an opportunity to make a contribution in this debate and, in particular, I repeat my words of praise for my departmental officers.

At 4 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Under the provisions of the Sessional Order agreed to by the House on 22 October, I shall now put the questions for the Vote under consideration and the balance remaining unvoted for the Department of Primary Industries.

The questions for the following Votes were put, and agreed to—

Department of Primary Industries—

	\$
Primary Industries	5,892,284
Balance of Department, Trust and Special Funds	9,952,949

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT
CHIEF OFFICE

Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development) (4.1 p.m.): I move—

“That \$553,837 be granted for ‘Department of Industrial Development—Chief Office.’”

Since its inception in the latter part of 1963, the activities of the Department of Industrial Development have been progressively extended to cater for the increasing demands on its services both by existing industry and industrialists contemplating investment in this State.

As hon. members are aware, the department carries out a regular advertising campaign not only interstate, but also in Europe, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Asia, with a view to keeping before the people of those countries the undoubted opportunities which exist for the establishment of industry in this State.

Supporting promotional material issued by the department is given world-wide circulation. Specific surveys have been undertaken covering some 30 industries which it is thought offer definite prospects for profitable investment. These are reviewed periodically to take account of the latest developments in the State. It is of interest to record that two industries from this series have already started operations in Queensland.

There is general acceptance in Australia, and indeed in many overseas countries, of the vital role that the department is playing in the attraction of industry to the State. This is shown in the constant flow of inquiries which the department receives on a wide range of matters related to industry. An example of this is that in the past two years requests were received for detailed analyses relating to approximately 40 manufactured items in which industrialists were interested.

The industrial performance of the State during the period since the establishment of the department has been outstanding. Some

idea of the marked acceleration in industrial growth is shown in the increases over the 10-year period since 1957. In the five years to June, 1962, factory production, expressed in terms of annual growth-rates, rose by 4.6 per cent., and in the five years to 1967 it accelerated sharply, to 12.1 per cent.

There is little doubt that, when figures for the last financial year are published, they will show that rapid growth was well maintained. In fact, the value of factory production is expected to be in the vicinity of \$660,000,000. In 1966-67, the latest period for which figures are available, factory production reached a record figure of \$593,000,000. As I have just indicated, this record will certainly be eclipsed when the figures for 1967-68 are released.

Factory employment, which had been rising at an annual rate of around 2 per cent., rose 3.1 per cent. in 1967-68 to a peak figure of 124,400 at the end of June. The stimulus imparted to over-all development by the expansion of manufacturing activity has created additional work opportunities in the rapidly growing tertiary sector.

There is no doubt that the structural changes in the State's economy, associated with its growing industrialisation, are making the State less prone to factors which make for instability, such as adverse seasonal conditions and fluctuating world commodity prices. In fact, events of recent years clearly indicate the increasing ability of the State to maintain growth in aggregate demand, output and employment. Capital expenditure, the dynamic force in generating economic growth and development, gathered increased momentum in 1967-68.

Buoyancy in the building industry is indicative of growth, and expenditure on new buildings in 1967-68 was \$255,000,000, an increase of 10.6 per cent. on the level of the previous year. Activity in construction of new factories, in particular, imparted a significant stimulus. This sustained upswing in building activity was reflected in an increased production of building materials. This in turn induced further capital expenditure, both in the expansion of existing capacity and in the establishment of new factories for the manufacture of building materials.

Some very significant increases were recorded in the production of basic building materials during the past 12 months. Brick production reached a record level in excess of 118,000,000, an increase of 8.2 per cent. on the previous year's figure. During the first two months of the present year brick output continued to rise and was running at nearly 21 per cent. above the level of the corresponding period of 1967-68.

Evidence of the tremendous development which is taking place in this section of the State's industry is shown by the fact that Brickworks Ltd. and Brittain's Bricks and Pipes Pty. Ltd. have recently completed expansion programmes involving capital

investment of \$2,250,000 and \$1,000,000 respectively. A \$750,000 stoneware pipe plant is also being installed by Rocla Pipes. It is of particular interest to note that all three of these plants will use natural gas when it is available early next year.

Other industries associated with building have also been buoyant. Production of hot-water systems and paints were respectively 11 per cent. and 10 per cent. higher in 1967-68 than in the previous year. In July of the current fiscal year production of hot-water systems was 40 per cent., and paints 28 per cent., above the level of the same period last year.

Production of plaster building-sheets has also risen sharply and in 1967-68 reached a level 35 per cent. above that of the previous year. The quantity of logs processed by plywood and veneer mills in 1967-68 rose by 13.5 per cent., thus reflecting to a large degree the rising demand for hardboard and particle board. Most important of all is that there was a 5.6 per cent. increase in the work-force of the building industry in the last financial year.

Further evidence of the upsurge in capital investment in the State is provided by the marked increase that has occurred in the imports of plant and machinery to meet the needs of the State's rapidly expanding economy. Imports of such equipment rose by 14.7 per cent. last year to a record level of \$216,000,000.

A constant strengthening and diversification is taking place in the industrial structure of the State, and the environment is most conducive to rapid development.

In the important industrial metals, machines and conveyances group of industries, expansion of production was also significant. Production of alumina in the past financial year naturally highlighted activity in this section.

Conditions were buoyant in engineering works, and particularly in shipbuilding; substantially increased output at motor assembly works resulted from the upsurge in demand for private, industrial, and commercial vehicles.

New motor vehicle registrations were 17 per cent. above the figure for the previous year and reached a new peak. Similarly, expenditure on commercial and industrial motor vehicles reached a record level. Registrations of new trucks and lorries in particular rose by nearly 22 per cent. also to an all-time peak.

The upsurge in industrial activity is clearly reflected in the pronounced rise of 12.5 per cent. in electricity generated in 1967-68.

Mineral-sands processing projects are increasing, with multi-million investments in Southern Queensland.

Mount Morgan Ltd. has started a \$4,500,000 re-equipment and expansion programme.

In shipbuilding, whilst there has been a general growth, the developments in Bundaberg and Cairns must be regarded as particularly satisfactory. Both Evans Deakin in Brisbane and Walkers of Maryborough have recently completed expansion programmes.

The Townsville copper refinery will complete a \$4,000,000 project this year to bring the total investment in the plant, which started less than 10 years ago, to \$17,000,000.

Since the Estimates of the department were debated two years ago, two major developments have occurred that undoubtedly will have far-reaching and lasting effects on the industrialisation of Queensland.

The first was the opening last year of the Queensland alumina refinery in Gladstone. The second was the decision to build the \$30,000,000 fertiliser plant on Gibson Island, which is now in the final stages of completion and will be in operation early next year.

The alumina refinery is undoubtedly one of the outstanding secondary-industry operations ever started in this State. Its present capacity of 600,000 tons of alumina a year will be increased to 900,000 tons by the beginning of next year. In all, this plant represents a capital investment of \$160,000,000, and it is highly unlikely that this will be the final expansion programme. The alumina plant contributes to national as well as local prosperity in that 80 per cent. of its present output is sold on export markets.

Since the opening of the refinery there have been other developments in the aluminium industry. There are now two aluminium extrusion plants in the State and considerable growth and expansion has taken place in industries fabricating and producing the end product.

During my recent overseas visit it was indeed encouraging to find that Queensland aluminium products enjoyed a fine reputation in the building trade in South-east Asia. With improved living standards in this part of the world, there is no doubt there is an expanding market available to Queensland manufacturers.

The establishment of a smelter in Queensland would of course complete the aluminium complex. This in fact is one of the Central Queensland industries which it is confidently expected would follow the provision of a major power-station in that area with low unit costs. As hon. members are aware, this matter is one which has been the subject of the most careful study by the Government and its advisers, and a special case has been submitted to the Right Honourable the Prime Minister in the hope that ways and means may be found to finance the project.

Of particular significance in relation to the State's industrial growth is the construction on Gibson Island of the Austral-Pacific

fertiliser plant, which will use natural gas as a feedstock. The substantial requirements of this plant over a long term made possible, of course, the harnessing of the State's natural-gas reserves. The plant itself will produce nitrogenous fertiliser for both the Australian and overseas markets. Its production will be on a scale sufficiently large to permit a substantial export trade. The utilisation of natural gas will open up a new era of development in Queensland and will give impetus to the already spectacular growth which has taken place over the past five years in the chemical industry.

The Government has played an active role in the development of the State's natural-gas resources. The Department of Industrial Development has in fact provided guarantees totalling \$8,000,000 for the construction of the pipeline and to ensure the ready availability of natural gas in South-east Queensland for industrial, commercial and domestic use. The guarantees provided were \$5,700,000 to Associated Pipelines Ltd. for the pipeline construction and \$2,300,000 to the South Brisbane Gas and Light Co. Ltd. for conversion of domestic appliances in its area of franchise. I think it should be emphasised that the use of gas is not confined to Brisbane, but is available to Ipswich or Toowoomba or any other area along the pipeline route.

Other major chemical investments in the State have been made by A.C.F. & Shirleys Fertilizers Ltd. and I.C.I.A.N.Z. The Brisbane complex of these associated companies represents an investment of some \$14,000,000, whilst planned investment includes \$7,500,000 in Townsville and Gladstone.

The Central Queensland Acid Co. has plans for a \$10,000,000 sulphuric acid plant at Gladstone. In Brisbane, Amoco Australia Pty. Limited has started work on a \$4,000,000 programme which includes an alkylation and sulphur-recovery plant.

Another interesting development is the decision to establish a factory at Strathpine for the production of matches. This will be a joint venture between Australia and Japanese capital. As hon. members would be aware, this is a completely new type of industry to Queensland.

While industry growth is widespread throughout the State, it is recognised that many country centres are keenly anxious to attract additional industry to their areas. It is, of course, unnecessary for me to remind hon. members that Queensland is in fact the most decentralised State in Australia. The pattern of industry location and development that has emerged will ensure that it remains so. As evidence of this, I can do no better than refer to the regional flow of capital expenditure.

In 1961-62 the capital value of plant and machinery employed in factories located in Southern Queensland represented 57 per cent. of the State's aggregate, with the remaining 43 per cent. in the two other major regions.

By 1966-67 the situation was reversed, with Southern Queensland accounting for only 47 per cent., and 53 per cent. being attributable to Central and Northern Queensland. Clearly, then, the greater proportion of the new investment in plant and machinery undertaken by factories in recent years has occurred in the central and northern regions of the State.

In an endeavour to further encourage the decentralisation of industry, the Government recently approved a number of special measures. These cover a wide field, including more liberal conditions in the granting of financial assistance, freight concessions, provision of housing for key personnel, and the development of fully serviced industrial estates in a number of provincial centres. These measures recognise the added difficulties associated with industry establishment in country centres and the tendency of industry to follow the major concentrations of population.

Financial assistance to industry at the present time is generally confined to bank guarantees. The new provisions allow cash advances to be made to help the establishment of a decentralised industry, where finance is not available from normal commercial sources. It will be appreciated that as public funds are involved, adequate security in terms of the Industrial Development Acts must still be available.

It is perhaps not inappropriate to mention at this point that, of the 26 industries currently receiving financial assistance under the Industrial Development Acts, 1963 to 1964, no fewer than 21 relate to projects outside Brisbane.

As its contribution to the Government's policy of decentralisation, the Railway Department will negotiate concessional rail freights in respect of raw materials and finished products where a satisfactory volume is offering on a regular basis. In addition, the Department of Industrial Development will meet railway charges up to \$5,000 for any one project in connection with the movement of machinery or plant required for the establishment of a decentralised industry. The same concessions will be made to an existing industry where the new plant means a substantial increase in employment and there is no conflict with established industry.

The special allocation of houses will be provided under employer-tenancy agreements. These houses will, of course, be in addition to those which would be provided in the normal course of events by the Queensland Housing Commission.

As a further incentive to decentralisation, the Department of Industrial Development is developing Crown industrial estates in Townsville, Rockhampton, Gladstone, Toowoomba and Southport. I want to make it quite clear here that the department is quite prepared to take such steps as may be necessary to provide land in any provincial area on a Crown leasehold basis if it is needed by a specific industry. The cities where estates

are currently being developed have been selected because there is evidence of a growing demand for industrial land in these areas.

The development of Crown industrial estates provides for orderly growth of industries and maintains, to some extent, a restraint on rising land prices. There is a consistent demand for land in Crown industrial estates by both large and small industries. The Department has provided leases for more than 120 industries—some of them quite small—since it began less than five years ago.

Last financial year the department spent approximately \$1,500,000 on estate development. Programmed expenditure for this year is of the order of \$2,800,000. Crown industrial estates now cover more than 2,500 acres in the metropolitan area, while in provincial centres approximately 1,000 acres are being actively developed. Another 4,500 acres have been reserved against future needs.

In the metropolitan area the Rocklea Estate is fully occupied with about 3,000 people employed in 110 industries. The Colmslie Estate, which was opened in 1966, is also now fully allocated. Approximately 200 industries are established at Hamilton, whilst four industries are now operating on the recently opened Acacia Ridge Estate.

Development of the 436-acre Wacol Estate began 15 months ago and already some \$600,000 has been spent on the provision of roads, water, and sewerage. An additional \$400,000 is to be spent this year. Wacol is being developed as a prestige estate in park-like surroundings, and it is proving of great interest to industrialists, with approximately 60 acres of land already taken up. Reserve areas which are held on the outskirts of this estate can provide for large or small industries. I might also mention that, in all Crown leases granted for industrial purposes, a special provision is inserted requiring the lessee to landscape and beautify his property to a reasonable extent.

I feel here that it may be of interest to the Committee if I specified the amounts it is planned to spend on the development of country estates this year. The provisional allocations are as follows: Gladstone \$186,000; Townsville \$171,000; Rockhampton \$100,000; Southport \$60,000; and Toowoomba \$50,000. A sum of \$370,000 has also been provided for the acquisition and development of land in other provincial cities.

During the past year the department worked closely with the University of Queensland on certain projects which it was felt could benefit Queensland's industrial growth. A sum of \$6,500 is being provided this year for a continuation of this work in association with the Chemical Engineering and Economics Departments of the university.

The regional surveys which are being produced by the department, with the assistance of Dr. Skerman, of the university's Department of Agriculture, are now nearing completion. Indeed, they are already available

for a number of districts. These surveys will prove extremely helpful in bringing to the notice of industrialists the resources available in the provincial centres of the State.

Regional studies covering Central and Northern Queensland are also being undertaken by the department in conjunction with the Commonwealth Department of National Development. These studies are now well advanced.

I should like to say a few words here on the Metal Trades Export Group Mission which, as Minister for Industrial Development, I was privileged to lead to South-east Asia in September and October. There is no doubt that the mission achieved a considerable measure of success in its dual objectives of expanding trade and of creating goodwill. From my own point of view, I was able to see something of the industrial growth taking place in these countries. It was also good to learn at first hand that Australia and Australian products are held in high regard in the countries of South-east Asia. The mission was particularly well received by the Governments, the business communities, the Press and other news media in all the countries visited.

An export trade is becoming increasingly important to us, and clearly South-east Asia offers a fast-developing and valuable market as the standard of living rises in that region. We can help the countries of South-east Asia, and at the same time help ourselves, by establishing joint ventures whereby semi-processed goods are exported for completion and assembly in these areas. It would be quite possible to establish a finishing plant in one of these countries and develop a further export market from there, particularly where the price factor is concerned.

South-east Asia is a market in which changes are taking place, not only because of political influences but also because of national aspirations. Industrialisation is the objective of all these countries. Through the medium of industrialisation the Government's aim is to reduce unemployment and to raise living standards.

While there is local capital available for investment in most of the South-east Asian area, there is a shortage of experienced management and technical know-how. That is why the pattern for industrial growth is slanted to the joint-enterprise operation. Queensland manufacturers would be well advised to investigate fully the excellent opportunities which exist for joint participation with local industrialists in South-east Asia.

Turning now to the subject of migration, I think it is reasonable to say that each year brings more difficulties in the attraction of migrants. Despite this, we have been fortunate in being able to maintain a steady flow of migrants, particularly skilled workers, from the United Kingdom.

The return of prosperity to the countries of Western Europe and the economic problems of the United Kingdom have militated to a great extent against migration from those countries. A special Government nomination scheme for skilled British workers has yielded satisfactory results, and the recent strengthening of the migration staff in Queensland House should have a favourable influence on our future migrant intake.

As Queensland industrialises, so we will need more skilled workers. For every skilled operative, some two to three workers will be required in tertiary industry. Clearly we will not be able to rely on natural increase to meet this additional demand for labour. Hence, the need to attract migrant labour will become all the more necessary with the passage of time. This is a matter which is receiving the earnest consideration of the Government.

Queensland has become widely recognised not only as a profitable avenue for capital investment, but also as a country for individual opportunity for advancement.

Mineral development in the State is as yet only in its infancy. There is no doubt that the rich and varied resources of Queensland are capable of enormous expansion and of supporting huge industrial complexes. A major requisite of such development will be large-scale power generation, with power costs low enough to enable local industries to be competitive on world markets. There is a growing national awareness of what Queensland's raw materials can contribute to the national economy through the export market. There is no doubt the prospects for the future look extremely bright.

I am sure that in the not-too-distant future we will see an upsurge of industrial activity based on our coal and mineral resources, more particularly those of the Central Queensland region. We can also, I believe, look forward to an increase in output of our food-processing industries. In addition, there is no doubt that the present upward trend in the other sectors of industry will be progressively accelerated.

Turning now to the appropriations which it is proposed to make to cover the services of the department for the current year, I would comment briefly as follows.

There is a slight increase in the amount provided for salaries. This is to cover normal annual increments and variations of the Public Service Award. It will be observed that the number of officers will remain approximately the same.

During the past year the post of Assistant Director (Technical Services) was created. This officer has a wide experience in private industry and should prove an acquisition to the department.

In the Contingencies (Subdivision), provision has been made to cover the cost of participation of both the Director of the department and myself in the recent Metal Trades Group Mission to South-east Asia.

Provision has also been made for the purchase of certain projection equipment. This will be helpful in showing visiting industrialists, who only have limited time at their disposal, films of specific Queensland developments and the site possibilities for industry establishment on our provincial estates.

The bulk of the money provided for estate maintenance relates to the Rocklea estate, where most of our leased industrial buildings are situated. As these buildings are ageing, maintenance will continue at a relatively high level. Last year a start was made on a repainting programme, and approximately \$29,000 has been allowed for continuation of this work. Provision has also been made for the replacement of electrical wiring in a number of the buildings, at a cost of approximately \$20,000.

I have already dealt, in my earlier remarks, with the subject of special investigations.

In the case of industry promotion, it will be observed that provision has been made for an increase of \$17,549 compared with the amount actually expended in 1967-68. Advertising rates, particularly overseas, are continually increasing, and it is only by careful selection of appropriate media that we are able to maintain the extent of our promotional campaign.

During the past year special leaflets were prepared for inclusion in the pay envelopes of all Crown employees emphasising the importance of buying Queensland-made when price and quality are right. With the assistance of local authorities, manufacturers, retail organisations and other similar bodies, it is hoped to bring this message to every employee in the State. As part of the "Buy Queensland Made" campaign, a series of television simulcasts were also arranged to portray the diversity of Queensland's industry. These films were produced jointly by the Government and the industries concerned. The series will be continued during the current year. Steps have also been taken to use the television media for promotional purposes both in Sydney and Melbourne.

Under the agreement between the Government and Clausen Steamship Co. (Australia) Pty. Ltd., a subsidy is paid on the carriage of cattle from Gulf, Peninsula and Northern Territory ports to Queensland's east coast ports. The rate of subsidy is \$6 a head for cattle from Gulf and Peninsula ports and \$4 a head for cattle transported from Northern Territory ports. From the inception of the first agreement in May, 1962, to 30 June, 1968, a total subsidy of \$226,654 has been paid by the Government. The total subsidy payable in any one year is limited to \$50,000, hence provision has been made for this amount in the current Estimates.

In the case of the Immigration Office, costs fluctuate according to the method of migrant arrival, by sea or air. Clearly, also,

additional costs are incurred when the final destination is a provincial centre. Account has been allowed for this in the present appropriation.

As far as Trust Funds are concerned, a special appropriation has been made to cover the additional incentives offered by the Government to encourage decentralisation.

I have already dealt at some length with the development of our industrial estates. The Industrial Estates Construction Fund is, of course, financed from rentals received from land leased to industry and by transfers from the Loan Fund. With the passage of time, more and more of this work will be financed from rentals received.

I will conclude the presentation of these Estimates by acknowledging the service being rendered to the State of Queensland by the officers and staff of the Department of Industrial Development—in particular, the Director (Sir David Muir), the Director of Technical Services (Mr. Young), and the Assistant Under Secretary (Mr. Bensted); in general, the other officers of the department, all of whom are dedicated to the furtherance of development of industry in this State.

This department is truly a service department in every aspect of its operations, and whilst it is difficult to apply a yardstick to measure the degree of service rendered, nevertheless, the manner in which industry turns to the department for advice, technical assistance, and guidance, in an infinite variety of ways, is but one measure of its performance.

I have studied the operations of similar departments in other States of the Commonwealth, and during my recent visit to South-east Asia I paid particular attention to this aspect of Government administration in those countries. Furthermore, I have acquainted myself with similar Government programmes elsewhere, and I am satisfied that the Department of Industrial Development in Queensland has a more realistic and practical approach in the matter of promoting and fostering development of industry than has any of its counterparts elsewhere.

Since its creation in 1963, the department has developed policies and programmes which are designed to maximise the development and expansion of industry throughout this State of ours, and it now stands poised ready to give the maximum impetus to the impending massive development in this State which will continue on into the next decade in dramatic fashion.

Accordingly, I submit the Estimates of the Chief Office of the Department of Industrial Development and the State Immigration Office for the consideration of hon. members.

Mr. BROMLEY (Norman) (4.44 p.m.): The Minister concluded his remarks by paying a well-deserved tribute to Sir David Muir and his assistants and to the members of the Industries Assistance Board, and I open

my remarks by paying a similar tribute. I believe that the officers of the Department of Industrial Development, particularly Sir David Muir and Mr. Young, are very dedicated and that their ideas for the industrial development of the State are very progressive. However, after going through the report and reading comments in the newspapers, I think that the ideas of these officers may be overridden by the Government's desire to give Australia away to foreigners, and I hope to develop that theme a little later.

The Australian Labour Party, of course, has always recognised the urgency of the need for expanding secondary industries in Australia, and particularly in this large State of Queensland. We have always advocated the need for the continued addition of trained personnel in this field. I heard the Minister say in his opening remarks that while the staff had not been increased greatly, there was a most important addition to it. Unfortunately, as I said, while we as a party believe in encouraging the expansion of industrial development throughout the State, one has only to read the innumerable newspaper cuttings in the Library and elsewhere—I do not intend to go through them one by one, but they are here for everybody to see—to realise that this is an era of propaganda, promises, and more promises, which unfortunately do not reach fruition. The particular promises I am now referring to, of course, are those made within the industrial development sphere. These promises, like old soldiers, do not die; they simply fade away. Then a new batch is spawned and hatched. Perhaps some of the promises the Minister has made today may be hatched and come to fruition, and do something for this great State.

Throughout the years, each Minister for Industrial Development seems automatically to churn out promises, day after day, week after week, year after year. I will deal with automation later on, but, as I say, these promises never seem to come to fruition.

We on this side of the Chamber will wholeheartedly support any definite, worthwhile suggestions put forward by the Government that will help to decentralise industry throughout Queensland or that will in any way help to develop the State in general.

Mr. Houghton: You are talking with tongue in cheek.

Mr. BROMLEY: I know that that sort of interjection should be completely ignored, Mr. Hooper, particularly when we hear a hypocrite such as the hon. member say that I am speaking with tongue in cheek. I feel that that is an insult to people who honestly believe in this State of Queensland, and believe that it must progress.

I reiterate that we will assist in every way possible to develop Queensland and to bring prosperity to it. At the same time, I do not think we should give our State away bit by bit. Of course, I am not the

only one who says this sort of thing. In fact, the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. McEwen, said that we must not sell our farm bit by bit. However, I do not want to dwell on that at the moment because I think we have to pool our ideas to help the progress of Queensland in all ways, and particularly in industrial development. I think we have to work together as a team, and I am sincere when I say this. After all, it is for the benefit of the State and of people in all sections of it.

I suggest to the Committee that there should be set up a central planning and co-ordinating committee to advise the State on industrial development matters.

Mr. Houghton: It already exists. That is how far behind you are.

Mr. BROMLEY: I am not behind at all. I do not think the hon. member has a clue. He was trying to get some industrial development for Redcliffe last year and was not very successful, so he cannot talk. The committee is not already functioning, so I suggest that it should be set up.

Expert and responsible persons—and I emphasise the word “responsible”—from all parts of the State should constitute such a committee. They should be representative of all the areas of the State and all sections of the commercial community. They should represent banking, primary industries and local authorities, which should all have a voice in the planning of this State's industrial development. It is not desirable that people should be able to say that the State has a Queen Street Government. In fact, some members of the Country Party have told me, and not in confidence, that the Minister for Industrial Development should not be a member of the Liberal Party but a member of the Country Party. I will not buy into that argument, but I do not go along with them when they say that at times the Government can be referred to as a Queen Street Government and that country areas suffer as a result of its policies.

Representatives of all parts of the State should have a voice in the planning of its industrial development. I have mentioned bankers, and in addition I think that trade union leaders and industrial experts should have a place on the committee that I suggest. The decisions of the committee could be submitted to the Minister and his department, and they should be looked at and heeded. The voice of the people on the committee should be heard.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: Not necessarily heeded. As soon as these committees make recommendations, people think that Governments should act upon them. I disagree with that view.

Mr. BROMLEY: I did not say that their decisions should be acted upon straight away; I said that members of the committee should be heard and their recommendations heeded.

I do not mean to indicate that the Government should rush into implementation of them, but it should certainly listen to advice from experts in the many commercial spheres.

I recently visited the North, and at Collinsville and Townsville people told me that there appears to be a lack of co-ordination among Ministers in the field of industrial development. I refer, of course, to the present Minister for Industrial Development, the Minister for Local Government, the Minister for Mines, and the Premier. Owing to this lack of co-operation the local authorities appear to be completely ignored. Members of local authorities have told me that their suggestions for the development of industry throughout the State have been ignored. If they have been, and I believe that they have, year after year the lack of co-operation among Ministers is costing the State many millions of dollars in wastage. Of course, that inhibits progress, which is so earnestly desired by all hon. members.

I am worried by the stories I hear about big take-overs of industries. To my knowledge, never has a large take-over of any manufacturing company or any industry resulted in a reduction in prices to the consumer. Never has it meant a better go for the ordinary people in the community. It seems to me that with each take-over the country comes nearer to control by monopolies. That is a very worrying feature to people who think about these things.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: There is one Queensland company that has taken over southern concerns.

Mr. BROMLEY: I take it that the hon. member is referring to Q.U.F. We heard a dissertation by the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha, supplied to him by Mr. Taylor, of Q.U.F., on primary industries. I know the company to which the hon. member is referring.

I do not think enough people realise the extent to which our country is being sold out to overseas interests. I make it quite clear on behalf of the A.L.P. that we welcome overseas capital and investment when it brings—

Mr. Campbell: That is rather refreshing to hear.

Mr. BROMLEY: We have always made it clear that we welcome overseas investment when it creates new industries, more employment and new techniques. The Minister spoke about the need to bring new industries to Australia and he also referred to exports, which I also wish to deal with.

I repeat that we of the Opposition welcome overseas investment when it creates new industries, new techniques and employment in this country. But it is well known that responsible people in all political fields—irrespective of the recent interjections—and in all walks of life, are worried. They have made public statements about

speculative capital similar to those that I am now making. It is not good when original Australian ownership is replaced by foreign ownership.

Mr. Porter: How much of that is being used?

Mr. BROMLEY: Quite a lot of it.

Mr. Porter: How much, in proportion to the gross national product? You talk about it as a threat.

Mr. BROMLEY: I will produce some figures later in my speech. The proportion of foreign capital in the petroleum industry (that is, in its refining and distribution) amounts to 95 per cent. Overseas interests also own 95 per cent. of Australia's motor industry. Many other instances can be cited. The Labour Party assisted G.M.H. to get started. I do not wish to be side-tracked, but I point out that various instances can be cited of overseas control of some of our interests in Queensland. Mount Isa Mines Ltd. is doing a good job in Queensland, but 54 per cent. of its capital is held by various overseas interests. I have referred to General Motors, but the Ford Motor Co., Shell, Nestles, Sunbeam Corporation, Volkswagen, Johnson & Johnson, and Cadbury-Fry, are all overseas interests that are gradually gaining a stranglehold on this country. Those companies, with about 12 other overseas firms, control the investment of over \$600,000,000 in Australia. The alumina company is virtually 100 per cent. foreign-controlled. I am worried about foreign investment, but I do not think the irresponsible members on the Government side are.

I now wish to quote an article that appeared in "The Courier-Mail" of Tuesday, 1 October, 1968, in which Sir Norman Young said, "The Reliance on Japan is 'frightening'." He then made further comments that I have no time to deal with now, but he later said—

"Australia's future export development was dependent to a somewhat frightening extent on Japan's being able to maintain a stable economy."

He went on to speak about the concern that these matters are causing. He spoke about foreign dollars and foreign capital invested in Queensland and in Australia.

What I think we should do—and I advocate this—is to conduct a complete survey of the fuel and other needs of the existing manufacturing, or secondary, industries throughout the country and an analysis of the investment of Queensland and Australian capital, and overseas capital, so that we can plan the best use of this capital in such a way that State resources—and we have plenty of them and do not have to talk about them here—are used in the best interests of the State.

We should go further and implement a policy favourable to decentralisation, more so than the Minister spoke about today and

previous Ministers have spoken about. It should be a decentralisation plan that is economically feasible, and its economic feasibility would be proved by these surveys.

Unfortunately—and it is worrying to me—Queensland today has the doubtful distinction of being the State with the lowest personal income and the highest cost of living. This causes great concern. The Minister spoke of the need to attract migrants. I was with him the other night at a function at which the Good Neighbour Council of Queensland welcomed migrants. We must concern ourselves with attracting migrants here. And we must not only encourage them to come here, but also keep them here. We must take into consideration the number of migrants who leave Queensland after we have got them here because we do not do enough for them or provide industrial manufacturing industries to give them jobs and to provide them with security. The Minister is quite rightly worried about this.

Mr. Porter: The rise in the cost of living should give you concern, because the whole of the recent increase was in Brisbane City Council charges.

Mr. BROMLEY: Irrespective of the reason for it, the fact is that there was an increase, and I do not want to be diverted. I could talk about other increases in the cost of living caused by manufacturing industries with which members of the Liberal Party are concerned. But I do not want to talk about those. The fact is that we have a high cost of living and a low personal income.

I shall speak briefly now of the need for decentralisation of industries to encourage young people of school-leaving age to stay in country areas. It is worrying to see the number of people who leave various areas of the State. I have here the percentages of people who have left many Queensland townships. Unfortunately, I have not the time to relate the figures, but the list is tremendous. We must expand secondary industry in those townships to provide work and, what is most important, to assist families to stay together so that the young people can stay with their parents and grow up with them. Then, when they need advice, they can turn to their parents for it. These are some of the worrying matters that we must consider.

Mr. Chinchin: Are you thinking of direction of labour to certain areas?

Mr. BROMLEY: I am not talking about direction of labour. How stupid can interjections get! I have spoken of the need to introduce light industry to rural areas and the need to investigate water conservation, fuel supplies, and everything else connected with the establishment of industries to keep in rural areas those young people who desire to remain there with their parents. From about

this time of the year to the end of it I receive letters from people I know in country areas who say that things look pretty bleak for their children, that they will have to come to Brisbane, and can I possibly get them jobs and find them accommodation where they will be well looked after. This is a tremendous worry to parents who find themselves in that position. I think young people should be encouraged to remain in the country by the expansion of light industry to those areas, and, if I had time, I could refer to some suitable industries.

No doubt many older members in the Chamber will remember daylight saving in this State during the war years. I was in Hobart last year when a scheme of daylight saving was introduced there, and almost all people to whom I spoke about it, including business people and those on the land, were in favour of it. I think that we could give some thought to it here, as it may perhaps be a means of increasing production in manufacturing industries. At least it provides food for thought.

One thing that worries me is the amount of money made available on loan to some firms. The report of Sir David Muir shows large sums given to some industries to assist them.

Mr. Miller: Did you say "given"?

Mr. BROMLEY: Lent.

Mr. Miller: That is better.

Mr. BROMLEY: I had not finished what I was going to say. The sums are given in the form of loans. Although I do not want to say anything against the firms involved, it concerns me to see a company such as Thies Peabody Coal Co. Pty. Ltd. receiving loans amounting to \$1,400,000. All the loans granted are shown in this report. Associated Pipelines Ltd. has been granted \$5,700,000, probably to assist in the construction of the gas line from Roma to Brisbane. None of that money has yet been paid back, although I am not saying that it will not be returned. What concerns me is seeing large firms, which are supposed to have plenty of capital of their own, being granted substantial financial assistance whilst many other responsible people have to go to a great deal of trouble to receive any help.

(Time expired.)

Mr. PORTER (Toowong) (5.9 p.m.): When the Estimates of the Department of Education were being discussed by the Committee, I had occasion to say that that department was one section of governmental responsibility which was passing through times of very exciting change. I think that that can be said with equal application of the activities within the portfolio of the Minister whose Estimates we are considering today. In introducing his Estimates the Minister indicated the scope of this change, which, though it may not satisfy everybody, does suggest that there has been a great advance in the field of industrial

development in this State, and much more can be expected in the relatively near future. Without a doubt, this Government has provided the climate that encourages the development of industry, both secondary and tertiary, in various parts of Queensland—something that was sadly lacking in the State when the Government assumed office in 1957.

I see little point in going back too many years, but hon. members have to remember that the Country-Liberal Government, in terms of attempting to drag the State up, as it were, by its industrial boot-straps, had a tremendous task, because in 1957 Queensland was a long way behind the eight-ball in comparison with industrial development in most other States. It was, of course, rather typical of the A.L.P. attitude that the hon. member for Norman should suggest that his party has a policy of welcoming industrial development. These words are lip-service, because with almost every compliment that was given—everything to do with industrial development, the operation of a free economy, business competition, and so on—came the kick in the ribs.

These are indeed times of great change. We are all aware of so many aspects that make industrialisation essential—the explosion of populations; the phenomenon, of which we have all talked before, of endless urbanisation. I think, too, that another big factor of change has been the emergence of what one might call the motor-car democracy. And, of course, there have been tremendous advances in technology. This has meant a proliferation of industrial development, and that, in its turn, has achieved so many of the things for which the Labour Party fought, and fought well, in days gone by. But these things have been achieved—a full-employment economy is here; dramatic advances in living standards and the looming promise (or is it a threat?) of the age of greater leisure (it may well be a threat unless we learn to use our leisure well). And with all these, plus what lies ahead of us—the awesome probings into space that are going on at present—come a great host of moral and social problems. We have the perplexities of a juvenile-orientated society, and this grows very much out of industrial development. Concomitant with this is the decline in the authority of orthodox religion. These are all factors of social change that must be considered when one thinks in terms of industrial and tertiary development.

Perhaps as dangerous as anything in this area of industrial change is the rise to power, in both Government and big business, of what one might call the technocrat, and this is something that has to be watched very carefully.

The great problem—and I am sure that the Minister and his very competent officers are aware of this—is that industrial development on the large scale that we need brings problems with it, problems associated with great complexes of industrialisation—such physical things as air and water pollution; the

hastening of not the drift but the rush from rural areas towards urban areas; the desecration of much of the country's natural beauty, of which some hon. members opposite speak very feelingly and with great sincerity. And, of course, one of the problems that industrial development automatically brings, as large cities grow larger, is the frustration engendered by city congestion.

All these things are unfortunate by-products of industrialisation. But quite obviously most of us believe that the advantages outweigh the disadvantages. We have a more sophisticated form of living; because of the rapidly changing technology, we get more goods and more services of all kinds. It is well said that the poor man of today enjoys more material advantages in terms of living standards than did a prince in mediaeval times. Of course, we can all enjoy vast improvements in such services as health, educational opportunities, and so on. We can even look forward to the prospect of inter-planetary travel—although, as far as I am concerned, I will gladly give my ticket to anybody who wants it.

I should think that, on one aspect, both sides of the Chamber will agree that the political objectives of all parties in terms of industrial development should be for growth and development, with stability. The parties represented on this side of the Committee have now been in Government in the Federal sphere for 20 years and in this State sphere—on these Benches—for 11 years, and in the last two decades the Australian scene, of which we in Queensland are a vital part, has been transformed by industrial development. Because of this, we have been able to push our population up almost 50 per cent. on what it was in 1958; our work-force has seen an advance of 50 per cent.; the number of dwelling units has advanced over 50 per cent.; the national income has increased more than fivefold; public authority investment has multiplied eightfold; savings bank accounts have multiplied fourfold; the total of trading bank deposits—that is, the weekly average—has more than doubled; and the value of mineral production, which of course is an essential factor in present-day development, has increased fivefold from \$180,000,000 to \$900,000,000.

The hon. member for Norman referred to the problem, as he saw it, of encouraging overseas investment to buy Australia piece by piece. I asked him then if he would be good enough to relate the threat as he saw it to the over-all situation. This he was either unwilling or unable to do.

Mr. Bromley: I will see you about it afterwards.

Mr. PORTER: There is no need for the hon. member to see me afterwards; I will tell him now. The fact is that in the last 20 years there has been \$60,000 million in all forms of capital investment in Australia. This is an investment of something of the order of \$5,000 for every man,

woman and child in Australia over this past 20 years. Of that \$60,000 million, \$55,000 million has been contributed from Australian resources; only \$5,000 million has come from overseas sources. It is very interesting, when one hears these horrendous tales of what is happening in terms of selling Australia to the outside world, to know what is the real situation.

Mr. Bromley: Don't you agree with Mr. McEwen?

Mr. PORTER: No. I do not agree with Mr. McEwen on this.

Mr. Bromley: There is another split in the ranks.

Mr. PORTER: No, I do not think so. I do not think we have to agree on everything. I would say—and I would expect the Minister to agree with this—that for future industrial development, to a very large degree we are going to look to resource-based industries—minerals, oils, natural gas, and all the attendant complexes that go with them.

Our own Queensland production almost trebled in the decade from 1947 to 1957; it trebled again from 1957 to 1967, and the general aspect of industrial development has been well covered by the Minister. One has only to think of the colossal transformation that has occurred in the last five years. Five years ago we did not have an oil refinery; we only had one major vehicle-assembly plant; we did not have an alumina plant. These are all things that have happened so recently, yet we tend to take them for granted and forget how much we have achieved, particularly when there are so many people around anxious to take a small part of the picture, pretend that it is the whole, and, on that claim that little or nothing has been done.

Indeed, when I consider what has been achieved and the urgent requirements for future development in this State, I never fail to be amazed and saddened at the rather churlish, insular and out-dated attitude of the A.L.P. to the introduction of capital from outside the country. I think they have to realise that there is very little prospect of our going it alone. This applies to every country in the world. If we are to develop, we must use what aid comes to us from older, better-established, larger economies, which have greater resources in money, experience and the necessary scientific and technical knowledge and skills. We must do this without making it appear that we do not want them here at all, because if we do not want them they will certainly go to a country that does.

I rather think that the A.L.P. completely misses the point of what is happening in the world today, that is, this emergence of what one might call the multi-national type of development. This has been one of the great and exciting factors of the last 10 years—

the tendency of very big business, no matter what its country of origin is, to look on the whole world as its scene of operations. It is a type of business that reaches out almost everywhere in the world for both markets and products, and confers considerable benefits on the host nation in which it establishes itself. Owing to enormous improvements in communications and transport, such as the advent of the jet airliner, and the fact that it is easy to convey decisions from one place to another, I am sure that this growth of multi-national business is something that will develop even further and is something from which Queensland can benefit to a considerable extent. We should never, as the Opposition seems to do, concern ourselves merely with the question, "What is 'he' getting out of this?" This is the attitude of the Opposition to the entrepreneur every time. We should be concerned with what "we" are getting out of it; what benefits are conferred on "us"; what comes to "us" in terms of ancillary development and the multitudinous products that flow from investment in oil, gas and other products.

Mr. Newton: That has been our main argument: what return will the people of Queensland receive?

Mr. PORTER: Again the hon. member reflects the typical Labour attitude that we are selling something for nothing and getting nothing out of it.

Mr. Newton: Tell us what we get out of it.

Mr. PORTER: The hon. member completely ignores what has been achieved so far in this State and what has been achieved by this industrial process in every country in the world where outside money and skills have been used.

What staggers me is that the Labour Party, which has always had as its light on the hill the prospect of "one world", the idea of bringing all the races of mankind together, should have this bitter hostility towards business and trade. If there is one thing that will bring all the countries together and make for "one world" it is free, unfettered trade. This is shown in the course of all history, and hon. members opposite should welcome this development and not be constantly complaining about it.

One of the major aspects of the role of a sensible Department of Industrial Development—and this one is sensible—is that it must so act as to carry out effective decentralisation. I should like to see the portfolio not simply as the Ministry for Industrial Development but also as the Ministry for decentralisation.

Mr. Houston: You are pursuing our policy again.

Mr. PORTER: I am merely making suggestions, and nobody can stop me from doing that.

In fact, in New South Wales there is a Minister for Decentralisation and Development, and in Western Australia, Mr. Court, a very able man, is the Minister for Industrial Development and the North West, which means the same as "decentralisation". I think that our Minister for Industrial Development could also be Minister for decentralisation. To effectively prosecute his portfolio he should be concerned with decentralisation. Indeed, this is what the Minister has done. The establishment of country industrial estates has been a very welcome and encouraging step towards this end.

The Minister said that we are the most decentralised State in Australia. Too often this is forgotten. It is very easy to say that we should have a greater amount of decentralisation in Queensland, but we sometimes conveniently forget that we are already far ahead of any other State in terms of effective decentralisation. To illustrate that, I point out that only 46.7 per cent. of Queensland's population lives in its capital city, whereas 69.8 per cent. of Victoria's population lives in Melbourne; 60.1 per cent. of New South Wales' population lives in Sydney; and 70.5 per cent. of Western Australia's population lives in Perth.

I say to members of the Opposition, "Don't sell us short; don't complain about decentralisation," for we are already leading the other States in the practical implementation of that policy. I suggest that for good long-range planning we must ensure that the suitable types of industry go to the areas most suited for them; that we make sure that we get the best possible usage of suitable sites; that we deploy transport and communications in the most effective way, and so on. That, of course, impinges on a role of town and regional planning. No matter what we discuss, it seems that we come back to what I feel is a very urgent necessity, namely, to consider the introduction of a proper scheme of town and regional planning.

The hon. member for Norman suggested the establishment of a committee. I am not inclined towards just another committee but it may be possible for us to consider what is done in Victoria, which has a State Development Committee, set up under a statute of 1958. It is a Government committee which reports on the balanced economic, industrial and rural development needs of the State, the extent of the requirements of decentralisation, and so on. It is a committee of the House, recognised by statute. It has power to go out and inspect areas, to summon the attendance of witnesses, to compel the production of maps and documents, and so on. A committee of the House of this nature, with statutory powers, might be of great assistance to the Minister and his officers in the tremendous task that confronts them.

I would also like to renew a previous plea I have made, namely, to make industrial development one of the major portfolios

in the Cabinet. If industrial development is to do the job it is required to do, its Minister must be in a position to give decisions almost on the spot. He confers with top people who want to know what can be done for them and what they can expect; he should be in a position to tell them. Quite obviously he must be a Minister who can work with, and have immediate access to, the Premier, and he must have the authority to make decisions if they are needed to obtain big new industries. These decisions may sometimes concern such matters as land tenure, rail and other facilities, power availability and cost, market assistance, and so on.

I envisage the Minister with the Industrial Development portfolio having real Cabinet authority. I would expect him to be armed with a statistical headquarters that would be something like command headquarters in a war. He would have all the relevant data available to him on cities, towns and areas of the State. He should be able to produce at a moment's notice, as it were, for interested parties, the data concerning population of an area, age groups and other groupings in different areas, with the climate and rainfall, power, water and other facilities, what works are going on in the area, and what is proposed. In other words, he should be able to provide a complete run-down of the picture as and when required. This may be largely provided at the moment, but I envisage something on which a great deal more money is spent in order to let the department have the very best of modern statistical and reference systems for this purpose.

I think we all commend the vital work that the department has done. This is considerable, despite the few small critical comments that may be made by the Opposition. I repeat that if we are to maintain the pace of development that is required in Queensland, if we are to realise our full potential and keep our place—and indeed improve our place in today's highly competitive conditions—the Department of Industrial Development must be upgraded and expanded. I would like to see this Minister also the Minister for decentralisation. It may be worth contemplating setting up a statutory body to assist in this enormous task of planning. I think it would be most effective if the Minister was able to call on the resources of a modern command headquarters. This is not something new or fanciful. This is done in some countries—indeed it is done in some Eastern countries—and very effective it is.

I believe that with these facilities the Minister for Industrial Development could ensure that the State would not only have the industrial and developmental success that we all want, but, much more to the point, it would also have the success that we have earned and richly deserve.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (5.31 p.m.): First of all, I thank the hon. member for Norman for leading in this debate on behalf of the Opposition. It was expected that I would be engaged on other duties when the Minister resumed his seat. I am most grateful to the hon. member for Norman and compliment him on the capable way in which he opened the debate on behalf of the Opposition.

Two things are abundantly clear from the remarks of the hon. member for Toowong; firstly, he has a complete lack of knowledge of the policy of the Australian Labour Party, and secondly, he has a complete lack of knowledge of the Department of Industrial Development. He started off by talking about the policy of the Australian Labour Party and, to say the least, he was miles from the target. I suggest to him in all sincerity that if he wants to talk common sense he should, for goodness sake, get a copy of our convention decisions and study them. In that way he will learn something about the party. His remarks about the party being opposed to industrial development and to overseas capital—in fact, according to him we are opposed to everything—were complete nonsense.

The hon. member attacked the Minister. I know that there is no love lost between certain sections of the Liberal Party—we have seen this over and over again—but I do not think that this is the occasion to make a personal attack on the Minister. To suggest that it should be a senior portfolio is to suggest that he is a junior Minister. I understand that Government members considered that all Ministers were important and that they worked together as a Cabinet. I do not believe that the Government looks on the Minister for Industrial Development as a junior Minister, and I am sure that he does not consider he is a junior Minister.

The hon. member for Toowong also made many suggestions about what the department should do. I have talked with Sir David Muir on many occasions about the shortcomings mentioned by the hon. member for Toowong, and on each occasion, in a short space of time Sir David was able to make the information available to me.

Therefore I say at this point of time that the hon. member for Toowong should do some homework on the policy of the Australian Labour Party, and on his Government's activities, so that he does not waste so much time talking tripe.

The hon. member for Toowong, in reply to the hon. member for Norman, spoke about increased living costs. He said that the increase was brought about solely by the Brisbane City Council. That is a half-truth. I get annoyed when some Government back-benchers get up and talk half-truths to try to score a point. The fact is that the Brisbane City Council did increase electricity charges. I do not deny that.

Mr. Porter: The reason for the increase in Brisbane was totally Brisbane City Council charges.

Mr. HOUSTON: The hon. member had his time, and I remained quiet while he made a fool of himself. He should not try to get further into the mire by interjecting while I am speaking.

The Brisbane City Council increased electricity charges purely and simply because the Southern Electric Authority, on the authority of the State Electricity Commission, increased its charges. The increase in these charges was not a direct result of any Brisbane City Council activity.

There were other increased charges, and they were brought about by the determination of the Brisbane City Council to balance its budget, which it is required to do by law, and to maintain the development of this city. Whether or not these charges are excessive I do not think is for us to determine; that will be decided by the people of Brisbane. Let us not forget that at the last two Brisbane City Council elections Alderman Jones and his colleagues, irrespective of what was thrown at the Labour administration, were returned with record majorities.

From time to time I hear the hon. member talking about the great development going on in this State and referring to things happening in Brisbane. If credit is claimed for the establishment of oil refineries, fertiliser works and other industrial developments in this city, does not the city council play its part in that growth? Has not the council to provide roads, water, electricity and gas? All those things come under city administration. There can be no separating advancement in the capital city from general State development. I say that all the hon. member does when he speaks that way is virtually praise the city council.

I say quite distinctly that no price rise has been imposed by the city council unless there was a very good reason for it. We also know that some prices have had to be increased to balance the council's budget because the Government reduced subsidies payable on various activities coming under city council control.

Another thing that the hon. member said was that the Liberal Party—or he and his group in particular—believes that our society should be a completely free-enterprise one. If free enterprise was left completely on its own, it would founder; it would not know where to go. The hon. member said in his opening remarks that the Department of Industrial Development is a most important department. It is most important, which is why the Labour Party supported its establishment in the first place. We know that there was a lot of ballyhoo when the late Sir Alan Munro was appointed the first Minister for Industrial Development—he retired from that position soon after—but I shall not go back to that part of the State's history. I certainly criticise the Government's policy

that has been handed on since then, although I do not criticise what has been attempted within the limits of established policy.

I say that this department is the one that assists industry, and most industries that the hon. member speaks of as great free-enterprise industries have to be assisted. Many of today's large industries are large and financially sound only because of Government assistance given at the time of their establishment. Therefore all this talk of a completely free-enterprise society is a lot of nonsense. There has to be a balance between free enterprise and the socialist system, and that is the policy of the Australian Labour Party. There has to be, under the present set-up, a certain amount of free enterprise, but, by the same token, the free-enterprise system would not be worth a bumper if it were not for the community effort and community money that has assisted it.

Whose money was used, for instance, in the reconstruction of the railway line to Mt. Isa? Whose money was used to build the railway line from Moura to Gladstone? Whose money was used for the development of the port at Weipa? Public money was used for all those things, as it is used every day to assist some form of private enterprise. Do not let us run away with the idea that these industries will prosper if left entirely to free enterprise. I say that if it were not for assistance rendered by Governments, they would not be successful at all.

Organisations set up as a result of Labour's policy, such as Trans Australia Airlines, the State Government Insurance Office, and the Metropolitan Public Abattoir, which has recently been discussed here, have an influence on the economy because through them Governments can keep a finger on the cost structure. I believe that they play a most important part in the development of this State. I do not apologise to anybody for saying that the Labour Party believes in this type of development and the fostering of these industries.

What we do recognise, of course, is that there is no point in having employees if there are no employers. The Opposition is not against employers merely for the sake of opposing them. I know that our opponents, particularly those on the back-benches who consider themselves ultra-conservatives, headed by the hon. member who has just resumed his seat, tell us—I know that they would like to believe it—that that is what our policy is; but it is not our policy.

The hon. member for Toowong spoke about the present high standard of living. How has that been achieved? Was it not brought about by the sound planning of former Governments? I do not want to get into a political fight, but that is what has happened over the years.

One thing that does worry me considerably today is the amount of overtime that men and women have to work. Far too many men and women are forced to work overtime, as

distinct from wanting to work it. I do not want to deny anyone the right to go to work if he so desires; but I do object when the stage is reached where the wife has to go to work to help support the family that she and her husband are raising. Of course, that has created other problems that I cannot discuss under these Estimates. When one speaks of living standards, one should bear in mind such things as that.

Let me deal with some of the other comments made by the hon. member for Toowong. He referred to the oil refineries. He should not lose sight of the fact that the oil refinery that is Australian-financed is the one that the Government did not care two hoots about and did not assist in any way. When we were arguing in this Chamber about which company was to be assisted, the Minister who was in charge of the Bill said, "There is room in Brisbane for only one refinery", and the one that he assisted was Amoco. What do we find? Ampol completed a refinery in Brisbane and Government members are now saying, "We now have two refineries in Brisbane. Give us all the credit." I say that no credit is due to them.

Mr. Porter: A good example of a free-enterprise system.

Mr. HOUSTON: I think I have answered the hon. member on the question of free enterprise. Not one free enterprise would have been successful in this country if it had not been assisted by sympathetic Governments and councils over the years, and that will continue to be so.

Mr. Porter: List them, instead of making general statements.

Mr. HOUSTON: What does the hon. member want to know?

Mr. Porter: You are trying to claim that literally every industrial operation in this country has had Government assistance.

Mr. HOUSTON: Indirectly, yes, every one of them—roads, water supply, electricity supply, the provision of power-houses. Public money was spent and interest is being paid. There is talk of a new major power-house, and I agree that one should be constructed, as I have said on other occasions. But when the power-house is built, money will be required to build it and interest will have to be paid, and all that money will come from the pockets of the people. However, industries provide employment, and for that reason the Opposition supports them. Unless public money is spent in the first instance, the State is not going to get very much out of such industries.

My colleague the hon. member for Baroona has reminded me of two instances. The first is Mount Isa Mines Ltd. Hon. members opposite talk about the great development at Mt. Isa. If it had not been for the assistance of Labour Governments, Mt. Isa would have gone out of existence before the Country-Liberal Government came to

office. The second is the Mitsui railway line. The Treasurer stood in this Chamber and argued with me on this question, but his main point was that the Government of Queensland had assisted the company. It was public money that helped build the railway line. Let us get away from the idea that public money has not assisted organisations such as these.

Mr. Hanlon: Thies Peabody got a \$750,000 Government-guaranteed loan from the Bank of New South Wales.

Mr. HOUSTON: That is quite correct.

The hon. member for Toowong asked, "What are we getting out of the investment?" That is the whole point of Labour's argument. What is the general public getting out of the sale of coal and other things? When hon. members opposite can show the Opposition that there is massive employment; that prices have come down; that people have not, as I said, to work long hours of overtime; that they can have their annual leave and not have to go seeking another job; that people can knock off work in one place and not have to seek a job somewhere else; that our people are working only a 40-hour week; that the income from one man is sufficient to keep his family; that people are having larger families because their economic position is sound, then I will say we have State development. But until we get to that stage, we are still in the process of developing and we cannot boast about those things.

The hon. member spoke about money coming from overseas for industrial development. I believe that the hon. member for Norman made it very clear where we stand on this matter. We welcome overseas investment provided it comes here to help us and provided it brings know-how and the like with it. But quite often this type of investment is not for that purpose alone. Where we have no Australian financial interest in an industry, we start to worry. The hon. member mentioned a comparatively small proportion of overseas capital compared with the total investment, but if he took out the figures over recent times for the State of Queensland alone, compared with Australia generally, he would find that the position here is much worse than that in any other State. Queensland is receiving proportionately more overseas capital than local capital and this is becoming a problem.

Perhaps we could suggest that some of our own money could be used to greater advantage. I have been concerned for some time about the amount of local money that is going into major office blocks as compared with the amount going into projects that would result in further development. I know that it is a good, sound investment for years to come to build office blocks and have office accommodation available, but I think it is more important to put those millions of dollars into the further development of young industries. This would help industries in

which there is a large man-power absorption, not only in construction of buildings and plant but in its operation as well.

I suggest that it would be advisable for the State to look at this matter. Perhaps it should be looked at at Commonwealth level to make it uniform, and I think the Commonwealth should consider trying to encourage Australian people with available money to invest in developmental projects instead of in buildings and the like which, once they are built, contribute little to employment and production. I think this is what we need. We know we need power-houses; we know we need aluminium works. In introducing his Estimates, the Minister emphasised the fact that the sale of building materials has increased. He also pointed out that brick production had increased, as well as electrical appliances and the like. This is all very good—it proves that our people are able to buy these necessities of life—but is it not just as logical that, as we are developing the production and sale of these more homely commodities, we should also be endeavouring to develop what I might call the more national commodities? I refer to such things as steelworks, aluminium production, and the like.

To my way of thinking, these are the things we have to go after. While we are relying on interstate and overseas importation of our primary industrial requirements—that is, iron, steel and aluminium—I feel that we cannot boast of true industrial development. Only the other day it was brought to my notice—and I think to the notice of this Chamber—that the contract for some railway wagons for Western Australia went to Japan in preference to Queensland.

Mr. Campbell: They weren't for Queensland.

Mr. HOUSTON: No. Western Australia wanted some railway wagons and, from memory, a Japanese company won the contract in preference to a Queensland company. It was given to the Japanese because they could land the finished article in Western Australia cheaper than the Queensland company could land the steel here to make the wagons. This is something that we have to look at and reason out why this is happening.

I know that we cannot tell one private company to buy locally manufactured goods, to buy "Queensland-made" or "Australian-made", if it can import goods much more cheaply from another country. We need to work out why some products can be purchased more cheaply in other countries. One of the reasons is that articles are not produced in Australia and there is no competition to the steelworks that are already established.

One thing that I want to see during my "term" in Parliament is the establishment of a steelworks in this State. If we are to go ahead with the development that we envisage it is absolutely necessary that a

steelworks be established in Queensland. I should like those business enterprises that are constructing tall buildings and providing great areas of office space to look at the advisability and possibility of investing money in a bigger type of enterprise. I know that it could be argued that the return to those enterprises could be a long way off, and we all realise that industrial development requires the expenditure of a great amount of money, so the Government should provide financial assistance to promote further industrial development.

The Minister mentioned the establishment of industrial estates. Those that were established in my electorate faced many problems, but as far as I know they have been overcome. I hope I am correct in saying that, for, as the Minister knows, on the last occasion when I suggested that, I was not very well informed on the matter. I believe that at the present time the people concerned with the establishment of the estates are helping to overcome the problems that face them. If they are not, other action will need to be taken at the appropriate time.

I was pleased to hear the Minister refer to the fact that lessees of portions of industrial estates will be compelled to provide garden settings and implement beautification. One pleasing feature of the newly developed industrial estates in Sydney and Melbourne is the provision of gardens and buildings of appropriate types. Although the groundwork associated with the provision of gardens is important, the companies that are concerned with the buildings on the estates should play a bigger part in their design. As the Minister knows, many of the buildings that are erected on the Colmslie Industrial Estate are serviceable and perform the function for which they were erected, but they certainly fall far short of the standard that is desirable in a city industrial estate.

The erection of buildings that fit into the over-all landscape would not require the expenditure of very much more finance than that already spent on the design, planning and erection of the present buildings. I make a plea to the Minister and to the firms and companies that occupy premises on industrial estates to give more thought to the type of buildings to be constructed and the materials used in their construction. If we live in a city of which we are proud it is easy for us to "sell" it to people who are interested in establishing their business in it.

The Minister referred also to the development of industrial estates relative to the difference between industrial-estate prices and ordinary land prices. I hope that his comments are correct. Unfortunately, the only other examples of the Government handling land sales that I know of is the sale of homestead land in the City of Brisbane for which up to \$5,000 has been charged. To my way of thinking, the Government's

policy does not achieve what the Minister hopes it will achieve. I know that the land is transferred on a lease basis for a start, but I hope that the prices paid for it are not too high.

I will close my speech with a reference to the hon. member for Toowong. Surely he cannot claim that free enterprise is providing the cheap land that the Minister said he was hoping to get. Is that not an example of how the State Government is assisting private enterprise, by providing cheaper land? Whichever way we look at it, as a State we must maintain a balance between private enterprise and the various Government activities—socialism, co-operation, call it what we like; it is Government participation on behalf of the people as a whole. The hon. member said that the Federal Government has been in power for 20 years and this State Government for 11 years. How can he say what a Labour Government would have done under the same circumstances? He is only raising Aunt Sallys—saying that a Labour Government would have done this and that—and then trying to knock them down. When Australia has been in need—in every war, in every depression—the people have turned to a Labour Government to help them out. That, to me, is the important factor.

Mr. Porter: Do you want another war?

Mr. HOUSTON: No, I do not. But unless Labour gains power shortly, all the Government's shortcomings will come home to roost.

(Time expired.)

[*Sitting suspended from 5.57 to 7.15 p.m.*]

Mr. McKECHNIE (Carnarvon) (7.15 p.m.): This afternoon I was heartened to hear the Minister for Industrial Development inform us that the greater percentage of secondary industry in the State is now outside the metropolitan area. Previously the metropolis definitely had the greater part of the State's secondary industry. I did not record the Minister's figures exactly, but I think he said that previously there was 57 per cent. in the metropolis and 43 per cent. in the country, whereas now there is 47 per cent. in the metropolis and 53 per cent. in the other areas of the State.

Mr. Houston: That would be money value, but not employment.

Mr. McKECHNIE: They are the figures the Minister gave.

Mr. Houston: I do not doubt his figures, but that would be money value, not employment.

Mr. McKECHNIE: What I am very pleased to see is that at last the trend is the way we want it. We are at last moving towards decentralisation. Although we are dealing with the Department of Industrial Development, we naturally associate with it the desire to decentralise. These

figures give an indication that we are now making progress along that road. I should like to see some acceleration, naturally, and I believe that we will see development along those lines.

With the development of the coal deposits and processing of bauxite in Central Queensland it will not be long before we find ways of providing cheaper electric power, which will naturally lead to our alumina being processed into aluminium. It is only natural that when an industry like the coal industry in Central Queensland is opened up, other industries will develop at the source. A steelworks will come to that area within the foreseeable future.

We have seen wonderful development in the petrochemical industry. I think the figures show that over the past five years there has been an increase of about 213 per cent. in petrochemicals following the establishment of the refineries in Brisbane. There will be similar development in Central Queensland. In his lifetime the hon. member for Port Curtis will see Gladstone as the Newcastle of Queensland. There will be a good deal of development in Gladstone, as there will be in Rockhampton also, and we are already seeing the effects of development in Townsville, where the copper from Mt. Isa is refined.

I am not greatly worried about the coastal area. I believe that we are developing in the right manner there. With the railway system of Queensland being what it is, and Queensland being such a widespread State, with a degree of decentralisation these coastal centres will increase industrially and will develop quite well.

The inland areas present a greater problem. Mt. Isa, has developed wonderfully, for a very clear-cut reason—the copper deposits and the mining of them. In addition, there are the phosphate-rock deposits that will be developed in that area. Towns and cities that are based primarily on the pastoral and agricultural industries present somewhat greater problems. Yet wonderful development is taking place in Queensland's most beautiful city—Toowoomba. I consider Toowoomba as our most beautiful city, and it is developing in a very worth-while way. I am in that city often, and I really appreciate it.

To a lesser extent, similar development is proceeding in Warwick and Dalby. In Dalby there is the fabrication of farm machinery, which is a type of decentralised industry that fits naturally into an agricultural area. Although in decentralisation a form of centralisation must be expected in some provincial areas—Toowoomba is a classic example of that—some of the smaller towns will be able to handle industrial enterprises of some significance.

There are towns along the southern border of Queensland which have certain advantages even over Brisbane. Stanthorpe is 100 miles closer to Sydney than Brisbane

is, but it is still relatively close to Brisbane. Goondiwindi is 200 miles closer to Sydney, yet relatively close to Brisbane. The locations of Stanthorpe and Goondiwindi will give them, in the foreseeable future, the advantage of access to the markets in both Sydney and Brisbane. In the case of Goondiwindi, Adelaide is not so far away, either, the way roads have developed across the flat land in western New South Wales. Consequently we will see in these areas—indeed, it is starting to develop now—a small degree of industrialisation.

Only last Friday I had the pleasure and privilege of opening, in Goondiwindi, the first enterprise established in Queensland by the New South Wales firm of F. W. Williams (Rural) Pty. Ltd. Although this firm has extensive interests in New South Wales and New Guinea, this is its first venture into Queensland. It was pleasing to see it opening quite a big set-up in the town. The local manager, Mr. John Burke, said that the location of the area was such that he saw great possibilities for the development in it of not only primary industries but secondary industries as well.

I welcome the statement about industrial estates that was made by the Minister a couple of months ago. Such estates will be of great help, because even in the smaller areas industry is frightened away if it cannot get possession of land quickly. The firm to which I referred just a moment ago found that, with all the co-operation possible from the Goondiwindi Town Council, it took 12 months to get possession of a suitable industrial site. If an industrial estate had been ready, this firm could have moved in much quicker and possibly attracted others, too.

Yesterday the only four pieces of Crown land available were sold for industrial purposes at Goondiwindi, and I know that there are other people who also require industrial sites. Admittedly they are only in business in a small way. I rang Goondiwindi today to find out how the sale went and learnt that the four blocks were purchased. I know of at least one other firm that would like to obtain a similar block of land, and I dare say there are others.

I therefore make an appeal to the Minister, which I shall put to him later in writing, for the establishment of industrial estates in places such as Goondiwindi and Stanthorpe. With the development of water that is taking place, there will be room for small industrial plants in smaller places such as Inglewood and Texas. With the development of the Fairbairn Dam in Central Queensland and other water schemes, small industries, possibly processing industries attached to primary industries, will be attracted to rural areas, and I am sure that this would be assisted if industrial sites were readily available under the scheme initiated by the Minister. Leasing industrial land is a very attractive proposition when

water, sewerage and power are available so that firms can move in immediately. They will have the assistance of up to \$5,000 worth of rail freight to bring their plant in, and they will then be able to negotiate with the Railway Department for contract freight rates, if the volume is sufficient, and to negotiate also for housing. Housing is short in the towns that are growing rapidly, and, even without industrialisation, towns in southern inland Queensland are growing quite rapidly and there will be a much greater population in those areas.

At the same time, the Department of Industrial Development will be working in conjunction with local authorities, which are keen to co-operate in matters such as this. The estates will be planned, and I agree with the Leader of the Opposition, and welcome the fact, that there will be plans for their beautification.

It is essential that the machinery and equipment required for farming should be fabricated in the area in which the farming is done. As I said earlier, Dalby has come quite a long way in the manufacture of farm machinery, and I know that farmers in the Dalby area get a much better service than do farmers in my electorate. They are right on the spot, and they have access to spares and can have things made to their own specifications. It is a wonderful advantage for farmers to have a manufacturer in their midst instead of some distance away. It is of advantage, too, to a secondary industry, because that industry can then benefit by the know-how of the people who are using their equipment.

Mr. Miller: Does that company export?

Mr. McKECHNIE: Napier Bros. sends a small quantity of machinery overseas. I am not sure of the figure, but I know that some of its equipment does leave our shores.

A short while ago the hon. member for Toowoomba East was goading me about processing.

Mr. P. Wood: I would not do that.

Mr. McKECHNIE: The hon. member assures me that he was prompting me. Progress in the field of processing has not been as great as it might be, but there is no doubt in my mind that it must, and will, come. I assure you, Mr. Hooper, that I am doing all in my power to further the processing of fruit into juices and other fruit products in the Granite Belt. As a matter of fact, Sir David Muir has kindly arranged an appointment for me tomorrow with Mr. Young of his department. It relates to a light industry in that area, and I hope that some progress will be made with the proposal. I thank Sir David for arranging for my constituent to meet Mr. Young, who is Director of Technical Services.

So far as processing is concerned, to begin with we plan to extract juices. That is a

fairly simple operation, and once it is being done we may be able to branch into other avenues.

There has been much talk in recent months about the establishment of wineries in Queensland. No move has been made to establish a winery on the Granite Belt, but I cannot think of any better area for such a purpose than the vineyards of the Granite Belt. They grow the best grapes in Queensland, and they grow them in large quantities. Much country that is still covered with timber could be used for the growing of grapes in that area.

Similarly, as the water supply is developed, other industries will follow. When the Border Rivers scheme is completed there will not be any better town for fodder processing than Texas. The development will be similar to that round Emerald when the Fairbairn Dam is completed. There would be ample green feed, such as lucerne, where this water is to process into stock feeds, and I am sure that the stock feeds of the future will be more concentrated, processed feeds that will be added to the roughage that will be stored where the stock are run. But, as is developing in Great Britain, there will be processing of lucernes and green feed into a pelletised, concentrated form.

Mr. Kaus: Aren't they doing that in New South Wales now?

Mr. McKECHNIE: It has been done in quite a few places, but the point I am making is that we will see an acceleration of this type of development throughout the State.

Earlier in the day, on another department's Estimates—the Department of Primary Industries—the Leader of the Opposition drew attention to the fact that we could export both our secondary and primary products to our neighbours in the North. I could not agree more, except that I believe that our greatest problem, which he did not discuss at length although he hinted at it, is to find ways of getting return trade from those countries. They certainly like our goods, and there are plenty of them there to use them, but the big question is, "What have they to trade in return?" That is going to be one of the problems we must solve. The Federal Government will have to find ways of helping them develop their products so that we can trade with them. The need is there, but it is a matter of how they will find ways and means to pay in cash or in kind. Whatever it is, production will have to be developed and we will have to assist to make those markets available to us.

Indonesia alone has 110,000,000 people and, if we can develop a trade with them that requires only a small amount of our primary or secondary products, it will be one of the solutions to our problems.

I thank the Minister for his assistance; I thank the officers of his department, headed by Sir David Muir, for the advice and encouragement they have given me in these things

that I admit we are not achieving as quickly as I would like but which I am confident will come within the foreseeable future.

Mr. HANSON (Port Curtis) (7.33 p.m.): We finished today a couple of periods of intense debate surrounding and affecting the primary industries of this State, and it is well worth while noting that, whilst the Department of Industrial Development is not associated with industries that are anywhere near the value of the primary industries in this State, nevertheless this is a very significant department and there has been considerable acceleration in its functions since its creation. This activity is confined not to this State only but extends to most areas of the world, because great emphasis is placed throughout the world today on industrial development.

Considerable argument and some ideas have been advanced by members of the Government this afternoon relative to the Labour Party's policy on industrial development and the intrusion of foreign enterprise into this country. Just to make it quite clear, I want to mention a statement made by the Federal Leader of the Labour Party in 1963 in his policy speech, and it still holds good today. I do not think it will upset members of the Government, but I hope it sinks in.

He said—

"I make it absolutely clear that the Labour Party welcomes overseas investment when it brings new industries, employment opportunities and new techniques. We do not welcome speculative capital, or capital which merely replaces foreign for Australian ownership of an established industry."

There is nothing wrong at all with that policy, and that is the thinking of the Labour Party. I make it perfectly clear also that we believe that, if any foreign-owned company wants to establish itself in this State, our own industries, which have a large Australian and Queensland shareholding content, certainly deserve an equal or even better chance of receiving concessions when they are handed out. That is not happening under this administration to the extent that it should happen. In my speech during the Budget debate I cited the example of one firm that has a large Queensland shareholding and has been held back by the State Government in its attempts to get on its feet. The Government's policy was to put a foreign-owned company in an advantageous position to the detriment of the Queensland company. The Treasurer has promised me that he will look into the matter, and I sincerely hope that he does.

The statement on the Labour Party's policy in this matter is possibly in direct contrast to a statement made by a former employer of the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt, the Vice President of Ford International, Mr. Tom Lilley.

In 1963 he said—

"Divided ownership results in a tangled skein of corporate relations. If you're going to be truly global you need the freedom of action that comes from establishing 100 per cent. ownership."

He is not beating about the bush, but is giving us a clear indication of what he thinks. So much for that matter.

Since World War II the international corporation has become a very exciting part of the world's economy. Its ability to marshal capital, to assemble managerial skills and techniques, and to gather scientific and technical information from many countries throughout the world, has made it a very major contributor to universal, national and State development. We have seen the introduction of hosts of new products and materials by the process of mechanisation and automation and we have seen the raising of standards of human productivity through international corporations and consortiums. All countries, including our own, have a desire to share in these industrial advances in order to raise the living standards of the people, who are very important even in a consideration of industrial development.

Companies that use mass markets to further their activities undoubtedly have a responsibility to the countries in which they carry out their operations and to citizens of those countries to provide them with job opportunities and training in imported skills. I maintain that it is very important that the companies that are establishing themselves in other countries should not put too great an emphasis on profit and should never completely disregard the customs, practices and aspirations of the people. Research and innovation should not be limited to the national headquarters of overseas companies, but should be spread over the countries in which they have their various enterprises and undertakings.

At this stage I draw the Committee's attention to a computer assistance study undertaken by the Queensland University into industrial development in Central Queensland. Like the leader-writer in the Rockhampton "Morning Bulletin" of 21 June, I hope that this study will not be another academic exercise that is pigeon-holed by the administration. There are plenty of industrial gaps in the Central region despite the fact that, as a result of feasibility studies, a couple of great enterprises have come to the area.

Hon. members on both sides of the Committee have said that there are plenty of opportunities for well-planned development. They can be attracted only by such studies so that every type of industry, resource, result, possibility and potential is laid clearly on the line. If that is done we will be able to take advantage of these studies in the future and so ensure that many of the findings are implemented.

I am indeed disappointed by a couple of items concerning this department. We have a Minister for Industrial Development, yet the Premier carries the title of Minister for State Development. Where is the thin line of demarcation? Who is developing what? What are the Premier's responsibilities in State development, and what are the Minister's responsibilities in the field of industrial development? When an overseas enterprise is willing to invest money in this State, not only are the Ministers for State Development and Industrial Development interested, but an intense investigation is undertaken by the Treasurer, the Minister for Mines, and others. More emphasis in negotiations must be given to the Minister for Industrial Development when he is dealing with people who are willing to invest money or engage in an operation of some magnitude. Let us not be confused by the word "development". Let us see that the Minister's duties are quite clear and concise; that duties do not conflict and that we do not have a jumble such as at present which stems from the names given to the various ministries.

I am also extremely disappointed in that the Government has seen fit to take away from the Minister for Industrial Development the control of electric power within this State. The two portfolios run hand in hand. If we are to achieve industrial development of great magnitude in Queensland we must have a power-station similar to the ones at Liddell and Vales Point in New South Wales, to supply the needs of great industries not only now but in the future.

I said in my Budget speech that the construction of an aluminium refinery would commence today if the administration would face up to its responsibility of getting on with the job of establishing a large-scale power-station in the Central region. That is essential for the industrial development of Queensland. It is completely useless to voice in this Chamber and on the hustings clichés such as "Queensland Unlimited; the State of the Future." It is useless to produce glossy magazines and to advertise in "The New Age"—(Government laughter)—I should say "The Australian", or in "The Australian Financial Review". It is absolutely hopeless. I know that the Minister for Lands would advertise in "The Tribune" if he could; a lot of tripe in "The Tribune".

Nevertheless I believe that we must have adequate and more than adequate supplies of cheap power in this State in order to attract various industries. Personally I think that there will be within this State a plant producing aluminium—that is for certain—but the fact that Queensland has alumina powder is not sufficient reason for the establishment of a plant. If another State in Australia can produce aluminium from alumina cheaper than we can it will certainly get the business. It is ludicrous to think that we will shortly send alumina powder to the Australuco plant in New South Wales, and to New

Zealand, which, with the assistance of Japanese capital, will establish an aluminium refinery. We are sending bauxite, as I said in a speech earlier this session, to the island of Sardinia in the Mediterranean where alumina powder will be manufactured for the European Economic Community to supply the various plants in Germany and Italy. Why can we not grab the reins and establish a power-station of great magnitude in this State and so get this vital industry? There is a desire for every State in Australia to be reasonably independent, but it is Australia's over-all picture that is in jeopardy if we fail to live up to our individual responsibilities. If we cannot produce aluminium in Queensland because we have not an economic source of electric power, Queensland will have to go through the normal chain of events and build a large power-station here. Someone must come up with an idea on how to produce low-cost power.

Mr. Carey: You know that this Government has the idea and that it has started to put it into operation.

Mr. HANSON: In my maiden speech in 1963 I mentioned this matter. I told the then Minister for Industrial Development (the late Sir Alan Munro), when he spoke in glowing terms about the Calcap Power Station, that it was a toy, a meccano set, and that it would not play a very significant part in the development of this State.

The Government must think "big." Government members are the great representatives of free enterprise. But there has been a considerable lack of business acumen on the part of Government members. They have not shouldered their responsibilities. They have been in power for 11 or 12 years and they have seen the trends throughout the world and the large industrial advances made in practically every country, yet they have been content to sit back in their soft seats and enjoy the emoluments of office. They have failed in their responsibilities to the people of this State. I shall have much pleasure in telling that to the people from the hustings in a few months' time, and I am certain that they will be emptied out or will be sitting on this side of the Chamber in Opposition. They have failed their trust by not discharging their responsibilities to the people.

It takes a visionary person who refuses to limit his thinking to a conventional design; it takes a scientist who refuses to accept the problems that are encountered, as excuses for not forging ahead. If the Government wishes to develop Central Queensland I cannot help but feel that the clichés I have just mentioned, namely, that capital is required and people are required, are nothing more than excuses for a lack of ideas, a lack of willingness and a lack of determination.

They are certainly not my words. They are the words of Al Sangwine, the man responsible for building the alumina plant

in Gladstone. He is a visionary man. Although he would not disclose it to members of the Government, for reasons that are quite obvious, I am sure, in his own private moments, as he now sits at head office in California, he must have certain feelings about the administration of this State, which has not lived up to its responsibility and has not seized its great opportunity.

I might add that there is also the possibility of the establishment of a steelworks in this State. It is absolutely ludicrous to think that there is no steelworks here when we have the hard coking coal so necessary for the production of steel, and the iron ore is produced in Western Australia. As a matter of fact, ships are brought round Cape York and taken inside the Reef, and the pilots actually get off the "Iron Range" and "Iron Dampier" at the "Jenny Lind" buoy outside Gladstone Harbour two or three times a week and come ashore. These are ships of The Broken Hill Proprietary Co. Ltd., and they continue to Port Kembla to keep the steel works functioning there.

I know that a study has been made of the shuttle service operating between Western Australia and this State for the carriage of hard coking coal and the shipment back of iron pellets. I do not see anything wrong with the economics of such a two-way industry, because I fully realise that there could be local marketing problems in this State. A news sheet from B.H.P. is worthy of note. In it reference is made to the plant constructed at Kwinana in Western Australia, and how the Premier officially opened it only recently. The item reads—

"The Premier of Western Australia, the Hon. David Brand, M.L.A., will open officially Stage One (Ironmaking) development of Australia's fourth iron and steelworks at Kwinana, W.A., on Tuesday, (November 19).

"The plant has been built by The Broken Hill Proprietary Co. Ltd. group of companies at a cost of \$60 million, and is operated by Australian Iron & Steel Pty. Ltd., a wholly owned subsidiary.

"Almost as soon as the 600,000 tons per annum blast furnace was commissioned in May 1968, the plant was supplying Australian and Asian markets with foundry and basic iron.

"Since then, a sinter plant has been added and this enables the fines contained in the iron ore received from the group's quarry at Koolyanobbing to be converted to sinter which is charged to the blast furnace along with lump ore.

"Other major items of plant include considerable facilities for receiving, stockpiling, blending and shipping of raw materials, . . ."

So it goes on.

The opportunities are unlimited, and someone in the Government should be doing something about them. I believe that the Minister for Industrial Development has been somewhat frustrated by the administration and not allowed to move or breathe. Four or five other Ministers are also trying to jump into his carriage. I believe that if he could get a clear run, some progress might be made.

It is worthy of note that of the people who have a large percentage of the ownership of the consortium of Queensland Alumina Ltd., the Kaiser Steel Corporation has a large percentage interest in Hamersley Holdings Ltd. in Western Australia. As a matter of fact, the Hamersley field is being developed by Hamersley Holdings Ltd., through its wholly owned subsidiary, Hamersley Iron Pty. Ltd. At present 60 per cent. of the capital of Hamersley Holdings is held by C.R.A., and the remaining 40 per cent. by the Kaiser Steel Corporation of the United States. But after completion of the current \$25,000,000 share issue, the C.R.A. and Kaiser investments will comprise 54 per cent. and 36 per cent. respectively of the total. The remaining 10 per cent. will be held directly by the Australian public.

The influence of people who have been engaged in the steel industry for a considerable time could lead to the creation of a steel industry in Gladstone, and I hope that the Government uses a little more energy in this direction in the next few months because they will be in opposition in about six to eight months' time. I hope that they will be a little energetic so that when the Labour Party comes to office we will be given the same "fly" and the same few yards' start that the present administration obtained when we left office. Weipa then was on the drawing-board, and many other enterprises had been started. Let the Government be a little creative and not sit back basking in the reflected glory of the grand Australian Labour Party.

I understand that migration is included in the Minister's portfolio. It is disturbing to see the number of migrants going to other States, principally Western Australia, South Australia, and Victoria, in comparison with the number coming to this State. Possibly it is because Australia is such a wonderful country and that Fremantle and Adelaide are the first ports of call for ships coming from overseas. Brisbane is last on the line, which probably has something to do with the number of migrants who come to this State. I have spoken to many migrants in Perth and Adelaide, and they have told me that they liked the cities and decided to stay there. If in some way Brisbane could be made the first port of call, I am sure that Queensland would gain more migrants. Perhaps we could talk with the shipping companies about bringing some of the ships north-about through Torres Strait.

I wish to refer the Committee to an article that appeared in "The Courier-Mail" a couple of years ago relative to the industries in the South that keep many migrants there. The remarks that led to the publication of that article were made by Miss Jarrett, Victorian State Secretary of the Good Neighbour Council. She said—

"The lack of industry in Queensland, particularly that of the textile industry, was one of the reasons British migrants tended to stay in southern Australian cities rather than come to Queensland."

The article went on to say—

"Home ownership is the basic pattern of our lives in Australia," Miss Jarrett said.

"But people can't own homes without some sort of a bank balance.

"Therefore when a migrant family arrives in this country, both the husband and wife want to work.

"Many British women are skilled textile industry workers. They have been doing it for centuries. The southern cities have much more of this sort of work available for women than Queensland cities, so naturally they stay in the south."

That statement is very much bound up with industrial development. If there is any way in which the department can encourage the establishment of further textile industries here to use the skills of these people who, as the article says, have benefited by experience gained in the textile industry over many centuries, I think it should do so. It would be making a worth-while contribution to Queensland's progress if it did.

Mr. Carey: Is that your statement, or somebody else's statement?

Mr. HANSON: If the hon. member wishes to do so, he may have a look at it later. I think it is a very good statement. If he has trouble reading it, I will even lend him my glasses.

(Time expired.)

Mr. PILBEAM (Rockhampton South) (7.58 p.m.): Before speaking on these Estimates, I should like to be permitted to congratulate my friend the hon. member for Port Curtis on what I should say is one of the best acting performances in 1968. To speak for 25 minutes with his tongue in his cheek must be very close to being a world record. In fact, if it is not too late, I think we might nominate him for an "Oscar" when the next awards are being made.

If the truth were spoken, no-one should be more sincere than the hon. member for Port Curtis in thanking the Government for the massive development it has made possible in his home town of Gladstone. We have seen there a complete metamorphosis from a small township with seasonal employment and a great deal of unemployment at the end of the year to a modern, thriving industrial centre, with much more to come. The

Committee should have heard paeans of praise to the Government from the hon. member who has just resumed his seat.

In making my contribution to the Address-in-Reply debate, I referred to the industrial renaissance that is taking place in Queensland at present, and I pinpointed it to Central Queensland. No-one with any sincerity could doubt this strong upward industrial movement in Central Queensland when he looks at places like Gladstone, Emerald, Blackwater, and even places like the northern suburbs of the City of Rockhampton. No-one could doubt it when he looked at that marvellous old river, the Fitzroy, and saw that at last a progressive Government is doing something to harness its waters for industrial usage. To mark the occasion, he would be pleased to see the way the old river has changed colour. It has given delight to many old citizens of Rockhampton. It has changed from a Yarra-like complexion to something as pure and sparkling as the Hamilton reach of the Brisbane River. That is something that we did not predict and I would say it is a sign of the times. We have a much brighter future in Central Queensland, and we realise it when we look at the new face of the Fitzroy River.

I wish to congratulate this department, the Minister, the Director, Sir David Muir, the Director of Technical Services, Mr. Young, and the Assistant Under Secretary, Mr. Bended, and officers of the department for the part they have played in industrially developing, in particular, my part of Queensland. In order to achieve this result, the department has two functions. It has the opportunity of making a direct contribution to development and an opportunity to co-operate with other departments, which in turn must function adequately if we are to see this realistic development take place. The departments to which I refer specifically are the Departments of Main Roads, Electricity Supply, Irrigation and Water Supply, Primary Industries, Mining, and the port authorities under the Treasurer. The direct contributions were referred to in the Minister's speech when he told us of the numerous surveys of many descriptions that are now being made to provide the information that is necessary to answer industrial inquiries. Many of these inquiries—inquiries from all over the world—are being answered by the Department of Industrial Development.

Then, too, this department has the opportunity to guarantee loans to develop industrial enterprises. In this regard I am happy to say that 26 industries are currently receiving financial assistance, 21 of them outside of Brisbane, and these are the ones in which I am particularly interested.

The department, too, has the opportunity to ensure freight concessions and also to incur payment of railway charges up to \$5,000 for any one project in connection with the movement of machinery or plant

required for the establishment of a decentralised industry. Once again, this is the type of industry that I like to see established in this State.

A most important function of the department is the development of fully serviced industrial estates. This is most necessary in provincial centres, and I note with pleasure that industrial estates have been developed not only in Brisbane but also in places like Townsville, Rockhampton, Gladstone, Toowoomba and Southport, where \$1,500,000 was spent in estate development last year and \$2,800,000 is projected for the coming year.

Let me repeat what the Minister has told us regarding the provisional allocations to these separate estates. Gladstone next year will have an amount of \$186,000 spent on its industrial estate; Townsville will have \$171,000; Rockhampton will have \$100,000—and we are satisfied with that because we are a modest race—Southport will have \$60,000, and Toowoomba \$50,000.

In case hon. members think that Rockhampton has not been adequately catered for, let me repeat the words of Mr. Bensted when he came to Rockhampton to bring this estate into being. He told me that land in Rockhampton was roughly half the price of land in the other centres. That is something that pleases me. As yet, we have not got into the inflation race. In addition, he had an opportunity of acquiring some of the land that the Railway Department had set aside at Parkhurst but no longer required. As well, the Department of Industrial Development assists in the provision of housing for key personnel in industrial enterprises.

It is very gratifying to note that regional studies covering Central and North Queensland are now being undertaken by this Department in conjunction with the Commonwealth Department of National Development. I am very happy to see this Department pushing ahead so vigorously with its "Buy Queensland Made" campaign. I am pleased to see the big hoardings that advertise this on our highways, and I have been happy to see the advertisements that have appeared on television throughout the State. To a smaller degree we must approve the subsidy that is paid on cattle transported from Gulf and Northern Territory ports to Queensland's east-coast ports. Those of us who have ports that service meatworks on the east coast will appreciate these subsidies.

I was very interested to hear the Leader of the Opposition criticise the Government for co-operating with people who sought to set up major industries in the State and for providing railways, roads, water supply and other amenities. How can these industries be attracted to the State unless we co-operate with them? It is not the function of industry to provide water or to build roads. But even those undertakings have been subsidised to a great extent by a number of the industries. We have had some marvellous deals, particularly relative to the underwriting

of necessary highways. We have not had to build a railway unless it has been underwritten by the industry that proposed to use it.

The wisdom of the Government's policy of creating a climate that would enable private industry to flourish has been borne out over and over again. Every day we see greater industrial development in the State. I fully applaud this Government's full co-operation, and I have no resentment at all against a reasonable influx of overseas capital. Where would we have been without it? How else would the massive undertaking of Queensland Alumina Ltd. have been set up at Gladstone if foreign capital had not been provided? How else would Mount Morgan have been able to step up its affairs if Peko-Wallsend had not stepped in and financed a \$4,500,000 expansion programme?

In my book, industrial development means decentralised industrial development, for capital cities can live on their own fat and provide their own development. Once the population of a city reaches somewhere about the 50,000 to 60,000 mark, it can live largely on itself. If people buy locally a city can almost maintain itself, and in the case of a major city like Brisbane industry is attracted whether it is encouraged or not. It is attracted to a far greater degree, of course, if it has the benefit of support from a Department of Industrial Development such as the one in this State.

In regard to decentralised development, let me congratulate the Minister on the statements that he has made.

He said—

"While industry growth is widespread throughout the State, it is recognised that many country centres are keenly anxious to attract additional industry to their areas.

"It is, of course, unnecessary for me to remind honourable members that Queensland is in fact the most decentralised State in Australia."

Those are the words I like to hear.

The Minister continued—

"The pattern of industry location and development that has emerged will ensure that it remains so. As evidence of this I can do no better than refer to the regional flow of capital expenditure.

"In 1961-62 the capital value of plant and machinery employed in factories located in southern Queensland represented 57 per cent. of the State's aggregate, with the remaining 43 per cent. in the two other major regions. By 1966-67, the situation was reversed, with Southern Queensland accounting for only 47 per cent. and 53 per cent. being attributable to Central and Northern Queensland."

Who could possibly have imagined such a complete metamorphosis? If somebody had said 10 years ago that those figures would be read in this Committee he would have been told that he was dreaming. That is a wonderful transformation, and those of us who for

years resented what we called the "big octopus" of Brisbane must be a little heartened to read that the greater proportion of new investment in plant and machinery undertaken by factories in recent years has been in the central and northern regions of the State.

Local authorities have an obligation to develop their areas industrially. They can take a leaf from this Government's book by establishing population centres with full amenities such as sewerage, water, paved streets, drainage and good residential suburbs to attract the strong work-force that is necessary if large industries are established. That is most important. If industrial development is not matched with amenities, living standards are far from satisfactory. In every instance of large industrial development, local authorities have an obligation to match it with full city amenities. They also have an obligation to make facilities available to industries that are establishing in their areas. If an industry requires sewerage, bitumen roads, water and land at a reasonable price, all those things should be provided immediately by the local authority. Local authorities should be so set up as to supply them on demand. I know that in Rockhampton we have quite considerable holdings of land that we can make available for industrial development. If the local authorities cannot do these things, industries are often driven away. Human nature being what it is, as soon as local land-holders see an opportunity to double or treble the value of their land, they hold industries to ransom. If the Government has established an industrial estate in which land can be leased to industry without any capital outlay, or if the local authority has reasonable land-holdings that it can make available on lease, or at a reasonable price, the battle is half won.

Mr. Bromley interjected.

Mr. PILBEAM: Local authorities have an obligation to work with a spirit of co-operation, as this Government has done, in attracting industry.

Mr. Chinchin: What do you think about the performance of the Brisbane City Council?

Mr. PILBEAM: I am not concerned with the Brisbane City Council. The hon. member can look after that. I said specifically that I am directing my remarks to industrial development outside the capital city.

I refer now to some of the indirect contributions that this department makes. It has a responsibility to co-operate with the Main Roads Department in seeing that an adequate system of first-class highways is established in Queensland. I have spoken on this matter on many occasions. We will never get the fullest possible extent of decentralised development unless and until we can provide the whole of the State with a system of first-class bitumen highways. If I have said it once, I have said many times that we will never get this while we continue

to try to provide these roads out of income. We have no chance. We will have to follow the other countries of the world in raising massive loans to do this job.

Mr. Miller: And do it immediately.

Mr. PILBEAM: Do it immediately, and pay for it afterwards. It will have many side effects, not the least of which is the more speedy industrialisation of the whole State.

Then this department has the obligation to co-operate with the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission in providing an abundance of cheap industrial water. That is why I have referred to the Fitzroy River. We have a river system like this, which is the second biggest river system in Australia, and we have not as yet harnessed it for industrial usage. I am heartened to see the initial effort of this Government in regard to the Fairbairn Dam. I was fortunate enough to be at the opening ceremony. I look with great gratification at the initial effort of the City of Rockhampton with the Fitzroy River barrage, which will give us all the industrial water we need at a price that is only a fraction of that applying in the rest of the State. These are the things that will give us the industrial development that we are so keen on.

Let me say that I support the hon. member for Port Curtis in regard to the necessity for a large-scale power-station in Central Queensland. I was pleased to hear the Treasurer pledge his political future on his ability to provide this. He has already been overseas to secure the capital. We know the size of the utility. We know we need sets of up to 500 M.W. As my friend said, we need something to match the Liddell Power Station in New South Wales. If we have not a station of that magnitude we will never be able to match that State's price of power.

There is an obligation in undertakings like this to see that they are run economically and that they function in such a manner that no excess loading is put on the people in the area. I cannot have any part in something that creates a burden because of its uneconomic functioning. I have said that once before and I shall say it as many times as I have to until this position is rectified.

We also need a proper system of first-class, viable ports along the coast at every point where export is required, and we must develop and maintain a satisfactory railway system. The development of this State still depends to a great extent on a satisfactory railway system with a satisfactory system of freights, as well as on its highways and ports. I do not mean freights that hit at the decentralisation of industry. We have seen that happen in a few instances. We want a set of freights that enables the department to profit but at the same time does not strangle the efforts of an industry to establish itself in country areas.

I commenced by thanking the Minister and his department for the change in Central Queensland. Surely, with the great mineral development that is taking place there, the possibility of a massive power-station, and the wonderful Fitzroy River pouring its gift past the City of Rockhampton, our fondest hopes for the industrial development of Central Queensland must come to full fruition.

I look with great pleasure at the City of Gladstone, and without any envy at all, I applaud the massive industrial complex that has been established there. I look at Mt. Morgan and I see the \$4,500,000 expansion programme taking place there. Rockhampton has been a city of orderly, not explosive, development, but even in my city I see large undertakings such as the I.C.I.A.N.Z. salt complex, the cement works, the new meatworks of T. A. Field Pty. Ltd., the massive reconstruction of the Central Queensland Meat Export Co., the two flour mills, the engineering works, package works, and other industries that have been responsible for increasing the work-force of Rockhampton from 10,000 to 12,500 in the past 10 years and eliminating the seasonal unemployment with which Rockhampton, with its surrounding areas, was cursed for many years.

Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt: It's a different story from what it used to be.

Mr. PILBEAM: It is a different story from anything that has ever happened before in Rockhampton and Central Queensland generally. These are the reasons why I have been keen to take part in this debate. I look forward with real enthusiasm to living in this area for the next decade at least and seeing this wonderful part of Queensland, which Sir John Kemp referred to as the Ruhr of Queensland, advance to its full potential under this department and this Government.

Mr. P. WOOD (Toowoomba East) (8.22 p.m.): The department whose Estimates we are now discussing is certainly a very important one, and I listened with a great deal of interest to the Minister's remarks. Although his speech was brief compared with those of other Ministers when presenting their Estimates, it contained a great deal of useful information.

Mr. Bromley: It was better than some of the others.

Mr. P. WOOD: I do not want to make any comparisons. The Minister's report was brief, but comprehensive.

From the tone of the remarks of the hon. member for Toowong, to which I listened with a great deal of interest, he seemed to believe that the Minister did not have quite enough to do. In his usual fashion, the hon. member invented a policy which he ascribed to the Australian Labour Party. He

alleged, amongst other things, that the Australian Labour Party was not interested in industrial development.

Mr. Ramsden: That would be a pretty fair statement.

Mr. P. WOOD: That allegation has been completely answered by previous speakers on this side of the Chamber, but that interjection by the hon. member for Merthyr and the comments of the hon. member for Toowong indicate the muddle-headed thinking that is so typical of both those hon. members. Quite apart from the reasons quoted by other Opposition members, it is certainly to the electoral advantage of the A.L.P. to encourage industrial development, because I do not think that anybody would dispute that the majority of industrial workers support the policies of the A.L.P.

Mr. Carey: That might have been so 20 years ago, but not now. They have seen the light.

Mr. P. WOOD: If hon. members opposite look at the latest figures they will see that the statement that I made is as accurate today as it was 10 or 20 years ago. Probably more people engaged in industry now support the policies of the Labour Party. If for no other reason than electoral advantage (and certainly there are more important reasons to take into consideration), the A.L.P. has always supported—and, when the opportunity again presents itself, will continue to support—industrial development.

Mr. Miller: Does your party believe in socialism?

Mr. P. WOOD: My party believes in socialism perhaps to a greater extent than hon. members opposite believe in it, but all hon. members in this Parliament support socialist principles.

Mr. Miller: To what extent?

Mr. P. WOOD: Hon. members opposite make a great song and dance, and talk a lot of nonsense, about their supposed opposition to socialist policy. The hon. member who interjected and the Minister have committed themselves to a policy of socialism in the department whose Estimates are now under discussion.

The Government has, by socialist enterprise, established a series of industrial estates in certain provincial cities, and hon. members heard the Minister promise to do all he could to extend that socialist enterprise to other areas of Queensland. If hon. members opposite are as convinced and confirmed anti-socialists as they pretend to be—if they are really genuine—I would expect to hear them in this debate attack the Minister for his socialist policies.

Mr. Porter: That is the role of government.

Mr. P. WOOD: I agree with the hon. member for Toowong that it is the role of government. It is socialist policy. As I said

in a debate not long ago, government in Australia is a blend of socialism and free enterprise.

Mr. Miller: Not a mixture?

Mr. P. WOOD: A blend, or a mixture. Whether the hon. member likes it or not, he cannot escape that fact.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. P. WOOD: I am not going to develop that argument any further, because I made some comments on that subject in the Address-in-Reply debate.

Mr. Porter interjected.

Mr. P. WOOD: The hon. member for Toowong, who seems to take umbrage at what I am saying, attacked socialism in his contribution to the debate on these Estimates; but, as always, his comments were very general. In all his speeches he is fond of generalities and stays away from anything specific. Since his arrival in this Chamber he has been the apostle of change; but when it comes to the specific details of change, the hon. member has nothing to offer. He did that again today. When I hear him say something specific about any topic, I shall be interested in listening to him.

I suppose I should offer the hon. member for Toowong some encouragement. However, I again urge the Government and the Minister, as I have on other occasions, to consider more seriously than they have up till now the wisdom of establishing a separate department of decentralisation, as has been done successfully in other States. I have not yet heard sound reasons and arguments advanced against that proposal.

I believe that a separate department of decentralisation should be established. I do not suggest that it should be a separate portfolio, because I think that the Minister for Industrial Development is well able to assume the responsibility for the administration of such a department. I am not being critical of the Minister when I say that the demands upon him at present are not so great that he could not undertake that additional responsibility.

The aim of the Government in Queensland—it has been the aim of Australian Labour Party Governments—should be to develop many minimum-size towns rather than one large metropolis. After a city reaches a certain size and a certain population—these are economic facts that are known, I am sure, to all hon. members—it becomes unwieldy and economically expensive.

Mr. Carey: Would you send the people down to the Gold Coast?

Mr. P. WOOD: It certainly is an expensive place.

Likewise, small towns in country areas are economically expensive for all sorts of industrial and commercial operations—because of

their smallness, not because of the largeness that affects Brisbane. There cannot be any doubt that Brisbane has reached the stage at which its size and the difficulty of communication within the city is affecting adversely many businesses and commercial enterprises. Despite what may be done under the Wilbur Smith Plan, that trend will continue and the position will get even worse.

The solution lies not in the Wilbur Smith Plan and its freeways, but in moving industrial and commercial enterprises from Brisbane to other centres. This, I readily concede, is something that it would be most difficult to achieve.

Mr. Ramsden: Under socialism, you would just move them.

Mr. P. WOOD: The hon. member does not have a good idea of socialism.

We should limit, wherever possible, the urban sprawl of Brisbane and encourage both commercial and industrial enterprises away from Brisbane. This is aimed at by the Department of Industrial Development, and I can only speak with a great deal of praise for much of the work done by this department. I have seen some of its market studies and industry studies and today I noticed in the library, I think for the first time, a long list of regional surveys. This type of work being done by the department is excellent, and I hope, and know, that it will continue to be done. The information contained in these various studies and surveys is of great value and importance, and it will be of great assistance to people wanting either to remove their enterprises from overcrowded areas or to establish new enterprises in provincial areas.

I said that we should establish a separate department of decentralisation. Decentralisation would involve the activities of many Ministers. In fact, it is hard to think of a Minister who would not, in some way or other, be involved in decentralisation activities. Whether one thinks of the Main Roads Department, the Railway Department, the Treasurer, the Lands Department, they will all in some way, large or small, be involved in decentralisation. I quite frankly question whether this Minister has sufficient authority to effectively co-ordinate all the activities necessary if we are to fight for decentralisation with sufficient strength.

I was pleased to hear the hon. member for Port Curtis query the position of the Premier as Minister for State Development. I can only see the title of Minister for State Development, which is granted to the Premier, as one of honour and glory, and I do not know, and have not heard, just what responsibility or authority it carries.

I ask that serious consideration be given to the establishment of a department of decentralisation. If there are good reasons why this cannot be done, then I should like to hear them. I certainly have not heard them so far.

Mr. Carey: How many Ministers do you think should be in Cabinet?

Mr. P. WOOD: We are committed by our policy to adding an additional Minister to the Cabinet when we are elected next year. I think the number then will be quite sufficient to perform the necessary duties.

I want to make some comment further to my remarks about the co-ordination of Government departments in a ministry of decentralisation. I believe it is important that the Government should set a list of priorities for decentralisation and for development in Queensland. Unfortunately the resources of the Government are limited, and, if a list of priorities was set, some people might be offended at the priority granted to their district. But we must of necessity concentrate Government resources according to the highest priority. I think that the hon. member for Port Curtis very effectively indicated some of the most important priorities when he spoke of the need for a large-scale power-house in Central Queensland. That is the sort of undertaking that should receive top priority and the concentrated resources of Government departments.

In the report of the Director of the department I notice a policy that reduced rail freights will be provided where satisfactory volume and regular tonnages are involved. I support that policy, and I ask the Minister to consider extending it. In country and provincial areas many industries are quite small. The great majority of them may not be able to satisfy the volume and regularity requirements of the policy of rail-freight reductions. However, it is just as important, and perhaps even more important, to encourage small industries to expand as it is to encourage large industries to expand. In Toowoomba there is one of the greatest examples of an industry that began as a small one and developed into a large one. I refer to the Southern Cross group of companies.

A Government Member: That was built by Mr. Chalk.

Mr. P. WOOD: I am not going to make any comment about the Treasurer's part in those companies.

By providing some positive incentive to small companies in country and provincial areas by way of reduced freights we may be laying the foundations for a much larger enterprise in years to come. Even if this is not the case, if it is just for a large company that has a large and regular volume of business to be given financial encouragement, then it is equally as just for a small company to be given the same incentive.

I ask the Minister to consider enlarging his policy of providing financial assistance to new industries in certain areas. I support this policy. We may be achieving as much or more by offering financial assistance to an existing industry to expand. I know that

under some circumstances existing industry will be given encouragement by way of freight concessions on the shipment of machinery, but other small companies may have requirements for financial assistance other than in this direction. I would be interested and pleased to hear the Minister's comments on an expansion of this sort of financial assistance to existing companies who want to enlarge their activities.

My next point deals with a problem that seriously affects my electorate and, I am sure, electorates in all provincial cities and country areas. I refer to the employment of young teenage girls who have left school and are unable to obtain satisfactory employment in their home towns. This problem is a serious and a continuing one in Toowoomba, and unfortunately I cannot see any immediate solution to it. Toowoomba people have acted on their own initiative to overcome it. Some well-attended public meetings were held in this direction, and I think they served a good purpose. They highlighted the problem and indicated its seriousness. As a result of some of those meetings, girls were encouraged to take additional courses of instruction and extra training.

That is all very desirable, but it has resulted in increasing competition for existing job opportunities. The solution lies less in giving girls extra training—commendable though that may be—than in creating extra job opportunities for young girls in all provincial areas.

It is not easy to present any solution to this problem. The type of employment that many young girls are offered is unacceptable to them. It is difficult to condemn them for that. I do not blame young girls with good Junior passes, or perhaps Senior passes, being reluctant to accept domestic work, and on many occasions that is the only job opportunity available to them despite many years of education, with good results. I repeat that the solution lies in the creation of more job opportunities. The Department and the Minister have many problems to overcome in this direction. If they can encourage the provincial cities by their policy of selected trade production, and by establishing industrial estates, we will be going some way towards overcoming the problem.

I was very pleased, as I am sure most hon. members were, to see that industrial estates have been established in various parts of Queensland. I listened with interest to the Minister's remarks when he introduced his Estimates, but I did not hear any detailed reference to the Wilsonton Industrial Estate in Toowoomba, neither is any detailed information concerning this estate contained in the Director's report. If the Minister has any information concerning it that can be made public—I know that if negotiations are taking place it may not be in the best interests to make details public—and he can give me the information, I will be most happy to receive it.

I will conclude my remarks by making some reference to migration figures which, I am sorry to say, are not as good as I should like them to be. The departmental report points out—

“Arrivals of assisted passage migrants in Queensland from the United Kingdom totalled 4,593 during 1967-68 . . .

“In the previous year arrivals numbered 5,547.”

There has been a decline in migration, for which there are many reasons. I was very interested to hear the comments of the hon. member for Port Curtis about our share of migrants being less than it ought to be. It is certainly less than the proportionate share received by other States. I think all statistics will confirm the view that we are getting a proportionately smaller number of migrants than any other State in Australia. In addition, our yearly net population increase in the last few years—there have been fluctuating increases and decreases—has generally remained stationary, or has even declined. I know the difficulty experienced in attracting migrants to Queensland and retaining them when they come here. Only last week I was approached by a migrant who sought my assistance to obtain employment that offered him better rates of pay. He was able to earn elsewhere what he wanted to earn, in the same class of job as he was seeking in Toowoomba. He went to Melbourne.

It is interesting to note that while we are having difficulty attracting migrants here and keeping them here, the Queensland average salary per year for the past year was the lowest of any State in Australia, and that the Victorian average was the highest. The average salary of employees in manufacturing industries in the past year was \$2,725 in Queensland and \$3,120 in Victoria. The Australian average was \$3,028. So it is no wonder that we have difficulty retaining migrants once we get them here.

The Toowoomba Foundry, the company of which I spoke a few moments ago, recruited 40 skilled tradesmen in 1964, and within a year all but one had gone despite the fact that the company offered quite a handsome bonus to them if they stayed with it for 12 months.

I should like the Minister, if he has the information available, to tell us the results of the department's advertising, which I notice in numerous publications. It is of a very high standard and I compliment those responsible for it. Most companies that engage in extensive advertising have a means of discovering the effectiveness of their advertising, and I should like that information from the Minister.

(Time expired.)

Mr. DEWAR (Wavell) (8.47 p.m.): Firstly I pay a compliment to the personnel of the Department of Industrial Development, particularly Sir David Muir, the Director of Industrial Development, Mr. Young, the

Director of Technical Services, Mr. Bensted, Assistant Under Secretary, and Mr. Smith, who is in charge of research, who grace that office. They are dedicated people. I think back with a great deal of pride and happiness on my association with them. They are imbued with one thought, that is, to do everything in their power to further the industrial development of this State.

My speech could well be described as a mixed grill or a curate's egg. It will contain some criticism and I hope it will contain some constructive criticism.

I should like to refer to the comments that I heard the hon. member for Port Curtis pass when I came into the Chamber tonight. I did not hear the earlier part of his remarks. I understand that once again he referred to what he termed the loss of an aluminium smelter at Gladstone some three years ago. It is not unusual to hear this type of speech from the hon. member for Port Curtis, so the fact that I did not hear him tonight does not in any way dull my impressions of his thoughts in the matter.

I repeat, as I have done at least twice, that there are only two reasons why this smelter was not built in Queensland, and they are very simple and tangible reasons: one is the cost of power (and I shall give the reason for that later) and the other is the cold economic fact that, taking two tons of alumina to make a ton of aluminium ingot, it costs less to take two tons of alumina to Newcastle than to take one ton of aluminium ingot. As the Australian component of the Alcan group had an extrusion works at that site, it is obvious that it was not prepared to pay more for its raw materials.

It is high time that the people realised the disadvantage under which Queensland labours in the production of cheap power. The basis element in this is the inadequate amount of money available to construct stations sufficiently large to produce cheap power. Certainly we have all the necessary cheap fuel, but we have not the necessary finance, and I am sceptical of the loud-mouthings in the Press in August to the effect that money for this work might come from overseas sources.

The cold facts of the matter are that in New South Wales in recent years there has been built at Liddell a station based on the use of 500 megawatt sets. In Queensland when we have built a station we have used 30, 60, 66 or 120 megawatt sets. It is essential to impose the incremental cost charge on top of the production-price charge because we must accept that one set will not be in operation. As is the case at the Calcap Power Station, where four 30 megawatt sets were to be installed, it is to be assumed that only three will produce 90 megawatts of power because there will always be one out of action for overhaul purposes. This incremental cost therefore has to be added to the price of the power produced.

What is the situation in New South Wales? To my knowledge, two years ago the entire output of the Liddell Power Station could be offered because, if it was necessary to do any maintenance work, the station could draw power from the Snowy Mountains Authority. It was therefore possible to sell every kilowatt of power produced by that station. The taxpayers of Queensland are therefore at a disadvantage because money obtained from Australian taxation, some of it no doubt from Queensland and Western Australia, has been poured into the vast Snowy Mountains scheme, and we in Queensland are doubly disadvantaged by having to compete in power costs with Victoria and New South Wales who do not have to load their prices to take care of incremental costs.

It was indicated by the Capricornia Regional Electricity Board 18 months ago that the cost of power was too high for the creation of a smelter, and, if it had been decided to reduce the price by the payment of subsidy, that cost would have fallen upon the consumers of power in the C.R.E.B. area. Reducing the price to compete with power offered in New South Wales would have cost nearly \$1,000,000 in subsidy. Does the hon. member for Port Curtis suggest that the people of Gladstone would have been prepared to pay more for their power to encourage to that district what would have been a very small smelter? If that is what he wants, he should have the courage to say that he would expect the people of Gladstone to pay more for their power, because that is the long and short of it. That consideration is quite apart from the fact that it costs less to take two tons of alumina to Newcastle than it would cost to take one ton of aluminium ingots.

There has been comment about the Government's establishing industrial estates; it has been said that that is socialism. I do not know whether there is, on either side of this Chamber, a greater exponent of free enterprise than I am. Having said that, I will say that I had to fight tooth and nail for weeks in a certain place to get the right to develop industrial estates in the way in which they are being developed today.

Mr. Hanson: They did not take notice of your submissions.

Mr. DEWAR: That is right. They did not take any notice of a lot of things that I said.

There is nothing socialistic about governments owning land, developing it, and making it available for industry on the best possible terms, because in every regard the development of the estates is being carried out by private enterprise. At least in my day—and I initiated all this in conference with Sir David Muir—the contracts were being let to private enterprise. If that is socialism, then I am prepared to back socialism.

Mr. P. Wood: I am pleased to hear it.

Mr. DEWAR: I can say that quite easily, because it is not socialism.

What is done in New South Wales? My activities in the last 18 months have entailed a fair amount of travelling interstate in Australia and a little travelling overseas. I can say only that I am amazed at the growth that is taking place in New South Wales and Victoria. Anyone who goes there and who does not see, even without looking for it, what is going on, has scales on his eyes. As recently as last Monday, I was unable to get a bed in a hotel in Sydney.

Mr. Bromley: They heard you were a Liberal.

Mr. DEWAR: No, they heard that I was an Independent, and even that did not help.

A fortnight ago a very influential friend of mine in Sydney, through his office staff, spent some hours trying to get me a bed for two nights in a hotel or motel in Sydney, and that is in spite of the fact that almost every time anyone goes to that city he sees a new motel that has been built. It is evidence of the fantastic progress that is being made in that State.

What has New South Wales done to promote development? On this point I concur in the remarks of the hon. member for Toowoomba East. There is a great need for activity directed peculiarly and particularly towards decentralisation, and in New South Wales the Minister for Industrial Development is also Minister for Decentralisation. Not only is everything laid out on a platter; the red carpet—or the blue carpet, whichever one prefers—is rolled out. A person can go to northern New South Wales and have a factory built for him on very reasonable lease conditions. He can even get a subsidy for training staff. That is another thing that I tried to introduce as part of the approach to the attraction of industry to this State; but, as did many other suggestions, it fell on sandy and rather stony soil.

The suggestion that the provision of roads and houses to encourage industrial development is worthy of criticism indicates fairly, I think, the attitude of the man who mouthed those words.

The great need of this State is population, and the results show that we have a continuing decline in the percentage of migrants we attract. We cannot hope to get new settlers into our State to the degree that we need them, and to get them we should be prepared to woo them, unless we are prepared to face up to the crying need for more housing and more employment. The other States are achieving their results simply because they have faced up to this particular need.

Now, to cite New South Wales again—I saw evidence of this in London myself—New South Wales and other States of

Australia go to great lengths in order to trap at the source industrialists intending to migrate to Australia. Because I may not get a chance to speak on the Premier's Estimates, I will mention this now: some three to four years ago, having returned from a journey that took me to the Trade Fair at Hanover and to our migration set-up in London, I made a recommendation. Having investigated what was being done in the other States, I made the recommendation that a suitable type of Queenslander; a man in the 35-year age group, possessed of full energy and with adequate education and a knowledge of industry and of this State; a dedicated man be found and sent there to spearhead under the Agent-General the attraction at the source of industrialists who are needed for the development of this State. Having submitted that in painstaking detail, with the assistance of Sir David Muir, to the right place, I was not even afforded the courtesy of a reply. I found only two or maybe three days before the event that a man who subsequently became known as the industries liaison officer was to arrive in Queensland to learn something about Queensland. He turned out to be a man of Welsh origin. From memory, this was about the middle of 1966. The State brought him out here at considerable expense and had him here for three months learning all about Queensland. And I find in the Agent-General's report that he resigned at the beginning of this year.

So much for the reception of the suggestion I made and the dismal failure of what was done in lieu. The result was that Mr. Leyshon, a highly qualified man, has been transferred from the Treasury Department to do the job that was required, and take the type of action that was required and suggested by me over three years ago.

There is far too much smugness and complacency in the air and I want to sound a note that I hope may lead to consideration by someone of the present situation. The Statistician's figures for 1966-67 show that the value of rural production was \$508,000,000, an increase of some \$57,000,000 on the previous year or 41.06 per cent., but of the non-rural section of primary, the figure for which is \$136,000,000, some \$21,000,000 of this is in the forestry, fishing and trapping section, with mining \$115,000,000, or 9.3 per cent. of the total.

Over the last eight to 10 months we have heard talk of development in this State, and almost all of that talk has surrounded mining. Yet in the last year for which a complete set of figures are available, 1966-67, mining accounted for only 9.3 per cent. of the total net value of production in this State. In that year manufacturing represented \$593,000,000, or 48 per cent. of the total of \$1,237 million. That figure was a slight decrease on the percentage for the previous year, and although it indicates quite clearly the maturity that our State's manufacturing pursuits are assuming it also indicates that a far greater

regard must be paid to the promotion of them than has been the Government's wont in the past.

The Statistician has issued figures, not in total, but surrounding that of primary production for the last financial year, 1967-68. We see that the rural section of primary industry has slipped back slightly to \$495,000,000, or 39.3 per cent. of the estimated total of net value of production, and that the non-rural section is \$135,000,000, or \$1,000,000 less than last year; that forestry, trapping and fishing is the same at \$21,000,000; and that mining, in which sphere all the "hoo-ha" has been going on in the last 12 months, is \$1,000,000 less than it was the year before.

This is the smugness and complacency to which I was referring! We have heard ad nauseam that we are going somewhere developmentally, but almost all this spate of Press announcement has surrounded mining development. Yet our figures for the most recent period of 12 months are down by \$1,000,000 on the previous year. As a fairly reliable estimate, the net value of manufacturing for the last financial year should be approximately \$630,000,000, and may be more. This, then, becomes approximately 50 per cent. of the total net value of production of this State.

I want to refer to a comment by the Director of the Department of Industrial Development on page 1 of his report, where he says—

"Queensland's industrial performance has been quite outstanding in recent years. During the five years to 1967, the latest year for which figures are available, the value of factory production rose 70 per cent., compared with only 27 per cent. in the earlier five-year period."

Being a very modest man, I do not suggest that the fact that I was in the Cabinet during those five years had anything to do with that performance.

I draw attention to the Queensland Pocket Year Book for 1968, in which the figures on page 72 cause me a good deal of concern.

In 1956-57, the year in which the Labour Government fell, there were 101,494 employees in industry. That figure fell in 1957-58, then rose slightly to 102,000 in 1960-61, and fell back to 99,657 in 1961-62. Over those five or six years there was a virtual stalemate. In 1962-63 the figure jumped to 103,000; in 1963-64 to 108,000; in 1964-65 to 114,000; in 1965-66 to 115,000; in 1966-67—and it is here that I am caused concern—the figure was only 115,784, or only 161 more than the year before.

There is no room for complacency and smugness. No real credit can accrue to anyone on the score, as it is advertised, that we are making gigantic strides industrially.

In my close association with industry over the last 12 months I have found a great deal of gloom, particularly in the heavy industry

and engineering fields. It is impossible to escape running into people who are greatly concerned. It is time that the scales were ripped from the eyes of those who have a bent for rushing to the Press and talking about development. The development of our mining pursuits, almost in their entirety, rests on the basis of our exporting raw materials, virtually none of which are being fabricated to any degree, except bauxite and copper. With both those minerals we are taking only one transitional step—but not the final step. That is not development. It is something that we need but it is not something we need in lieu of the type of manufacturing operation that will take our raw materials and develop them so that we can export from that angle. What has happened in mining, with a drop of \$1,000,000 this year compared with last year, is indicative of the problem confronting our primary producers, namely, fluctuating world markets.

We cannot expect to encourage migrants to come to this State unless we can offer them employment. In the last 12 months I sadly relate this has not been the case. I adjure all those concerned with the responsibility to get something done.

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) (9.12 p.m.): I wish to pay a tribute to the staff controlled by the Minister for Industrial Development. Maurice Chevalier had a theme song called "Thank Heaven for Little Girls". I think the Minister's theme song should be, "Thank Heaven for Industrial Officers and Departmental Officers". When we note the extent to which most Government members lean on departmental officers we get an indication of the true value of Ministers. Judging by events last week, it is not always possible for Ministers to lean too heavily on their departmental officers with the assurance that they will get the correct information from them.

The figures in the Estimates relating to the Department of Industrial Development are indicative of the importance and responsibility attached to this department. I am not engaging in personalities when I point out that the estimated expenditure for this department in the coming 12 months totals only \$725,000, compared with millions of dollars to be spent by other departments, and that sum includes an amount of \$170,000 to be spent in the immigration field.

I pay a tribute to Mr. Rutherford, who is in charge of the Department of Immigration. I have known him for many years and I know that he does a tremendous job for immigrants to this State.

Mr. Bromley: He is a good, square man, too.

Mr. MELLOY: He is.

I also pay a tribute to Sir David Muir on his association with the Department of Industrial Development, and to the officers working under him. To the Minister himself

I extend my sympathy because I realise he has a job that perhaps he is not altogether happy with. I am sure that at times he feels extremely frustrated in his office.

The Minister mentioned the development of this State as expressed in terms of dollars. This could be due to the general increase in the national economy brought about by an increase in population. This affects all departments of government. A natural increase in expenditure and receipts will follow any population increase.

Where would this State be if it were not for the coal, copper and bauxite which are the bases of any increase in the economic development of this State? Without them, and relying solely on the Government's initiative, Queensland would be by far one of the poorest and least-developed States, financially and otherwise, in Australia. It is in that position even at this stage.

The hon. member for Wavell hit the nail on the head when he spoke of all the "hoo-ha". I do not know what that is, but apparently it adequately expresses the position as far as he is concerned. He spoke of the great deal of gloom that he found among industrialists in his trips around the State. This is a serious matter. The hon. member for Wavell was closely associated with the industrial development of Queensland when he was Minister for Industrial Development. He comes into the Chamber on this occasion and downgrades the work of the Government, lately his own colleagues, in the industrial development of this State.

The hon. member for Rockhampton South went to great lengths to speak of the development at Gladstone. If any credit goes anywhere for this it goes to the hon. member for Port Curtis. But the hon. member for Rockhampton South is trying to claim the credit for the Government. The Government can claim no credit whatever for the development at Gladstone. The coal was there, the bauxite was available and the shipping facilities were there. And Hanson was there! Can the hon. member for Rockhampton South convince me that if these things were not there, industries would have been established at Gladstone purely at the urging of the Government? Certainly not. The Government can take no credit in this regard. All the necessary facilities and circumstances were there. This consortium went to Gladstone and would have gone there irrespective of whether a Communist Government or any other Government was in power. It is far from reasonable that the hon. member for Rockhampton South should claim any credit for the Government in this regard.

The hon. member also said that local authorities and the Government should make land available to industries on such conditions that they will rush to various parts of the State to establish themselves. Why pander so much to industry? Are there not people throughout the length and breadth

of this State looking for land on which to build homes? Are there not workers looking for ways and means of obtaining finance to pay low deposits on land on which they can have homes erected? Why cannot the Government adopt the same attitude to them as it does to industry? These are the people whom the Government should be concerned about and whom it should be encouraging to obtain land.

Despite the claims of the Government, Queensland has developed into the State with the lowest wages and the highest unemployment. That does not demonstrate any attempt by the Government to develop the State. In fact, there has been no real industrial development in Queensland during the Government's term of office. The figures compiled by the Bureau of Census and Statistics for 1966-67 show that in Queensland last year there were fewer factories employing more than 100 workers than there were in the previous year. Factories in that category are the ones that employ what might be described as the average worker. Some employ skilled workers, and some employ semi-skilled workers. They are not huge combines, and they are the types of factories needed to develop the State, not in specific areas but generally throughout Queensland. It is small factories which will provide in the long run most employment for the average worker, and it is these factories that are decreasing in number under this Government.

Unless an atmosphere conducive to development and employment can be provided in this State, new settlers will not be encouraged to come here. They are the people who will create the demand for manufactured goods. It is seen in the last volume of the Quarterly Summary of Australian Statistics that, in the three months ended March, 1968, of the 37,375 new settlers who came to Australia only 2,485 came to Queensland. New South Wales received 12,000-odd; 10,000-odd went to Victoria; 3,000-odd went to South Australia; and approximately 6,000 went to Western Australia. Each of those States attracted far more new settlers than Queensland, which attracted only 2,485.

There is an example of the development that the Government boasts about. Queensland is not able to attract workers and the population needed to develop manufacturing industries. It is of little use manufacturing goods if we do not have the people to buy them. The population must be increased for this reason, and, as I have pointed out, the Government is failing in this regard.

I now wish to say a few words about take-overs in this State. This is another matter that is causing considerable concern in industry. Hon. members will recall that Bruce Pie Industries, which was engaged in textile manufacturing in Queensland, was taken over by southern interests and in no time that factory was closed. That is the effect of take-overs.

One finds, too, that the take-over of retail stores such as Allan & Stark Ltd. and McWhirters Ltd. by Myers, and Finney Isles & Co. Ltd. and T. C. Beirne Ltd. by David Jones, has had an effect on small industries in Queensland. These big firms now have all their printing done in the southern States, which has meant a loss to Queensland printers; their accounting is done in the southern States, and most of the manufactured goods that they sell in Brisbane are manufactured in Victoria or New South Wales. In fact, Queensland is becoming merely a sales outlet for the manufacturers of New South Wales and Victoria through the retail stores that have been taken over by southern interests.

Mr. Thackeray: In other words they are discount houses.

Mr. MELLOY: That is true.

Decentralisation is another matter to which the Government gives lip-service. Recently, Mr. Westerman, secretary of the Beaudesert Chamber of Commerce, said that the State Government was not realising the industrial-development potential of small country towns. This raised a very serious question, because hon. members have seen frequently, particularly in the past 12 months, instances of complaints by individual towns that there is insufficient employment for their juveniles. Young people have had to migrate to the cities, and in some cases this has meant the breaking-up of homes because parents have not been in favour of their children moving to cities while the family remained in a country town. The Country Party conference felt so strongly about decentralisation—and this has been mentioned by the hon. member for Toowoomba East—that it urged the Government to set up a department of decentralisation.

In its efforts to boost the industrial development of Queensland, the Government has encouraged various missions from overseas to visit the State. It hoped to interest overseas investors in setting up industries in Queensland. The first was the British Federation of Manufacturers of Construction Equipment Mission, then came a Japanese mission, a delegation from the Republic of China, and the City of Westminster Chamber of Commerce Trade Mission. Various other people with trade interests were brought to the State also, but nowhere does anyone see any result of the investigations made by them. Apparently none of them were impressed by what they saw in this State, particularly if investigations were made in southern States such as New South Wales and Victoria, where industry is encouraged to a far greater degree than it is here.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Smith): Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr. MELLOY: The Minister and the Government have said frequently that they believe in the investment of overseas funds in Queensland industries. Hon. members on this side

of the Chamber agree with that. They would like to see sufficient overseas financial investment in Queensland to encourage the development of industry; but they would also like to see the Queensland or Australian equity in that industry maintained so that its control would remain in this State.

This is not happening at all. I suppose all hon. members have received a copy of the Directory of Overseas Investment in Australian Manufacturing Industry. It is published by the Commonwealth Department of Trade and Industry and it sets out the holdings of various manufacturing concerns in this country and in this State. I am going to cite a few of them because they are of great interest to the people of Queensland. This is what the Australian Labour Party complains about—overseas interests coming here and taking part in our industries, and all the real value, all the profits and benefits of these industries, going overseas. As has been pointed out before, all we get are the handling charges for the goods and the payment of wages to the workers in the industries. The real benefits, which would enable us to provide hospitals and schools, are going out of the State.

I cite a few of these companies and the quantum of holdings in the hands of overseas interests. The Australian Aluminium Co. holds 100 per cent. It is of Canadian origin and there is no Australian interest in it. Comalco Industries contains a 92.5 per cent. holding by overseas interest; Conzinc Riotinto of Australia, 85 per cent. overseas holdings; Queensland Alumina Ltd., 98.8 per cent. overseas holdings. These figures are important because they indicate overseas holdings in industry in this country and demonstrate the complete hold that overseas interests have on our industries. Allis-Chalmers Australia Pty. Ltd., which handles earth-moving equipment, has a 100 per cent. overseas holding; Massey-Ferguson also has 100 per cent. I will go through quite a few of them, because I think it is important.

Mr. Kaus: Don't you believe in profit?

Mr. MELLOY: In adequate profit, yes, but what I am complaining about, as I have said, is that all the profits are going overseas. It is Australian products from which they are deriving their profits. That is not in the interest of Australia by any means.

Standard Telephones and Cables Pty. Ltd., which has assets in Australia worth \$22,000,000, is held 100 per cent. overseas; Sunbeam Corporation, which markets a tremendous quantity of goods in this country and has assets valued at \$9,000,000, is 100 per cent. overseas holding; Black & Decker, electrical goods, 100 per cent. I will name the 100 per cent. holdings in this country because they indicate just how widespread this sort of thing is. Amoco holds 100 per cent.; Walpamur Paint Company 100 per cent.; Bayer Pharma Pty. Ltd. 100 per cent.;

Beecham (Australia) Pty. Ltd. 100 per cent.; British Drug Houses 100 per cent. We do not own anything in these shows.

These are the things that we complain about. There are actually dozens of these holdings—Kayser Pty. Ltd., the lingerie manufacturer, has 100 per cent. overseas holding; D. & W. Murray, a well-known firm in this city, has 100 per cent. overseas holding; Paton & Baldwin is 100 per cent. Penn Elastic Co. (Qld.) Pty. Ltd., who have a factory in Salisbury, have 100 per cent. overseas holding.

These are the things we complain about, and we are challenged by being asked whether or not we believe in overseas investment to encourage our industries. We do, but, as I have said, the Australian Labour Party wants to see Australian enterprises share in the control of these companies. We do not want to see all our products going overseas without any return coming to Queensland, as is the case with our exports of coal, alumina, and copper. Our motor-car industry is held 100 per cent. overseas by G.M.H. and by the Ford company. These are the things that we complain about.

I turn now to the matter of automation and the problems that it has created. The effects of automation are neglected by the Government. What has it done to offset them in industry in this State?

In March of last year the Government said it had assigned officers to study the effects on industry of automation. We have heard nothing of the investigations that were made. What has come of them?

Queensland is a primary-producing State, and in the long run it will stand or fall on the degree to which it maintains its primary industries. Already its secondary industries are worth more than its primary industries. The development of our secondary industries is not to the good of Queenslanders because profits do not remain here, so if we continue to develop and foster secondary industries at the expense of our primary industries the day will soon come when we will not be able to compete with overseas interests on the world and home markets.

(Time expired.)

Mr. W. D. HEWITT (Chatsworth) (9.37 p.m.): In the course of quite a remarkable speech the hon. member for Nudgee referred to Maurice Chevalier and his very delightful song, "Thank Heaven for Little Girls". If hon. members are going to refer to artists, I should like to invoke that famous author Lewis Carroll and his well-known work "Alice in Wonderland".

Mr. Melloy: That aptly describes the Government.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: Let me refer not to "Alice in Wonderland" but rather to "Jack in Blunderland".

Mr. Melloy interjected.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: The hon. member spoke for 25 minutes, so why can't he be quiet now?

In the course of his speech, which was of sweeping generalities, the hon. member made the remarkable allegation that no credit accrues to the Government for the development that has taken place in Gladstone, and he made the equally remarkable allegation that no industrial development can be credited to the Government. He also referred, in dark and despondent terms, to unemployment problems. The facts so belie the hon. gentleman's allegations that they do not need rebuttal at all. The fact is that Gladstone developed because of a healthy political climate.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind hon. members on both sides of the Chamber that talking across the Chamber will not be permitted. I have called hon. members to order frequently today, and I do not intend to tolerate any further cross-firing.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: To say that there has been no industrial development is to deny the contents of a well-constructed annual report and also the evidence that is in front of anybody who cares to open his eyes and survey the situation.

Let us follow through the hon. gentleman's allegations relative to unemployment and rebut them quite easily by referring to page 2 of the report of the Director of Industrial Development. The reference to employment in the report is in these terms—

"Employment continued to rise in 1967-68 with the rate of increase accelerating over the final months of the year. In April, 1968, the level of total civilian employment was 2.9% higher than 12 months earlier.

"The rising trend in manufacturing employment also was maintained and by April, 1968, had reached a level of 2.3% above that for the previous year. Most sectors of manufacturing shared in this increase."

I suggest to the hon. member that he devote an hour of his time tomorrow to closely studying the report, when he will find a complete answer to every point that he attempted to develop tonight.

The Estimates that we are discussing were introduced by the Minister at 4 o'clock this afternoon, following a day-long debate on primary industries. I think it is significant that, in the one day, we debate Estimates of two departments that have such an impact upon the economy of the State. As a consequence, we can identify the relationship between those two departments. We can also identify the dependence of the State upon the endeavours of these two departments.

It is readily acknowledged that primary production is still the great earner in this State and that our economy is still geared to primary industry. But primary production these days is confronted with many problems, both short-term and long-term. In one of the finest speeches we have heard this session, the hon. member for Clayfield developed this theme very well this afternoon. Because of the problems that we see in primary production, the need is greater to pursue our industrial-development programme. There are two significant reasons for this: first, to augment the income of the State, and second, to bolster the economy, which for too long was almost totally dependent upon primary production. I say, not for the first time, that the effects of the drought upon the economy of this State would have had a much more severe impact if the State had not pursued the industrial-development programme that we have seen.

The report, and the Minister's speech—as ever progressive—need no bolstering by back-benchers. Indeed there is little to add to them. One could content oneself merely with thanking the officers for their never-ending courtesy and congratulating them on their undoubted efficiency. Great though our industrial development has been, and progressive though our policies have been, we must continue to look for ways to further accelerate this development. It is true that the programmes have done much to accelerate development in the fields of technical assistance, with guaranteed loans (which the hon. member for Norman hopelessly confused this afternoon), with industrial estates (it is pleasing to note that these have been developed, not only in the metropolitan area, but in Townsville, Southport, Caboolture, Rockhampton, Gladstone and Toowoomba), and also with the ready economic advice that is available to aspiring industrialists or, indeed, to established industrialists. These contributions are all of inestimable and continuing value. I should also refer to the very fine documentaries that the department has produced in recent months and that have been shown, I believe, with telling effect over the television networks in this State.

During the last few hours the hon. member for Nudgee and others have been searching for some vindication of the department. In effect they have been asking what the department has done. I can cite one classic example in vindication of the department's efforts. Two years ago, when these Estimates were last discussed, a document that the department then produced was almost hot off the Press. It was a booklet called "Manufacturing Opportunity to Queensland." That booklet outlines a very close assessment of 25 industries that could, with advantage, be established in Queensland. The survey and comprehensive inquiry that were conducted were a tribute to the authors of the document.

It is noticeable that the Director, in his report this year, has made reference again to this study. He said—

“The preliminary studies which were undertaken of some 30 opportunities for manufacturing investment in Queensland have continued to arouse the interest of potential investors.

“Most of these studies were revised during the year in the light of the changing economic environment.”

What is not mentioned—if it is mentioned I have missed it—is that one of the industries which was not more than a recommendation two years ago now flourishes at Redbank. I refer to the malting industry. This industry was created at Redbank and now saves this State thousands of dollars because the nonsense of sending barley to the South to be processed and then buying malt has now been avoided. This is a total vindication of the research, analysis and study that the department does. Gracing one of the pages of this report is a photograph of Smith Mitchell & Co.'s malting complex at Redbank. This is one vindication of many, and it is one that should be cited tonight.

While in the course of an Estimates debate the Minister and his department are allowed for a moment to congratulate themselves on what has been attained, they must nevertheless look forward to future goals. I think that we should try to spell out our aims in this field. As I see them they are simply identified: to industrialise our State, to diversify our industries, and to arrest the drift to the cities by the creation of industries in the provincial cities. This is being done because this Government has created the right political climate, the political climate that establishes stability and security I think that in this State of Queensland there is possibly little more that could be done to attract more industry here. I believe that there is still a field for the Commonwealth Government to explore, that is, the question of further and original forms of tax concession to new industries and indeed to existing expanding industries. I hope that the Minister has this aspect ever before him.

Our continuing problem—and it has been referred to constantly tonight—has been the fact that we lack industries that demand a heavy labour content. I am the first to concede this fact. The many complexes that we have already attracted have this apparent weakness. This, of course, is a challenge that faces this department and indeed this State. There can be no question at all that the creation of a new power-complex in Central Queensland would do much to solve these problems.

The direct cause of these difficulties is our problem in attracting migrants to this State. Again, I am not the first to lend voice to those thoughts tonight. It is noteworthy that the Director advises in his report that in the

year 1967-68 4,593 assisted migrants came to Queensland from the United Kingdom. When from that number is subtracted the 2,330 who were actually nominated by families residing in Queensland, it will be seen that Queensland attracted only an additional 2,263 from the United Kingdom.

The problem of attracting migrants is strengthened by reference to page 6 of Australian Immigration, Quarterly Statistical Summary, which gives a State-by-State breakdown of arrivals of new settlers for the period 1963-64 to the financial year just ended. If the migrant intake for those years is totalled, it will be found that the Commonwealth's gain was 682,726 but the gain for Queensland was only 44,660, which is a mere 6.54 per cent. and, in anybody's language, not good enough.

Of course, there are those who say, “Which should come first—industries to attract people, or people who themselves create new employment possibilities?” I think a slice has to be taken from both cakes. I hesitate to give an answer to the question why Queensland does not get a better share of migrants, but I am one who believes that there is at times a calculated indifference in Southern States to the needs of Queensland. I think that it is pretty important for the Minister and his advisers to look over their shoulders on occasions.

If we do not attract our migrants by orthodox means, obviously we have to become adventuresome. I support the hon. member for Port Curtis to the full when he mentioned tonight that migrants travelling round the southern part of Australia have their trip lengthened by setting their sights upon Queensland, and I think there is a natural tendency for people who have spent four, five or six weeks on the water to want to disembark and re-establish their new lives as quickly as possible. I think that if we could arrange for ships carrying migrants to come straight to the Eastern seaboard, this could be part of the solution to the problem. I am one of those who believe in direct airlifts, and I believe that if we can go overseas and sell our State for industrial development and for investment potential, we should also be able to sell it as a good place in which to live. I hope that the Minister, in the course of his constant endeavours, will look for some venturesome way of drawing more migrants to Queensland.

There is little more that I wish to say on these Estimates, other than to congratulate my friend the Minister on this, the occasion of his first presentation of Estimates. The Minister and I have known each other a long time, and I think he will agree with me that we have been up a few dry gullies together. I hope that both of us are spared long enough to continue with our humble efforts towards the growing greatness of this State.

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 9.54 p.m.