

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**THURSDAY, 5 AUGUST 1971**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

under the promotion of Domacorn Pty. Ltd., which was under police investigation in December, 1970?

(2) Is there any indication of a refund to ticket holders?

*Answers:—*

(1) "The matter is still under police investigations."

(2) "I understand that the Supreme Court has made an order for the winding up of Domacorn Pty. Ltd. and has appointed Lloyd George Rees and John Robert Rees, chartered accountants, to be liquidators of the company."

#### ACTIVITIES OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL COUNCIL

**Mr. W. D. Hewitt**, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

Is it intended that the Environmental Control Council will invite assistance and submissions from specialist bodies? If so, (a) what bodies will be asked to co-operate and (b) to what degree will they be permitted to participate in the Council's activities?

*Answer:—*

"Yes. (a) (i) To date assistance has been sought from the Commonwealth Acoustic Laboratory with respect to noise and the Department of Civil Aviation has also provided assistance in this respect; (ii) Representation and assistance on two advisory committees have been sought; (iii) On the Noise Control Committee—the Australian Medical Association, the Chamber of Manufactures, the Trades and Labor Council and the University of Queensland Mechanical Engineering Department; (iv) On waste disposal on land—the Institute of Health Surveyors, the Brisbane City Council and the Chamber of Manufactures; (v) The nature of the information required and assistance available will determine the organisations or individuals approached. However, those most likely to be of assistance include professional institutes and associations, development associations, e.g., organisations of companies with common interests such as Rutile and Zircon Development Association; educational bodies—universities, colleges of advanced education; local authorities; Queensland conservation council (member bodies are numerous, 35); trade unions; and existing advisory committees, e.g., air pollution councils, Beach Protection Authority, etc. (b) The main advice sought will be of a technical nature and will be directed towards the advisory committees. However, similar information, particularly of a more general nature, may be directed towards the Environmental Control Council. Outside bodies will be asked to co-operate by participating in seminars for the exchange of ideas and information between them and the Environmental Control Council. It is not

## THURSDAY, 5 AUGUST 1971

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

### PAPER

The following paper was laid on the table:—

Order in Council under the Racing and Betting Act 1954–1971.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

#### DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY; MINISTER FOR MINES AND MAIN ROADS

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (11.3 a.m.): I desire to inform the House that in connection with the overseas visit of the Minister for Mines and Main Roads, His Excellency the Governor has, by virtue of the provisions of the Officials in Parliament Act 1896–1969, authorised and empowered the Honourable Alan Roy Fletcher, Minister for Education and Cultural Activities, to perform and exercise all or any of the duties, powers, and authorities imposed or conferred upon the Minister for Mines and Main Roads by any Act, rule, practice or ordinance on and from 5 August 1971 and until the return to Queensland of the Honourable Ronald Ernest Camm.

I lay upon the table of the House a copy of the Government Gazette Extraordinary of 4 August 1971 notifying this arrangement.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the Government Gazette Extraordinary upon the table.

### QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

#### LIONS ART UNION PROMOTED BY DOMACORN PTY. LTD.

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

(1) What is the present position in relation to the Lions Art Union launched

intended that non-Governmental organisations participate directly in the activities of the Environmental Control Council."

**SALE OF RAILWAY DEPARTMENT MOTOR VEHICLES, NORTH QUEENSLAND**

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

(1) Are Railway Department road motor vehicles such as cars and trucks, which are used in the Northern Division and due for replacement, returned to Brisbane for sale? If so, why are they not offered for sale in North Queensland?

(2) What is the actual cost of loading, unloading and railing (a) a car and (b) a four-ton truck from Townsville to Brisbane?

*Answer:—*

(1 and 2) "The prices offered are not as satisfactory as those obtained in Brisbane even after taking into consideration the cost of loading, unloading and freight."

**Mr. AIKENS:** I notice that in my next question the portion dealing with the knock-knee'd dairy maids has been excised. Is there any constitutional basis for that action?

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Yes, very constitutional. It was a facetious question.

**Mr. AIKENS:** Thank you. I now ask the question—or what is left of it.

**INCREASE IN BUTTER PRICE**

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

Has he been advised that the price of butter has been substantially increased and that this rise in price has been wholly or partly brought about by the declining sales of butter to the Queensland people? If so, has this decline in sales resulted from the incredibly silly but expensive television advertisements sponsored by the Butter Board?

*Answer:—*

"I am informed that the bulk wholesale price of butter was increased by 2 cents per lb. as from August 3, 1971. This decision was made by The Dairying Industry Council and will apply on an Australia wide basis. I am also informed that overall butter sales in Queensland have increased by almost 4 per cent. during 1970-71."

**DINMORE-CHURCHILL BYPASS ROAD, CUNNINGHAM HIGHWAY, IPSWICH**

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

(1) Has any further progress been made with the planning of the proposed southern bypass of the Cunningham Highway at Ipswich from Dinmore to Churchill?

(2) When will its construction commence?

(3) As heavy interstate vehicles are using streets and roads in the suburbs of the City of Ipswich at considerable inconvenience to the residents in these suburbs, will he take urgent action to have an early commencement made on the construction of this bypass?

*Answers:—*

(1) "Yes."

(2) "Provision has been made for work to commence late in the Department's five-year planning programme."

(3) "The Main Roads Department is aware of the traffic situation in the area but having regard to available funds and the priorities of works on a State-wide basis it is impossible to advance the planned date for construction of the bypass without upsetting the priorities of urgent projects in other areas."

**NEW TOWN PLAN FOR IPSWICH**

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

(1) Has the proposed new town plan for the City of Ipswich, submitted on October 30 last, been approved? If so, what was the date of approval?

(2) If not, what is the reason for the delay and what period of time will still be required for examination of the plan?

*Answers:—*

(1) "No."

(2) "Town-planning schemes submitted to the Department are dealt with in order of lodgement. It is not possible at this stage to indicate when final approval to the Ipswich plan will be obtained."

**NATIONAL PARK, COOLOOLA AREA**

**Mr. O'Donnell**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Lands,—

With reference to his statement that it will not be possible to name a large section of the area proposed for a National Park at Cooloola because it is covered by an authority to prospect expiring on June 30, 1972—

(1) Who holds the relevant authority to prospect?

(2) As it is obvious that no lease will be granted and that an authority to prospect may be surrendered, why are the people concerned being obstructive to the implementation of the declaration?

*Answer:—*

"These Questions relate to matters which come within the jurisdiction of my colleague the Honourable the Minister for Mines and Main Roads and I suggest that they be re-directed to him."

FEES, QUEENSLAND UNIVERSITY UNION;  
LECTURER D. O'NEILL

Dr. Crawford, pursuant to notice, asked  
The Minister for Education,—

As there is still great concern both in university circles and in the general community regarding the attitudes of certain university personnel—

(1) Do students have an option of not paying union fees at present incorporated in their university fees?

(2) Are statements of income and expenditure of the students' union displayed prominently in public places? If not, can such a display be arranged, preferably on a monthly basis?

(3) What lectures and tutorials did Mr. D. O'Neill have listed for the week ended July 31 and did he give them or cancel them?

(4) What day did Mr. O'Neill designate as the day on which he was technically on strike?

(5) Did the University pay this person for the full week ended July 31?

(6) Did similar or identical conditions apply to other staff members believed to be on strike?

Answers:—

(1) "I am advised that, although all students must pay the full tuition fee to

the university, persons whose beliefs prevent them from belonging to a corporate body have received a refund from the University of Queensland Union."

(2) "Annual financial statements of the University of Queensland Union are widely available after audit. Five copies have been provided for the information of the House. A statement on the trading operations of the union is provided monthly to the house committee which includes representatives of the Senate. Only a half-yearly statement is prepared on the operations of the union budget and I table copies of the 1971 budget. Staff shortages prevent more frequent statements."

(3 to 5) "The Registrar was advised on July 29 by the Head of the Department of English of a signed statement by Mr. O'Neill in which he regarded himself as having been on strike since 11 a.m. on Thursday, July 22, until the end of the Springbok tour in Australia. The tour ended in Toowoomba on Tuesday August 3. Mr. O'Neill, in common with other university staff, was advised when the July salary payment was made on July 28 that strike deductions would be made from the August payment. As I understand it this means that Mr. O'Neill will lose pay from July 22 to August 3, both dates inclusive. The lectures or seminars for which Mr. O'Neill was scheduled for the week ending July 31, were as follows:—

Day	Hour	Lecture or Seminar	Class	—
Monday 26th ..	10 a.m. 5 p.m.	L S	English Prose .. Victorian and Modern Literature ..	Cancelled 1 student arrived and went away
Wednesday 28th	11 a.m. 12 noon	S S	Literary Theory and Criticism .. Literary Theory and Criticism ..	Part taken by Miss Sloane Part taken by Miss Sloane
Thursday 29th ..	11 a.m. 12 noon	S S	Victorian and Modern Literature .. English Prose ..	Not taken Taken by Mr. Marks "

(6) "The same conditions will apply to all on strike."

Papers.—Whereupon Mr. Fletcher laid upon the Table of the House copies of the papers referred to.

UPGRADING OF CAPRICORN HIGHWAY

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

(1) Has he received a request from the Rockhampton Regional Promotion Bureau to meet a special deputation to discuss the upgrading of the Capricorn Highway?

(2) When is it intended to meet the deputation?

(3) Is he aware of the alleged statement by the Minister for Mines and Main Roads as reported in *The Morning Bulletin* of July 7, that that highway would not be completed in the present five-year road works programme?

(4) As this statement conflicts with previous political promises made by his

Government, will he give some definite undertaking concerning the upgrading of this highway?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "When appropriate arrangements can be made."

(3) "Yes."

(4) "It is always stressed in statements relating to road construction programmes in all areas that these are dependent on changing situations both of finance and development. In the case of the Capricorn Highway the rapid developments in the mining industry in the Blackwater area, coupled with anticipated agricultural development resulting from construction of the Fairbairn Dam, means that upgrading of the section between Rockhampton and Emerald with the consequent rapid increase in traffic has had to be speeded up with resultant rearrangement of overall priorities for construction of the complete highway."

ROAD ACCIDENTS, BRUCE AND CAPRICORN  
HIGHWAYS

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

With regard to (a) the Bruce Highway between Rockhampton and Bundaberg and (b) the Capricorn Highway between Rockhampton and Emerald—

(1) How many road accidents have been reported in each of the last three years?

(2) How many persons have been (a) injured and (b) killed in accidents on these roads in each of the last three years?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "Statistics are only available for 1969 and 1970. The following information is furnished:—

Bruce Highway between Rockhampton  
and Bundaberg

—	1969	1970
Number of accidents ..	177	190
Number killed .. ..	5	5
Number injured .. ..	67	95

Capricorn Highway between Rockhampton  
and Emerald

—	1969	1970
Number of accidents ..	109	97
Number killed .. ..	5	12
Number injured .. ..	53	51"

NEW RAILWAY STATION, ROCKHAMPTON

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

(1) When is it expected that the new Rockhampton railway station will be completed?

(2) What is the latest estimate of the final cost?

(3) When the station is completed, is it intended to alter the northern approach by removing the present line in Denison Street?

(4) Has consideration been given to the construction of a new railway bridge over the Fitzroy River as part of the overall improvement programme of the rail facilities in Rockhampton?

Answers:—

(1) "Due to representations from the former Member for Rockhampton South and the current Member for Rockhampton North, the new station will be finished in 1973."

(2) "Approximately \$2.2 million."

(3 and 4) "No."

COMMONWEALTH AID FOR RESTORATION  
OF FLOOD-DAMAGED LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
ASSETS

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

As a result of his representations to the Prime Minister, how much did (a) local authorities and (b) the Main Roads Department receive for maintenance because of flood submergence?

Answer:—

"(a) Local authorities and certain other local bodies will be eligible for grants of 66½ per cent. of the cost of restoration of damage to Local Government assets due to flood submergence. Estimates of such costs, not yet confirmed, totalled some \$2 million which would attract grants of approximately \$1.3 million; (b) The present estimate of the amount to be recouped by the Commonwealth is \$937,250. No recoupment has been received to date."

HOUSE-BUILDING COSTS

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

(1) What is the average cost per square of building timber homes in the metropolitan area and in the country areas of Queensland?

(2) Do the costs of country houses vary greatly from area to area?

(3) How do costs in Queensland compare with those in other States?

Answers:—

(1 and 2) "The average price per square accepted in April–June, 1971, for timber houses to be erected on Commission land in or near Brisbane was \$820. By comparison the following are the prices per square for some of the country areas in which contracts were let in January–June, 1971—Moura \$783, Biloela \$800, Blackwater \$849, Gladstone \$889, Sarina \$952, Georgetown \$1,147, Boulia \$1,194. However, it must be accepted that specifications vary according to local requirements and available facilities."

(3) "It is difficult to obtain common ground on which to provide an accurate Interstate comparison. However the Commonwealth Department of Housing reports that the average cost of houses for which applications were received in 1969–70 for grants under the *Home Savings Grant Act* 1964–1970 were Queensland \$9,601, Victoria \$10,196, Western Australia \$10,327, South Australia \$10,355, New South Wales \$10,358, Tasmania \$10,555, Capital Territory \$13,440."

SOLAR ENERGY RESEARCH

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

(1) What research has been made into solar energy for (a) domestic use and (b) commercial purposes?

(2) Are large-scale opportunities available for harnessing energy from this source or must the method be necessarily restricted?

Answers:—

(1) "(a) and (b) The Mechanical Engineering Department of the University of Queensland and the C.S.I.R.O. have been active in solar energy research for many years. Solar hot-water systems are available commercially. In Queensland an experimental house with solar air-conditioning has been built by the university. Other applications have been studied in Australia and overseas, e.g., solar cells (to produce electricity), solar water distillation and solar furnaces."

(2) "So far the large-scale use of solar energy for domestic and commercial purposes has not proved generally economic, and its use has been limited to special situations."

RAILWAY DEPARTMENT ROLLING-STOCK

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

(1) What was the value of Railway Department rolling-stock purchased for the years 1967-68, 1968-69 and 1969-70?

(2) What was the value, in the years mentioned, of imported rolling-stock as compared with locally-manufactured rolling-stock and what were the comparative costs of the locally-manufactured stock?

Answers:—

(1) "1967-68, \$11,465,208; 1968-69, \$12,897,032; 1969-70, \$14,784,684."

(2) "The contracts for all of the rolling-stock were entered into with Queensland companies. It has been the policy to place orders with Queensland companies, assuming quality, delivery time, etc., are acceptable."

CURRAJONG STATE SCHOOL, TOWNSVILLE

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

As certain buildings and classroom wings at the Currajong State School have an inadequate water supply during peak periods, will a survey be made by one of his departmental officers with a view to relieving the position by providing larger or additional water pipelines?

Answer:—

"An investigation will be made into the matter raised."

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

(1) How many children are presently attending the Currajong State School, Townsville?

(2) What library facilities are available and how many rooms are involved?

(3) Are such facilities considered adequate for the number of children attending the school?

(4) What shelter from the tropical sun and rain is available at the school and is this considered adequate? If not, what action is to be taken?

Answers:—

(1) "The most recent enrolment return, dated May 28, 1971, reported an enrolment of 1,034."

(2) "One library room is available."

(3) "No. The library is considered to be a very important facility in a primary school and it is intended to upgrade provisions as quickly as finances permit."

(4) "A sheltered area of 10,080 square feet is available. This is in accordance with standard provision in this type of building and is considered adequate."

APPLICATIONS FOR HOUSING COMMISSION RENTAL ACCOMMODATION, TOWNSVILLE

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

How many applications for rental accommodation are presently held by the Queensland Housing Commission, Townsville, and what are the numbers in each priority?

Answer:—

"One hundred and twenty-six comprising:—100 points, nil; 80 points, 1; 60 points, 3; 40 points, 22; without points, 100."

WHEAT FREIGHT RATES, QUEENSLAND AND NEW SOUTH WALES

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

(1) What is the cost of railage on wheat, per ton and per bushel, from Goondiwindi to Pinkenba?

(2) What are the corresponding rates from Boggabilla to Newcastle and from Boggabilla to Sydney, at the rates applicable last season and at the rates to be applied in New South Wales for the coming season?

(3) To what extent does subsidy from the New South Wales Treasury reduce this rate to the wheat grower?

Answers:—

(1 and 2) "The freight rates are as follows:—

From	To	Per Ton	Per Bushel
Goondiwindi	Pinkenba ..	\$ 9.00	cents 24.11
Boggabilla ..	Newcastle ..	12.14	32.52
Boggabilla ..	Sydney ..	12.81	34.32

There has been no increase in the New South Wales freight rates for wheat over last season."

(3) "The rebated rates consequent on New South Wales Treasury subsidy are:—

From	To	Per Ton	Per Bushel
Boggabilla ..	Newcastle ..	\$ 9.90	cents 26.52
Boggabilla ..	Sydney ..	10.46	28.02

It will be seen that the Queensland freight rates are even lower than the subsidised freight rates in New South Wales."

#### WEIGHT LABELLING OF COMMODITY CONTAINERS

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the bewildering variety of weights and measures appearing on cans, bottles and packets of food and other products, for example, 4½ oz., 14½ oz., 15½ oz., 1 lb. 8½ oz., etc.?

(2) Is he aware that this makes it almost impossible for the housewife trying to keep within her budget to calculate the price per ounce and so make comparisons of competing products as to which is the better buy?

(3) As this appears to be an attempt by manufacturers to hide price increases by reducing the weight of the contents, as happened recently with chocolates, will he consider, when introducing metric weights and measures, compelling manufacturers to market their products in set divisions of a kilogram or litre such as a quarter, half and three-quarters?

(4) If he cannot do this in the case of products manufactured in other States, will he raise the matter at the next meeting of Commonwealth and State Ministers or authorities administering consumer affairs?

Answers:—

(1) "The articles referred to are not basic commodities and are not included in the list of items in the Schedule in Part V of the Queensland Weights and Measures Regulations which requires them to be packed in standard sizes. This Schedule and Part V of the Regulations are uniform throughout the States of the Commonwealth."

(2) "The four commodities the labels of which the Honourable Member submitted are as follows:—Spaghetti with deep fried meat balls, evaporated milk, baked beans, hot toast savouries with ham and cheese. These are packed in rigid containers which in themselves are in most cases of a standard size. For economy in packaging both in local and export trade the same size can is used for a variety of commodities of different densities. This will show a variation in the statement of weight dependent on the article packed. To require each of these commodities when packed in rigid containers to be packed in standard units of weight would greatly increase packaging costs by requiring a can of the suitable size for each commodity. In some instances the packer has to comply with the requirements of countries to which the commodity is to be exported and there is a tendency to mark the statement of weight below what it actually is so that there is no possibility of the contents of the can being short in weight."

(3) "Most basic commodities referred to in the Schedule will be required to be packed in standard metric units of weight related to the kilogramme and similarly units of volume related to the litre. With the use of the decimal coinage they should be capable of being costed by the purchaser."

(4) "As the State subscribes to uniformity with other States in respect to Weights and Measures matters, it has to accept a decision that is approved by the majority of the States. However, the Honourable Member may be assured that the officers of the Weights and Measures Department are working closely in conjunction with the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs to ensure that there will be no exploitation of the consumer. This matter is also the concern of the Metric Conversion Board who, it will be expected, will provide safeguards for the public."

#### NEW PRIMARY SCHOOLS

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

(1) How many new primary schools to the present date have been built during the period of the State Country-Liberal Party Government?

(2) How many of these were one-teacher establishments?

(3) Where were these schools built?

(4) How many of these were replacements owing to (a) re-siting, (b) dilapidation and (c) accidental destruction?

(5) How many such completely new schools were built on new educational design principles and where were they built?

(6) How many of the proposed five new schools for 1971-72 are to be (a) extra and (b) replacement schools and where is it proposed to build them?

Answers:—

(1 to 4) "The compilation of this information would require considerable time. If the Honourable Member really requires the details requested, I shall make them available as soon as possible."

(5) "Six multiple area schools have been constructed. These are located at Petrie Terrace, Norville, Heatley, Moranbah, Glenmore and Kuraby. I would point out that major additions in the new designs have been made to Moorooka, Happy Valley (Mount Isa) and The Gap. Additional teaching areas in this style have also been added to various schools throughout the State."

(6) "New schools are proposed for construction at Craigslea and MacGregor (Brisbane), Gabbinbar (Toowoomba), Healey (Mount Isa), and a replacement school is proposed at Goondi (Innisfail). Burketown, Croydon, Nelly Bay and Currumbin Valley are also to receive replacement schools."

#### COMMONWEALTH SCIENCE LABORATORIES

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

(1) How many State secondary schools have not yet received Commonwealth senior science blocks, what are the classifications of these schools and where are they?

(2) How many non-Government schools have not yet received Commonwealth senior science blocks?

(3) How many class III State secondary schools have received Commonwealth senior science blocks and where are they?

(4) When is it proposed to build a Commonwealth senior science block at Beenleigh State secondary school?

Answers:—

(1) "Out of 105 high schools 36 have not yet been provided with Commonwealth science laboratories. The schools are listed hereunder:—Grade 1: MacGregor, Nashville, Oxley. Grade 2: Acacia Ridge, Atherton, Beaudesert, Beenleigh, Biloela, Boonah, Bowen, Bundamba, Caloundra, Centenary Heights (Toowoomba), Charleville, Chinchilla, Emerald, Gayndah, Goondiwindi, Gordonvale, Heatley (Townsville), Holland Park, Home Hill, Isis District (Childers), Kingaroy, Lockyer District (Gatton), Malanda, Maroochydore, Monto, Oakey, Pittsworth, Proserpine, Richlands, Sarina, Stanthorpe, Thursday Island, and Yeppoon."

(2) "My Department does not administer the construction of Commonwealth science laboratories at non-State schools in Queensland. The information requested by the Honourable Member is available only from the Commonwealth Department of Education and Science in Canberra."

(3) "There are no Grade 3 high schools. From July 1, all Grade 3 high schools were reclassified as Grade 2."

(4) "No definite date can be given. My Department is waiting to assess the effect that the new high school at Woodridge will have on the enrolment at Beenleigh. In any case it is anticipated that a Commonwealth laboratory will be provided at Beenleigh during the period of the current grant in addition to the laboratory accommodation already there."

#### DRINK-DRIVING CHARGES

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

(1) How many drivers were charged with driving under the influence of liquor or a drug between July 25 and August 2 and between July 1 and July 25?

(2) How many of these during each period were within the metropolitan area?

Answers:—

(1) "This information for the whole of the State is not available at this date, but I will supply such statistics to the Honourable Member when the information is collated."

(2) "The number of drivers charged in the metropolitan area with driving under the influence of liquor or a drug from July 25 to August 2 inclusive was 26, and the number for the period July 1 to July 25 inclusive was 75."

#### DEMOUNTABLE SCHOOL CLASSROOMS

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

(1) How many demountable classroom buildings were purchased by his Department for the years 1967-68, 1968-69, 1969-70 and 1970-71?

(2) What is the total number of demountable buildings at present owned by the Department?

(3) From which firms were these buildings purchased for the above years and where are they located?

(4) Have any of the demountable classroom buildings purchased between 1960 and 1963 been written off by his Department?

Answers:—

(1) "1967-68, 59; 1968-69, 18; 1969-70, 32; 1970-71, 68."

(2) "255."

(3) "Northstate Engineering Co. Pty. Ltd., Sherwood; O'Neill Industries Pty. Ltd., Eagle Farm; C. K. & L. E. Fritz, Buranda; Unison Australia Pty. Ltd., Rocklea; Commercial Building Co. Pty. Ltd., Salisbury North."

(4) "No."

#### HOUSING COMMISSION PENSIONERS' UNIT SCHEME

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

(1) Under the new Pensioners' Unit Scheme, what age-pensioner persons, single and married couples, are not eligible to be considered for these units?

(2) Is any priority system being applied to applications received and, if so, what is the formula?

Answers:—

(1) "The Commonwealth, in agreeing to make a grant for accommodation for single age pensioners, stipulated that the pensioner be living in poor or too expensive accommodation and be receiving, or eligible for, the supplementary rent allowance paid by the Commonwealth to those categories of single pensioners who qualify therefor. The same criteria will apply to accommodation being provided with State finance for age pensioner couples except that the provision relating to supplementary allowance is not applicable to couples."

(2) "For pensioners who qualify as in (1), regard will then be given to the relative standard of an applicant's current accommodation and the amount of rent paid therefor, the date of lodgment of the application and such other factors as may be appropriate to equitable and sympathetic consideration."

#### WONDALL HEIGHTS STATE SCHOOL

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

Have plans and specifications been drawn up for additional classroom accommodation at the Wondall Heights State School? If so, will the accommodation be available for the commencement of the 1972 school year?

Answer:—

"No."

#### KEROSENE TAINT IN MULLET

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

Is his Department carrying out any research into the problem of kerosene taint in mullet and, if not, why was this work discontinued?

Answer:—

"The Department is continuing its research into the problem of the kerosene-like taint in mullet, and in fact has accorded a high priority to this work."

#### QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

##### USE OF OFFICIAL AEROPLANE

Mr. TUCKER: I ask the Premier: With reference to his answer yesterday to the Leader of the Opposition relative to the use of the new Government aircraft for the four months ended 31 July 1971, which revealed that, of the 45 flights undertaken by him during that period, most had been to Kingaroy, in his electorate, which is only 100 miles from Brisbane, how does he justify this, when members who are 1,000 miles from Brisbane are allowed only 21 return flights to Brisbane?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: The honourable member for Townsville North and his colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, again claimed yesterday that they were not given sufficient air tickets—I do not recall whether they mentioned 40-odd tickets—to travel to and from their electorates. I am the Premier of this State and I have a very big responsibility not only in my electorate but throughout Queensland. As the honourable member knows, I have travelled very extensively throughout Queensland on Government business, and I inform him that I intend to continue to do so.

##### HOME HEALTH EDUCATION SERVICE

Mr. WRIGHT: I ask the Minister for Justice: Has he given a personal recommendation to a series of books sold by the Home Health Education Service, an organisation which uses the door-to-door sales technique?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: The answer is "No".

Mr. WRIGHT: I direct a further question to the Minister. Did he write a personal letter to or for this organisation? Is he aware that such a letter is being shown to all prospective customers, which is the normal practice for salesmen when trying to sell books in this way, implying that he recommends the series in question?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: The answer is still "No".

##### INVESTIGATION OF HOUSE-PAINTING CONTRACTORS

Mr. JENSEN: I ask the Minister for Labour and Tourism: In view of his ministerial statement yesterday morning, will he look into the dealings of some firms using similar tactics in house-painting contracts, one such case having been put to him in writing by me, and name these firms in Parliament to protect the unsuspecting people of Queensland?

**Mr. HERBERT:** I ask that the question be put on notice. It is not that I do not want to answer it now, but I received a most unusual message from my office this morning. It is being examined by Crown Law officers. All I have to say at this stage is that I will not be threatened.

**Mr. JENSEN:** I meant to ask the question yesterday, but I could not get the call.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member for Bundaberg wish to place the question on notice?

**Mr. JENSEN:** Yes.

#### AGENT-GENERAL FOR QUEENSLAND, LONDON

**Mr. BLAKE:** I ask the Premier: In view of the critical importance to Queensland's primary industries of representation at the highest levels during the period of Great Britain's decision-making on entry to the European Common Market, how long has the position of Agent-General for Queensland in London been vacant, and when will an appointment be made?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** The position in London is not vacant, as the honourable member tries to imply. An acting Agent-General has been appointed, and this has been publicised. Apart from that, Sir Alan Summerville has been specially delegated to give his full attention in this particular area. As I said on Tuesday last, he has been to and fro and reporting to me and Cabinet on his activities on behalf of the Government.

#### PUBLICISING OF PRICE INCREASES

**Mr. R. JONES:** I ask the Minister for Labour and Tourism: As Minister in charge of consumer affairs, is there any possibility of extending a service to consumers whereby all commodities that are subject to a price rise will be listed from week to week and published in the local Press, which I understand is the practice in the Dominion of New Zealand?

**Mr. HERBERT:** No.

#### ALLEGED BOGUS AUCTION SALES

**Mr. BALDWIN:** I desire to direct three questions without notice, the first to the Minister for Labour and Tourism. Is the Minister aware of the wholesale trickery that is being practised by snide, fly-by-night individuals and companies who conduct bogus auctions in Queen Street at which persons are persuaded by slick talk to bid for secret parcels? These companies promote sales of goods of doubtful origin and quality, and then disappear, leaving unpaid bills.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! Does the honourable member intend to make a speech or ask a question?

**Mr. BALDWIN:** The solution comes in the last sentence, if I am given a chance to read it.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member, unfortunately, has developed a habit of making a speech and then, in the last sentence, asking the question. He is not entitled to fill his question up with a statement and then ask the question in the last sentence. It is not necessary in order to make the question clear.

**Mr. BALDWIN:** Will you hear the last sentence, Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Provided that the honourable member's next statement is the last sentence, I am prepared to hear it. So far, it is out or order.

**Mr. BALDWIN:** Will the Minister give consideration to having this practice investigated?

**Mr. HERBERT:** The Commissioner for Consumer Affairs issued a Press statement on this matter last week in which he enumerated the pitfalls and problems in much better language than that used by the honourable member for Logan. A copy of that statement is available to all honourable members. The Commissioner made it only last week, and all I can assume is that the honourable member has read it and repeated it as a question. What he requests has already been done.

**Mr. BALDWIN:** I apologise for being so busy as not to be able to read everything that appears in the Press.

#### REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION, WESTBROOK TRAINING CENTRE

**Mr. BALDWIN:** I ask the Minister for Health: With reference to the inquiry being conducted at Westbrook, will he give consideration to making the report available to the public or to interested members of Parliament when it is completed?

**Mr. TOOTH:** The report has already been laid upon the table of the House, and copies have been made available to the Press and to all radio and television stations.

**Mr. BALDWIN:** Again I apologise through you, Mr. Speaker. I do not mind these personalities being indulged in. I think I am right in my next question.

#### INDUSTRIAL SURVEY, REDLAND SHIRE

**Mr. BALDWIN:** I ask the Minister for Industrial Development: Will he inform me whether the industrial survey of the Redland Shire—

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! It would be better if the honourable member placed his question on notice. The Minister for Industrial Development is not present.

## FORM OF QUESTION

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) having given notice of a question regarding membership of the Queensland Club—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The question does not appear to come within the province of the Minister mentioned.

Mr. BENNETT: It definitely does, Mr. Speaker. It is a licensed club. This matter has been discussed before.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is very doubtful.

## ELECTORAL DISTRICTS BILL

## COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Hooper, Greenslopes, in the chair)

Clauses 1 to 3, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 4—Number of members of Legislative Assembly—

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (11.56 a.m.): This is the vital clause in the Bill. It determines the number of electorates under the redistribution and provides for 82 instead of the existing 78. I do not wish to repeat my comments of yesterday, but this Parliament decided in April that there should be 78 seats. Neither the Premier, for the Country Party, nor the Treasurer, for the Liberal Party, has seen fit to justify the change. So far as I am aware, there has been a change only at the party administrative level, not the parliamentary level.

The Labor Party firmly believes that 78 seats are sufficient. The proposed 82 seats will result in five extra seats within 100 miles of Brisbane and one less in the vast western and northern parts of the State. We do not regard that as a just redistribution. It is certainly contrary to all the opinions expressed by Government spokesmen when touring the State.

In the circumstances, the Opposition will oppose this clause. I have not circulated an amendment designed to reduce the number of seats to 78 for the simple and obvious reason that, if the proposal in the Bill for 82 seats is defeated, the Premier will throw his hands in the air as he did on the previous occasion and say that he will have to look at the matter. If the provision relative to 82 seats was defeated, it is obvious that we would come back to 78 seats. That would require a complete rearrangement of zones, and the shires included in the various zones, and the allocation of seats in the zones. For those reasons we intend to oppose this clause, and I trust that Liberal Party members—particularly those who were so adamant with their State president, Mr. Robinson, and State leader, the Treasurer, that they would not agree under any circumstances to an increase in

the number of seats—will show their fortitude in Parliament by supporting the Labor Party on this occasion.

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) (11.59 a.m.): I oppose this clause for a reason entirely different from that advanced by the Leader of the Opposition. I will not besmirch myself or my political reputation by indulging in the dog fight that has developed over the number of seats in the various zones. We have witnessed some amazing changes of opinion amongst A.L.P. and Liberal Party members, and now among Country Party members. Liberal Party members were adamant that there should not be any more than 78 seats and Labor Party members stood by them cheek to jowl. On this issue they were political blood-brothers. The Country Party, of course, wanted 82 seats.

Mr. Bennett interjected.

Mr. AIKENS: If the honourable member for South Brisbane was in the Chamber more often and was more intelligent—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. AIKENS: We have seen all this chopping and changing, and political activity on the part of them all. I repeat what I said in the early days, namely, that every party wants a redistribution to suit its own party interests. Politics being the game that it is, I do not blame the Country Party, the Liberal Party or the Australian Labor Party for wanting a redistribution to suit itself, because that is part and parcel of the very putrid game of politics.

As I said at the introductory stage of the Bill, there should be no more than 60 members in this Parliament. I already do the work of two members, and I am not beaten into the ground or physically or mentally exhausted. As I say, I believe that there should be no more than 60 members of this Assembly. Therefore, I am opposed to this clause, which provides, among other things, that there should be 82 members.

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) (12.2 p.m.): I, like the Leader of the Opposition, oppose clause 4. The Australian Labor Party is completely opposed to the whole Bill. There can be no justification for increasing the number of seats in Queensland from 78 to 82. At the moment there is a good deal of political thought that Queensland is already over-governed, and the people of Queensland demonstrated this during a recent Senate election, which revolved around the question whether the Senate should be enlarged or not—in other words, whether we should or should not have more parliamentarians.

North Queensland and Western Queensland will not benefit one jot as a result of this proposal. In fact, on a percentage basis, those areas will lose.

**Mr. Aikens:** It would have been worse under the A.L.P. redistribution.

**Mr. TUCKER:** That would have to be seen. We are discussing this clause of this Bill, and it is no use talking about what the A.L.P. might or might not have done. We are discussing the proposal before the Committee and I am pointing out that, under this clause, the North and the West will continue to have only 15 representatives. I describe the Bill as a retrograde step in that regard, because those areas will have representation by 15 members out of 82 instead of 15 out of 78.

I think that we are giving the best representation we can give under prevailing conditions. The Premier talks about proper and decent representation. I claim that proper representation could be given and would be given by extending the facilities for members representing the North and West rather than by increasing the over-all number of members. If country members were given proper travel facilities, there would be no need to advance the argument that proper representation can be given to the people of Queensland only by increasing the number of seats from 78 to 82.

I advert to the question that I asked the Premier this morning concerning the use of the Government aeroplane. I preface my remarks by stating that I have no argument with the Premier if he feels that he has to give better representation to his area of Kingaroy, or to the whole of Queensland. But let it be remembered that the Premier's electorate is about 100 miles to the north, which means an easy drive in a motor-car of about two hours from Brisbane.

**Mr. Bjelke-Petersen:** It is 150 miles from Brisbane.

**Mr. TUCKER:** I stand corrected. As the Premier drives, it would probably take about 1½ hours; as I drive, it would take about 2½ hours. I accept the fact that the Premier's electorate is 150 miles north of Brisbane, give or take a little. However, the great majority of northern members represent electorates that are at least 1,000 miles from Brisbane, and some of my colleagues' electorates are much further away than that. We cannot travel to the metropolitan area in a couple of hours of easy driving.

**Mr. Aikens:** It could take them two hours to drive to the aerodrome to catch a plane.

**Mr. TUCKER:** That may be so, but that is perhaps another argument, on traffic problems, for some other time.

Areas such as those represented by the Premier are within easy reach of Brisbane, whereas for members representing people in the North and the West travelling to Brisbane is not easy. These days the

electors demand that we be in our electorates as much as we possibly can, which means that country members want to use planes to move quickly to and from their areas, just as the Premier uses the aircraft, which was bought by the Government and made available to him, to travel between his electorate and the metropolitan area. In four months, the Premier used it 45 times. Although some of those trips would have been to other areas of the State, I think the Premier will admit that the great majority of them were to Kingaroy. If the Premier feels that he must do this on behalf of his constituents, I have no argument with him, but surely those of us who represent country areas of the State should be able to give a similar service to our electors. If the Premier needs an aircraft to give his electors proper representation, I do not think that other members should be restricted to 21 return flights to their electorates throughout the year.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The clause under discussion deals with the number of seats in Parliament.

**Mr. TUCKER:** I am dealing with the question of representation, and I am making the point that there would be no need to increase the number of seats from 78 to 82 if members were given proper facilities to represent their electorates. To attend the weekly parliamentary sittings during each session, and to travel to Brisbane to represent our constituents during the remainder of the year, we are given 21 return flights to Brisbane. Every member knows that that number is not sufficient. We are therefore forced to use other means of transport to Brisbane, and thus spend days travelling in the course of representing our electorates.

**Mr. Low:** What do you think about the new State movement? This situation will correct itself when you get your new State in North Queensland.

**Mr. TUCKER:** I will accept that interjection. It would be fortuitous for the Labor Party, and for me personally, if a new State were created in North Queensland, because there is no doubt about who would be in command. However, I shall not go into that matter any further. If the Premier finds it necessary to use the Government aircraft to give proper representation to his electorate and to the whole of Queensland, all I ask is that other honourable members be treated justly and equitably. In the light of the Premier's use of the aircraft, I cannot concede that we are being treated justly at the moment. I repeat that I have no argument against the Premier's continuing to move around the State and that I am asking only for equity.

As I pointed out yesterday, no country member has an office or a secretary in his electorate. All of us have offices in our

own homes, and our wives have to man those offices while we are in Brisbane during the week. In my opinion, if members of this Assembly had been provided with facilities similar to those available to Federal members of Parliament they could have represented larger areas. If members representing Western electorates had been provided with more air flights they could have covered their areas much better and more quickly, and perhaps could have given even better representation than they do now. Of course, they try to represent their constituents energetically and properly.

For the two reasons I have put forward, I cannot see any justification for raising the number of members from 78 to 82. If the Premier had wanted to do something for country members, he could have made better facilities available to them. The fact that four new seats are being given to the south-east part of Queensland is of no advantage to the people in North Queensland, and, as a Northern member, I do not think there is any justification for the Bill.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (12.12 p.m.): I do not wish to say a great deal at this stage. It was rather interesting to hear Opposition members condemning, one might say, the action taken by the father of the honourable member for Baroona in increasing the number of seats from 62 to 75. I am sure that the honourable member for Baroona is thinking how strange it is that his colleagues are speaking as they now are about the increase in the number of seats on this occasion. As honourable members well know, if there was justification for increasing the number of seats by 13 on that occasion, there is even more justification for an increase from 78 to 82 on this occasion. In 1957 the population had increased by 20 per cent. since the previous redistribution, and the number of seats was increased from 75 to 78 by Sir Francis Nicklin's Government. Between 1957 and 1971 the population has increased by over 20 per cent. and the Government is increasing the number of seats proportionately—from 78 to 82.

The Leader of the Opposition and the Labor Party wanted to have 48 of the 78 seats in the south-east corner of the State.

**Mr. Houston:** You are giving 52 to the south-east corner.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** The Bill provides for 47 seats in the south-east corner.

The argument advanced by honourable members opposite that the best way of overcoming difficulties arising from increased population and giving better representation is to provide more aircraft flights for country members is, I think, rather weak. It certainly would make easier the job of the honourable member who has just resumed his seat. In a 500-mile-an-hour jet, it takes him only two hours to return to his electorate.

**Mr. Tucker:** That is when I have enough air-flight vouchers.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** The honourable member has only one electorate to represent, and Parliament does not sit for the whole of the year. It has been suggested to me again and again that, as Premier, I should not have an aircraft—that I should travel by train and car. Similarly, I say to the honourable member for Townsville North, "If that is the basis of your argument, it is equally true that you should travel by train, because you get a free rail pass."

**Mr. Tucker:** It takes two days.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I appreciate that. I emphasise the point only to indicate how ridiculous it is when, from time to time, honourable members opposite are critical of the Government for operating an aircraft in this modern age. While the honourable gentleman's suggestion would help members, it would not help constituents to gain access to their parliamentary representatives. That is one of the reasons for the increase in seats to 82. With more members, constituents will have more ready access to their parliamentary representatives.

The Government has no intention of accepting any suggestion that the Leader of the Opposition might make about reducing the number of seats.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (12.16 p.m.): I am sick and tired of the Premier and other Country Party members saying that the Australian Labor Party's proposal was for 48 seats. I have denied it before, and I shall do so again. The area that we bounded was just outside 150 miles from Brisbane. Under this Bill there are 52 seats within 150 miles of Brisbane. If the Premier retained the number at 78, he would still have no more than we proposed.

As I said before, our proposal did not work out at 48 seats as the Premier suggested. It is completely wrong for him to make these statements in an effort to justify his argument. If he wanted our redistribution to be the order of the day, he could have spoken to me about it and I would have been very pleased to show him an honest redistribution on the basis of 78 seats.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON** (Salisbury) (12.17 p.m.): I had not intended to enter this debate, but I do so now after listening to the Premier in reply to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. It would seem that the Premier attempts to justify the sudden increase from 78 to 82 seats, in the short period of three months, by referring to better representation and increased electoral numbers. If he considers it necessary to reduce enrolments in electorates, or to create new electorates, so that members will have fewer constituents to look after, why has the Government, over the years, not been concerned about the position in the metropolitan area?

My own electorate now contains between 22,000 and 23,000 electors. I have represented those people over the last 12 years, and the members in electorates like Aspley, Belmont and Nudgee have also been able efficiently and adequately to represent their respective 20,000 constituents. At the same time, in the inner-city electorates of Merthyr and South Brisbane, for example, the enrolments have dropped to 8,000 or 9,000. Had the Premier wished to give effect to the opinion he now voices, he had the means at his disposal to carry out a partial redistribution and cure the imbalance between inner-city and outer-city electorates.

I do not accept the need for better representation as one of the reasons why the Premier suddenly decided it was necessary to have additional seats. Those honourable members who have represented the outer-suburban electorates over many years have given just as good representation as those who have had fewer constituents.

What the Premier said is just a hollow sham and fraud in his endeavour to solve the problem that arose with coalition parties having two different ideologies. Because the two parties could not agree, somebody had to give way. Consequently, we have had compromise after compromise. I say that the whole basic reason for the increase to 82 seats is not that the Premier or his colleagues are concerned about adequate representation, but because of this rotten compromise that exists in the coalition Government's thinking.

**Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE** (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (12.21 p.m.): I must rise to correct a misconception that the Leader of the Opposition keeps on repeating. The A.L.P.'s final suggestion, or propaganda, or whatever one likes to call it, was that the commission should be told to divide Queensland into 78 seats. With 960,000-odd electors, that would give an average quota of 12,500. If the population within the south-eastern region, as contained in the Bill, had been divided by the 12,500 that would have come out of that suggestion, it would have given 48 seats in that region.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (12.22 p.m.): It is a completely wrong assumption on the part of the Minister that, under the Labor Party's suggestion, the commission would not have used its knowledge and initiative in reference to the 20 per cent. tolerance, up or down, in electorate numbers. In addition, I have said repeatedly that the Labor Party recognises the problem of vast distances and poor communications, and naturally, under our scheme, the commissioners—not a political party—would take these things into consideration. It would not be something pre-arranged by the Government parties.

**Dr. Delamothé:** By your party.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** No, by the Minister's. It is the Minister's party that has talked all this nonsense about whether there should be 83 seats, 84, 79, or something else. The Government parties kept plucking numbers out of the air until finally they came up with 82.

I would still be interested to know what pressures were brought to bear in this matter. However, if the Minister can only get 48 seats, at the worst, out of our proposal and, provided the commission had to justify its decision—I say it would not, particularly with a Supreme Court judge as the chairman—then it is still only 48, whereas the Government proposal for this region, as I said, is now 52 seats.

**Mr. AIKENS** (Townsville South) (12.23 p.m.): I do not want to prolong this debate, but, having heard the few speeches made already, it is obvious to me that members are arguing according to their own particular, personal interests. They can feel the cold winds of electoral defeat blowing up the legs of their pants. That does not affect me. My attitude towards any redistribution—and this is the third with which I have been concerned as a member—is that anyone can pick the seats. I will have a look at them, pick a seat for myself and win it against all comers. That is my personal attitude towards redistribution.

I was rather amazed—I have heard it before and I think I should mention it here in case people begin to forget it—at the claim of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that if we in the country areas had better secretarial, office and travel facilities we could represent our electorates better. That is true. It is true that we have to supply our own offices. It is true that our women-folk have to act as our unofficial secretaries. It is true that we have to buy our own typewriters, or at least, I did. But I am amazed that A.L.P. members should bring this forward at this belated hour. I remind them that at every commission this Government has appointed to inquire into salaries, allowances and working conditions of parliamentarians—two under Mr. Justice Webb and one the infamous Done Committee—I went along and put all these proposals to them. When I put them to the Done Committee, I was asked, "If you think these things are so necessary, Mr. Aikens, why is it that no other members of Parliament are coming along to support you?"

The A.L.P. blacklisted the Done Committee purely for putrid, party-political purposes. Mr. Done almost told me that if I could have got some support for my proposals—the ones that have been put forward today by both the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition—we probably would have got extra facilities such as secretarial assistance, and so on. We have not

got them, simply because the A.L.P. black-listed the Done Committee; and now members of the Opposition are barn-storming by putting them forward here and occasionally from the public platform.

I claim that there should be no more than 60 seats in this Parliament. Of that number there should be only 15 in the whole of the metropolitan area, another 15 along the coast as far north as Mackay, and the remaining 30 seats should be in North Queensland and Western Queensland. Those are my views and, although I know there is no possible chance of having them accepted, I put them forward as honest views. I am not going to be diverted into all sorts of extraneous party-political arguments; I simply say I do not give two hoots in hell what is done in a redistribution. The electorates can be cut up in any manner at all; I shall pick one of the five or six that are open to me, and win it. My suggestions are not influenced by any personal considerations at all.

**Mr. WRIGHT** (Rockhampton South) (12.27 p.m.): Since I have been in this Chamber I have become sick and tired of this practice of referring to the past. The honourable member for Townsville South has said that we cannot do something because we did not do it previously. If we do not get away from that kind of thinking, we will never progress in this, a very progressive State.

As the Leader of the Opposition has said, this clause is a very important one. Although the Premier has tried to put up a smoke-screen by saying that 82 seats will provide better representation for the electors, we know that the sole reason for the increase in number is his desire to retain his power in this State. He knows that unless there are 82 seats he will not remain as Premier.

We must look very carefully at this matter of better representation, because it seems to be the crux of the issue. I agree with those honourable members who have said that we cannot give better representation to the electors without being given better facilities. On many occasions I have heard Government members say that the Parliament of this State is a very big business—and so it is; we handle many millions of dollars. If any sphere of big business desires to achieve greater efficiency, it does not do so by increasing the number of employees. In fact, it does the opposite, that is, reduce the number of employees and, at the same time, provide better machinery and up-to-date facilities. It has been claimed that we cannot represent our constituents properly, and this is so. We cannot do a first-class job without better facilities.

Federal members receive higher salaries than we do—but that is not the matter under consideration—and they also enjoy better facilities, so that they can give their constituents far better representation. Each

Federal member is provided with a full-time secretary to answer all phone calls and to do typing and clerical work. The Federal members have at their disposal all the necessary office equipment, such as photocopying machines, and, as well, they are provided with free telephones and an unlimited number of free flights. It is time that the State Government gave consideration to the provision of similar facilities so that we can provide the people of Queensland with better representation.

A comparison can be made between State members and officers in many Government departments and semi-governmental instrumentalities. By way of illustration, I point out that the National Fitness officer in my electorate is provided with full-time clerical assistance. Unlike us, people who hold positions similar to his are provided with clerical assistance, free telephones and free travel to Brisbane and return. There is no need for an increase in the number of seats from 78 to 82. Instead, we should improve the facilities provided for present members and, by so doing, we will give far better representation to the people of Queensland and thus put an end to the fast-growing agitation for new States.

**Mr. HUGHES** (Kurilpa) (12.31 p.m.): There is no doubt that some of the submissions made by Opposition members contain more than a ring of truth worth listening to. On the other hand people get the representation they pay for. We must be cognisant of the number of seats and the vastness of Queensland. Without a reasonable balance between these known factors, we cannot give the people the type of representation they are entitled to. In view of the vastness of the State, the number of air-travel warrants provided for country members is too few. City members are not greatly affected, but air travel is a recurring problem for country members. No member should be subjected to personal privation by having to put his hand in his pocket to represent his area properly.

**Mr. Tucker:** Many of us have to do that towards the end of the year.

**Mr. HUGHES:** Cabinet should be mindful of that fact in future when considering allowances and expenses. There is a justifiable case for improvement. Federal members have adequate facilities at their disposal. They have ample free air-travel.

**Mr. Bennett:** They tell me you get free expenses.

**Mr. HUGHES:** Only from private business sources—and I earn them, as does the honourable member at the Bar.

Federal members not only receive almost unlimited air-travel warrants. They also enjoy free telephones, offices in country areas, and other services. The Government would do well to look into the provision of office facilities for members in country areas where

there is a Main Roads or some other Government department office. Where that is not possible, other arrangements should be made to provide office facilities for country members. They must do their job, and it cannot be done entirely in Brisbane.

I am in sympathy with many of the Opposition's claims, but I cannot agree that a case has been made for only 78 seats.

**Mr. Bennett:** You didn't say that in the last session. You supported our submission.

**Mr. HUGHES:** We also wanted other principles or tenets in the Bill changed, and, by our action, we are here today discussing those changes. They have been embodied in this Bill, which provides for electoral justice.

The 1958 redistribution provided for 78 members who would represent 1,000,000 people, which meant that, on a per-capita basis, each member represented 19,230 people. Under this legislation, 82 members will represent the present population, which means that each member will represent 21,951 people. It can therefore be justly said that the few extra seats provided do not even maintain the 1958 ratio.

**Mr. Bennett:** Tell us about the gerrymander you worked on Connolly.

**Mr. HUGHES:** Anything I do in the political sense I do first in the interests of the people and then in the interests of the party. That practice has always proven successful. The proof is in the results.

**Mr. Sherrington:** I represent 23,000 people.

**Mr. HUGHES:** That is right. On that basis, the honourable member must agree that we should have this redistribution. None of us would cavil at that.

With this relationship of the number of persons to each member, because of the increase in population, even with the 82 seats provided in the Bill the ratio will be higher than it was with the 78 members under the last redistribution.

We must also take into account the vastness of this State. This warrants special consideration. The position is not analogous with that in Victoria, or even in New South Wales or South Australia. Western Australia also needs special consideration because of its vastness. That must be taken into consideration in prescribing the number of seats. If we adopted the suggestion of the honourable member for Townsville South for 60 seats, or if we adopted the A.L.P. suggestion, we would have electorates with areas twice the size of England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales, and it would be hopelessly impossible for anyone to represent them.

People get the representation they pay for. Under the present set of circumstances, many men who could make a tremendous contribution to the advancement of this State will not enter Parliament. They are people

with experience in many fields of endeavour and people in vocations which fit them well to make a worth-while contribution to this State. They include businessmen with executive experience, and professional men who have had a lifetime of experience in certain fields of endeavour. They will not stand for Parliament because of the financial and personal sacrifice they would have to make.

We all know that the wife of a parliamentarian is an unpaid servant. She does the work ungrudgingly and uncomplainingly, but she does it. Added to this is the lack of facilities and air-travel warrants. All this adds up to not being given an opportunity to properly represent the people of Queensland, and the Government is lacking in not providing the best possible representation for the people. If we reduced the number of electorates we would accentuate this problem. Therefore, I believe that the arguments put forward by the Opposition are spurious and that they were advanced with a political motive in mind.

**Mr. F. P. MOORE** (Mourilyan) (12.38 p.m.): The Leader of the Opposition has repeatedly said that he would accept a proposal for a commission to divide up the State at will and that he would be willing to place the A.L.P. submissions before that commission and make them public. The Premier has said that he would not agree to that.

The honourable member for Kurilpa claimed that our arguments are spurious. This morning the Premier answered a question about the number of flights he has made to and from his electorate. Through the Labor caucus I approached the Treasurer for consideration of the plight in which I find myself in this regard. I do not have a lady to fly me around. On the contrary, my dear wife has to drive 100 miles from Tully to Cairns to pick me up and drive me back to Tully where I have my home. The honourable member for Kurilpa said that the professional man and the businessman will not stand for Parliament. I was a member of a profession, and I am undoubtedly losing money by being a member of Parliament.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! We are debating clause 4 which deals with the number of electorates. I would be obliged if the honourable member would confine his remarks to that issue.

**Mr. F. P. MOORE:** I am leading up to the cost of having four additional members of Parliament. The important point is that the conditions under which parliamentarians work today are not good enough. I have a good relationship with all the unions in my area, with the pensioners, and, in fact, with all my constituents, and I am sure that they would not want me not to make these submissions. I will face

any of my constituents and say that conditions for parliamentarians in this State are not up to the required standard. If one looks at other Parliaments, one becomes very aware of the anomalies existing here.

I support the Leader of the Opposition, and reiterate that the statements made from this side of the Chamber are not spurious, as the previous member said, although he did agree with our submissions about facilities and conditions. The Premier and his lady pilot made 45 trips to Kingaroy in four months, whereas members are allowed only 21 return flights a year to Brisbane from their nearest airport. My nearest airport is Cairns, which is 100 miles from Tully. If I went to Townsville, the distance would be 140 miles.

All in all, let the Premier look at the conditions obtaining in Parliament at present. Let him cease to be the hypocritical person that he has shown himself to be by throwing out baits such as the state of emergency declaration which have possibly lifted him a little in the eyes of the people.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH** (Tablelands) (12.42 p.m.): I support the submission of the Leader of the Opposition that the number of seats should remain at 78. I do so mainly because representation of the people is of utmost importance, and we cannot all live in the south-eastern corner, or any other part of the State.

Other means are available to keep the number of seats at 78. I think that what has been overlooked by the Government is that there is no elasticity which would allow the present 78 members to carry out their job properly. I have here a receipt for 10c that I had to pay because I overspent my allowance for air travel. I know that the amount overspent by the honourable member for Cook runs into hundreds of dollars. I think that providing greater facilities for members to represent their electorates adequately is more important than the cutting up of electorates and the formation of others. With the 82 seats now envisaged, all that I can see in the Far North are electorates even larger than the present ones. With an additional four seats in Parliament, even poorer representation will be given to the far-flung areas of the State.

At every opportunity the Premier has pointed the finger of scorn at the A.L.P. on its policy of one vote, one value. I do not think that the Premier even understands what that means. I challenged him on it in the local newspaper during the last election, but he did not make any reply. I have looked at redistribution proposals, and I have found that the A.L.P. has always advocated a quota that would give country people representation equal to that in the metropolitan area.

I say that some elasticity in the regulations would be of far greater benefit to the people than making large areas larger, so reducing

representation, and providing in the south-eastern corner, with its greater population, an extra four seats. I am certain that if a referendum were conducted on the matter, the people of Queensland would vote wholeheartedly to retain 78 seats.

Question—That clause 4, as read, stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 41

Ahern	Knox
Alison	Lane
Armstrong	Lickiss
Bird	Lonergan
Bjelke-Petersen	Low
Campbell	McKechnie
Chalk	Miller
Chinchen	Moore, R. E.
Delamotho	Müller
Diplock	Newbery
Fletcher	Rae
Heatley	Richter
Herbert	Row
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Sullivan
Hewitt, W. D.	Tomkins
Hinze	Tooth
Hodges	Wharton
Houghton	
Hughes	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hungerford	Cory
Jones, V. E.	Lee
Kaus	

NOES, 28

Aiken	Melloy
Bennett	Moore, F. P.
Blake	Newton
Bousen	O'Donnell
Bromley	Sherrington
Casey	Thackeray
Davis	Tucker
Hanlon	Wallis-Smith
Hanson	Wood, B.
Harris	Wood, P.
Houston	Wright
Inch	
Jensen	<i>Tellers:</i>
Jones, R.	Baldwin
Jordan	Marginson

PAIR:

Camm	Dean
------	------

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 5—Zones—

**Mr. HUGHES** (Kurilpa) (12.51 p.m.): This clause relates to the various zones. Undoubtedly organisations, political parties and others will be putting before the commission their views on how the redistribution should take place within the confines of the zones as described in this clause. I strongly urge that all submissions put before the commission be made public. That will ensure not only that justice will be done but that justice will appear to be done; it will be shown to be done.

**Mr. P. Wood** interjected.

**Mr. HUGHES:** The honourable member is casting aspersions on some unnamed people who will form the commission. Undoubtedly the commission will consist of people of experience and good repute. One person who immediately comes to mind is Mr. Radford—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber. I remind honourable members

that it is very difficult to hear when loud conversations are being carried on. I ask them to refrain.

**Mr. HUGHES:** One name that immediately suggests itself is that of Mr. Radford, the Principal Electoral Officer, because of his knowledge and experience and the position he occupies. He has sat on previous commissions. Here we have an honourable member opposite casting aspersions on the integrity of people who will be sitting on the commission. Honourable members opposite will have to change their attitude in this regard, or the public will continue to have nothing to do with them.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! Does the honourable member realise that he is not speaking to clause 5?

**Mr. HUGHES:** I am speaking to the question of zones—where they should be and how they should be and, in fact, how the electorates will finally be put before Parliament. In this respect, I believe that all submissions that are made to the commission, in relation to zones and all other matters, should be made public. Then the public would know what was put before the commission, and on what basis the commission made its findings on electoral redistribution.

Clause 5, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 6 and 7, as read, agreed to.

Clause 8—Appointment of Commissioners—

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (12.55 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

“On page 4, line 8, after the word ‘be’ insert the words—

‘a Judge of the Supreme Court of Queensland who shall be’”.

I have frequently said, particularly in this debate, that I believe that, as political parties are associated very closely with electoral redistribution, and as it is necessary for the public to be given a complete picture and to be convinced that the redistribution was carried out not only according to law but was, in every sense, completely divorced from party politics and from those who appointed the commissioners, if anyone other than a judge who at present holds that position is appointed chairman of the commission, it could be said that he was a Government appointee and had certain biases. However, if a Supreme Court judge is appointed, the Chief Justice would be responsible for deciding who would perform the duties and, in such circumstances, the public would have no objection at all.

Arguments can arise in these matters. Let us look back at the last redistribution and at the electorate of Aubigny, which had a quota of 9,128. Its area was 1,465 square miles. We all know where Aubigny is, and I think it would be true to say that one might expect that another electorate in the same vicinity under similar conditions and with

approximately the same area, would have the same number of electors. However, in that distribution, Cook, with an area of 49,850 square miles—49,000-odd as against 1,000-odd—had 8,365 electors—not very much different from Aubigny, with 9,128, but what a tremendous difference in area there was! At that time, the Government well knew—and the commissioners should have been told—that in the very near future Aborigines were to be included on the rolls, and that the number of electors in that area would be greatly increased.

Another electorate, fairly close to Cook—the electorate of Mulgrave—covered 1,240 square miles and had 7,039 electors. Why should there be this tremendous difference?

**Mr. Chinchen:** What has this to do with clause 8?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** It has a lot to do with it. As the honourable member is blindly following this debate, let me point out to him that I am arguing that commissioners have to be appointed. They then determine the electorates, what their areas will be and how many electors they will contain. I want to ensure that when the report is published on this occasion there is no adverse public reaction and that no-one will be able to go through the figures and say, as I said in 1958, that the whole thing was a gerrymander. That is what we found on that occasion.

Let us look at a couple of other electorates. Cunningham has an area of 3,100 square miles. Isis is larger, with 4,404 square miles. Isis is to the north and Cunningham to the west, both being approximately the same distance from Brisbane. Perhaps Isis is a little farther away. In Cunningham, however, there are only 7,800 electors whereas in Isis there are 9,700. Again, why the large variation? These are questions that have to be answered.

A similar position exists in respect of other electorates. Fassifern, with an area of 1,680 square miles has 9,376 electors. The point is that when we get the final report from the commission, the general public must be satisfied in all respects.

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

**Mr. TUCKER** (Townsville North) (2.15 p.m.): I wish to add to the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition in moving this amendment. In essence it means that one of the three electoral commissioners will be a judge of the Supreme Court of Queensland. In the lobbies of this building, in the city streets, and in fact all over the State, we have heard a good deal of talk about where the electoral boundaries will be. On many occasions I have been asked by people, “What is going to happen in the Townsville area? After hearing others say what will happen on the Gold Coast and in Brisbane, surely you must know what is going to happen in Townsville.” Whether

that kind of talk is based on fact or not, it fills us with a great deal of trepidation, because it appears that a number of members already know where the boundaries of their electorates will be and that certain members will be thrown out and the position of others strengthened. We have heard all this kind of talk.

**Mr. Bjelke-Petersen:** This is the same sort of talk that we hear about what will happen in your party.

**Mr. TUCKER:** If the Premier gives credence to what he has heard about what will happen in our party, I suppose I cannot be blamed for giving credence to the talk that I have heard about the redistribution.

**Mr. Sullivan:** Your party's President has made a statement, and the honourable member for Barooka has made a statement.

**Mr. Sherrington:** What about when you put the skids under Joh?

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the honourable member for Salisbury and the Minister for Lands to discontinue this cross-firing.

**Mr. TUCKER:** I do not want to embarrass the Minister for Lands by repeating statements he has made to me about the electoral boundaries, but if he wants to take the matter any further I will be happy to do so.

As I have said, we are filled with trepidation by what we have heard people say about the electoral boundaries. It appears to members of the Opposition and also to the people of Queensland that the matter is already cut and dried. This talk has drifted out to the community, with the result that members are approached by people who say, "The boundaries are already decided. Why don't you know where yours are going to be?" The community has accepted the fact that the boundaries have already been drawn up.

This brings me to my next point. If the impression gained by the community and members of Parliament is a correct one, it means that the electoral commissioners will be nothing more than puppets dancing on strings held by the Government. I do not claim that that will necessarily be so, but it is certainly the impression to be gained. In this climate no man of honour and integrity, if approached to serve on the commission, could say anything other than, "I would not serve on the commission if that is the impression held by the community, because some of the mud will rub off on me." If that impression remains, the Government will not get the men who should be asked to serve on the commission. It will get only men who want to do the Government a favour, those who are looking for favours in return.

Realising this, the Australian Labor Party hoped that we would have a commission completely divorced from politics, comprising people of independent thought. We believe it should work under the chairmanship of a man whose integrity is above suspicion, and that is why we framed our amendment as we did.

I did not have time to find all of the newspaper clippings, but I remind honourable members that local papers on the Gold Coast published details of supposed boundaries.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** Keep them and see if they tally; that will show how wrong it was.

**Mr. TUCKER:** Taking this argument a little further, it may have been the "ginger" group of the Liberal Party that upset it, and not the honourable member who has interjected or anyone who supported the previous Bill.

My point is that, at that time, in the Gold Coast area there were many disgruntled Country Party and Liberal Party supporters who said in the Press, "If this is the way redistribution is to be carried out, if this is the way statements are to be made about how boundaries are to be drawn, we have had enough of the Country Party and the Liberal Party." Not long ago I read some extracts to the House about this matter.

**Mr. Bromley:** The honourable member for South Coast told Bruce Small about the boundaries down there.

**Mr. Sullivan:** That was not indicated in the Maryborough by-election; they want more and more of this Government.

**Mr. TUCKER:** Would the honourable gentleman say that the Maryborough by-election was fought on the question of the redistribution? If it had been fought on that basis, it is quite possible that the result would have been the reverse. That is my opinion, and the Minister for Lands is entitled to his opinion. If the by-election had been fought on that question and not all the other political chicanery, we would have won a clear-cut victory.

**Mr. Hinze:** Your leader referred to "gerrymander" in his speeches in Maryborough, and so did I.

**Mr. TUCKER:** The point is that the honourable member is never a very good advocate in any sphere.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. TUCKER:** The honourable member for South Coast did not cut much ice up there. As a matter of fact, it was said in Maryborough that he got there by chance; that he got lost on the road to Brisbane and finished up there.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I know that the honourable member for Townsville North has been somewhat side-tracked, but I ask him to return to clause 8.

**Mr. TUCKER:** The Leader of the Opposition referred to some of the discrepancies in the last redistribution. There were so many discrepancies that many people questioned how they could have occurred. They cast a shadow on all of the commissioners. They may have been decent fellows trying to do the right thing at all times (although I doubt it), but a shadow was cast on them. Some of them received political appointments later, and that should never be forgotten by this House. Even today the member for Townsville South cast doubt on a commission or commissioner appointed by this Government. Honourable members heard his statement about a commission or commissioner appointed to deal with salaries.

The commission should be above suspicion, so a judge of the Supreme Court should be appointed as its chairman. He would have nothing to gain, and no suspicion could be cast on him. The commissioners should be like Caesar's wife—above suspicion. This matter should be above party politics. The only protection that a citizen has is the setting of fair and honest electoral boundaries, which will guarantee that a majority of votes will result in a majority of seats in Parliament. The only way to give the citizen that protection is to appoint a Supreme Court judge as the chairman of the commission. If that is done, I will believe in it, and so will the people of Queensland.

**Mr. O'DONNELL (Barcoo) (2.27 p.m.):** I give my wholehearted support to the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and other Opposition speakers in this debate. I shall now give my opinion, which, of course, has not been given by any other honourable member.

I disagree entirely with the lack of frankness in the appointment of commissioners. I say with all sincerity that this is a very important piece of legislation, yet it is utterly devoid of particulars of the qualifications required of those who are to be appointed commissioners. In our initial proposals on the Bill we outlined the people we would like to see appointed to such a commission. But the Government has failed completely to give us any knowledge at all of the section of the professional community from which the commissioners will be drawn, or the qualifications that will be required of them. It is totally undesirable that we should be asked to give a blank cheque to the Government to appoint three commissioners without having been given some indication of the qualifications they will be required to have.

Much could be said about clause 12, and I do not want to go into the details of the respective abilities that should be required of persons who will have to make decisions on certain aspects of electoral redistribution, but surely we are entitled to know what persons will be considered for appointment.

To that end we should be given an outline of the qualifications for appointment to the three positions on the commission.

It has been well stated why a person with the status of a judge of the Supreme Court should be appointed. With such a person there could be no feeling among the people that his appointment to the commission could be a means of his getting future kudos and status. The people know that judges of the Supreme Court are qualified men. They know that each judge is qualified legally, and by his own position in the community, to sit on such a commission. In other words, a judge is regarded as a man of impartiality. That is why the A.L.P. wants a judge to be chairman of the commission. Such a person would be a tower of strength in both aspects that I have mentioned.

**Mr. Hanlon:** That would be particularly so if provision was made for a minority report from the commission, as there is in the case of most commissions.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I agree.

So far as the other two members of the commission are concerned, I would expect their qualifications and reputations to be such that we would have no hesitation in saying that they would be able to render a service to the community. I speak briefly to condemn the designer of the Bill for failing to display to members of this Parliament the frankness which this piece of legislation obviously demands.

**Mr. HUGHES (Kurilpa) (2.32 p.m.):** Whilst it may be argued that it would be desirable to appoint a judge of the Supreme Court as chairman of the commission, I cannot subscribe to the view that such an appointment is necessary, or that it is undesirable if the chairman is not a judge.

**Mr. Bennett:** Don't you want it to be free from corruption?

**Mr. HUGHES:** What the honourable member is suggesting is that any person or persons appointed to consider analytically the question put forward, on certain guide-lines, and make recommendations, would be (a) partial, and (b) corrupt. What right has the honourable member to make such presumptions about the integrity of those who will serve on the commission? Commissions in the past have included Mr. Radford, the Principal Electoral Officer, and he was appointed by a Labor Government. The honourable member suggests by his interjection that Mr. Radford is corrupt. This is not the first time that such suggestions have been made in this Chamber by Labor members against people in high places in the Public Service.

The work of the commission will be properly done by those who will be appointed to it, and undoubtedly they will be professional people with experience, integrity, and

unimpeachable reputations in the community. In my view, one appointee will undoubtedly be the Principal Electoral Officer.

I also suggest that whilst under normal circumstances it may be desirable for one member of the commission to be a judge, it is not essential. The absence of a judge will not produce any better or worse report, and I believe that the work of the commission can be carried out properly and impartially by people of good repute who will undoubtedly make up the commission.

The A.L.P. also conveniently forgets that there is a backlog of work in the Supreme Court. The honourable member for South Brisbane should know the extent of that backlog, but he wants to reduce the number of judges. The honourable member has previously implored the Government to add to the Supreme Court bench. I have detailed in this Chamber certain aspects of the situation that now prevails, and has prevailed for some considerable time, in which only about five of the 11 Supreme Court judges are actually sitting on the bench hearing cases. With judges going on circuit, sitting in Chambers, and doing Federal work, too few judges are available for ordinary court work.

**Mr. Hanlon:** Whose fault is that?

**Mr. HUGHES:** As I said, I have implored the Government to try to improve the situation. However, this state of affairs is not peculiar to Brisbane, or to Queensland; it exists throughout the nation. It is the result not only of an increase in population but also of the tenor and pulse of business throughout this developing nation. It brings in its wake more business, more money, more land deals, and so on. An affluent society in which additional money is spent brings with it more litigation. The honourable member for South Brisbane cannot deny that. Because of that, greater demands are made on the courts, and neither he nor I, nor anyone else who is aware of the situation, would want to deplete further the strength of the Supreme Court bench and, consequently, make it more difficult for people to obtain speedy justice. In fact, such action would create injustice by preventing people from having their cases heard expeditiously.

Fewer judges than ever before attended the opening of Parliament last week.

**Mr. Hanlon:** They could not stand the garden party afterwards.

**Mr. HUGHES:** It has been traditional for consuls, knights of the realm and members of the judiciary to attend the opening of Parliament, but on this occasion fewer judges attended than ever before. I suggest that that was because of the tremendous amount of work at the courts.

One of the best things that ever happened was Sir William Mack's departure from the judicial scene. I see many nods of approval to that statement. It could not happen too soon for me, or for many others. Even at that time there was a tremendous backlog of cases that had to be picked up. Honourable members opposite want to aggravate the situation by depleting still further the Supreme Court bench. They have argued that it is desirable to have a Supreme Court judge on the commission. This is not necessary, and the absence of a judge will not make the commission partial.

The argument advanced by honourable members opposite is a slur on the integrity of those who will serve on the commission, and I believe that we have available the services of people of high repute and ability who will do an impartial job for the benefit of the State. I believe that a commission can be set up satisfactorily without depleting the number of judges, who already are overworked and over-taxed. I ask honourable members opposite to consider how much harm would be done to the State by the appointment to the commission of a member of the judiciary. I believe that such an appointment is completely unnecessary.

**Mr. BENNETT** (South Brisbane) (2.38 p.m.): I did not propose entering the debate, because I thought that the amendment was so logical and the arguments already placed before honourable members in support of it so convincing that it would be unnecessary to argue the question and that, if anything, the amendment could be defeated only by weight of numbers by those who are prepared to blindly follow the possibility of corruption.

**Mr. Hughes:** That is a slur on the people who will form the commission. You should be ashamed of yourself.

**Mr. BENNETT:** If the commission is not presided over by a Supreme Court judge, any self-respecting person of integrity should refuse to serve on it, and I refuse to withdraw my remarks. Anyone who is prepared to be a sycophant, a Government stooge, or a party supporter, and to allow himself to be corrupted by the opportunity and promise of reward, as did Percy Wright on the last commission, should attract the derision of the people of Queensland for his unfair, unprincipled and completely biased attitude. We only have to look at his history.

I have supported the Government recently on the score of law and order, but I believe that Parliament especially is completely obliged to do its utmost to maintain respect in the community for our democratic instrumentalities, the most important of which would be an electoral redistribution commission which should safeguard the integrity of the Parliament that appoints it.

I have nothing personally against Percy Wright; he has never done me any harm. He was never a challenge to me at the Bar because he was so junior, and in any case had not been practising for very long. He was one of the most junior barristers at the Bar when he was appointed to the previous commission. In anticipation of his appointment he resigned from his position as a solicitor with Morris, Fletcher & Cross and applied for admission to the Bar because he had been promised this appointment. Within a few short months he was appointed as chairman of the commission and then, having provided a redistribution to safeguard the cheap, dishonest political hides of this Government, he was appointed to the position of President of the Land Court, with the operations of which, at that time, he had very little experience. Certainly he was not the most able and best qualified barrister in Brisbane in that field. I repeat that he was one of the very junior barristers, yet the position to which he was appointed carries a salary equivalent of that of a Supreme Court judge.

This Government says that justice must not only be done but must also appear to be done. Therefore, why not appoint a man who cannot expect a great political reward such as was received by Percy Wright, one of the most junior barristers in Queensland at the time of his appointment? Usually, in order to get such a top-line appointment a barrister has to serve many long years at the Bar and prove his capacity, ability and stability and to gain the necessary experience and attain some maturity. I do not say that this is an essential prerequisite, but more often than not those who are appointed to such positions are Her Majesty's counsel. On this occasion it was a public, political and parliamentary bribe by this Government in appointing Percy Wright to his present position. Let us not have a repetition of that episode.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** There is not a word of truth in what you say.

**Mr. BENNETT:** Nobody can deny it, as the honourable member will realise if he reads the history of it. It was only because the honourable member for Kurilpa, in the psalm-singing fashion that is typical of him, endeavoured to justify the Government's attitude in this regard that I spoke as I have today. I was prepared to let it go on the level of whether we wanted to be statesmen and act in a bona-fide fashion and be fair in the matter, or to stoop to cheap political intrigue and manipulation, as has been advocated by the honourable member for Kurilpa.

It will be well remembered that in order to safeguard this Government at the time, my former electorate of Kurilpa—I was there long before the present honourable member for that area—was completely emasculated in an endeavour to preserve the

then incumbent, Mr. Peter Connolly, a man of great ability, a Queen's Counsel who has been a leader of the Bar in both Queensland and Australia. But because of peregrinations within the Liberal Party and the opportunity for chicanery and trickery, the present honourable member for Kurilpa was able, by cheap skulduggery, to manoeuvre Peter Connolly out of office in the Liberal Party.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I hope the honourable member for South Brisbane is not imputing improper motives to any other honourable member. If he is, I shall ask him to withdraw the remark.

**Mr. BENNETT:** Far be it from me to impute any improper motives to anybody. I was just telling the Committee about the sad passing of Peter Connolly from the political scene.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the honourable member to withdraw the remark.

**Mr. BENNETT:** Very well, at your request and direction, Mr. Hooper, I withdraw the remark. I could not help remembering that, when I was in a little difficulty on one occasion and the political climate in some circles was not glowing as healthily for me as it might have been, a friend of mine, whose name I suppose I had better not mention, came tearing up the hill to me. He said, "I see you are in a bit of difficulty, Col. Write me out a ticket and I will come along and give you a vote in the plebiscite." I replied, "I can't do that sort of thing." He said, "Well, I did it for Clive Hughes. I have never been in the Liberal Party in my life, but he used to come and give me a ticket and I would go to the Liberal Party meetings and give him a vote."

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! Although the honourable member's remarks may be entertaining, I am sure he will agree that they are far removed from the amendment before the Committee.

**Mr. Hughes:** Mr. Nolan, your Communist boss, will save your head.

**Mr. BENNETT:** The honourable member may impute motives of that nature and cast defamatory innuendoes in my direction, but on the basis of integrity—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! If the honourable member for South Brisbane heard a remark passed by another honourable member, I ask him to draw it to my attention.

**Mr. BENNETT:** He said I would dance to the tune of my Communist boss, Mr. Nolan. I think that is a pretty harsh statement to make. I do not care what he says about me, but it is very unfair for Mr. Nolan to be accused.

**Mr. Hughes:** Anyway, struggle on.

**Mr. BENNETT:** These comments, of course, do not lend dignity to the debate. I have been reliably informed by my friendly colleagues in the Country Party that the honourable member for Kurilpa is only barnstorming in this debate to try to delay the division until the Country Party members are forced to leave the Chamber to catch their planes. He wants to see them caught with their pants down—and it would not be the first time he has done that.

Certain people have said that there are too few Supreme Court judges in Queensland, and with that contention I entirely agree. But it is no argument against the principle of having a completely independent person presiding over the commission. A Supreme Court judge cannot hope for any promotion, reward or preferment from any decision that he makes. In the legal world there is only one position higher than Supreme Court judge, and that is Chief Justice. The present occupant of that office will, please God, be spared for many years, so that if a judge were to be appointed to preside over the commission he could not hope for any reward whatever. Surely a Supreme Court judge is the ideal appointee to such a post.

I am prepared to concede that in the community there are men who, unlike Percy Wright, would, if appointed to the commission, carry out with honesty and bona fides such a redistribution. I am equally conscious of the fact that in order to do so they should have to be men of integrity and outstanding ability as well as being completely divorced from politics. If such men are public servants, we would expect them, in the ordinary course of events, to be promoted in the near future. However, it could be alleged that, if such a man was promoted, he had received his promotion as a reward. It is important that the prestige of our democratic instrumentalities be preserved and that those who want to destroy it or beat it down are not presented by Governments and Parliaments with golden opportunities of doing so. They should not be given the chance of alleging that a decent, honest, just and fair man received his promotion as a reward for corruption. Charges such as that could be made by those people who are intent on destroying our way of life. If there are too few Supreme Court judges, more should be appointed. In any case, in order to relieve a judge who may be appointed to perform this task, an acting judge could be appointed. There is ample provision for that.

I indicate quite clearly that the A.L.P. has never cast any aspersions on the integrity or ability of Mr. Radford, the Principal Electoral Officer. It is natural that he should be appointed as a commissioner to advise the other commissioners on machinery matters of which he has personal knowledge. No-one in Queensland would be better informed on the electoral machinery of this State. It is therefore logical that he should

be appointed. He also has at his disposal all the resources of the department, and he could use them successfully.

Any innuendo that we on this side want to disown Mr. Radford is untrue. The Government will be very foolish if it does not appoint him as a commissioner. If he is not appointed, the redistribution will certainly not be completed before the next election. I bitterly resent, as would most lawyers—if not all of them—and all members of the judiciary, the cheap, snide, nasty and untrue remarks of the honourable member for Kurilpa about Sir William Mack, who, after years of service as a barrister, as a member of the judiciary, as Chief Justice, and as Acting Governor, is now in a very poor state of health. To say the least, it was quite unkind, unjustified and cowardly to attack him in this Chamber after his being forced to resign because of ill health following a courageous endeavour to resume his duties. It was shockingly unfair to attack him. The honourable member did not attack him in his hey-day, when no doubt he could have dealt with any unfair accusations of this nature.

Sir William Mack is regarded as an outstanding lawyer. His impartiality and integrity were never in question and, in my opinion, that is an essential quality in any judge. He had a close knowledge of the criminal law, and I am sure that all prisoners who passed through the criminal courts over which he presided would concede, to use an Australianism, that they got a “fair go”. It is indeed regrettable that, in the twilight of his career, after he had to resign and could no longer carry on his exalted career, a member should descend on his ailing body like a vulture. However, the honourable member's remarks will not be accepted in the circles in which Sir William Mack is known.

It is manifestly obvious that the Government has considered the appointment of a Supreme Court judge but that it is not prepared to write the provision into the Bill. It has been equally obvious since the inception of the debate that my leader and other A.L.P. members are particularly desirous of having a Supreme Court judge appointed. Even in the boxing world, if one contestant suggests that he might not get a fair deal from a referee, the parties agree on what they believe to be an impartial appointee. This happened recently when a referee was brought here from New South Wales.

If the Government was bona fide in its intentions and if there was no latent desire on its part to use and manipulate some party pact to carry out a pre-arranged boundary redistribution that has already been organised, the Government would say, in all fairness, “Even though we do not consider the amendment necessary because we do not see why a party-political official or appointee could not carry out the job in a detached

fashion, seeing that the Leader of the Opposition and his party object to any referee or commissioner other than a Supreme Court judge, in order to underline our fairness, bona fides, honesty and integrity, we will give you what you want and then you cannot whinge later." But the Government is not prepared to do that.

I support the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and challenge the Government to accept the amendment. I put my challenge on the basis that if the Government is not willing to accept the amendment, it will leave a smelly cloud hanging over the whole redistribution procedure. On the other hand, if the Government is willing to accept the amendment, it will provide some evidence of its bona fides and its own governmental integrity.

In view of what the Premier has said recently on other matters of State in Queensland, if he is sincere in wanting to preserve the prestige of Parliament I will, in conscience, support him. But if I lose my trust in certain democratic instrumentalities and no longer have faith in certain appointees, I will join with that section of the community which on many occasions I do not like, and in fact distrust, and support it in its criticism of the Government. And if decent men such as I am adopt that attitude, we will be going a long way towards undermining public respect for our democratic instrumentalities. Quite frankly, I do not want to be put in that position.

**Mr. Sullivan:** Is it true that you are fast losing faith with an organisation with which you have had a fairly long association?

**Mr. BENNETT:** I can assure the Minister that we in the Parliamentary Labor Party have never been more harmonious, and that the solidarity and loyalty within our ranks are in marked contrast with the sabotage, traitorousness and castigation of the Minister for Lands.

(Time expired.)

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (2.59 p.m.): I have listened with a great deal of interest to the speeches of honourable members opposite. I could not help thinking of the old fable of the individual who went around in broad daylight, on a bright, sunny day, with a lighted candle in his hand looking for an honest man. Opposition members seemed to be in the same situation themselves, running around with a lighted candle. The only honest person they seemed to be able to find is a Supreme Court judge. This is extraordinary. I cannot accept the claim that there is only one honest class in the whole State, namely, Supreme Court judges. To me, it is incredible that honourable members opposite, holding the positions that they do, should come into the Chamber and adopt such an attitude.

All that I shall say in reply is that the best people available will be sought and found, and I am not prepared to accept the amendment.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (3.1 p.m.): I cannot let the Premier get away with that statement. We did not suggest that persons other than judges are not honest. What we said is that we want no doubt to be left in the minds of the public. The Premier knows what I said. I said that there should be no doubt in the public mind about the integrity of the members of the commission, and the honesty of their recommendations.

**Mr. Bjelke-Petersen:** The amendment in effect says that whoever is appointed cannot be classed as honest.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** When numbers such as the ones decided at the last redistribution come out, one is quite justified in querying some of the decisions made. Why should Mulgrave, a little pocket-handkerchief electorate, have only 7,000 electors? How could any commission give a quota of 8,365 electors to an electorate of 49,850 sq. miles, and 7,039, over a thousand fewer, to an electorate of 1,240 sq. miles, or 1/40 of the area of the first electorate mentioned?

**Mr. B. Wood:** Those two electorates are next door to each other, too.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** That is right. Let us look at what has happened over a period of time. The Cook electorate has an increased enrolment of 13,478 and Mulgrave now has only 7,161. Were those who drew these boundaries honest and sincere? I do not think they were. If this sort of thing is done again on the coming redistribution, there will be a hue and cry about it. If the Government wants to prevent that possibility and leave no doubt in the public mind, a Supreme Court judge, because of his position in the community, is the only person who I feel should be appointed as chairman of the commission.

The other two members should be persons who are closely associated with the electoral system, and have some knowledge of such things as distances and boundaries. Their positions are not so important. The Bill provides in other clauses for the making of submissions to the commission. Who are the persons in the community most fitted to analyse submissions, sift evidence, and make decisions on material placed before them? The ones best able to do that are those who have had experience as judges. Listening to evidence and sifting out the things that are of importance is the job of a judge.

If the Premier does not agree to this amendment, I say, bearing in mind that the Liberals have advocated this principle many times, that honourable members opposite have sold their souls for the sake of unity within the Liberal and Country Parties.

**Mr. HANLON** (Baroona) (3.4 p.m.): I had not intended to speak on this clause. In the light of some of the comments that have been made, I intended to rise on clause 21, which relates to the report of the commissioners. However, I now join the Leader of the Opposition in objecting to the Premier's statement that our amendment suggests that the only honest men who can be found are judges of the Supreme Court.

**Mr. Lee:** You have said that.

**Mr. HANLON:** We have not said that. The reason why I interjected when the honourable member for Barcoo was speaking about the desirability of having a judge of the Supreme Court on the commission was that the commissioners are to be appointed in terms of the other provisions of the Bill—that is, of course, unless the Premier proposes to change them, and he has not submitted any amendments indicating that he intends to change other clauses of the Bill.

As the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, the commissioners who are appointed under this clause, even if the amendment moved by the Opposition is carried, will be bound by the terms of their appointment. They will not be able to go outside the terms that we lay down for them in the remainder of the Bill. As the Leader of the Opposition said, the commissioners will be bound to sit, whether they are judges or ordinary people sitting as commissioners, in terms, firstly, of receiving information that is not made public and, secondly, of making a report not to this Parliament or to the public but to the Premier. I ask the Premier: is it not true that the report will be a report to him personally? The Bill spells out in clause 21 that the report will be to the Premier.

In view of the history of this question of redistribution and the Government's actions, I believe that it is a private Bill. It is not a Bill in the public interest; it is the Premier's Bill. Why should not the commissioners report to the Premier? Why should not they finalise the farce that is taking place under the guise of a democratic process by the Government? They will be the Premier's commissioners. That, in effect, is what the Premier is arguing—"They are my commissioners, so let them report to me. They are my commissioners, so let me appoint them. They are my commissioners, so let not the Opposition, the Parliament, or the public seek to determine that they will be people who will be accepted by the community as being completely impartial." The Leader of the Opposition has moved this amendment because, as he has said, a judge of the Supreme Court is acceptable to the people of this State as being impartial.

I wish to develop the interjection I made when the honourable member for Barcoo was putting very succinctly the reasons why the Opposition is seeking to have a judge of the Supreme Court as a member of the commission. Even if the Government accepts

the amendment, that does not mean that a judge of the Supreme Court will be able to tell the public what he, as a commissioner, thinks about the boundaries that exist in this State. As I read the remaining clauses of the Bill, there is no provision for a judge of the Supreme Court, or for Joe Blow or anybody else who is appointed a commissioner under the Bill, to come out and say that he has been outvoted two to one.

If he accepts the judicial responsibility, as we believe it to be, of a commissioner—a responsibility that he has been "conned" into in the belief that it is going to be a fair-dinkum commission—there is no provision for him to say publicly to the people of Queensland, to this Parliament or to anybody, "I have made certain submissions. I have indicated to my fellow commissioners that this is a set-up job, that this is a set-up proposal." His report will be part and parcel of a report by the commission to the Premier, which nobody can force the Premier to disclose. There is no provision in the Bill, as there is in many forms of inquiry under the Commissions of Inquiry Act and other Acts, for a minority report, whether the commissioner is a Supreme Court judge or anybody else.

The Premier has not circulated any amendments suggesting that he intends to give any commissioner the right under the Bill to enter a minority report even to himself, let alone to the public. What is the position of an honest citizen? I want to take that matter up with the Premier because I think an unfair slur is being cast on people such as Sir Douglas Fraser—Mr. Fraser, as he was at the time of the last redistribution—and other former commissioners. In the 1949 redistribution, Labor set the example by having a Supreme Court judge as a member of the commission, and we are now inviting the Premier to follow that example. I invite him to go further. The Premier might well say, "I may have a Supreme Court judge on the commission." He might say, "The Opposition wants to spell out in the Bill that we must have a Supreme Court judge on the commission." He might get up and say, "I may have one." He is not going to say whether he will or not, and why should he not say so? At least, we can say from the record of our redistribution that, whatever criticism the people may voice about it, we did have a Supreme Court judge.

I go further. If the Premier is not prepared here and now to accept this submission—and we strongly believe that it should be spelt out in the Bill that one member should be a judge of the Supreme Court—is he going to provide the rightful opportunity for a commissioner, whether he be a judge or not, to enter a minority report, and is he prepared to allow the commission to hear the evidence publicly and give its decision on the evidence as presented, which, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out,

would be the position with a normal inquiry and with a judge sitting in his own court as a judge?

I have just asked my colleague the honourable member for South Brisbane what is the only circumstance he knows of when a judge sits in chambers, and he has told me that this is done only when it is a private matter and one that does not concern the public. That is the only occasion on which a judge will sit in chambers on any matter—where there is no general disadvantage in the public not being able to hear what the judge directs.

Can the Premier honestly get up in this Chamber and say that the redistribution of electorates, under which the people of this State will go to the polls to determine the Government of the State for the next three years, is not a matter of public interest that should be heard in open court? I do not think he can. And it is entirely wrong of the Premier to say that the Opposition in seeking to have a judge of the Supreme Court as one of the commissioners is reflecting on the commissioners. The reflection on the commissioners under this Bill is by the Premier, because he is not prepared to give them the opportunity of acting as commissioners should, of hearing evidence in open and publishing the submissions received, of giving their reasons publicly and, if one of them desires to do so, of submitting a minority report. We have heard from honourable members opposite much about the protection of minority interests, so why not give a commissioner, if he is in the minority, the right to state his views publicly and explain why he is in the minority.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (3.13 p.m.): I do not know whether the honourable member ever stops to read his own father's words and reactions in regard to this sort of thing.

**Mr. Hanlon:** He agreed to a Supreme Court judge, for a start.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** If his father were here today he would be rather surprised at many of the statements and views expressed about this measure, having regard to what was said on the measure he introduced into this House and the method and procedures adopted on that occasion. He would be rather horrified to hear them.

**Mr. Hanlon:** He did agree to appoint a Supreme Court judge.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I am sure the honourable member has not completely followed the Bill, because he has said that I get the report, implying that I and I only will receive it. I refer him to clause 22. If he reads that he will realise that I am only the medium by which the report goes to the public. Clause 22 gives the answers to the issues he raised a few moments ago.

Question—That the words proposed to be inserted in clause 8 (Mr. Houston's amendment) be so inserted—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 29

Aiken	Marginson
Baldwin	Melloy
Bennett	Moore, F. P.
Blake	Newton
Bousen	O'Donnell
Bromley	Sherrington
Casey	Thackeray
Davis	Tucker
Hanlon	Wallis-Smith
Hanson	Wood, B.
Harris	Wood, P.
Houston	
Inch	
Jones, R.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Jordan	Jensen
Lloyd	Wright

NOES, 40

Ahern	Knox
Alison	Lane
Armstrong	Lee
Bird	Lickiss
Bjelke-Petersen	Loneragan
Campbell	Low
Chalk	McKechnie
Chinchen	Moore, R. E.
Delamothe	Müller
Diplock	Newbery
Fletcher	Rae
Heatley	Richter
Herbert	Row
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Sullivan
Hewitt, W. D.	Tooth
Hinze	Wharton
Hodges	
Houghton	
Hughes	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hungerford	Müller
Jones, V. E.	Tomkins
Kaus	

PAIR:

Dean	Camm
------	------

Resolved in the negative.

Clause 8, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 9 to 11, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 12—Matters to be considered in distributing Zones—

**Mr. O'DONNELL** (Barcoo) (3.21 p.m.): I am rather interested in the matters to be considered by the commission in distributing zones and determining the boundaries. We on this side of the Chamber are virtually ignorant of where the boundaries are to be established.

**Mr. Chinchen:** So are we.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** If that is so I am afraid the Liberal Party cannot have drawn up its own plan.

**Mr. Chinchen:** That is quite right.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** That may be right, but I do not believe that the Country Party has failed in that respect. From what I have heard here and there on the grape-vine, there are strong indications that a full-scale recommendation will be made, if not by the Government, at least by the Country Party, to the commission when it goes into session.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** No doubt, you will be putting yours in, too.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I suppose I could play the principal role of objector to the plans already drawn up for submission by the Government as a coalition or by the individual Government parties.

Earlier in the debate the Leader of the Opposition referred to the remoteness of some centres from others in the same electorate under the last redistribution and the rather ridiculous situation of including certain towns in some electorates. I have fairly trustworthy information that the Shire of Bauhinia will be taken from the electorate of Barcoo and included in the electorate of Roma. When making its decision, the commission will have to face up to such recommendations, whether they be from individual parties or the coalition Government parties.

I shall deal with this example to see how it complies with the matters to be considered in distributing zones. Provision (a) deals with community or diversity of interest. Some argument could be advanced in favour of that because, after all, both are rural areas. They are not necessarily very similar, but they are rural areas devoted to primary production. But what a shock it is to read provision (b), "means of communication". The Government, being very thoughtless about the needs of the electors of Roma, pulled up the Roma-Injune railway line, thereby destroying one means of communication. No recognised air service exists between Springsure, Rolleston and Roma, and there is only inferior road communication.

**Mr. Low:** Why don't you go and live there?

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I have been living there for 25 years. I have as much right to have my wife in Brisbane as the honourable member has to have his here.

That is one of the most ridiculous propositions I have ever heard. To add to it, we have a regional entity in Central Queensland known as the Central Highlands, and to excise the Bauhinia Shire from the Central Highlands, which is its regional home, would be one of the most "crackpot" decisions ever made by any commission. This is the type of proposition that will be put to the commission by the Government. I warn all honourable members that there should be no intrusion into these regional areas, because of their tremendous community interest and their geographic position. We all know of the Nogoia Valley and cannot deny that the Bauhinia Shire is an entity in the Nogoia Valley as well as being an entity in the Central Highlands.

"Physical features" is rather immaterial until "means of communication" is considered. There could be some reason for drawing some form of boundary in the Arcadia Valley, because the people of the Arcadia Valley, of necessity through their location, patronise the town of Injune. But the thought behind the planning of this redistribution is completely wrong when the whole

of the shire is divorced from an area in which it has a keen interest—its communications are directed north to Emerald and north-east to Rockhampton—and its member is comparatively isolated in the town of Roma.

I must raise this question today in all sincerity, because this could happen in a peculiar kind of gerrymander in a number of areas of this State. It is not a boundary gerrymander; it is a gerrymander in which people's interests are given least consideration and political motives maximum consideration.

I know how the people in Bauhinia Shire vote. I know that I do not get a majority there. But, if this happens, it will not be in the best interests of most of the people of Bauhinia Shire. After all, a number of our departments have been decentralised and there will be regional offices in Roma and in Rockhampton. This area, which is to be moved for political purposes only, will be confused about which regional centre it is connected with. If this area is retained as it is now, it could apply to the regional offices in Rockhampton, whereas if it is transferred to the electorate of Roma, it would have to apply on some matter to the regional offices in Roma, and this could be confusing. The example of the Gregory electorate on the 1958 redistribution was quoted by the Leader of the Opposition, and here is another example cropping up through the trend of Country Party thought on the forthcoming distribution.

I am afraid that when we get down to the visual approach to planning, which has been kept "under the cushion" except for odd leakages, we will see other anomalies giving rise to certain problems that the people will bitterly resent. If the Government seeks to take the major area of Bauhinia out of the Central Queensland influence, in which it plays a very significant part, the people will resent it greatly. Let it not be forgotten that there is a Country Party majority there now. I am afraid that it will not for long remain the electorate of the honourable member for Roma, if he is the recipient of this area, because there will be the feeling among the people that the Government has not their best interests at heart.

I am very concerned about the matters to be considered in the distribution of zones. It is imperative for the members of the commission, the people entrusted with the task of fixing boundaries, to see that they are not determined by political parties in the interests of those parties. That is why we spent so much time today debating clause 8. This is important, because members know very well that throughout Queensland there is today a great deal of unrest among primary producers. They are not "copping it sweet" any more. It is well known that the grain-growers are very resentful. It is also well known that in these areas grain-growers are playing an important part.

I do not want to extend my argument in other directions, but I urge the case that I am putting forward today in the hope that it will be read by the members of the commission and will bring to them a complete recognition of some of the anomalies that can arise from a party's pursuit of political security.

**Mr. BALDWIN** (Logan) (3.33 p.m.): I support the appeal made by the honourable member for Barcoo to those who will be charged with the responsibility of distributing electorates within the prescribed zones. I base what I have to say on what happened at the last redistribution, which obviously failed to take into account the demographic trends on the southern periphery of the metropolitan area. The things prescribed for consideration must have escaped the notice of those who did the job. If they had not, the whole of the Woodridge area would have been included in the Brisbane metropolitan area, and the border between the Albert Shire and the Beaudesert Shire would not have run through the centre of the fast-growing area of southern Kingston.

That is the kind of thing that has happened. The metropolitan boundary, which was fixed in some way long ago, actually cuts across people's properties, across streets, and across communities of interest. If boundaries were fixed on communities of interest alone, the whole of the Woodridge-Kingston area, with its 4,500 voters and 10,000 population, would be included in the metropolitan zone, or the metropolitan zone would be discarded. If that is not done, anomalies similar to those that were created in the 1958 redistribution will result.

As I mentioned in my speech on the second reading of the Bill, I have seen a map—I do not know how it got out—that is in keeping with everything that I would expect of a Country-Liberal Government striving for survival. It is in keeping with what I would do if I were in the same desperate situation as honourable members opposite are today. I would create electorates to suit the voting strength of my party in the various areas. The map I saw created a new electorate that was tailor-made to return a Country Party member in the area that I represent. That was the Government's obvious hope and intent. If honourable members opposite say that this clause is "fair dinkum", then the map is bogus; but if the map is correct, then the clause is bogus. I shall be watching, as will all other honourable members, to see the outcome.

If this east-west bend and the general phasing of obvious Country Party areas into existing centres of Labor support takes place—I know where they are; it is my job to know where they are, because I am a member returned by a Labor majority—it is true, as the honourable member for Barcoo has said, that there will be confusion. The confusion in my area has been bad enough

since 1958. I refer honourable members to what I said in my speech on the second reading, when I made a plea that community of interest, especially educational interest, should be kept clearly in mind. If the zoning is to be as illustrated in the map that appeared in the Press recently, all I can say is that the Government hopes to confuse, diffuse and divide.

I make a plea to the Government, if it has any control over the commission—if not, I make a plea to the commissioners themselves—not to do anything similar to what was done in the 1958 redistribution, but to keep well clear of problems of that kind. Some people in the Logan electorate live in eight different zones—one fire zone, one police zone, one Federal zone, one State zone, one local authority zone, one ambulance zone, and so on.

**Mr. Lickiss** interjected.

**Mr. BALDWIN:** The honourable member gave an excellent example of the confusion that reigns in his mind in a speech that he made previously.

**Mr. Lickiss:** I have not spoken in the debate on this Bill.

**Mr. BALDWIN:** I apologise to the honourable member for Mt. Coot-tha. I thought the interjection came from the honourable member sitting beside him. However, he ought to speak. If he had some intestinal fortitude to back up what he said on the previous occasion on which a Bill dealing with electoral redistribution was before us, he would be speaking on this very issue.

**Mr. Casey:** He does not speak at all now that he has received the pay-off from the Liberal leaders.

**Mr. BALDWIN:** It sounds as if he has been granted some immunity, together with the rest of them.

**Mr. Lickiss:** You are still in the twilight zone; that is your trouble.

**Mr. BALDWIN:** I was out of the twilight zone before the honourable member knew there was one.

**Mr. Chinchin:** The honourable member for Logan is in the Egerton zone.

**Mr. BALDWIN:** I can handle that all right, without the honourable member's derisive suggestions.

Clause 12 (2) refers to suggestions in writing with respect to the distribution of a zone, and so on. Because this is such an important issue in the minds of the public—they are not as silly as they used to be when they were dazzled by the hoax that a Country-Liberal Government would end their troubles, as they were in 1958—I hope they will ask what is happening in this redistribution. I confidently and optimistically forecast that so many submissions will be made that if they are all studied it will

require an army of office-workers. However, I see that the Government has anticipated that position and has stipulated that the commissioners "may" consider all suggestions lodged. The Bill does not provide that they will or shall, but that they may.

Of course, we know why that provision is there. They may not consider all the submissions that are lodged. They will not have a chance of considering them all, because they will get so many. This will be a good thing. And I will bet they will never be publicised. However, we hope that copies of these submissions will come to areas in which we take an interest and will be published. The Government will see something that will surprise it if I can go on what has been said to me so far about what the man in the street is thinking about the redistribution—that is, that it will be done to restore the democratic power of the ballot box to the hands of the electorate and not to the hands of a sectional Government striving desperately for survival.

I reiterate that I will bet guineas to gooseberries that this Government will not put out beforehand a map showing its suggestions. It will not be game. If it does, the map that is put out by the commissioners that it supports must be the same. However, by next year we will know the answer to these very important questions.

The people in the southern periphery of the metropolitan area who fall within the Government's South-Eastern Zone will find themselves thinking very carefully. I will give them all the information I can from this Bill to make them think carefully, and, from what I know of them and the way they have been neglected and put into limbo by the policies of this Government, I am sure that they will have very strong suggestions to make on the redistribution within the zones.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH** (Tablelands) (3.43 p.m.): I would be lacking in my duty as representative of the Tablelands electorate if I did not speak on this clause. I am thinking, of course, of the fact that this is probably the swan-song for the Tablelands electorate. On the proposals put forward, it appears that my electorate has been sacrificed to provide an extra seat in Cairns. For three elections the Premier and his party have tried unsuccessfully to capture Tablelands, and I suppose it is easy to understand why it will be eliminated. It is not a matter of, "If you can't beat them, join them," but of, "If you can't win it, eliminate it."

I propose to quote some figures to show how ridiculous are the suggestions and proposals in this Bill. The Tablelands electorate covers 76,560 square miles and it has 8,000 voters. It is to provide sufficient voters in the Mulgrave electorate, with only 1,240 square miles and 7,000 electors, to give it its quota. According to the proposals, a large section of Tablelands will go towards making the North Cairns seat. I will call

it "North Cairns," for want of a better name. I am referring to the second seat in Cairns. To me, it seems that Tablelands is being carved up to the detriment and loss of the people living in it. The few voters who will be left will go into the huge electorate of Cook, which already has an area of 54,000 square miles, so what possibility is there of proper representation being given to the electors of Cook? Absolutely none at all. Where will the member who represents the Cook electorate live? Will he live near the Palmer River, which is about the centre of the electorate, or will he live somewhere else?

So much for the Premier's claim that the electors will receive better representation. In an electorate that will stretch from the Torres Strait islands down as far as a line drawn east from Normanton, in which for many months of the year the roads are impassable, it will be impossible for the member to give good representation to his constituents.

**Mr. Baldwin:** The Premier will lend the member his aeroplane.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** Yes, when it is not flying to and from Kingaroy.

As I say, portion of the Tablelands electorate is to be put into the Mulgrave electorate to bring its number of voters up to the desired quota. One wonders why one electorate should be eliminated simply to boost the numbers in another. All that the Government is doing is assisting one section of the community at the expense of another, and I know that the people who live on the Tableland will take very unkindly to this proposal. For years the Tableland has been the food-bowl of the North, and, whilst a redistribution will not interfere with production, it will mean that the local people will lose their identity. How ridiculous it is for the Premier to point the finger of scorn at the Labor Party and its principle of "One vote, one value", when he proposes to eliminate one electorate to provide another with sufficient numbers.

**Mr. Tucker:** He is virtually forcing them to lose their identity.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** That is so. The Tablelands electorate is well known throughout the Commonwealth for the role that it played during the war years, so it deserves special consideration by way of a more practical approach to a redistribution.

I was horrified to learn that certain divisions of the Mareeba Shire are to be put into other regions. The Mareeba Shire is so large that on the road to Mt. Garnet a motorist crosses the boundaries of the Mareeba, Herberton, Dalrymple Shires, and so on. As the honourable members for Barcoo and Logan have said, a more practical approach should be made to the redistribution so that a great number of people who live in the Outback will not be placed at a disadvantage.

Clause 12, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 13 to 18, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 19—Notice of proposed distribution or redistribution—

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (3.49 p.m.): I move the following amendment:—

“On page 10, after line 19, insert the following new subclause:—

‘(7) Where there is no place appointed under The Justices Acts 1886 to 1968 for holding magistrates courts and no police station within a proposed electoral district the Commissioners shall cause a copy of the map and a copy of the statement to be publicly exhibited or, as the case requires, deposited within the time specified in that behalf at the place so appointed or the police station that in the opinion of the Commissioners is nearest to the proposed electoral district.’”

The Leader of the Opposition suggested this amendment, and I am happy to accept it.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (3.51 p.m.): I do not wish to labour the point. As the Premier has said, I pointed out this weakness in the Bill during the second reading. Naturally, I am pleased that the Premier has accepted the provision, which should be contained in the Bill.

Amendment (Mr. Bjelke-Petersen) agreed to.

Clause 19, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 20 to 23, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Schedule—

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (3.53 p.m.): As I forecast in my second-reading speech, I intend to move an amendment to the schedule. I therefore move—

“On page 13, line 26, omit the words—  
‘constituted by the Area of the City of Mackay;’

and insert in lieu thereof the following phrase—

‘constituted by—

(i) the Area of the City of Mackay; and

(ii) the part of Division 1 of the Area of the Shire of Pioneer that is comprised in the area bounded by a line commencing on the Pioneer River at Willetts Road, thence proceeding along Willetts Road to the Bruce Highway, thence along the Bruce Highway to the intersection of that Highway and Norris Road, thence along Norris Road to the Mackay Habana Road, thence along the Mackay Habana Road to McCready’s Creek, thence along McCready’s Creek to the coastline, thence along the coastline to the mouth

of the Pioneer River and thence along the Pioneer River to the point of commencement;’”.

I outlined the reasons for the amendment in my second-reading speech. I pointed out that this adjustment in the boundaries of the Provincial City Zone of the Mackay area would be desirable to ensure that this area conforms with the quota requirements. Broadly, the amendment transfers the area known as North Mackay from the Country Zone to the Mackay Provincial Zone.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (3.54 p.m.): It is unfortunate that, in such an important Bill, major changes should be made in the Committee stage. Since the amendment was circulated, I have tried to find out what the extra voting strength would be. It is important to know what effect the extra numbers will have on the electorate concerned, and also what effect the numbers transferred from one zone to another will have on the over-all position.

The present member for Mackay will be returned at the next election, and he is quite capable of looking after the larger number of electors. I know from my own experience that many people living in North Mackay already seek his assistance. Therefore the area being included is acceptable on the basis of political representation. But this goes further than that. Principles are involved. From what I can ascertain, the number of electors affected is about 5,000.

**Mr. Bjelke-Petersen:** No; that is not right.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Yes, it is. I have been in touch with the people who should know. I have been told that 6,000 people reside in the shire and that most of them live in this area. I asked if the number could be 5,000 and I was told that that could be the figure. Therefore, the Mackay electorate will have 15,500 electors, or even if only 4,000 reside in this area, 14,500 electors. It will make Mackay the largest electorate in the State. It will have 3,000 more electors than the smallest metropolitan electorate. It will make the quota for Mackay about 2,500 more than that for the Bundaberg electorates, the Cairns electorates, the Rockhampton electorates and the Townsville electorates.

Surely the Government should know more about this. It is wrong for the Premier to move an amendment at this stage, not knowing approximately how many electors are involved. The Government’s attitude is, “Here is a Bill; take it or leave it. We will not give you any details.” All the figures that we have used have been obtained by us. This is completely wrong. This electorate should not be changed to make it so large compared with other electorates. In the Bill that was amended and not proceeded with earlier this year, the Mackay electorate was exactly as it is in the present Bill. And the earlier Bill provided for 78 seats, whereas this Bill provides for 82 seats.

Let me now deal with the effect that this provision will have on other electorates. Because these 5,000 electors are taken out of the Country Zone, the quota for each of the 15 country electorates will be reduced by 300, from 9,400 to 9,100.

**Mr. Bjelke-Petersen:** No, it won't.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Yes, it will. If the Premier thinks I am wrong he should give us the approximate figures. I can only work on the figures that I have been able to obtain through the proper channels. In any case, for every 1,500 electors added to the Mackay electorate, which is in the Provincial Cities Zone, the quota of each of the 15 country electorates will be reduced by 100.

I do not think there will be any argument about those figures. Near enough to 5,000 people are involved here. Even taking a figure half-way between the 4,000 and 5,000 that we agreed on, that is 300 fewer. The base figure for the country will therefore be reduced to 9,100. That will mean one extra country seat in the southern part of Queensland. After all, Mackay is in the northern area of the State. If 5,000, or 4,500, are to be taken out of the Country Zone and added to the provincial city of Mackay, these electors cannot be placed in the country seats in that area.

**Mr. Low:** Mackay is not growing fast. Its population is almost stationary. It is not like Cairns.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** The honourable member for Cooroora makes more speeches by interjection than he does by getting on his feet. He is talking about the Mackay area. When the Goonyella railway-line project was before Parliament, Ministers told us how coal was to be brought to Mackay, and what tremendous development there would be in that city. Now, honourable members opposite say that that is not correct. They would say anything at all to try to win a political point. This will happen under Edmund Casey, and it was going well under Fred Graham. Let there be no doubt about that.

What is provided in the Bill will eliminate one of the seats originally prescribed in that northern area. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition conclusively proved by his figures that the northern part of Queensland was getting a bad deal under the present Bill. With this amendment, it will get an even worse deal. If the quota is reduced from 9,400 to 9,100, this will naturally mean an extra seat in the southern part of the State. It has just dawned on me that the seat of the hon. member who has been interjecting is one that will be in jeopardy under the Bill.

**Mr. Low:** It will be all right.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** You know that?

**Mr. Low:** Yes.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I am pleased to hear that the honourable member for Cooroora is able to say, "I know that my seat is all right." How does he know that?

**Honourable Members** interjected.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. HOUSTON:** At least the honourable member is honest enough to come forward and say, "I know what we have designed." Of course he does. He has proved his point, and I accept his interjection.

Without labouring the point, I say that the Opposition is not happy with this provision, although there are no problems for the honourable member for Mackay in being able to represent the area envisaged.

**Mr. R. E. Moore:** Vote against it.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** That is more than the honourable member for Windsor is game to do. There is no fear that the honourable member for Mackay will not be able to look after this area, but that is not the point. The point is that the balance of redistribution has been upset, and this move has been made because, if the truth be known, the Minister for Mines and Main Roads had a look at the map, saw the figures, and said, "North Mackay will be my downfall. The voters in North Mackay will be the ones who will put me out of Parliament." That is the real crux of the whole matter. Let there be no doubt about that.

**Mr. Sherrington:** He made an early submission.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** That is right. He made a submission and "shot through". There is no other reason why this has been done by the Government. It was not done after careful consideration.

**Mr. Bjelke-Petersen:** That is not the reason.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** What is the reason? The Premier says that that is not the reason.

**Mr. Bjelke-Petersen:** I gave it a moment ago.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** The Premier did not give any reason at all.

**Mr. Bjelke-Petersen:** You wait and see.

**Mr. Davis** interjected.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I do not know whether the honourable member for Brisbane was present when I made an appeal for cross-firing to cease. If he was not, I now warn him that I will not tolerate cross-firing.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I will give the Premier a chance to further explain to the Committee that the basic reason for the change was not to try to save his colleague the Minister for Mines and Main Roads.

**Mr. CASEY** (Mackay) (4.6 p.m.): Lest there be any misapprehension or any attempt by Government members to misrepresent some of my comments, let me say at the outset that I do not mind this section of North Mackay being included in my electorate. As the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, because of the locality in which I live I am already doing a considerable amount of work in that area. In fact, as honourable members have heard in this Chamber on other occasions, I do a considerable amount of work in the whole of the Mackay district, which is one of the few in Queensland that is completely integrated.

The history of the Mackay electorate shows that this particular area of North Mackay has been part of the Mackay electorate for a considerable number of years. It was part of the Mackay electorate when it was held by the late Mr. Forgan Smith and later by Mr. Fred Graham, who preceded me. In the 1949 redistribution it became part of the electorate of Whitsunday. The people of North Mackay would not mind in the least being included in the Mackay electorate and, as I said earlier, I am not opposed in any way to their inclusion.

However, something has gone wrong. Something has occurred in the last week that has changed the Government's mind on this issue. Two Bills dealing with electoral redistribution have been introduced into the Chamber this year, and one thing that stuck out in both of them was that in the Provincial Cities Zone the electorate of Mackay retained its existing boundaries. When the first Bill was introduced, the Mackay electorate was well below quota figures. That was the subject of criticism in this Chamber by the Leader of the Opposition, and that criticism was answered by the honourable member for Whitsunday. I refrain from saying very much about his comments at this stage because he is not present to answer personally anything that I say. Nonetheless, every honourable member who was present knows—it is recorded in "Hansard"—that the Minister for Mines and Main Roads said quite openly and forcefully that he did not want to lose North Mackay from his electorate, that he wanted to keep it.

When the Bill now before the Committee was introduced, again we found that the boundary of the Mackay electorate was to coincide with the boundary of the city of Mackay. Suddenly, after the Bill had been given its first and second readings, almost at the death when the Premier came into the Chamber to pilot the Bill through the Committee stage, a switch was made and North Mackay was to be included in the Mackay electorate. The Premier said that the change has been made because the Government has had a look at the figures and now sees that the electorate is below quota. As I said earlier, the Leader of the Opposition told the Premier that in this Chamber in March and April this year, yet

nothing was done about it. Why was no consideration given to that in the three or four months before the present Bill was introduced? Why has the Government decided suddenly, on the eve of the Bill going through the Committee stage, that Mackay is below quota and that North Mackay should be included in it? I say that there is some reason other than numbers behind that decision.

I confirm the figures given this afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition. In the area outlined in the amendment, there would be approximately 4,500 voters. I go further and say that it is also rather significant that included within this area delineated by the proposed boundaries are the Mackay Harbour, the Slade Point area (which is the fastest-growing area in the Mackay district at the present time with the Lands Department's own subdivisional proposals as well as a private subdivisional proposal), and the Andergrove area. Those three areas are within the boundaries of the new electorate and are excised from the Whitsunday electorate. It is rather strange. I do not know whether this has been done at the request of the Premier or the honourable member for Whitsunday, or what has happened, but something has occurred.

Within the last week something has boiled to a head that will become a major controversy in the Mackay district over the next three, six, nine or twelve months. It is the fact that another large coal exporter is preparing to go ahead and present proposals to the Government for the opening up of a further coal mine in the Mackay district, which will possibly have as its outlet a port just north of the existing Mackay harbour. Within the last week in the Mackay district considerable controversy has started to boil up over this issue. It is one that is certainly going to be most dangerous for the electoral prospects of the Minister for Mines, whose responsibility it will be, in the main, to frame the agreement between this company and the Government.

This development could be interpreted by the people of the Mackay district as the reason behind the change in electoral boundaries at this stage, and that, in fact, the Minister for Mines wants to ensure that the controversy does not blow up in the electorate he represents. I will go no further than that. I am not in any way criticising him personally on this issue because he is not present in the Chamber today.

**Mr. Low** interjected.

**Mr. CASEY:** The jackal trying to interject from the opposite side, as he attempted to do this morning, does not know the facts and figures. He is trying to assert that the Mackay district is not growing in population. He is talking through the top of his lovely grey hair. He just does not know. The figures, in fact, indicate that both the city and urban areas are progressing, but it is

one of those peculiar areas in Queensland where a major anomaly exists over local authority boundaries.

We have already accepted in this Bill that local authority boundaries shall be a major factor in determining new electoral boundaries. For the reasons set out in this Bill—community of interest, means of communication and so on—I challenge the Government to include this area also in the city of Mackay, to alter the local authority boundaries and correct an anomaly which is a major issue in the area and has been for quite a number of years. If the House does accept the reasons outlined by the Premier as to why this area should be included in Mackay, then for exactly the same sound and beneficial reasons as outlined in the clauses of the Bill that have already been accepted by this Chamber, this particular area should also be included within the city of Mackay.

I have already dealt with some aspects of this matter, but I should like to point out one further feature that this amendment highlights. We have determined the methods by which boundaries shall be set. There are only two places in which the Bill contravenes the clause already adopted in which it is stated that the boundaries of local authority areas and the divisions of local authority areas shall be major factors in defining electorates, whereas in actual fact we find that divisions themselves are divided.

There is just as much an affinity between the people of Andergrove, Habana, Eimeo, Bucasia and North Mackay as there is between the people of Glenella and North Mackay. All of those small communities are virtually part of North Mackay, yet that area is to be divided for redistribution purposes. If the number of voters that I have mentioned is to be taken out of the Whitsunday electorate, it will mean that on the existing boundaries the number of electors in Whitsunday will drop to approximately 5,500. It is obvious that to boost that electorate to the desired quota it will have to obtain voters from another electorate. It appears that they will come from Bowen, and that brings me to another point.

The Clarke Range is to be used as a dividing line, with the result that Collinsville will be separated from Bowen and put in the Far Western and Northern Zone. No-one would know better than the Minister for Justice that the people of Collinsville have a great affinity with the people of Bowen and no affinity at all with the people of any other township or area in the electorate in which it will be placed. Despite that, Collinsville will be placed in the Far Western and Northern Zone. The only reason for this is the Government's desire to carve up the Bowen electorate and to shift the electors there into the adjoining electorates. I do not know how the Burdekin electorate will finish up, but it would appear that if all of North Mackay comes into the Mackay

electorate, at least portion of Bowen must go into Whitsunday to make up that electorate's numbers. These are the real reasons for this amendment, not those as outlined by the Premier.

I repeat that I do not in any way mind representing the people of North Mackay—I will be quite happy to do so—and I know that if they are included in my electorate they will give me their full support at the next election.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted from the Schedule (Mr. Bjelke-Petersen's amendment) stand part of the Schedule—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 27

Aiken	Marginson
Baldwin	Melloy
Bennett	Newton
Blake	O'Donnell
Bousen	Sherrington
Bromley	Thackeray
Casey	Tucker
Hanlon	Wallis-Smith
Hanson	Wood, P.
Harris	Wright
Houston	
Inch	<i>Tellers:</i>
Jensen	Davis
Jones, R.	Moore, F. P.
Jordan	

NOES, 41

Ahern	Knox
Alison	Lane
Armstrong	Lee
Bird	Lickiss
Bjelke-Petersen	Loneragan
Campbell	Low
Chalk	McKechnie
Chinchen	Miller
Cory	Moore, R. E.
Delamothé	Müller
Diplock	Rae
Fletcher	Richter
Heatley	Row
Herbert	Sullivan
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Tomkins
Hewitt, W. D.	Tooth
Hinze	Wharton
Hodges	
Houghton	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hughes	Kaus
Hungerford	Newbery
Jones, V. E.	

PAIR:

Dean	Camm
------	------

Resolved in the negative.

Amendment (Mr. Bjelke-Petersen) agreed to.

Schedule, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported, with amendments.

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Mr. Bjelke-Petersen, by leave, read a third time.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier): I move—

“That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until Tuesday, 24 August 1971.”

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.28 p.m.