

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 22 AUGUST 1968

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 22 AUGUST, 1968

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

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE**APPOINTMENT OF HON. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN**

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that a vacancy exists in the Standing Orders Committee consequent upon the death of the Honourable J. C. A. Pizzey. The Honourable J. Bjelke-Petersen has been appointed to fill that vacancy.

PANEL OF TEMPORARY CHAIRMEN**NOMINATION OF MR. C. C. CAREY**

Mr. SPEAKER: I nominate Cecil Charles Carey, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Albert, to fill the vacancy in the Panel of Temporary Chairmen caused by the appointment of Mr. Hodges to the Ministry.

CONFERENCE OF PRESIDING OFFICERS

Mr. SPEAKER: I lay upon the table of the House a copy of the report of proceedings of the First Conference of Presiding Officers of Australian Parliaments, which was held in Canberra in January of this year.

QUESTIONS**GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION IN BRISBANE TRAM AND BUS STRIKE**

(a) **Mr. Ramsden**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Labour and Tourism,—

In view of statements circulating on August 20 that the Lord Mayor, Alderman Jones, had sought Government intervention in the current bus and tram strike and in view of the Lord Mayor's denial in *The Courier-Mail* of August 21 that he had sought such intervention, will he make a full statement to the House of the actual position?

Answer:—

“On Tuesday afternoon last, a newspaper reporter approached The Honourable the Premier, my Under Secretary, and myself, and stated to each of us that he had been informed that the Lord Mayor had asked the Government to invoke the penal clauses of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Acts in relation to the present tram and bus strike, and asked if this were correct. He was informed by the three of us that we had no knowledge of any such approach. The Lord Mayor has since issued an emphatic denial that he made such an approach. As stated by me in *The Courier-Mail* yesterday, adequate

facilities exist under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Acts for the settlement of this dispute, but the Lord Mayor states that, in accordance with A.L.P. policy, he is not prepared to utilise them. The Government will not interfere with the functions of this completely independent Conciliation and Arbitration Tribunal, nor will it take action which will result in the shifting of the responsibility and blame for the present deplorable situation from the Australian Labor Party and the Lord Mayor."

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

Were representations made to him on behalf of the Parliamentary Labor Party requesting intercession on a governmental level in an endeavour to resolve the present bus and tram strike in Brisbane? If so, by whom were such representations made and what was the Government's response?

Answer:—

"No such representations were made to me."

NATURAL GAS, SOUTH BRISBANE GAS COMPANY

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

(1) When will natural gas be available to customers of the South Brisbane Gas Company?

(2) Will any costs of conversion be charged to the consumer?

(3) What will be the city gate price per therm paid by the South Brisbane Gas Company to Associated Pipelines, who are building and running the pipeline from Roma?

Answers:—

(1) "It is anticipated supply to some consumers will commence in March, 1969, and all consumers should be receiving natural gas by the end of September, 1969."

(2) "There will be no direct charge but costs of conversion will be amortised by the company by including a proportion of such costs in its working expenses over a number of years."

(3) "There will be a base price of 3.75 cents per therm with minor variations depending on the rate of delivery of the gas. Normal escalation provisions will also apply."

CARNARVON DEVELOPMENT CO. PTY. LTD.

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

Is Carnarvon Development Co. Pty. Ltd. registered in Queensland? If so, who are the directors and principal shareholders?

Answer:—

"Carnarvon Development Co. Pty. Ltd. was incorporated in Queensland on 6th November, 1967. The directors of this company are: John Laurence Morrison, Town Hall Chambers, McDowall Street, Roma; Thomas Ernest Warren, 105 McDowall Street, Roma. In accordance with the Returns of Allotment of Shares filed in the Companies Registry on 4th December, 1967, 30th January, 1968, and 16th April, 1968, the following have been allotted shares in the company:—John Laurence Morrison, Town Hall Chambers, McDowall Street, Roma, 26,025 \$1 ordinary shares fully paid up; Thomas Ernest Warren, 105 McDowall Street, Roma, 8,750 \$1 ordinary shares fully paid up."

DOCTORS' FEES, BLOOD AND BREATHALYSER TESTS

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

(1) Prior to August 1, 1968, what was the average time spent on a blood test by a private doctor and what fee was paid for this test?

(2) Since August 1, 1968, what is the current fee paid to private doctors for (a) a breathalyser test and/or (b) a blood test, and what is the average time spent on each test?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "The Questions refer to the payment to qualified medical practitioners for the conduct of tests under police direction and I would suggest that the Honourable Member direct the Questions to the appropriate Minister."

SCHOOL SECONDARY DEPARTMENTS AND HIGH SCHOOLS

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

(1) What was the total number of Secondary Departments and High Schools in Queensland at the start of the 1958 school year?

(2) Of the above, how many were in the following areas:—(a) metropolitan, (b) provincial cities and (c) country districts?

(3) What number will there be in operation at the start of the 1969 school year?

(4) Of the above, how many will be in the following categories (a) metropolitan, (b) provincial cities and (c) country districts?

Answers:—

(1) "39 high schools, 38 secondary departments.

(2) "State high schools—(a) metropolitan 12, (b) provincial cities 14, (c) country districts 13. Secondary departments—(a) metropolitan —, (b) provincial cities —, (c) country districts 38."

(3) "101 high schools, 66 secondary departments."

(4) "State high schools—(a) metropolitan 29, (b) provincial cities 21, (c) country districts 51. Secondary departments—(a) metropolitan —, (b) provincial cities —, (c) country districts 66."

SCHOOL TRANSPORT SERVICES

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

(1) What was the total number of secondary and primary school transport services in operation and the cost involved at the end of the 1957 school year?

(2) How many secondary and primary school services were there at the start of the 1968 school year, with total cost?

Answers:—

(1) "369 primary services, 3 secondary services; total cost, \$556,502."

(2) "805 primary services, 240 secondary services; total cost, \$2,981,145."

SCHOOL OF THE AIR

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

(1) In what year was the "School of the Air" established in Queensland?

(2) What was the cost of its operation during the 1967 school year?

(3) Which are the areas benefiting most from this service?

Answers:—

(1) "The first 'School of the Air' was established in 1960."

(2) "The total cost was \$26,699.05, including—(a) Salaries \$15,855.90, (b) Contingencies \$10,843.15 (including 40 transceivers)."

(3) "Within a radius of 300 miles from the Royal Flying Doctor Service bases at Mount Isa, Charters Towers and Charleville."

PENSIONER RENTALS

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

What legislative protection exists to prevent landlords from raising rents charged to pensioners for rooms, tenements, houses and other forms of accommodation following any increase in pension payments?

Answer:—

"*The Landlord and Tenant Acts, 1948 to 1961*," prohibits the increasing of rentals of those premises which were leased for the purposes of residence at any time during the period December 1, 1954, to December 1, 1957, save with the permission of the Fair Rents Court or, in certain cases, of a Registrar of such a Court. Other premises do not come within the rent control provisions of those Acts. Any complaint of the raising of a pensioner's rent following any increase in pension payments may be forwarded to my office, not only to allow me to have first-hand information of such cases, but also to enable me to take such action as may be desirable under the circumstances."

RADIOACTIVE FALLOUT, FRENCH NUCLEAR TESTS

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

(1) Will he ascertain whether the nuclear fallout from French tests in the central Pacific on the same latitude as Brisbane have resulted, owing to the westward drift in the upper atmosphere, in a tenfold increase of radioactivity in the water of the reservoirs of the New South Wales Water Board?

(2) Have tests been instituted in Queensland in the coastal area of our own water supply and what measures have been or will be taken to protect the people of this State now that a much more powerful explosion, a hydrogen bomb, is to occur this week?

Answers:—

(1) "I am advised that my Department has no knowledge of a tenfold increase in the radioactivity in the water of the reservoirs of the Metropolitan Water and Sewerage Board in New South Wales."

(2) "I am further advised that no tests have been carried out on the radioactivity levels of public water supplies in Queensland. Instead, regular sampling of the level of radioactivity in bone and in milk, which are regarded as being more sensitive indices of radioactivity levels, is carried out, as well as fallout levels of short-life fission products. I am informed that there should be no health hazards expected in Australia as a result of the current French testing."

OPPORTUNITY SCHOOL, AYR

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

As land on which an Opportunity School will be erected at Ayr was acquired by the Education Department some time ago, when is it proposed to commence the construction of the urgently needed school?

Answer:—

"It is not possible at this juncture to indicate when construction will commence on the building for the Ayr Opportunity School. This project will, however, continue to receive consideration in relation to available funds."

SCHOOL FACILITIES, KARUMBA

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

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

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

Answers:—

(1) "Approval was given for the establishment of a school at Kurumba in April, 1968, on the assurance that a suitable building was available for temporary use, and that accommodation at a reasonable cost was available at Kurumba for a teacher. School supplies were forwarded and a head teacher was appointed by the Regional Director, Longreach, to take up duty on May 13, 1968. Despite previous assurances concerning suitable teacher accommodation, this was not available and the opening of the school was deferred. On June 21, it was advised that the local offer of temporary accommodation was withdrawn."

(2) "Yes. It is now proposed to arrange departmental accommodation at Karumba both for the school and for the teacher at the earliest opportunity."

TEACHERS, MITCHELL RIVER AND EDWARD RIVER SCHOOLS

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

(1) Further to his Answers to my Questions on November 7, 1967 and April 2, 1968 relative to the appointment of teachers from the Education Department to Mitchell River and Edward River schools, is he aware that there is still only one departmental teacher at Mitchell River school?

(2) Will he give early consideration to filling the vacancy?

(3) When will further appointments be made in order to bring both schools up to full teaching strength with departmental teachers?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes. The staff teacher appointed on secondment to the school entered upon national service training at the beginning of this year."

(2) "Applications were invited, in the *Education Office Gazette*, from qualified persons for appointment to the vacant position, but no applications were received."

(3) "Applications have again been invited to fill the vacancy. An appointment on secondment will be made when a suitable teacher is available. Until the Edward River and Mitchell River schools are under the control of my Department, I am unable to say when these schools will be fully staffed by departmental teachers."

"GIVE WAY" SIGNS, SINGLE-LANE BRIDGES

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

In an effort to prevent road accidents on single-lane bridges, will he have "Give Way" and other appropriate signs erected and for the location of the signs to follow a uniform and standard pattern?

Answer:—

"Experience here and overseas has shown that proliferation of warning signs can result in a general lowering of their effectiveness. Therefore care is taken to ensure that such signs are erected only in situations where they are warranted. The Honourable Member can be assured that 'Give Way' and other appropriate signs will continue to be erected on the approaches to narrow bridges where they are found to be warranted. 'Give Way' signs at one lane bridges are located in accordance with a clearly defined uniform and standard pattern, but provision is made to vary this where conditions at the site make this necessary."

FUNDS FOR REDCLIFFE TRAMWAY TRANSPORT SYSTEM

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

Has his attention been drawn to the publicity and violent reaction by the citizens of Brisbane to the removal of tram tracks and the destruction of trams by Brisbane City Council? If so, will he consider making special Loan Funds available to the Redcliffe City Council so as to enable it to negotiate for the acquisition of these items and materials with a view to installing a tramway transport system in Redcliffe?

Answer:—

"Yes. However, I must point out to the Honourable Member that the debenture allocation to semi-governmental bodies

for the current financial year has already been made and no further allocation is available."

PENALTIES ON TRADE UNIONS FOR INDUSTRIAL BREACHES

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

(1) What penalties have been imposed on Trade Unions for industrial breaches over the last three years?

(2) If any such penalties have been imposed, have all of them been applied?

Answers:—

(1) "Nineteen penalties, totalling \$6,400."

(2) "Five have been paid, and action has been taken by the Industrial Registrar regarding the penalties outstanding."

RAILWAY SERVICE TO REDCLIFFE

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

In view of the popular reaction to the use of the existing railway services, will he consider extending the railway to Redcliffe and surrounding areas?

Answer:—

"A public transportation study is to be undertaken by Wilbur Smith and Associates. The Honourable Member might care to arrange for the Redcliffe City Council to prepare a submission for the consultants on this matter."

STAFF SHORTAGES IN DENTAL CLINICS

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

(1) How many dental clinics in Queensland are short-staffed in dentists and dental technicians?

(2) How many dental clinics are functioning outside the metropolitan area?

(3) How many are not operating due to lack of dentists and/or dental technicians?

(4) How many dentists are employed in clinics and dental hospitals in Queensland?

Answers:—

(1) "(a) Dentists—(i) Metropolitan 2, (ii) Country 10. Four of the vacancies in country dental clinics will be filled in the near future by appointees who have not yet taken up duty. (b) Dental technicians—(i) Metropolitan 1, (ii) Country 2."

(2) "Eighty-six including part-time and itinerant clinics and the mobile dental clinic."

(3) "(a) Dentists—(i) Three full-time clinics are presently not operating and three are operating on a part-time basis only, being serviced by private dentists. (ii) Part-time itinerant clinics, eight—Arrangements have been made for a dentist to visit three of the part-time itinerant clinics in the near future. (b) There are no dental clinics not operating due to shortage of dental technicians."

(4) "(a) Dental clinics—full-time 42, part-time 11; (b) Dental hospitals—full-time 60, part-time 16."

TICKET-BOX, BINDHA RAILWAY STATION

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

(1) Is he aware of the delay caused to employees at Northgate Cannery by the positioning of the ticket-box on the over-bridge at Bindha Station?

(2) Is he aware that this delay is responsible for many employees missing their train between 4 p.m. and 5 p.m. each day?

(3) Will he give immediate attention to the re-siting of the ticket-box to facilitate access to the platform?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) "This request will be investigated."

SALE OF SECOND-GRADE NEW ZEALAND BUTTER IN QUEENSLAND

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

(1) Has he any knowledge of the sale of second-grade New Zealand butter in Queensland?

(2) Has his attention been drawn to the statement in the *Retail World* of June 24, 1968, attributed to an officer of the Queensland Butter Board, that the Board had investigated this matter and found that "the second-grade" butter was, in fact, cooking margarine, rewrapped and sold as butter?

(3) In view of the serious nature of all aspects of this practice, will he inform the House of the full results of the Board's investigation, what traders and importers were involved and what action was taken against them?

Answers:—

(1) "No second-grade New Zealand butter is on sale in Queensland."

(2) "Yes."

(3) "The Butter Marketing Board referred the matter to my Department. As investigations are still being made, further information cannot be divulged at this juncture."

RATIONALISATION PLAN FOR MARKETING
OF PINEAPPLES

Mr. V. E. Jones, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Primary Industries,—

With regard to the ballot held recently on a rationalisation plan for the marketing of pineapples within that industry which was held within three sections of growers who voted an overall decision in favour of the plan, is he now in a position to advise this House of his approval or otherwise of the scheme?

Answer:—

“An industry rationalisation plan such as the one put forward by the pineapple industry and voted upon by growers involves complex practical and legal issues. At present, several aspects are under examination and I expect to place the industry’s plan before Cabinet in the very near future.”

SUBMISSIONS ON STAFFING OF POLICE
STATIONS

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

(1) What was the number of police districts in the State as at June 30, 1968?

(2) Of this number, how many were asked to submit submissions on the shortage of clerical or other staff?

(3) What was the number of submissions returned from these police districts?

(4) What was the number of clerical and other staff required by them?

(5) How many of the requested staff have been appointed and have taken up duties in the respective police districts?

Answers:—

(1) “At June 30, 1968, there were 17 police districts, and the C. I. Branch, Traffic Branch, Licensing Branch and Police Depot.”

(2) “On May 14, 1968, all of these districts and branches were asked to submit reports on the shortage of civilian staff such as clerks, female clerk-typists and testing officers.”

(3) “All districts and branches submitted reports.”

(4 and 5) “The requirements outlined in the reports are being considered in conjunction with the preparation of the current year’s Budget Estimates which will in due course be presented to Parliament. No appointments as a consequence have yet been made.”

HOUSING COMMISSION RENTAL
ACCOMMODATION

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

(1) What is the number of applications, in all categories, for rental accommodation at present lodged with the Queensland Housing Commission?

(2) What is the priority rating of these applications in all categories?

(3) What was the number of (a) houses and (b) flats allotted for rental accommodation from January 1, 1968 to July 31, 1968?

(4) What was the number of (a) houses and (b) flats which became available for re-letting in the same period?

(5) Were all re-let vacancies re-let?

(6) What was the number of houses repossessed from home owners for the same period and were these resold or re-let?

(7) What was the number of State rental houses up to July 31, 1968, being purchased under the tenant home-ownership scheme?

Answers:—

(1) “4,095.”

(2) “100 points 155; 80 points 39; 60 points 95; 40 points 1,441; nil points 2,365.”

(3) “442 new houses.”

(4) “(a) 684, (b) 38.”

(5) “Yes—other than those currently receiving maintenance attention.”

(6) “Thirty-three. Wherever practicable the borrowers or purchasers remain in occupation on the basis of a weekly rental which, if paid regularly, enables them to be reinstated at the end of approximately 3 years. In several cases the houses were sold or are in process of sale or were let to tenants. In these cases the original borrowers and purchasers retain an equity which is payable to them when actually realised by the Commission.”

(7) “To July 31, 1968, 2,220 tenants have arranged to purchase and at date a further 133 have paid preliminary deposits.”

DISMISSAL OF BUILDING WORKERS
FROM DAY LABOUR PROJECTS

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

(1) How many building workers have been dismissed from day labour projects covered by the Works Department in (a) the metropolitan area and (b) country areas since April 1, 1968?

(2) Are further dismissals to take place on the completion of jobs at present being carried out by the construction branch of the Department?

(3) What is the number of contracts that have been let to contractors in (a) the metropolitan area and (b) country areas from January 1, 1968, to July 31, 1968?

Answers:—

(1) "Eighty-five employees have been discharged from the construction work force of the Department of Works since April 1, 1968, being forty-nine in the metropolitan area and thirty-six in country areas. However because of engagements the nett reduction in the total number of employees over the same period was eight only."

(2) "It is probable that further discharges will take place on the completion of jobs at present being carried out by the Construction Branch of the Department of Works in the rationalisation of trades within the work force which is a continuing process involving engagement of labour and discharges as jobs are commenced and completed in the various centres throughout the State."

(3) "From January 1, 1968 to July 31, 1968, 55 major contracts were let for the performance of work in the metropolitan area and 85 for the performance of work in country areas. Numerous minor contracts were let during the period but information as to the number of such contracts is not readily available as statistical information in this regard is not kept. The incurring of the expense to obtain the information could not be justified."

SUMMONSES AGAINST JOINT OWNERS OF MOTOR VEHICLES

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to a Press report of a complaint by Mr. B. Anderson, Praed Street, Red Hill, of summonses being issued against both his wife and himself as joint owners of a motor vehicle, when he neglected to make payment by the due date on a parking ticket for an alleged offence by him in the parking of his car in Upper Roma Street?

(2) As this procedure individually against joint owners for a single offence of this nature appears to be required in the terms of the relevant legislation, will he consider amendments to obviate a multiple penalty in these circumstances by the pure chance of a vehicle being registered in joint ownership?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "This Question should be directed to my colleague, the Honourable the Minister for Transport, who now administers the Traffic Acts."

WAIVING OF WATER CHARGES, BURNETT RIVER

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

In view of the shortage of water storage in the incompleted Wuruma Dam, will he waive water charges to those irrigators on the Burnett River who find themselves without adequate water?

Answer:—

"Wuruma Dam, which will not be completed until early next year, is presently capable of storing some 13,000 acre feet but currently contains only about 1,000 acre feet because of low inflows in recent months. In addition to the above, about 3,000 acre feet is currently stored in Mundubbera Weir. To the present the two storages have been able to meet all irrigation demands on the Burnett River and no irrigator has experienced shortages of water. The volume of water currently available in storage represents about half the average annual requirements for irrigation and it is likely that inflows into the storages over the balance of the year will provide some replenishment. Under the circumstances, it is felt that the present charges should stand. However, if the Irrigation Commission is unable to maintain irrigation supplies to all license holders, consideration will be given to a rebate of charges to landholders who are unable to divert the quantity of water to which they are entitled under their minimum license charge for the year."

EMERGENCY TEACHER TRAINING SCHEME

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

(1) Further to his Answers to my Questions of March 20 this year and August 29 last year, when is it anticipated that the report of the committee which was appointed on April 24, 1967, to review teacher education in Queensland will be issued?

(2) Were the recent proposals concerning three-year courses of training for some teacher trainees recommendations of the committee?

Answers:—

(1) "It is anticipated that the report of the committee will be issued in 1969."

(2) "Yes. The proposals were the subject of the interim report submitted to Cabinet in June, 1968."

RESIGNATIONS AND ADMISSIONS TO
TEACHING SERVICE

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

(1) How many teachers have tendered resignations from his Department since the last day of the 1967 school year to the present date?

(2) How many of these teachers (a) were males, (b) had degrees and (c) were high-school teachers?

(3) How many teachers have been (a) admitted and (b) re-admitted to his Department in the same period?

(4) How many of these teachers (a) are males and (b) have degrees?

Answers:—

(1) "1,205 teachers resigned from the Department of Education between the end of December, 1967 and the end of July, 1968."

(2) "233 of these teachers were males and 459 were secondary teachers of whom 57 had degrees."

(3) "2,298 teachers were admitted to the service, 839 being re-admissions."

(4) "478 of these were males, and 138 were secondary teachers with degrees."

ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION, CEN-
TENARY HEIGHTS HIGH SCHOOL,
TOOWOOMBA

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

(1) Is he aware that additional accommodation will be required at the Centenary Heights High School, Toowoomba, at the beginning of the next school year as the school enrolment is expected to more than double?

(2) Has approval been given for the additional accommodation necessary and, if not, when is it anticipated that approval will be given?

(3) What are the details of the additional accommodation planned?

(4) When will construction begin?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2 and 3) "Although no indication can be given at present when additional accommodation will be approved, the construction of the second section of this school was included in the Draft Works Programme for the current year."

(4) "It is anticipated that the additional accommodation will be available at the beginning of the 1969 school year."

ENROLMENTS AND COURSES, INSTITUTES
OF TECHNOLOGY

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

How many students are enrolled at the present time and in what courses at each of the Technological Institutes, viz, Brisbane, Toowoomba and Rockhampton?

Answer:—

"Enrolments in second term 1968 of Technological Institutes are: Brisbane 3,890, Darling Downs 309, Capricornia 174; total, 4,373. I table details of enrolments by courses."

*Paper:—*Whereupon, Mr. Fletcher laid upon the Table the details referred to.

Mr. DAVIES: Could the information tabled by the Minister be inserted in "Hansard"?

Mr. SPEAKER: If it is too lengthy, no.

Mr. DAVIES: There must be something to hide.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will withdraw that remark. It is a reflection not only on myself and my remark but also on the Minister.

Mr. DAVIES: In deference to you, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the remark.

Mr. SPEAKER: And to the Minister.

Mr. DAVIES: And to the Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I advise the hon. member, and all hon. members, that it is time that we gave some thought to these very lengthy answers appearing in "Hansard". They are obtainable at the table of the House and are available to all hon. members for perusal and for the extraction of items of interest from them. The cost of printing "Hansard" is becoming astronomical, and I think it is time that we had a good look at it.

Mr. Melloy: You cannot withhold information from the public.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! In reply to that remark, I would also advise that all information that is tabled in this House is available to the public and to the Press.

GROWTH RATES, MARYBOROUGH,
GYMPIE AND WARWICK

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the statement made by Mr. Slaughter in *The Courier-Mail* of August 20: that Maryborough, Gympie and Warwick were threatened with decay because of their stunted growth rates?

(2) Does he regard the above statement as being a correct estimate of the present economic state of each of the cities?

(3) If he does not believe that these cities are threatened with decay, will he give reasons why?

(4) If he accepts Mr. Slaughter's statement, will he indicate what steps his Country-Liberal Party Government is taking to remove this threat to these important cities in their respective rich regions of this State?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "No."

(3 and 4) "In no circumstances would I accept—even as a generalisation—that the cities of Maryborough, Gympie and Warwick are threatened with decay, or that they will not share in the State's increasing prosperity. Indeed, the Honourable Member provides the answer himself when he points out that the cities referred to are the centres of rich regions."

INDUSTRIAL ESTATES

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

(1) What is the area of the Industrial Estate, Wacol?

(2) Was the area Crown reserve or purchased and, if purchased, when was it purchased and at what cost?

(3) How much money has been spent on this area since it was acquired and how much during each of the last five years?

(4) What is each industry to be charged annually for use of the area and will industry have to recompense the Government for the cost of preparation of the area?

(5) (a) How many industrial concerns have been established in this area and how many are in the process of being built and (b) what are the names of each of these concerns?

(6) What effort was made by the Government to have these industries established in Maryborough or some other country area outside the Brisbane-Ipswich region?

(7) (a) In what other centres of the State has the Government decided to establish an industrial estate and how much money is to be spent on each area during the next twelve months, (b) if the important industrial centre of Maryborough is not included in the number, will he arrange to include it and (c) if he believes that there is not available land within the present boundaries of the City of Maryborough, will he make the necessary alterations to the boundary to see that an industrial estate can be established within such altered boundaries?

Answers:—

(1) "436 acres."

(2) "All but 32½ acres was land owned by the Crown. The freehold portion was purchased in 1964 for the sum of \$68,022."

(3) "Up to 1965-66 no expenditure was incurred by the Crown. For the past two years the figures are as follows:—1966-67, \$45,233; 1967-68, \$334,243."

(4) "(a) The rentals are assessed on the basis of 3 per cent. of the capital valuation of the land. The valuation, of course, varies according to the location of individual allotments. (b) In arriving at the capital valuation, account is taken of the overall development costs."

(5) "(a) One has been established and two are in the course of establishment. (b) The British Motor Corporation (Australia) Pty. Ltd.; Industrial Engineering (Qld.) Pty. Ltd.; Australian Liquid Air Ltd. In addition to the above, two further areas are under provisional reservations, whilst three other applications are currently being processed."

(6) "In its negotiations with industrialists, the Department of Industrial Development makes a point of emphasising the various areas of the State which offer prospects for capital investment. The Honourable Member can rest assured that in this connection Maryborough is not overlooked. In the final analysis, however, it is the party providing the capital and technical know-how who will decide the ultimate location of any plant."

(7) "(a) Industrial estates outside the metropolitan area are currently being developed at Townsville, Rockhampton, Gladstone, Toowoomba and Southport. The amount to be spent on estate development during the next twelve months will depend on the amount appropriated by Parliament later in this Session. (b and c) The question of developing industrial estates in other provincial centres will be considered immediately there is evidence that a demand exists for such land."

COMPULSORY UNIONISM IN PUBLIC SERVICE

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

(1) Is he aware that a memorandum has been circulated by C. J. Tuckfield for the Director of Tuberculosis, stating that it is the policy of the Government that all employees must be financial members of a registered industrial union and that in accordance with that policy a certificate has to be issued in relation to each individual indicating the union of which he or she is a member before any salary increase can be paid?

(2) Is a similar demand being made of all employees in his Department and is it being done with his authority?

(3) In view of clear court decisions concerning compulsion in this matter and a clear expression of Government policy as recently as May of this year by the late Premier, will he take action to have any such memoranda withdrawn and further ensure that any salary increases due to employees are paid as a right and not dependent on union membership?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) "I was not aware of the circular memorandum referred to by the Honourable Member. In May of this year, the then Premier stated that in so far as the Public Service is concerned, the requirement that employees of the Crown must become members of a registered industrial union had not been varied. I have given directions that the current memorandum be withdrawn and that any future memoranda be in accordance with this declared policy."

TRANSPORT FACILITIES FOR NORTH CHERMSIDE AND GEEBUNG AREAS

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

(1) What progress has been made in the long-drawn-out and seemingly never-ending investigation of the alleviation of the transport problem for the hundreds of families in the North Chermside and Geebung areas, who are completely isolated from normal transport facilities?

(2) Will he give an assurance that the residents of these areas will be given the major consideration and not be made the scapegoats in any consideration that might arise as to whether the Government Railways or the city transport system might benefit from their patronage?

Answers:—

(1) "Improvements to the transport services in the Chermside and Geebung areas have been hampered and delayed by the failure of the local private bus operator and the Brisbane City Council to reach finality in negotiations for the acquisition of the privately-owned service in the area by the Council. The Commissioner for Transport has repeatedly pressed the parties to either reach agreement or inform him that negotiations have completely collapsed. In the latter event, the Commissioner would take immediate steps to invite applications by public advertisement from persons interested in establishing a satisfactory bus service in the area. The statement that hundreds of families in the area are completely isolated from normal transport facilities is not correct. At present the area is serviced by rail, private bus service and by the City Council service.

The Commissioner for Transport realises there is room for improvement and re-organisation and has been working to that end."

(2) "The Honourable Member is assured that in considering alterations or additions to public transport systems wherever they are located, the Commissioner for Transport takes only the public interest into consideration and is not motivated by considerations as to whether the Government railways or any other city transport system might benefit from the patronage to be gained. I might add the Honourable Member for Aspley has made numerous representations to me on the subject as the areas referred to are also in the Aspley electorate."

SPEEDIER HANDLING OF SHARE TRANSACTIONS

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

(1) Has he received from small investors complaints in recent months relative to the flow of share scrip?

(2) As many large-scale mining and oil companies and even sharebrokers' offices employ, in a number of instances, only skeleton staff to handle the many and increasing transactions, is there any way under the present Companies Act whereby he can insist on and obtain a far better service than is at present meted out to the small investor?

(3) As much embarrassment is being caused at present to persons of modest means who desire ready cash, is there machinery in the abovementioned Act whereby registers of shareholders can be insisted on as opposed to the issuing of scrip at all or alternatively for the introduction of a system based on signatures of shareholders as practised by the Southern Electric Authority over a number of years as opposed to scrip issue?

Answers:—

(1) "One such complaint has been received by me."

(2) "Under section 99 (1) of *The Companies Acts, 1961 to 1964*," of this State every company is required, within one month after the date on which a transfer of any of its shares is lodged with the company, to complete and have ready for delivery all the appropriate certificates in connection with the transfer. I believe uniform legislation is had throughout Australia in this regard."

(3) "Each company is obliged under the Acts to have a register of members but no machinery is provided therein for the introduction of a system based on signatures of shareholders as practised by the Southern Electric Authority. I might add that I am informed that complaints

have been received by the Stock Exchanges as to the delay in the issuing of share certificates by companies, by reason of the tremendous increase of speculative buying. The Stock Exchanges have taken these complaints up with the companies concerned. Some companies have overcome the previous delay while others are endeavouring to remedy the position despite difficulty in obtaining additional trained staff."

AIR POLLUTION, GLADSTONE

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

(1) In view of a public statement recently made by the Chairman of the Queensland Air Pollution Council, Dr. B. M. Gabriell, that the Queensland Government will soon consider whether to extend the Clean Air Act to include Gladstone, Mt. Isa and Townsville, has any positive move been made Departmentally in this regard?

(2) What personnel at present comprise the Department or Sub-Department administering the Clean Air Act?

(3) As a large sulphuric acid plant is shortly contemplated for the Gladstone waterfront area, have any approaches been made to his Department relative to its construction?

(4) In view of the large-scale public disquiet that could possibly be associated with the construction of this plant, is it possible to enlist the services of the Director of Air Pollution and his engineers and have them visit the town of Gladstone to ensure that (a) the acid factory is located sufficiently away from prevailing breezes so as not to constitute a hazard to people, to their health and to their homes and (b) the ultimate in pollution control will be installed in this factory so as to minimize what could be a grave and serious menace?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes, as a preliminary to extending control to centres other than Brisbane and Ipswich my Department proposes to appoint another air pollution control engineer."

(2) "The staff at present consists of the Director of Air Pollution Control, a control engineer, a senior chemist, a laboratory technician, and a clerk-typist. Additionally, positions for a laboratory mechanic and a laboratory attendant have been advertised."

(3) "The manager, Mount Morgan Mines, has already approached the Director of Air Pollution Control on the design of a sulphuric acid plant in Gladstone which will meet the requirements of the

Clean Air Act if and when this is proclaimed in Gladstone. This action is commendable and indicates that management desires to co-operate with the Air Pollution Control Council."

(4) "(a) Until Gladstone is proclaimed as an area to which the Clean Air Act will apply, my Department is not in a position to approve or disapprove of any site. (b) See Answer to (3) above."

CONTRIBUTIONS BY ROCKHAMPTON RAILWAY EMPLOYEES TO Q.A.T.B.

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

In view of the rising costs of maintaining a free ambulance service at Rockhampton, will he reconsider the Commissioner for Railways' decision on ambulance collections at Rockhampton and allow the General Manager to make deductions from the wages of any section of the railway employees who wish to contribute to the Q.A.T.B., Rockhampton?

Answer:—

"At present there are thirty-four deductions accounted for through the Railway paysheets; to increase that number would involve additional clerical work and affect the paying programme. As a number of organisations were seeking similar arrangements for periodic payments, it was decided that no additional deductions would be made because of the extra cost involved."

X-RAY EQUIPMENT, TOWNSVILLE GENERAL HOSPITAL

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

(1) What type of X-ray equipment is to be installed in the new wing presently under construction at the Townsville General Hospital?

(2) What will be the cost of the equipment and when is it likely to be installed?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "Recommendations from the Queensland Radium Institute for the supply and installation of equipment in the X-ray department of the new outpatients block at the Townsville hospital are presently under consideration. It is anticipated that a decision will be made shortly and a copy of the advice sent to the Board will be made available to the Honourable Member for his information."

TOWNSVILLE ABATTOIR

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

(1) What was the throughput for the years 1962 to 1968 for cattle, calves, sheep and pigs at the Townsville abattoir?

(2) What were the meat introductions into the Townsville abattoir area for the years 1966, 1967 and 1968?

(3) Have killing fees been lately increased for cattle, calves, sheep and pigs? If so, what was the old charge and what is the new?

(4) What are the present killing charges of these animals at the abattoirs in Bundaberg, Ipswich and Toowoomba?

(5) Did the Townsville abattoir finish the year with a surplus or a deficit? If a deficit, to what is it attributed?

Answer:—

(1 to 5) "I am arranging for the information sought by the Honourable Member for Townsville North to be assembled and will make it available as soon as practicable."

SUPPLY OF MEAT TO LAVARACK ARMY BARRACKS, TOWNSVILLE

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

(1) Why was the successful tenderer for the supply of meat to the Lavarack Army Barracks not required to kill through the Townsville abattoir and where is this meat processed?

(2) If it were a question of hygiene, why does a recent call for tenders for the supply of pork, mutton, lamb, etc. state that the meat must be processed through the municipal abattoir?

(3) Does the processing of the meats call for less hygienic methods?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) "The calling of tenders for the supply of meat to the Lavarack Army Barracks is a matter for the Commonwealth. However, tenderers are required to comply with the provisions of "The Meat Industry Act of 1965" which ensures that the necessary standards of hygiene are observed. Operators at the Townsville District Abattoir have equal opportunity with other operators to tender for this supply. The latter however are required to obtain a consent for the introduction of meat into the Area, which is ordinarily given if the source of supply meets hygiene standards. Pigs, sheep and calves are not normally killed at nearby export works."

DAMAGE TO RAILWAY BRIDGE, MT. ISA LINE

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

Further to his Answer to my Question on March 20, 1968, relative to the damaged railway bridge near Nelia, has the Board of Enquiry appointed to enquire into the

matter completed its investigations and, if so, what are its findings and what recommendations have been made by it?

Answer:—

"The Board of Inquiry has completed its investigations and has submitted a report to the Commissioner for Railways. The Commissioner is studying the report. The recommendations of the Board were—

(1) No attempt be made to re-use the substructure and two damaged spans of Bridge No. 226. The good spans should be used as spares or to lengthen other bridges on the Mt. Isa. Project.

(2) The following guiding principles be adopted in the design of a new bridge in lieu of Bridge No. 226:—(a) The rail level be placed at or about the "2 year" flood R.L., which is the approximate level of the original Bridge No. 371. (b) The new bridge length be of the same order as that of Bridge No. 371. (c) The bridge be designed to cause minimum obstruction to flood flow. (d) Rail level on the new bridge extend on the approach embankments as far as practicable.

The Commissioner assures me that in the design of the new bridge these recommendations have been adopted. The new bridge will be completed in early November, 1968."

COMPREHENSIVE MOTOR VEHICLE INSURANCE PREMIUMS

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

(1) On what basis do insurers increase the comprehensive premium charges on standard-built sedan cars which owners alter principally by lowering the chassis?

(2) For what reason were premiums increased on thirty-six high-powered motor vehicles from May 1, 1968?

(3) Has any basic review, in the light of over twelve months' experience, taken place regarding the premium ratings as outlined in categories of vehicles under the alleged "Safety Record Plan," which commenced on February 1, 1967? If not, why not, and if so, what were the findings?

Answers:—

(1) "If the Honourable Member will let me have specific details of any increase so levied, I will have the matter investigated."

(2) "Because of adverse claims experience."

(3) "A full twelve months' statistics of the Safety Record Plan has recently been received by the Insurance Commissioner and is at present under examination."

SUGAR EXPORTS

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

(1) What will be Queensland's free market export tonnage of sugar for 1969 and at what price per ton?

(2) How do these figures compare with those of 1967 and 1968?

(3) What tonnages are anticipated for export to the United Kingdom and the United States of America and at what price per ton?

Answers:—

(1) "Australia's sales to the free market during the 1969 calendar year (to which it is assumed the Honourable Member refers) will be determined by the quota allotted under a new International Sugar Agreement, should this be negotiated in October. In any event it is not possible at present to determine the quantity of sugar which will be available for free market sales during the year in question. Calendar year sales comprise sugars from two seasons and neither the 1968 season harvest nor plantings for 1969 are complete. The price provisions of the International Sugar Agreement also have still to be negotiated. It must be understood, of course, that free market prices vary from day to day and hence are unpredictable."

(2) "The price declared for free market sales (including those to preferential areas) during the 1967 season was \$38.55 per ton 94 net titre. The quantity sold was approximately 1.1m. long tons."

(3) "The price for Australia's deliveries to the United Kingdom under the British Commonwealth Sugar Agreement during 1969 will not be determined until November. The annual quantity is now fixed at 335,000 long tons. Australia's basic annual tonnage for delivery to the United States of America is 156,725 long tons. The return to the Australian sugar industry is based on the ruling United States of America domestic price at the time of sale."

FOUR-LANE SECTIONS, BRUCE HIGHWAY

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

(1) Is it proposed to construct a four-lane highway between Beerburum and Landsborough?

(2) What is the daily average number of vehicles on the Bruce Highway using (a) the four lanes between the Maroochydore turnoff and Nambour and (b) the two lanes between Beerburum and Landsborough, during (i) week days, (ii) the Christmas-New Year and (iii) the Easter holidays?

(3) What is the length of the four-lane highway between the Maroochydore turn-off and Nambour and what did it cost to construct?

(4) What is the cost of the highway construction between Burpengary and Landsborough and what additional cost would be involved in now making this a four-lane highway?

Answers:—

(1) "Not in the immediate future."

(2) "Traffic counts—(a) between Maroochydore turnoff and Nambour—Average annual daily traffic, 4,619; (i) Week day average daily, 3,811; (ii) Christmas/New Year average daily, 5,140; (iii) Easter holidays daily, 6,000; (b) Beerburum — Landsborough—Average annual daily traffic, 5,110; (i), (ii) and (iii) Figures not available. (No permanent counter installed)."

(3) "Length 4½ miles. Cost \$761,000."

(4) "Length 2¼ miles. Cost—Burpengary—Glasshouse Mountains, \$1,900,000; Cost to complete to Landsborough, \$400,000; Total, \$2,300,000. The estimated cost of providing an additional two lanes based on current contract prices would be \$2,400,000."

OVERLOADING OF RAILWAY WAGONS
UNDER CONTRACT RATES TO NORTH
QUEENSLAND

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

(1) Further to his Answers to my Questions on December 6, 1967, and March 20, 1968, concerning extensive incidents of overloading rail wagons subject to contract rates to northern ports under distributing agents or other contract rates, have the investigations been completed?

(2) If so, is he now in a position to disclose the findings in relation to names of defaulting firms, outstanding amounts involved and the loss of revenue to the Railway Department over the period the contract rates have operated?

(3) What action is proposed to be taken to recoup these amounts?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) "As advised the Honourable Member on March 20, 1968, the investigations are extensive. They are still not complete. I am sure the Honourable Member would agree that it would be improper for me to make any statement until the investigations are complete. The papers associated with these investigations have been placed in the hands of the police."

GREAT BARRIER REEF INVESTIGATION:
REPORT OF DR. H. S. LADD

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

(1) Will he outline the detail of the itinerary and field programme in North Queensland of Dr. H. S. Ladd, American Marine Geologist and coral reef expert on visit to Queensland from the U.S.A. by invitation of the Minister, as recorded in *The Cairns Post* of May 2, 1968, to carry out special investigations on the Great Barrier Reef, said to be completed on May 26 last?

(2) Will the report, expected in July, be made available to Honourable Members?

Answers:—

(1) "The Itinerary and field programme of Dr. H. S. Ladd was:—May 3—Brisbane—Gladstone, by aircraft. May 4—Gladstone—Heron Island, by launch. May 5, 6—Examination of Heron Island and Wistari Reefs, by launch. May 7—Heron Island—Gladstone, by helicopter. May 8—Gladstone—Rockhampton—Swain Reefs—Mackay—Whitsunday Group—Outer Barrier—Burdekin delta—Townsville, by aircraft. May 9—Conference at University College, Townsville; Townsville—Outer Barrier—Townsville, by aircraft. May 10, 11—Proposed launch trip to various reefs abandoned because of high winds. May 12—Examination of Magnetic Island and reef flats, by launch; Townsville—Cairns, by aircraft. May 13—Cairns. May 14—Cairns—Horn Island, by aircraft; Horn Island—Warrior Reefs—Outer Barrier—Horn Island, by aircraft; to Thursday Island by launch. May 15—Examination of reefs off Great and Little Woody Islands, and reef off Possession Island, by launch. May 16—Examination of reefs off Waiweer Island, by launch. May 17—Horn Island—Cairns, by plane. May 18—Cairns—Cape Flattery—Outer Barrier—Innisfail—Cairns, by aircraft; Cairns—Port Douglas—Cairns, by car. May 19, 21—Cairns—Innisfail, by aircraft; Innisfail—Green Island—Cairns, by launch (rough weather prevented landings on reefs other than Green Island). May 22—Cairns—Mackay—Shute Harbour, by plane; to South Molle Island by launch. May 23—South Molle Island—Outer Barrier—South Molle Island, by launch. May 24—South Molle Island—Dent Island—Long Island—Shute Harbour, by launch; Shute Harbour—Outer Barrier—Lindeman Island, by aircraft. May 25—Lindeman Island—Brampton Island, by aircraft. May 26—Brampton Island—Mackay—Brisbane, by aircraft."

(2) "The report is at present being studied by my departmental officers and when their comments have been examined a decision will be made on the publication of the report."

COMMEMORATION OF CAPTAIN COOK'S
VOYAGE ALONG QUEENSLAND COAST

Mr. R. Jones, pursuant to notice, asked
The Premier,—

(1) Is appropriate action anticipated by his Government separate from or in conjunction with the Commonwealth Government to initiate commemoration ceremonies in 1970 for the 200th anniversary of the historic voyage by Lieutenant James Cook, R.N., along the Queensland coast?

(2) Is it the intention of his Government to take the opportunity of this unique occasion to undertake world-wide tourist publicity and promotion to identify Queensland, the Barrier Reef and the adjacent islands of the coastline and Torres Strait with the voyage and to commemorate the enactment of Captain Cook taking possession of the East Coast of Australia in the name of the Crown?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "Yes. Steps have already been taken towards this end."

PAPERS

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

Reports—

The Nominal Defendant (Queensland) for the year 1967-68.

The Auditor-General under the Supreme Court Funds Acts, 1895 to 1958," for the year 1967-68.

The President of the Industrial Court of Queensland for the year 1967-68.

FORM OF QUESTIONS

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) having given notice of a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I do not know whether the hon. member for Townsville South is trying to be funny or facetious, but the Premier is not in any way obliged to answer such questions and I am not obliged to accept them, and I will not. It is making a mockery of question time in this Parliament.

Mr. AIKENS: I think it was the most important question today. There was nothing funny about it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. THACKERAY (Rockhampton North) proceeding to give notice of a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! the hon. member's question appears to contain more detail than question.

Mr. THACKERAY: It is seeking information.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! It is seeking an expression of opinion. I shall have a very close look at it.

Mr. THACKERAY: I shall continue with the paragraph and you can put the scissors through it where necessary.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! If the hon. member for Rockhampton North is trying to be facetious he has missed the beat entirely. The statement is often made that I put the scissors through questions. I vet them. I can assure the hon. member that I shall pay very close attention to his question. If he continues at any further length I shall have to rule it out of order because it is too lengthy.

Mr. THACKERAY: I will let it go at that. I will finish there and you can have a good look at it later on.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (12.17 p.m.), by leave: In "The Courier-Mail" this morning I am reported as having called, when the hon. member for Townsville South gave notice of a question about Brisbane's tram and bus strike, "You only want the Government to put the boot into us". I realise the difficulty in the Press gallery of catching an interjection in these circumstances, but I want to record the fact that the report is in error in the use of the word "us". The word I used was "them", meaning the striking unionists. My remark was, "You only want the Government to put the boot into them".

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) (12.18 p.m.), by leave: On Saturday, 27 July, Sunday, 28 July, and Monday, 29 July, 1968, I, accompanied by Mr. E. Wallis-Smith, M.L.A., Mr. H. Dean, M.L.A. and Mr. Peter Wood, M.L.A., visited Edward River and Mitchell River Aboriginal Stations, travelling on a chartered Bush Pilots' aircraft from Cairns.

Apparently for some political gain, statements were made and an untrue rumour is circulating that the trip was wholly financed by some political party, company, or person, and that the members concerned pocketed the \$10 a day allowance payable under the Done Committee's recommendation.

I wish to state quite definitely that all expenses incurred, including board at the various stations, were met equally by the members themselves, and by no other party, company, or person. It is true that in some cases the members took advantage, quite legitimately, of the parliamentary scheme to travel to Cairns, but thereafter the costs were our own responsibility.

SITTING DAYS

Hon. R. E. CAMM (Whitsunday—Minister for Mines, Main Roads and Electricity), for **Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier): I move—

"That, unless otherwise ordered, the House will meet for the dispatch of business at 11 o'clock a.m. on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday in each week, and that on Tuesdays and Wednesdays and after 1 o'clock p.m. on Thursdays, Government business shall take precedence of all other business."

Motion agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

TEMPORARY CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY AND WAYS AND MEANS

APPROPRIATION BILL No. 1

Hon. R. E. CAMM (Whitsunday—Minister for Mines, Main Roads and Electricity), for **Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier): I move—

"That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would otherwise prevent the constitution of Committees of Supply and Ways and Means, the receiving of Resolutions on the same day as they shall have passed in those Committees, and the passing of an Appropriation Bill through all its stages in one day."

Motion agreed to.

OVERTIME PAID IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. BROMLEY (Norman), for **Mr. HARRIS** (Wynnum): I move—

"That there be laid upon the table of the House a return showing the amount of overtime paid in each Government department (all funds) in 1967-68."

Motion agreed to.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

Debate resumed from 21 August (see p. 29) on Mr. Pilbeam's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (12.21 p.m.): As the first speaker on behalf of the Opposition, I wish to assure His Excellency the Governor that members of the Opposition fully endorse the statement contained in his Opening Speech that nothing must occur that will lessen our attachment to the Throne, weaken our true democracy or impair the functioning of our democratic institutions.

I listened with great interest to the Opening Speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor and also to the speeches by the hon. member for Rockhampton South and the hon. member for Landsborough. The

Speech by the Governor was certainly not very long. Of course, this is not surprising as he did not have much to talk about in the way of new achievements during the year. I think I can say with truth that the main boast will come from the Treasurer later in the year when he brings down his Budget. Even then, I am confident that the Opposition will be able to show quite conclusively that, on the one hand, the Treasurer over-taxed the people last year and also in the preceding year, and, on the other hand, that he has not spent the money at all wisely.

However, it is not my purpose on this occasion to speak on, or make reference to, what we normally term primary Budget matters. After carefully studying the Governor's Speech, Opposition members feel there is much more that we expected him to say—much more reference to legislation that is contemplated; much more reference to the programme of desired water conservation, of desired reforestation, of desired agricultural and pastoral developments. We believe he could have said much more regarding main roads, much more on education, and certainly much more relative to road safety. These are the things we believe the Governor's advisers should have told him about. We also believe that more could have been said about the decentralisation of our State and the breaking down of our once proud boast that Queensland was the most decentralised State of the Commonwealth.

For these and many other reasons, I, on behalf of the Opposition, now move the following amendment:—

“Add the words—

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

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

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

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

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

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

In his Opening Speech the Governor referred to the export of our minerals, and apparently the Government is very pleased that it is able to export such great quantities of our minerals. The Opposition has no objection at all to exporting that which is surplus to our needs; that which, after careful investigation, is found to be not required for home consumption in the foreseeable future—provided that there is a safeguard for future generations.

After all, when we look back on our own childhood we see that things that were considered impossible in those days are now accomplished facts. Early writers spoke of things in space, wrist-watch radios, television, and such. We thought it was fiction; but today, of course, these things are realities. So in our planning for the use of our natural resources we cannot take for granted that anything may not be wanted in the future; we have to base the whole of our planning on the assumption that it may be required. We cannot squander our natural resources; but this is what the Government is doing today in a desire to court favour with overseas countries and to boast that it is achieving markets. This is its basis for its claim of development. To this, the Opposition strongly objects.

Many of these mineral fields were discovered not last week or the week before but years ago. It is true that they were not developed. At that stage it was not economically sound to develop them. It is also true that this Government has brought in overseas capital and overseas investors. In fact, whole companies have come here and taken over our natural resources and developed them and exploited them overseas, and the stage has been reached where every field of mineral that is easily accessible and has a market potential is very quickly becoming unavailable to the Australian people. We find that these companies, which are owned exclusively outside Australia, are getting leases of mineral fields and are tying up contracts with overseas companies to such an extent that if large deposits of iron-ore were discovered in this State in a few years' time we would have to barter with overseas nations to be able to purchase some of our coal to work our own steel industry.

Mr. Camm: That's ridiculous.

Mr. HOUSTON: The Minister might say it is ridiculous, but the facts do not show that; the facts show quite conclusively that he is giving everything away. If he listens a bit longer he will see how and why.

It is all very well to boast of large contracts for sale to Japanese markets; but let us not lose sight of the fact that in the terms of these contracts there is no safeguard at all that the Australian consumer will receive priority in obtaining his supplies of any of these minerals that may be required to bring about industrial development in this State.

Mr. Camm: You don't know what the conditions are.

Mr. HOUSTON: I know better than the Minister knows what the conditions are, and I know that there is no guarantee at all. There is not one bit of evidence to show that there is. All that an overseas company has to do is to say, "We have to fulfil this commitment, otherwise we lose the contract," and that is the end of it. The primary importance as far as the company is concerned is honouring the contract that the Minister has endorsed.

Mr. Camm: That's right.

Mr. HOUSTON: That is true. If the company requires more to fulfil its contract, what is left for the Australian consumer if he wants it? And we hope that the Australian consumers will want it in the near future with the discovery of iron-ore. This position is not peculiar to Queensland; unfortunately, every anti-Labour Government throughout this Commonwealth is doing the same thing, and the discovery of iron-ore in Western Australia is another example. I am concerned about Queensland. I am concerned that, in the future, Queenslanders who want to start industries may have to buy back from foreign investors what was their natural heritage.

The Opposition strongly condemns the Government for allowing this situation to develop. We were told that when these companies came here they would provide railways. Does the Government deny that? Does it deny that the agreement on which it is now relying originally stipulated that the company would provide the railway line to Moura? Again, in the Weipa agreement the company said, "We will build the port; we will provide the houses; we will look after the Aboriginal people who live there."

Mr. Camm: Do you want to pass our railways and ports over to foreign enterprise?

Mr. HOUSTON: It was the Government's agreement. The Government brought the agreement to this House—or one of its Ministers did. We were told that the company was to build the Moura railway line. The Minister may deny that, but it is the truth. Who does the Minister say wants to give it away? The only reason the Government did not carry on with that proposal was

that once the company got the Government's signature it told the Government to jump in the lake. It told the Government that the Government had to provide the railway lines.

As I continue I will point out other things for which the Government signed a contract but which it has not carried out. We object to this attitude. We were told that when these companies came here they would provide the railways; we were told that they would provide the houses; we were told that they were to provide the port facilities and many other things; but we find that State money is being used for these purposes.

It may be argued that, for the State to develop, such services must be provided. But they are not being provided for the general community; they are being provided for the sole purpose of allowing individual companies to reap the whole benefit.

A Government Member: That is not right.

Mr. HOUSTON: The hon. member can make his own speech. I am giving the facts.

Mr. Camm interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: The Minister is very interested, but can he tell me what other companies are getting benefits at Weipa? Are other companies using the Weipa port? Of course they are not. It was built purely and simply for the development of the Weipa bauxite field. The company promised to look after the Aborigines in the area, but how many of them are working on the site?

Mr. Houghton: That is because they would not work.

Mr. HOUSTON: Don't talk nonsense. What a statement to make! I will tell the hon. member later why the Aborigines are not working.

Mr. Davies: What racial prejudice!

Mr. HOUSTON: There is no doubt about that. What a great type of agreement the Government entered into!

Mr. Sullivan interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: Can the Minister tell me the name of any other industry that is operating at Weipa today? Name one!

Mr. Sullivan interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: There has not been one. All the developments there have been for this particular industry. What other industries have been developed on the new coal fields?

Mr. Chinchen: What do you expect?

Mr. HOUSTON: I expect a lot more development; I expect the Government's propaganda to have some real basis.

Only recently the Treasurer went to the United States of America seeking finance to build a large power-house. The previous Treasurer, too, went over there to get money, but came back without it. The questions I intend to ask are—

Mr. Chinchen: We are waiting.

Mr. HOUSTON: If the hon. member listens, I will tell him. I will give him time to write them down.

What is wrong with the Commonwealth Government when it cannot assist Queensland in the provision of this much-needed power complex? Let the Government answer that one for a start. If it cannot answer that question, let it answer this one: why have not these companies, which are supposed to be so wealthy, which have had so much done for them and which have been spoon-fed here, agreed to make money available for the building of this power-house? They are the ones who will get the benefit from it. What do we want the power-house for primarily? Is it not for an aluminium works? What is wrong with these companies?

Mr. Walsh: Mount Isa did it.

Mr. HOUSTON: That is true. Mount Isa did it. We have only to go to Tasmania and look at the iron-ore development there to see that the houses and everything else are provided by the company itself. It made its own provisions, under a Labour Government.

Mr. Camm: Are you in favour of electricity-generating stations being built by private enterprise in Queensland?

Mr. HOUSTON: As far as I am concerned, I want electricity development in this State.

Mr. Camm: By private enterprise?

Mr. HOUSTON: I will answer that one as I go along, and I will tell the Minister in detail how he can get it.

Mr. Camm: Be a little bit consistent.

Mr. HOUSTON: I am quite consistent.

Mr. Camm: Go and ask Macdonald, of the Trades and Labour Council, what you have to do.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HOUSTON: What the Government requires for power-stations, or any other development, is money. But the control of power in this State should be in the hands of the people. Let there be no doubt or argument about that.

I shall wait until the House quietens down a little so that the Minister can hear distinctly and plainly what the Opposition view is in the matter. Let me say that the companies have to assist in the development, as they are reaping the benefit from it. Money that is spent on behalf of these companies is not available for other purposes. Companies that come to Queensland and get our natural wealth have contributed little to the State's development in the provision of money required for these other facilities.

It could be argued that it is the carriage of these products by the railways that made the railway lines pay and that we will get a return over a period of time. Perhaps it could be said that houses and amenities have to be provided for people to go and work

at these places, as in most cases they are isolated. But this is only being done at the expense of something else.

While railways were being constructed to these places and while port facilities were being built, power-houses were not being built and developed. While homes are being provided on these fields, they are not being provided in other places. Workers who work for small industries, workers who work for small concerns and workers who work for other than these big companies have been denied homes.

Mr. Camm: They have not.

Mr. HOUSTON: Of course they have. The Government has only so much money to spend on State housing, and if houses are built exclusively on these coal fields, how can they be built in other places? In Tasmania and in other States of this Commonwealth, the companies concerned are building the houses out of their own financial backing and allowing the State to build houses for the general public and not just specifically for those who happen to work for those companies.

Mr. Walsh: Mount Isa Mines Ltd. did that under a Labour Government.

Mr. HOUSTON: That is very true, and so did Mary Kathleen Uranium Ltd., again under a Labour Government. And this Government is claiming that it is doing so much. It is selling Queensland out. And, of course, it is doing it for another reason, too. The Government knows full well that if an employee is living in a house that is controlled by the company he works for and not by the State, the company can certainly put a fairly heavy hand on him relative to industrial action.

Mr. Chinchin: That is what you just said you wanted.

Mr. HOUSTON: Go back to sleep.

Workers who are employed by small industries and small concerns in various parts of this State are missing out. They are forced to pay high rents, in some cases for most unsuitable accommodation, while the best possible accommodation is being provided elsewhere, just to make sure that these companies are allowed to take our natural wealth from us.

Last year the hon. member for Belmont and I visited one of these mining places and he can tell you the same as I can, namely, that we saw four-bedroom homes there. Where, in Brisbane or any other place, can a four-bedroom home be made readily available for our people?

Mr. Newton: One bedroom was being used as an art studio.

Mr. HOUSTON: That is right. We said to the fellow who had occupancy of it, "You must have a large family." He said, "No, I have a couple of small boys."

Mr. Camm: He is working on it.

Mr. HOUSTON: He has not been very successful, because he has had no more children since. I often wondered why Ministers visited these places. It was certainly not to advance the State, but to see how the local population was getting on.

At any rate, we found that this fellow had two young boys. Even if he did have other children, surely two or three bedrooms would have been sufficient. We inquired why he had a home with four bedrooms. He said, "My wife likes painting and she likes a room that she can shut off from the rest of the house so that the kiddies won't interfere with her." Surely we are not using State money to provide homes for people like that—and this fellow was not a worker in the general sense of that word but one of the higher-paid officials who could well afford to provide his own home. I will not mention the name of the company, because I am not particularly interested in the individual as such. It is the principle that is wrong.

Mr. Chinchon: Are you sure that the company did not subscribe money for that house?

Mr. HOUSTON: I am sure. The State provided it.

Mr. Chinchon: All the money?

Mr. HOUSTON: All the money for that housing. It could be argued that the winning of this wealth is providing a return to the State. Certainly royalties are being paid, but what a pittance they are! Our mineral royalties would be the lowest of those payable anywhere in the world.

Mr. Camm: They are twice as much as they were when you were in power.

Mr. HOUSTON: That is nonsense. The royalty was then 6d. a ton on coal, and it is still 5c a ton.

Mr. Camm: It was 1d. a ton over 1,000,000 tons.

Mr. HOUSTON: That is right, and what was the coal being used for? It was being used for local consumption. I shall come to that later if the Minister cares to stay around. It would be hard to find any other nation that has received so little for its natural resources. At the recent inquiry into off-shore oil resources, did the Minister for Mines, or any of the other Ministers, give evidence? Did they back their statements in this House? Did they appear at the inquiry and submit themselves to cross-examination by senators of all political parties who were interested not in politics but in getting facts?

Mr. Camm: Are you so naive that you are trying to make that out?

Mr. HOUSTON: There were two A.L.P. members against seven Government supporters.

Mr. Camm: That is right.

Mr. HOUSTON: That is right. Surely the Minister was not frightened to stand up to them when the odds were 7 to 2 in his favour.

All that the Minister did was to send one of his departmental officers to the inquiry. I say shame on the Minister for giving that responsibility to a departmental officer when he himself should have been carrying it. This is the Minister's responsibility—he is the Minister of the Crown—but he did not go before the committee of inquiry to justify the royalties that he has forced on this State. In America the royalty rate is 16½ per cent.

Mr. Camm: No, it is not.

Mr. HOUSTON: It is.

Mr. Camm: It is not. I have just come back from there.

Mr. HOUSTON: Then the Minister did not find out the truth. He should have kept away from the places that he went to and learnt something of what was going on. It is 16½ per cent. in America.

Mr. Camm: No, it is not.

Mr. HOUSTON: It is. If the Minister thinks that that is incorrect, let him go before the Committee members and tell them about it. They are the ones who are sifting the evidence, and I rely on their judgment.

I can understand royalties being low if the mineral is being used to create employment within our own country. The Minister referred to the royalty of 1d. a ton that was once paid on coal. It is true that that was the royalty, but that coal from the Ipswich field was, in the first place, won from underground, and, in the second place, it was being used to fire the boilers of power-houses to assist other industries. It was being used for the production of gas for homes and industries, and by the railways.

Mr. Camm: You took that out of the information that I gave you last year when I replied to you. That is exactly what I said.

Mr. HOUSTON: I am glad the Minister agrees with me. After all, I have had more experience in this type of thing than he has. I can understand that royalties should be low when they create further development within our State, but there is no justification at all for "give away" royalties when the minerals are going overseas. Coal from the mines of Ipswich was used for our own purposes, whereas coal being exported to Japan is used solely to create industries in Japan and assist the work-force in that country. We have reached the ridiculous situation in this country of building a pipeline and being unable to manufacture it here; we have to go to Japan to get the pipes to carry out the job.

Mr. Camm: Whom do you blame for that?

Mr. HOUSTON: I blame the lack of a desire to make this State go ahead.

When the massive industrial development of Japan since the war is considered and the way in which its millions are kept in employment on a standard of living which is fast catching up with ours, it is realised that the

Japanese are the ones who are getting the major benefit from our coal. They are the ones who are benefiting from the failure to house our people suitably and the lack of advancement in our State in so many fields.

Where, then, is the balance? If we are going to provide the things that these companies want, if we are going to allow them to export our natural resources for the creation of employment in, and development of, their own countries, surely we should demand that they contribute something to our State's general welfare. As I said, the Government, in its approach to royalty value, in its approach to returns to the State for the capital outlay, is selling us out.

The Governor said in his Opening Speech that on last year's Budget, we were nearly \$1,000,000 in front. All this means is that, on a balanced Budget, we either overtaxed the people \$1,000,000 or we spent \$1,000,000 less of what was available to us than we should have.

Mr. Hanlon: It is "Chalkie's" election piggy-bank.

Mr. HOUSTON: Whatever the answer is, even if it is some position in between, I think it is quite clear that many more millions should, and could, have been spent over the last few years to accelerate Queensland's development and make sure that the people were getting the things to which they were entitled. A larger royalty payment would have been of great assistance in this respect.

In the amendment that I have moved to the motion, I said that medical services require more money. Surely no-one will deny that we need many more hospitals. I know it can be argued that, as a State, we have so many beds for so many patients. But is this a real indication? People require services where they live. The number of beds required depends not upon the number of beds per head of population but upon the availability of beds and the desirability of having hospitals and hospital services in certain locations. I believe that in Brisbane, for example, because of the many traffic and parking problems experienced at the three major hospitals, the time is long overdue when we should consider having hospitals of a smaller type and having at least first-class convalescent hospitals in the main outlying suburbs.

Mr. Tooth: Did you read the comments on the size of hospitals made in Sydney recently by leaders in this field?

Mr. HOUSTON: We listened to the Minister's contribution from leaders of the chiropractors when the Bill dealing with chiropractors was being debated; and look at the trouble that got him into!

Queensland's convalescent homes, particularly those for the aged, are now so expensive that the average person cannot afford to stay

at them. "Eventide" is badly overcrowded, and it certainly is not up to the standard of the modern accommodation available for senior citizens in other States.

Mr. Tooth: When did you come back?

Mr. HOUSTON: I have just come back from an extended visit to Tasmania, and I am very proud to be a member of the same party that is in Government there and is doing so much.

Mr. Tooth: Where else did you go besides Tasmania?

Mr. HOUSTON: The Minister can ask me later. I will give him details and the names and addresses of the places.

Those of us who have had the opportunity of seeing what other States have done in this field must surely feel, as I do, that it is about time we began looking after those to whom we so often refer as the pioneers, those to whom we give credit for making this country what it is. Surely we owe them something more than just to put them into institutions where the best we can offer them is a bed in a ward.

Mr. Armstrong: Do you know what Labour Governments did for them when they were in power?

Mr. HOUSTON: To boast of development and progress without looking after our aged people is to have a completely wrong idea of what progress means.

I should like to refer also to the lack of appreciation of the work of our nursing services, the lack of a realisation by the Government that these men and women are entitled to the best training possible. It does not require a lot of money to alter systems. What is required is a recognition that people want to advance, to be able to progress and keep pace with modern development.

Mr. Tooth interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: If the Minister wants to buy in, let him buy in on this one.

Mr. Tooth: I will.

Mr. HOUSTON: I wish you would, and I wish you would do something positive.

Mr. Tooth: You have been listening to the wrong people.

Mr. HOUSTON: I wish you would allow the men and women who want to become proficient in their calling to do so.

Without going into details of the desires and hopes of the nursing profession, I think it is true to say that they have had a raw deal over the years. I trust that the Government will take heed of, and do something to give effect to, the wishes of those who are expert in this field.

We cannot attract doctors to our country centres. Why not? Surely ways and means can be found to make sure that those who

live outside the larger cities can receive the same medical attention as those who live in those cities. Is there any less desire to get well on the part of sick people in the country than there is on the part of those in the city? Is there any less worry for a country mother with a child who is sick than there is for a city mother with a sick child? As a Government, we have to ensure that country hospitals are well staffed and well equipped, and that they certainly have a resident doctor. It is no good crying out that doctors will not go to the country. I believe that if circumstances and conditions are made attractive enough, doctors will go to country areas.

If we are prepared to pay extra money such as site allowances, etc., to workers who have to work under conditions that are recognised as being below the normal standard or undesirable, then we have to treat in the same way people who are required to live in areas which are not as acceptable as other centres.

As to law enforcement, I was very pleased to note recently that the number of unsolved crimes has dropped. It is quite significant that after the Opposition attempted to adjourn the House to debate police administration, there was a sudden desire for some change in the administration of the Police Force. I am very pleased—and I know this applies to my colleagues also—that results have been obtained, but why is it that conditions have to become desperate and critical before any action is taken? Surely the Minister in charge must keep his finger on the pulse of matters within his jurisdiction. He should know what is going on. Surely the Minister in charge should ask questions similar to those that I, and other members of the Opposition, ask in this House, and should have the answers at his finger-tips and take the necessary action to make sure that his department is efficient and modern in its operation. Much more has to be done.

Let me say now that I do not advise the Government to go ahead with plans to break up the Police Force into sections so that each becomes an isolated entity. I think it would be very unwise to separate the administration of traffic and the administration of law enforcement from the detection of crime. To my way of thinking, the purpose of the Police Force is principally the prevention of crime and the upholding of the law. Certainly we must have a Police Force skilled in the detection of crime so that we can point out to the prospective criminal that to carry out his criminal intent will only lead to his arrest and removal to gaol.

From a close investigation of the Government's attitude towards the police over recent years, it becomes evident that it is not prepared to increase, to any large extent, the number of police, nor is it prepared to spend money on ensuring that our Police Force is effective and highly skilled, and supplied with the best equipment.

One of the main things that has to be achieved in the administration of the Police Force is a good public image and I know that the Police Department itself, through the Commissioner, has endeavoured to attain this end through its public relations section. I think this is quite good, but no matter how hard the police work, or what theories or policies they put up, the public will finally judge them on their public activities.

I know that in many cases the job of a policeman is not a happy one. At times he has to do things he would rather not do, but I think it behoves the Government to make sure that the laws are such that, when a policeman has to carry out a duty, he does so in the honest belief that it is a good law, that it is a law that he can administer and enforce, knowing and believing that it is in the interests of the majority of the people.

Surely no policeman would be pleased to be given the job of hiding behind a building or a shrub to try to catch a motorist who is travelling at a speed above the statutory limit. Surely no policeman likes breaking up a march that has a peaceful purpose. These are things that police are asked to do, and surely, as individuals, they would not like doing them. I think it is wrong that our legislation—our direction to our police—makes it necessary for them to carry out such duties.

As to radar traps, I do not think that any denials on the part of the Minister in charge of police, the Police Commissioner, or anyone else, will convince the public that the radar traps are being used for any purpose other than as a money-making instrument. After all, speed is one thing, but speed in relation to prevailing conditions is another.

Although we have a 35-mile-an-hour speed limit in built-up areas, no-one can argue that 40 miles an hour is not safe under normal conditions. In fact, a few years ago, without the benefit of the advances in road engineering and so forth, we had a 40-mile-an-hour speed limit in this city, and the then Minister in charge of police and the Government strongly endorsed this as the speed limit. It was changed to 35 miles an hour to bring Queensland into line with other States, so for people to be charged for travelling at a speed close to, either above or below, 40 miles an hour is getting rather petty, and confirms my belief that it is not the speed that worries the Government but the income that can be derived from those caught exceeding it.

My point here, of course, is that it is not a matter of whether 35 or 40 miles an hour is the right speed, but that the police are being brought into disrepute with the public. This attitude on the part of the Premier in wanting to separate traffic from police administration is a negative way of overcoming the problem.

Let us do away with radar traps at certain locations. If radar must be used, then use it only in areas where there is danger in high speeds. We all realise that on some roads 60 miles an hour is quite safe under good

driving conditions, whereas 25 miles an hour is lunatic under other conditions. If radar has to be used, let it be used with discretion so that those who are caught are in no doubt that they have done the wrong thing, and then no discredit is brought on the Police Force.

Dealing with marches, I know that the law with regard to obtaining permits for marches has stood for a long time, but this has been modified to a point. However, we still have the situation where people who want to distribute literature have to obtain a permit to do so. To my way of thinking, this law may have been all right when it was introduced (I was not a member of this House at the time, and I do not know the circumstances in detail) but surely we cannot argue that people should not have the right to publish a pamphlet if they so desire.

We do not ask the Press to submit to a police officer every article it desires to publish. We do not ask the daily Press, the weekly Press, or any week-end publisher, to seek police or Government authority before an article can be written. We do not ask a person who desires to advertise some commodity to seek from the police a permit to have a handbill printed and handed out. We do not ask the local shopkeeper who wishes to advertise his prices to go to the police for a permit to have them printed and put over fences or in letter-boxes. Why must we go along with the idea that other people should have a permit before they can hand out literature? It cannot be the contents, surely, because another law provides that the names of the publisher and the printer should be clearly shown, and there has been no dispute over the carrying out of that provision. Surely the police are not intended to be judges of pamphlet content. For an article to be worth while, I believe that the names of the publisher or the writer and the printer would have to be disclosed. For instance, I occasionally receive anonymous letters, and they go straight into the wastepaper basket; but a signed letter, whatever the contents, is given due consideration. So it is with printed material. The only factor that could enter the matter is whether or not the handing out of the pamphlet could be creating a public nuisance.

There are other laws that relate to public nuisances, so surely this facet, if it became a problem, could be handled without going to the extreme of pettiness in demanding a permit. It is these petty things that cause the young members of our society to use marches to try to make their point known. It is a way of expression by this age group. What university students have attempted to do over the last few years is no different from what others of previous generations attempted to do.

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

Mr. HOUSTON: Before lunch I was recalling that, in my youth, I did things similar to those that university students have been

attempting to do for a time—not at the university level, but certainly at the same age-group level. As one gets older there are other means of protest at one's disposal. I think the main point is that as one gets older one's association with larger groups becomes less frequent. In the days of the depression there were marches because frequently many people congregated at the same time. Large numbers could be easily organised. The same thing can happen at universities today, but as the students grow older it will not be so easy to organise them in such groups. That does not mean that their ideas have changed, but, as the method of demonstrating is not available so readily and easily, they turn to other ways: by letters to the editor, pressure groups through other organisations—and I might say that the wise ones join political parties. But the individual should be able to voice his protest or make his recommendation known in the way he wishes, provided it does not interfere with the comfort of others. This is freedom.

In my view, there is nothing at all wrong in people demonstrating, provided it is a demonstration to get their point of view across and not a demonstration to force a point of view on other people. If we recognise that people can march, do march and will march to make their point known, let us ensure that the way to do it is made easy so that the police are not required to use authority and force to put into effect a law that is unreasonable and unnecessary.

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

Mr. HOUSTON: I thank the hon. member for Brisbane and the House for this privilege.

The best way for the police to enjoy public respect is for them not to be involved in incidents that involve them in physical conflict with people who have no violent intent.

I agree with the Commissioner that in the solving of major crime the public is most co-operative. Australian people do not like crime or violence, so I would suggest to the Government that laws be framed that will allow a policeman to carry out his duties in the belief and knowledge that what he is doing is right.

Let me now pass on to decentralisation. As we all know, it was Labour's proud boast that Queensland was the most decentralised State in the Commonwealth. We were decentralised because we maintained our population in the several areas of the State, and as our children grew up work was available for them. They did not have to leave their home areas. They could take their places in an expanding district and community. This was good. It is certainly true that unfortunately many of them did not have the opportunity of what we now refer to as "higher education". It is certainly true, too, that many of the roads in those areas were bad, but time and money

can overcome these problems. So one would have thought that with higher education available in their own areas, and with better means of communication and the advent of television, people would be content to remain in country areas. But, on the contrary, they are leaving. In many cases they do not want to leave, but they are forced to do so because of the hard economic reason that if they stay there are no jobs for them; there is no demand for trade and professional skills because the population in these areas is decreasing.

This trend must be stopped. The Government's attitude over the years has been to let many country centres die. Country people have told me that their Country Party members are not concerned with the reduction in population. They are told that they cannot stop progress. The loss of population is not progress. This is bad for Queensland. The closing down of railway centres, the closing down of railway lines, the change-over to dieselisation, the closing of local coal mines—these have all taken toll of the population in many country areas. Surely there is no reason why a town should not develop in the centre of our agricultural industries. In other parts of the world closer settlement is achieved and townships flourish.

Only recently I had the opportunity (and it is to the credit of the late Premier that he took up again the idea of parliamentary missions going overseas) to see what is being done in Malaysia, Taiwan and Japan to encourage closer settlement.

Mr. Carey: It was a most educational trip.

Mr. HOUSTON: That is right, and I hope that later on the hon. member for Albert will get up and support me on these views.

Those countries are making a success of closer settlement, but in Queensland we are leaving everything, as the Government says, to private enterprise. Private enterprise will only function where there is a profit to be obtained. This is private enterprise. This is what we understand by private enterprise. It is not a charitable institution. True, large financial companies will go into an area and be prepared to spend large sums of money for no return for many years, but only when they can see a handsome return over a period of time.

Although this type of investment is necessary in many fields, it cannot be relied on alone. The real decentralisation is in the activities of many small people. It is their effort that develops, and they are the consumers. These are the people who create further development. A town with only a very small population could not possibly support its own baker, garage, milk supply, picture theatre, radio station, doctor and chemist, but once a place has a population of a few thousand, these auxiliary services are required because there is then a demand for them; there is a snowballing effect of one person being of service to another. A decentralised town is then established.

As private enterprise alone has not been able to hold decentralisation, the Government has to come to the aid of these people. It can be done in many ways. Firstly, confidence in our own people is needed—confidence enough to give them financial backing. On analysis, the Government's present policy is only a token effort. Much more practical help is needed. If industry is to be established by private enterprise, naturally it will only be assisted by way of a loan. If it is to be established as a co-operative enterprise between the State and individuals, then more generous consideration should be given.

Whatever method is finally decided on, it is imperative, firstly, that assistance be given to these areas so that they are developed and, secondly, that the people themselves play a part in that development. Once industry is established, housing and other Government amenities must be provided.

The Government's policy on closer settlement is to develop areas and make them available only to those who have heavy financial backing. This is denying an opportunity to many people who desire to go onto the land.

I have mentioned Malaysia and Taiwan. In both these countries the respective Governments (neither of which could be classified as Socialist) recognise that they must develop their land, that there is a need for decentralised development, and they have been able to develop land to a stage of productivity. They have been able to provide accommodation and other amenities for people. Those who have the knowledge and desire to go onto the land are given the opportunity to do so. There is no money barrier nor is there a barrier to available finance. I believe that in Australia, particularly in Queensland, our land development policy is wrong. We will not develop quickly by having a policy of fostering those "who have" and denying those who, although they do not have money, have a great pioneering spirit and experience. Our earlier pioneers obtained land with little money backing them. Most of those who, today, are successful on the land, settled on their blocks under a policy of Government assistance, and it is to the credit of successive Labour Governments that this was so.

The present Government's policy of helping only those who have large financial holdings and backing is completely wrong in my view. If money is available to assist mining companies for large secondary development, I believe that money should be made available to assist people who have the knowledge and desire to pioneer our country areas in both primary and secondary pursuits.

In my amendment I have also mentioned road safety. The Government's attitude on road safety is to catch those who break the law. They believe that the radar trap, the breathalyser, the motor-cycle policeman sitting on his bike watching a "Stop" sign, are the ways to create road safety. They are certainly not my ways. We have advocated

previously that one of the best ways to bring home the need for road safety is to keep the people aware at all times that they have to take care. It has been previously proved that one of the great deterrents to careless driving is the knowledge that there is a policeman along the road, not sitting behind a stump, but travelling either by motor-bike or car along the same road. In other words, the sight of the law has a greater effect than the hand of the law.

Level crossings have recently been in the news, and I must say that the Premier acted very promptly when the matter was brought to his attention by the hon. member for Logan. But was it the words of the hon. member for Logan that did the trick, or was it the deaths of the people concerned? Was it the public outcry that did it? If it was the words of the hon. member for Logan, did he have to wait for death to strike before he took any action? Is this the first time that he has said anything about it? If it is, then he stands condemned. If it is not the first time, why did not the Government act previously? Must we have deaths at level crossings before any action is taken?

It has been said that it is the responsibility of the motorist to watch for trains. With the number of cars on the roads today, their speed, the speed of diesel engines, and the fact that it can be difficult to hear their approach, it is obvious that fewer precautions are taken on all sides and accidents at level crossings will occur. The best recourse is not only to warning devices but also to stopping devices. Boom gates and flashing lights have proved successful at other places. Ninety-seven crossings have been equipped with flashing lights in 11 years, so to equip the number still requiring attention (2,339) would take more than 200 years at the present rate. The whole thing is crazy. To talk of road safety on the one hand, and yet not attempt to overcome an obviously unsafe condition on the other hand, is hypocrisy.

The Minister for Transport is apparently quite happy that it could take another 200 years before all the crossings have gates and warning signs on them. I am afraid that in the re-shift of portfolios the Premier slipped up badly in letting the same gentleman control road safety and the railways because he has not shown any sense of road safety in his administration of the level-crossing position.

What about all the other crossings that require safety devices? Are they still going to take their turn, or is the Premier going to be very quick in telling the House that he has authorised the expenditure of much larger sums of money so that many more of these crossings can be eliminated and made safe in the near future? Surely we are not going to wait for more deaths before action is taken.

A matter that has been of great concern to me and my party for some time is the welfare of our Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders. As all members are aware, some

time ago this House brought in new legislation which was supported in broad principle by all members of the House because it was believed that the Government was endeavouring to ensure that these people really become part of the Australian community. Later the Federal Government held a referendum, when people again believed that the Government would ensure that the Aboriginal people would be given a fair deal. Unfortunately the high hopes of the Opposition that some really positive and quick action would be taken to assist these people have not materialised.

With reference to development, I believe that this should apply to all our people, and not just include certain sections. It is completely farcical to talk of State development when our Aboriginal citizens are not able even now to live a life that is comparable with the lives of those who came later. Let us consider how this came about. I think all will agree that the earlier citizens of Queensland had little or no regard for the welfare of these people. They looked upon them as enemies; they massacred them; they took their lands; and they stopped them from living the way of life to which they had been accustomed over centuries. As time went on, many tribes were completely wiped out. Those who were left were gradually forced to settle, in some cases, in areas far removed from their original hunting grounds and ceremonial places till the stage was reached that people in public life decided that some action should be taken to try to assist them.

But the time had passed; it was now too late to turn back the clock. The Aborigines themselves realised that they could not continue under their old laws and customs; they could not continue in the freedom they once enjoyed, where their occupation was the obtaining of food and carrying on their ceremonies and enjoying the same way of life as their forefathers had enjoyed. They realised that the time had arrived when this state of affairs could no longer exist.

I think it is to the credit of many church people that they attempted to assist Aborigines, and achieved a lot in many ways. It is unfortunate that, although they had the will to assist, they did not have the necessary financial backing. As a result, communities or settlements were established to which these people were moved together. Here they had to change their way of life completely, particularly the older people, and bow to new laws and standards, and a way of life foreign to them. They had to accept it, because this had become the established way of life of Queensland and its people.

A few years ago the Government realised that it had to play a greater role in this field than it had played previously, and area after area was taken over and put under State control. Twelve months ago the last remaining areas were brought under control. State finances have assisted housing, education and health, and provided general amenities to a greater extent than could be provided prior

to State control. However, what I want to say most definitely is that our assistance to these people is far too slow.

We have to tackle this problem in two phases, working conjointly. The first phase is the provision of homes, health services, education, and other amenities, which Queenslanders generally enjoy. We have to forget that the Aborigines are a community of people of the one race; we have to consider them purely and simply as Queenslanders, irrespective of their previous background and experiences.

I, and other members, have visited many of the native settlements and, while not decrying what has been done, I do think progress is far too slow, particularly when one realises the quality of the houses and other amenities provided (and the rapidity with which they are provided) for overseas companies operating at the various industrial developments in Queensland. Compare that with the development and progress at the settlements and it will be seen that we are not treating these native people in a way that is even approaching the same enthusiasm and speed. I call upon the Government to rectify this most serious position.

The second phase is to make sure that these people become self-supporting. I think it is shocking that in this year, 1968, there are communities of people virtually living on charity and social services. Even those who are gainfully employed in these communities are paid only a pittance. I think it is wrong. We have to help these people not only by means of housing and education but also by assisting them to fully become members of the community.

I call upon the Government to establish immediately an all-party committee to investigate thoroughly what industries can be created near these settlements, and what occupations these men and women can follow so that they can become self-supporting. We cannot hold our heads high while we have large numbers of our citizens living virtually in forced idleness, without hope and practical encouragement.

Those of us who have had the privilege of meeting these people agree completely that they are capable of being taught any occupation. Many members of their race have shown that they have the ability to take a place in various fields of endeavour.

The Government, of course, could say that the right to vote was given to them. But what good is the right to vote if they have not the wherewithal and the amenities of our way of life? It is up to us to see that they are given these opportunities in a very short space of time.

I should now like to refer to a matter nearer home. I have been involved in the controversy concerning the Gardens Point Bridge—that is, whether or not it should have a pedestrian way. As yet, I have not heard or read an argument which changes my view that the crossing should have a

pedestrian walk. After all, there are people who like to walk; there are people who are quite happy to walk from place to place. For example, tourists who come to our city like to walk from their place of abode, have a look round, and see what is offering nearby.

Mr. Lee: The world trend is not to provide footpaths.

Mr. HOUSTON: I will come to that later; but I think the hon. member will agree that visitors to towns or cities overseas do walk in the morning and the afternoon to see what those places have to offer.

Mr. Lee: Not on freeways.

Mr. HOUSTON: But they walk round to see what is going on.

I think it is completely ridiculous for the Deputy Commissioner of Main Roads, Mr. Lowe, to suggest that people will not walk a distance of 1,800 feet, which is less than three furlongs. Certainly people do not walk three furlongs just for the heck of it; but they certainly will walk that distance when it leads them where they want to go, and particularly when it leads them very close to the Botanical Gardens and when it will lead them, also, to the complex of parklands and very attractive Government buildings that is expected in the future, and when it will also give easy access to the shopping centre.

Others have suggested that the bridge should be made only a motorway because bridges in other parts of the world are purely motorways. I think that is the point that the hon. member for Yeronga wanted to make. I might go along with this if we had another 10 bridges; but here is a bridge where, at the present time, there is no other way in close proximity for a person to cross the river. To cross now, one has to go either through the Valley, over Story Bridge, in a ferry, or over Victoria Bridge. This new bridge will open up a new area of the city access to which previously has been a long, roundabout route. As to costs, surely a light foot-bridge is not going to cost so much when one considers that the footwalk will be attached to a very solid structure required for the road traffic itself.

Apart from all these arguments, to me the most important of all is a desire to keep motor traffic out of the city. I believe that as time goes on we will find that, unless we encourage people to leave their cars on the outskirts of the city and travel by other means into the city, we have a completely congested inner city—congested to the degree that it will become a dead heart.

One can advocate parking stations and off-street parking as much as one likes, but motor-cars still have to travel along roads to get to the parking stations and other places. We therefore should be encouraging people to leave their cars away from the city, and, if I wanted to be an advocate of good health, I could suggest that in years

past a walk of a mile or two was considered to be only a short distance. If one were to suggest in the country areas that a walk of three furlongs was a long one, one would be laughed at. Country children are asked to walk much further than this to get to their school bus, or to their schools.

I realise that this bridge is part of an expressway, but that is not an alternative way, as I said earlier, from one part of our city to another; it is the only way. I believe that if access were made onto a footway near the river bank on each side, people would walk across the river. Further, we could have nearby parking areas established and people could drive off the freeway onto the parking areas, and then walk across. With any kind of encouragement at all we would find people prepared to do this, particularly with the ideal climate that we enjoy for walking and recreation.

Many more things could be said, but I am just one member of a team. I moved the amendment because I believe that the Government is due for censure; I believe that its ballyhoo and propaganda is put out deliberately to camouflage its lack of progressive thinking, that it is relying entirely on big overseas investment, in a very restricted field, to bring about this State's development.

I am not at all influenced by the thought of a large surplus in the Budget. As I said at the outset, this is brought about primarily by over-taxation in the first instance, and then by bad planning on expenditure in the second. So, in whatever way the Government likes to handle its propaganda, we of the Opposition believe that the people of this State are not really fooled. The proof of sound administration is how it affects the ordinary person, and it cannot be denied that the public servant is unhappy, that we are short of police, that there is dissension in the teaching service, that nurses are very upset, that our country areas are losing population, and that there is little opportunity to do anything for those who have not heavy financial backing. Those with skills and pioneering spirit alone are not given the opportunity to show their worth. At the present time, this is the State for those who have, not for those who have not.

In conclusion, in the few moments left to me let me point out quite forcibly to the Government that we will not accept a similar situation to that which developed last year and the preceding year in handling the Government's legislative programme. We want ample notice of impending legislation, we want ample time to study the legislation after its introduction, and, on any matters of a controversial nature, we want sufficient time between the introductory stage and the second reading to allow the public to consider the purpose and operation of the legislation.

I should also like to mention a matter that you, Mr. Speaker, drew attention to this morning when you mentioned the cost of

printing "Hansard". Personally, I am not concerned with the cost of running Parliament, provided it is run efficiently. This is the supreme body in the State, and when members ask questions they do so representing thousands of people. When a Minister replies, he replies on behalf of the Government, so I say most emphatically and definitely that the Opposition expects his reply not only to be given but also to be recorded in full, not only in the records of this House, but also in "Hansard", so that we have not to spend hours finding material when replies have to be referred to at some future date. As "Hansard" is a public document that goes into libraries and schools, it must contain all the words spoken in Parliament. Surely the words of a ministerial statement are more important than an irresponsible interjection or, for that matter, a speech by a Government back-bencher.

At this point, may I also say that it is about time the Standing Orders Committee met and brought in a system of questions without notice so that, when answers are given to questions, we get a ministerial opinion and not that of a public servant. The present system of having only questions on notice leads to arrogance, laziness, and finally incompetence, which is certainly not in the best interests of this State.

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) (2.40 p.m.): It gives me great pleasure to second the amendment so ably moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I believe that he has shown in sharp focus the poor stewardship of this Government at the present moment. We have tremendous need for a change. Whether it be in March, April or May of 1969, it cannot come soon enough for the people of Queensland.

I want to deal particularly with that part of the amendment which reads as follows:—

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

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

It is well known that, amongst others, Queensland has a very rich coal basin in the central district of this State known as the Bowen Basin, in which it is estimated that there is something like a billion tons of coal. Some deposits have been measured, some have been indicated, and some have been inferred, and if we can take them for granted under these three headings we can say that there is something like a billion tons of coal in the Bowen Basin around about Central Queensland and stretching from there to the north and, to a degree, to the south.

There have been over the last few years feverish investigations and feverish exploitation of this Bowen Basin of ours, this wonderful coal reserve.

Mr. Chinchen: Nothing happened in your day at all.

Mr. TUCKER: Just let me go on and I will show the hon. member what has happened in his day. By the time I am finished he will hang his head in shame.

A Government Member: Watch your blood pressure.

Mr. TUCKER: My blood pressure is all right, but there are a lot of hon. members on the other side who will have to watch theirs. They have not done it very successfully over the last few years.

There are many names that come to mind when one talks about the Bowen Basin, names like Blair Athol, Bluff, Blackwater, Callide, Moura, Collinsville, and Kianga, to mention only a few. It is in those areas in the Bowen Basin that the exploitation of Queensland coal has taken place over the last three or four years, or possibly longer.

In the last few months, or in the last few weeks, a little place has come into prominence in that field. This is the place known as Goonyella, situated 142 miles south-west of Mackay. We find that there are also huge reserves of rich coking coal there, and in fact in the whole area of the Bowen Basin there are huge reserves of rich coking coal and rich steaming coal.

Associated with these places are names like Thiess Peabody Mitsui, B.H.P. Pty. Co. Ltd., Utah Development Co., Mitsubishi Shoji Kaisha, Conzinc Riotinto of Australia Ltd., Clutha Development, Kaiser Steel, and many others. I mention those few this afternoon because I want to deal specifically with some of them.

Some of those companies that I have mentioned have a certain Australian content. Possibly one that comes readily to mind is Thiess Peabody Mitsui. I am very doubtful about that company, because when I remember the losses that Thiess sustained on the Snowy I wonder how much Thiess really has or what interest Thiess really has in Thiess Peabody Mitsui. I wonder what percentage Thiess really owns in that company. Still, as I say, at least it does have some Australian content.

Let me refer to an extract from "The Australian" of 15 May, 1968, which contained an article headed "Utah firmly establishes Queensland on the coal export map." Amongst other things, the article says—

"The chairman of Utah Construction and Mining, Mr. M. Eccles, referred to the American scene. He said that much of the capital for the early development in mining, manufacturing and transportation was of European origin.

Had the United States been required to generate this capital internally, its economic growth and hence the growth of its living standards would have been much slower."

This is the part that I want to emphasise—

"When asked if, at a later date, the Australian subsidiary might be publicly floated, Mr. Eccles said that although Utah's operations here were the largest in any country outside the United States, it was still too early to make a decision on the point."

In other words, Mr. Eccles said that so far as Utah was concerned it had no Australian content at all. It was too early, Mr. Eccles said, to make a decision in regard to Utah.

Mr. Ramsden: I think you are misquoting him. You should read the question.

Mr. TUCKER: If he is being misquoted, the hon. member is at liberty to come over here and study the article. I know that it might be very hard for him to do anything beyond that, nevertheless it is here.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that casting aspersions or making derogatory remarks against other hon. members is entirely out of order. I trust that he will confine his remarks to the subject before the House.

Mr. TUCKER: With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, if you had been listening you would have heard him cast a reflection on me. He said that I deliberately misquoted.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I rise to a point of order. I cast no reflection on the hon. gentleman. I said that the answer he gave in the House was a misinterpretation in reply to the question that he directed.

Mr. TUCKER: I will slam you down every time you make a reflection on me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Despite the fact that the hon. member may have been provoked to pass the remark, I remind him that when he is making a speech he should address the Chair and not start fighting with other hon. members across the Chamber.

Mr. TUCKER: As I was saying, Utah Construction and Mining quite obviously has no Australian content at this time. Neither has Utah Mitsubishi, which we are told is going to exploit the Goonyella field, 142 miles south-west of Mackay. That company has no Australian content, nor has Clutha Development Pty. Limited an Australian content. It is very doubtful indeed whether Conzinc Riotinto of Australia has in fact an Australian content. It may have a small one—I grant that—but if it has it would be a very small percentage. It would probably be in the nature of 7½ per cent.—nothing better than that.

All the companies that I have mentioned have no Australian content at all, yet at the present time they are in on our rich natural resources and going for their lives. The main exploiters and main exporters of coal in Queensland at the present moment are not Queensland companies and they are not Australian companies; they are companies from outside. In fact, we have a very small Australian participation in the exploitation of our coal at the present time. This is a matter that every one of us should be worried about and one that we should understand.

Mr. Murray: The shares are listed on the Stock Exchange.

Mr. TUCKER: Oh, yes, the shares are listed.

Mr. Murray: They are available to you, or anyone else.

Mr. TUCKER: I do not care what the hon. member says. I know that these companies in fact have no Queensland or Australian participation. Whether the hon. member says they are listed or not, I do not accept it. At the present moment we have no say in them.

I suppose it will be said—and it is being said from the Government benches at the present moment—that companies like Utah have invested \$12,000,000 up to the present moment, and that as the years roll on, the figure will rise to \$36,000,000. So the Government says! What is the good of a dragline if in fact everything has been dragged out? What will it be used for after that? What will be the use then of the investment that these people have supposedly made in this area? It will be of no use to anybody at all. The amount invested there and the development of this field are of use only to the company, and when everything is scraped dry, that development will be of no use at all.

Using Utah as an example, my reply to this claim about these companies supposedly undertaking huge development and investing a great amount of money is this: Utah will export 1,500,000 tons of Queensland coal by 1969, and, in the next 10 years, it hopes to export 21,400,000 tons through our ports. Do hon. members opposite know what the company will get for that coal? It will get \$8.50 a ton, and, as I said, the company hopes to get rid of 21,400,000 tons in the next 10 years. Hon. members opposite can work out for themselves what it hopes to win at the expense of Queensland in the next 10 years.

What will we get out of this? What will come back to Queensland? The company will get \$8.50 a ton. In the next 10 years or so, while this company is exporting this coal, Queensland will get 5c a ton. Queensland will get a miserable 5c a ton while the company will get \$8.50 for every ton that is exported.

In addition, what do we give to companies like this? For Utah we have built a complete town at Blackwater through the Queensland Housing Commission.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr. TUCKER: That is right. I have been out there and have gone right through it. I have walked over every heap of coal out there, and I have gone along every street. I know what is out there and so do my colleagues. The Government is prepared to build the company a town, at no cost to the company. Utah will get this bonanza while we get a measly 5c.

In addition we have given the company freight concessions. But there are none for the grain-growers of this State! The Government will give Utah freight concessions on the carriage of coal but will not give the grain-growers of this State any freight concessions—or any real freight concessions at all.

Mr. Thackeray: The primary producers.

Mr. TUCKER: The primary producers of this State can go hang, but we run overseas, embrace the foreign companies, and embrace the Japanese, and give them freight concessions. At the present moment we are not able to find out what the agreement is between Utah and the Government because the Government will not publish it. The Government has kept it hidden. Nor will the Government tell us the real freight rates. But we know that freight concessions exist. We have given it a railway line to cart its coal over and we have given it the port facilities. We have given the company all these things, and for what return—royalty of 5c a ton!

Let us examine under the microscope what we have done for Thiess Peabody Mitsui Coal Pty. Ltd. We built a rail link to Moura at a cost of \$27,500,000. We recall that Ernie Evans said that we had the company bound hand and foot, and that it was going to build this rail link. Suddenly the Government came forward and, at an expense of \$27,500,000, built a line to Moura for Thiess Peabody Mitsui.

Mr. Chalk interjected.

Mr. TUCKER: The decision was yours, not mine. I am only saying what Ernie Evans said. The Treasurer then did a back somersault. Why did he do that? I shall show that in a minute. Only State money was used for the construction of this railway.

Mr. Chalk: It was not.

Mr. TUCKER: Yes, it was—\$27,500,000.

Mr. Chalk: Not a penny of State money.

Mr. TUCKER: There was no company contribution at all.

Mr. Chalk: You go home and get a brief.

Mr. TUCKER: I will give the Treasurer a brief in a minute. It is true that the company had to lodge an amount of security.

Mr. Chalk: That is right.

Mr. TUCKER: As I know it, that was called a security deposit. That security deposit should have been, according to what I can see, \$14,800,000 by 31 March, 1968. The records available to me go up only to 1967. If my calculations are correct, the company should have lodged by 31 March, 1968, an amount of \$14,800,000. But the records to June, 1967, show that at that time it had in fact lodged only \$4,600,000.

Mr. Chalk: How simple you are!

Mr. TUCKER: Just a moment.

Mr. Chalk: The whole of that money is in security as it is used. We are using their money. What's wrong with you?

Mr. TUCKER: As at 30 June, 1967, I notice that the Government had spent over \$19,000,000 on the project.

Mr. Chalk: What we had spent and what was lodged are entirely different things.

Mr. TUCKER: I am glad that the Treasurer is here, because I have something to raise now that he may be able to clear up. A peculiar thing shown by the records is that in June, 1967, the company was paid \$629,404 interest on the money that apparently at that stage was in Government inscribed stock. In that amount of \$629,404 was an amount of \$399,400 for the cost of raising the money.

Mr. Chalk: Don't you understand that?

Mr. TUCKER: Yes, we understand it all right. The cost of raising this money was paid to Thiess Peabody Mitsui.

Mr. Chalk: No.

Mr. TUCKER: Who is on which side now? The security deposit was held in Commonwealth Inscribed Stock and was not in fact used on the project at all. After April, 1968, the Treasurer said that if there was a throughput on the line of 2,000,000 tons a year, he was going to repay to the company the money that had been deposited in security.

Mr. Chalk: Quite true.

Mr. TUCKER: The first repayment was made on 1 April, 1968, and, if I can read correctly, repayments are designed to redeem the amount in full over 10 years. Although the company has in fact paid in that money, it is going to be paid back in full.

Mr. Chalk: And we have had the use of the railway.

Mr. TUCKER: In fact, it is going back to the company. What has it lost?

Mr. Chalk: I thought you were simple.

Mr. TUCKER: The Minister thought I was simple! He is the one who is simple in this instance. The first repayment was made on 1 April, and the amount will be repaid in full. It has nothing to lose.

Let us now look at the building of the line—and I have another question to ask of the Treasurer while he is in the Chamber. Clause 10 (1) of the agreement states—

“The State shall obtain prior approval of the company to all tenders before the acceptance thereof on the line.”

Mr. Chalk: Quite true.

Mr. TUCKER: The company, of course, is Thiess Peabody Mitsui, with the emphasis on Thiess.

Mr. Chalk: No.

Mr. TUCKER: Oh, yes, on this occasion.

Mr. Chalk: What interest has Thiess got in it?

Mr. TUCKER: That is the question I am asking. I do not think Thiess has very much. After the heavy losses it suffered in the Snowy Mountains, it probably has not got very much.

Mr. Chalk: No.

Mr. TUCKER: Let me show what happened during this time, with emphasis on Thiess. Contracts for the line were let in June, 1967, or round about that time, to the tune of about \$13,500,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, guess who got \$11,000,000 of the contracts worth \$13,500,000 let in June, 1967!

Mr. Chalk: Guess who won all the tenders by public tender, bar one!

Mr. TUCKER: Who had the contract to build the line for Thiess Peabody Mitsui? Thiess had the contract.

Mr. Chalk: Of course it did.

Mr. TUCKER: Remember what I said a moments ago: no tenders were let without the prior approval and acceptance of the company.

Mr. Chalk: Quite true.

Mr. TUCKER: So Caesar appeals to Caesar. Thiess goes back to Thiess Peabody Mitsui and asks whether its tenders are acceptable on this occasion. If ever I have seen anything loaded in favour of a company it is this contract and these tenders.

Mr. Chinen: That is business.

Mr. TUCKER: The hon. member can work it out for himself. I am giving him the facts.

Mr. Chinen: The open tender does not suit you.

Mr. TUCKER: This was a company that needed assistance to build a \$27,000,000 line. The company said, “We cannot build it.”; but one partner in the company that could not build it had \$11,000,000 worth of the contracts to build the line to suit itself and help itself. Where did the profit go from that? Who received the profit from that? Did it flow to the State, or did it in fact flow to

the company that claimed it was not able to build the line but in fact held the major portion of the contracts to build it? So we find that a company for which the Government was building a railway line was making a profit out of the building of the line—the line that was designed and put in there to suit it!

Mr. Chinchen: They are entirely different companies.

Mr. TUCKER: Entirely different companies!

Mr. Chinchen: Thiess Peabody Mitsui, and Thiess—of course they are.

Mr. TUCKER: What freight does Thiess Peabody Mitsui pay on this line? Do you know what it pays, Mr. Speaker? It pays \$1.98 a ton to Gladstone for the first 3,000,000 tons, and after that the rate is by agreement between the company and the Government. \$1.98 a ton to drag it over the whole of that line! That is the freight which the company is charged to take coal to Gladstone. The line cost \$27,500,000. Interest, redemption, running costs and maintenance on the line have to be met by the State—every cent of it.

Are we really making a profit out of the freight on that line, at \$1.98 a ton? I say that we are not; that we are running this line in the interests of Thiess Peabody Mitsui; and that there is nothing at all flowing back to this State. Anyone who looks at this will naturally wonder how long it will take to amortise the amounts the State has already laid out in connection with this line? It must take years and years and, with freight at \$1.98 a ton, nothing will flow back to us before that time. I keep on stressing that point.

Forget about Liberal Party members for the moment; would any Country Party member claim that anyone could haul grain over that line for that distance at \$1.98 a ton?

A Government Member: No.

Mr. TUCKER: Of course not. There is no way in the world one could haul grain over that line at \$1.98 a ton. Would primary producers be able to get that concession? The answer is, "Not at all".

We built homes for Thiess Peabody Mitsui at Moura through the Housing Commission and it is going to take us something like 78 years in rental repayments before we amortise that amount. Do hon. members opposite know that we pinned Thiess Peabody Mitsui down to a 10-year agreement only for the Housing Commission houses at Moura, although it will take the State 78 years to recoup the outlay on those homes.

Again, what royalty are we extracting from these people for every ton of coal that goes out of Gladstone? Five cents a ton. We have built homes for them at Moura and we have given them these freight concessions; we

built a railway line worth, as I say, \$27,500,000, and we run it and maintain it, yet all we ask from Thiess Peabody Mitsui is 5c a ton. And all hon. members opposite put up their hands and say they are in favour of that. I think there is something wrong if, in fact, they are. I know they have to stay behind the Government, but every clear-thinking man on that side must digest this and come up with an answer unfavourable to the Government of this State.

Mr. Thackeray: Wally Rae is very quiet. He agrees it is true.

Mr. Rae: I don't agree with him at all; this is the worst speech he has ever made.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Hooper): Order!

Mr. TUCKER: Although we get 5c a ton from Thiess Peabody Mitsui, they pay Thiess Bros. a royalty of 20c a ton. They pay this 20c a ton royalty to the Thiess company, yet we say that we are only able to ask them to pay us 5c a ton. It appears to me that the whole thing is completely farcical, but it is a farce at the expense of the people of Queensland.

Mr. Camm: I will reply to it in my own way.

Mr. TUCKER: I don't think the hon. gentleman would frighten any of our newest backbenchers with his contribution. The person who is steering this through is the Treasurer, the lord high everything of this State, Gordon Chalk. He is playing the star role on behalf of these companies in Queensland. It is a farce, and a farce at the expense of the people of Queensland. What sort of a Government is it that aids and abets overseas interests and allows them to grow fat on our natural resources? By what sort of thinking does the Government allow these people to come here and do this sort of thing. We have become the laughing stock of the whole world in this matter.

Internationalists—these fellows who owe allegiance to no country—phone one another and say, "Listen. Be in this over there. It is the greatest thing you can ever get your claws into in the whole world." "Be in it", they say, "This Government of Queensland would not know if the Town Hall fell on them; they would not wake up." They know there are millions of tons in Queensland just for the taking; they know it is just below the surface, and that they have only a few feet of dirt to rake off to get to it. They know it is the easiest thing in the whole world. They say to one another, "Be in it; it will never be so good anywhere else. And there is a Government out there that would not know. They are giving it to the whole world. It is the cheapest thing that ever came out of any country." "Consult with the Japanese coal interests," they say. "It is the cheapest coal anywhere in the world. Provided you can get into Queensland you are allowed to take advantage of the cheap coal and you

can sell it to the Japanese cheaper than anybody else in the world can sell because you can get it out of Queensland, and it is there by the million tons—the billion tons—and you can beat them by a wide mark." There is no way in the world the Japanese will go anywhere else while there is coal in Queensland. They say, "Get out there. The Government will build your railways; the Government will bear the cost of the freight concession; the Government will build your homes; the Government will give you port facilities. Good God! They will give you anything you ask for, provided you go out there and ask for it". They laugh in their beards. For all these things in Queensland do hon. members know what these companies are asked? They are asked to pay a royalty of 5c a ton. That is all the Government requires of them here in Queensland. They say, "Be in it. It will never be so good in the whole world again."

When the Treasurer went in pursuit of money for power, we can remember how he blew it up into headlines. "I am going overseas", he said, "to get \$100,000,000 or something more for a power-house for Queensland". He got big headlines in the Press at that time. He sallied forth overseas to get us money to build a power-house in Queensland, but there were no takers among the internationalists—those who control the money overseas. They were conspicuous by their absence. When we asked them to give us some money to build a power-house in Queensland, there was a pregnant silence. Nothing was said. They were absent. They were silent. As I say, there was pregnant silence at that time. They did not want to come over and put their money into something that was going to be an asset to us. Gordon Chalk returned from overseas as he returned from Canberra. He had nothing—sweet F.A., and the "F.A." stands for "Fanny Adams". He had no offers at all. To camouflage his puerile efforts, his weak efforts overseas, and his embarrassment at not being able to raise this cash to build us a power-house, he offered the overseas people another piece of the farm in Queensland. And no wonder he offered them another piece of the farm—the Yanks almost got Mr. Chalk. They almost bought him. Hon. members will remember what happened three or four months ago. They dangled the carrot in front of him. Did he say, "No, I don't want it"? No, he said, "Wait a moment". The tree down beside his window was bare. He was picking the leaves, not playing, "He loves me. He loves me not", but playing, "I will take it. I won't take it. I will take it. I won't take it". For a week he did that, and then suddenly, piously, he came out and said, "No, I won't take it. I will stay with Queensland". What would other hon. members or I have said? How long would it have taken us to make our decision? One minute. We know what we would do, but it took Gordon Chalk a week. The overseas fellows said, "We missed him by a little bit, but all we have to do next time is bait the trap a little bit better and we will buy him also.

We buy Queensland coal for nothing; we will buy the Treasurer for a little bit more". It took him a week to make up his mind—while all the Liberal Party behind him were praying to God he would take it and shoot off overseas.

When he offered this field at Goonyella he was almost killed in the rush. There was nothing for the power-house—not a word about that—but when he offered a bit more of the farm, Goonyella, he was almost killed in the rush to get in on the bonanza again.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TUCKER: Although this Government claims that it is bringing industry to Queensland, it is in fact not attracting industry at all. It is giving cheap royalties and selling a bit more of the farm, and all the time Queensland is losing. The cry of this naive Government is that it is attracting industry to Queensland, but it is attracting only those who can again see in this area a bonanza. Each time it sells a bit more of the farm it does so at give-away prices.

I am showing the House today that Queensland cannot afford this Government which is giving away our natural resources. Surely the Government, by its attitude, is placing in jeopardy the future of every young Queenslander. I repeat to members of the Country Party that the Japanese are getting a better deal than all the grain-growers and all the primary producers in this State. The Japanese are getting a better deal than every one of them. If hon. members do not believe that, if that fact has not sunk in, they should get a pull of "Hansard" tomorrow, read what I have said and so learn the facts. It is quite obvious that the primary producers of Queensland are getting less than the Japanese; that this coalition Government embraces and helps the Japanese rather than those who put it here, its vital supporters, namely, the pastoralists, grain-growers and primary producers.

If we must export our coal we should not export it at a royalty of 5c. We should double that royalty immediately if in fact we do not treble it or quadruple it. With the exception of the home market, we should double the royalties immediately. The statement that this would price us out of the world market is a calculated lie! At the present moment we are so far below the prices in the rest of the world that we have all of the Japanese industries asking us for coal—begging us for coal—because they will never find it at a price like this. An increase in royalty would not price us out of world markets. We can double the royalty at the moment and still compete on world markets. If that were done no Queenslander would be hurt in any way. It would not come out of any Queenslander's pocket. We are missing out on a painless source of revenue for the State because such a procedure would

not hit any Queenslander but only those who exploit us. While our education, health and other services languish for want of capital, what are we letting these people do? We are giving them coal at a royalty of 5c a ton when we should be doing something more about it. What a paradox when the State is crying out for money; when everywhere we need extra educational facilities; when we have a painless source of revenue and do nothing about it. It is a tragedy. I repeat that it can be done immediately without hurting any Queenslander.

Let me give another example of what we do. We export bauxite from Weipa for a royalty of 10c a ton. Do hon. members opposite know what the Commonwealth Government did at Gove, on the other side of the Gulf of Carpentaria? It asked for, and it got, a royalty of 30c a ton, not 10c a ton. The Commonwealth Government asked for 10c and 20c a ton for the local product, according to the profitability of the company.

(Time expired.)

Mr. PORTER (Toowong) (3.21 p.m.): The amendment that has been introduced into this House by the two principal speakers of the Opposition, one surprisingly pedestrian and the other quite vaudevillian, is, in my view, a prime piece of "jabberwocky". It is full of big words and fancy phrases and sententious sentences, a thing of sound and fury which, when it is actually read, signifies nothing at all.

You have to ask yourself, Mr. Speaker, what is the real substance of this elaborate, tortuously worded long-winded amendment. It was quite obviously designed to paint a picture of such gloom, misery, stupidity and stagnation that most of us must have expected to walk out of this Chamber this afternoon and see on the streets people dressed in rags, hollow-checked and starving, with no cars in the streets, none of the bustle of commerce and industry; just a lot of zombies going back to their caves or their humpies. The picture painted by the Leader of the Opposition and his deputy was so exaggerated and so absurd as to be almost farcical.

I would say that the amendment is typically out-of-date Labour rubbish. It is totally at variance with what all of us know to be the facts, what the entire community knows to be the facts, that is, that we live in a time of constantly rising standards of living, with a greater degree of job security than has been known in this country in our history, and with standards of medical, educational and other community services which are better than anything the State has ever known.

Mr. Hinze: A very affluent society.

Mr. PORTER: The hon. member for South Coast says that it is affluent. It is. It may not be as affluent as everybody could wish, but it most certainly is not the impoverished society that the hon. gentlemen opposite tried to portray.

I was also staggered by the way in which the hon. members opposite once again displayed their fanatical, their implacable, their almost pathological hatred of big business. Anything that has to do with the investment of large-scale capital brings down their wrath—they cannot stand it—and it is this dog-in-the-manger attitude which, of course, for so long kept this State in the development doldrums. This is the dyed-in-the-wool left-wing hostility that makes progress and development impossible and is against the utilising of the free market to get development and, of course, is against the use of the initiative and the ingenuity of the individual, for which we on this side of the House stand.

Nobody has suggested—and nobody will suggest, I am sure—during the course of this debate that we have achieved perfection in this State, that everything possible has been done, or that everything that has been done was done at all times in the best possible way. Of course, there is always much to be done, and there can always be argument as to emphasis, as to priorities and as to methods.

But to draw such an unrelieved picture of desolation and despair is so childish as, I think, to totally defeat their own purpose. There is, for instance, a "News Bulletin" which all members receive from Government sources, and the bulletin of March, 1968, lists projects now in process to the value of \$1,500 million. Do hon. members opposite suggest that the contents of this bulletin are wrong, or that individual aspects of it are in error? Or are they going to suggest that it does not matter anyhow, and that it means nothing? Of course, they will not suggest that at all. I am therefore forced to accept the conclusion that the amendment, couched in such grandiose but meaningless terms, is a gimmick. It is a kind of desperate endeavour to draw attention away from the real issues of the times—issues which, if seen with all clarity, will make the A.L.P. fear not only for the next election but for its long-term future as a significant part of the Australian political scene.

Mr. Aikens: Wait till Egerton gets back from Russia; he'll pull them out of the morass.

Mr. PORTER: Mr. Egerton, Mr. Laver—there are a few of them wandering round in odd places.

In supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and attacking this extraordinary amendment, I want to refer briefly to some of the political facts of life which I am sure all of us recognise, even though it sounds at times that we do not.

One such obvious fact is that we are in the final session of this Parliament and we are moving towards an election next year, which will be a vital poll. I am quite sure that that is what it will be; I have never yet faced an election which was not a vital one. The performances here of the Government, the Opposition, and individual members,

therefore have to be seen in this context and evaluated accordingly. We are all human. I have no doubt that although we discharge our proper responsibilities, we will do so with one eye cocked on the signs that will portray the political weather ahead. If we are realists, we will recognise that next year's judgment by the electorate will be largely determined by forces, pressures and circumstances which are well beyond our control. For instance, one such circumstance could be whether the Federal Government decides to hold a Federal poll this year, 12 months ahead of time. If that occurs, one can expect that the Federal Government will do things to provide as bland an economic, and hence a political, climate as it can. We have to recognise that, if this should happen, next year a successful Federal Government—and I am quite sure that the present one would be successful—might find it necessary to tilt the scales back again. In other words, stimulants applied in the latter part of 1968 may become sedatives to be applied in 1969. That sort of thing has happened before.

We all know that both the United Kingdom and the United States Governments are preparing further measures to restrict the outflow of investment capital. This should make Opposition members very happy, as they will not then have to worry about overseas capital coming here.

Mr. Aikens: As long as Clem Jones gets all the overseas capital.

Mr. PORTER: Mr. Jones will probably dig more holes, with capital or without it. It does not seem to worry him very much.

If we do not get this amount of investment capital from abroad, without doubt this will substantially affect our balance-of-trade payments. When that happens, restrictions will be applied which will hurt parts of our community. I would say that if there is to be a Federal election this year, this is a political fact of life which will affect our electoral prospects next year and one which, in my view at least, would suggest that we should have an election next year early rather than late.

In my two previous contributions to Address-in-Reply debates I have talked about the forces of change which are transforming our society, our attitudes and our political associations. I do not want to appear as any sort of prophet of change—or prophet of anything—but I do believe that if we ourselves can be alerted to what is happening around us, the changes that occur become so much less painful during the course of their operations. Change is here and the process is accelerating, and it is a process which none of our apprehensions and none of our vested interests in maintaining the status quo can possibly abort.

The inevitability of substantial political change is, I think, implicit in the way in which the Australian concept has changed over recent years. We have had many visitors to these shores who have gone away and

written books about us, and whilst we may not like their judgments, yet they are similar to an extent that should make us take some notice of them. Donald Horne, Pringle, Malcolm Muggeridge and others have all said that the Australian believes that everybody has an inalienable right to enjoy himself. They all believe that the Australian works harder at his leisure than he does at his work. Then, of course, there is the more serious judgment that we are a nation without a public sense of the future—in other words, we are a society whose predecessors, with great courage and great enthusiasm, pioneered a whole continent, and yet now we do not dare to do anything that is out of the ordinary.

These judgments may have been valid five, 10 or 20 years ago. I do not know; it is always difficult to tell. We have had it good here; there has been a tendency to take things as they were. And it is true, of course, that our mass media of communication do not encourage dissent or question in the way that the mass media in most other Western countries do. Perhaps the judgments were valid once; I do not think they are now. I think there have been vast changes in Australia, and the concept that was valid a few years ago is no longer there. For instance, the feeling that we are largely an outback people, that we are populated by a lean, tanned, hard-bitten race of individualists, is the great Australian myth, and as much pleasure as it may be to some of us to remember it in a nostalgic way, I doubt if it ever was true in toto; most certainly it is not true today.

Mr. Walsh: We were at one time a convict settlement.

Mr. PORTER: That is probably a good thing, too. It gave us solid roots in the past. We probably had to struggle to live, if our predecessors were convicts. But we are becoming rapidly not an outback nation but an urban community. By the 1980's, about 75 per cent. of the Australian community will live in cities of more than 100,000 people, and the populations of the capital cities will just about have doubled by that time. Brisbane is expected to have a population round the 1,250,000 mark.

Mr. Aikens: The Labour Party will see to that.

Mr. PORTER: It is not a question of anybody seeing to it. This is something that is happening all over the world, in under-developed countries as well as developed countries. It is a fact of life that we should recognise. Whether or not it is good or bad, I am not prepared to argue. It probably is bad, but it will happen. And cities then will be much different from those that we know now. It does not take much imagination to visualise a complex

here stretching from the near North Coast down to the New South Wales border, and perhaps beyond.

Mr. Chinchen: With one town hall!

Mr. PORTER: I should hope there will not be one town hall.

Another important aspect of this will be that as people live more and more in urban communities, so their political attitudes will become reshaped due to the pressures of our environment. Again I am not going to suggest whether for good or for bad, but that will happen. And as their attitudes become reshaped, so their political associations and political horizons become different.

Another great factor of change, of course, is the "younging" of our population. The hon. member for Landsborough mentioned this when seconding the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I think that about 53 per cent. of the present population is in the under-30 age group; within the next decade it will increase to about 55 per cent.

This indicates change of so vast an order that most of us find it more comfortable to pretend it is not happening. But it has happened. We now have the major section of our population in an age group which is not tied to conservatism, which has no outmoded political shibboleths branded into its soul by depression-era experiences, and which is still young enough to be enthusiastic, to be prepared to give things a go, and not to be tied by the notion that you must not try a thing because you might fail at it. I believe that this provides a huge free-wheeling element in the electorate that does not consider itself totally tied to any party in, perhaps, the sense that this generation's parents felt that they were tied.

I think it is a section of the electorate which looks for realistic attitudes from the political parties that it might tend to favour, and it certainly looks for dynamic leadership. It wants courage, enthusiasm and inspiration from its political figures, and I believe that personalities and parties that fail to meet these requirements are going to meet their deserts at the polls of the future.

There are still two other aspects of change which are perhaps very significant, too. One, I think, is the insatiable demands of modern technology. Every country in the world is now in the throes of change caused by technological changes. We in this country are slower to change than most, but change we must if we are to survive. When we become a highly developed technological society the transformation that this will work in our social habits and economic patterns, and hence our political attitudes, is so vast as to be beyond any realistic prediction at this stage.

Finally, I think there is one other factor of change which is perhaps more important than urbanisation, the "younging" of the electorate and the results of technological

change. I refer to our slow but growing recognition of our changing strategic environment. By this I mean that we are now becoming aware that we are part of the outside world, but it is almost as though we are not enjoying the discovery. I suppose this is because we have seen ourselves for so long as a dependent nation, growing up in the shadow of the strength of Great Britain and in more recent times tending to align ourselves with the strength of the United States. But, unpalatable as the knowledge is, I think most of us realise in our hearts that the time has come when we have to start depending upon ourselves, where we must fashion in Australia, for Australians, a viable reason for expanding nationhood. My own feeling is that this recognition began somewhere around the time of the 1956 Olympics, because we were then host to Russians and Hungarians at the time of the Hungarian revolution, when the Hungarians made a bid for freedom after a decade of Communist bondage and Soviet Union tanks and machine guns choked in blood the Hungarian cries for freedom. We then, because we had these people amongst us, realised that this was not a matter of just reading news-cable advices in headlines in newspapers; that it was something that affected people—people like ourselves. And with that awareness we have been thrust into this uneasy world around us by all the headlong progress of events in South-east Asia, the rapid flow of unhappy events that are nearer to our shores.

I think we now recognise that what happened to the Hungarians, to the South Koreans, to the Vietnamese, and is happening at this very moment to the Czechoslovakians, is something that, given a tragic combination of circumstances, could indeed happen to us.

When I said earlier that elections were largely determined by forces beyond our control, I believe that this is tragically exemplified in the events of the last 48 hours, when the people of Czechoslovakia, again trying to emerge out of the dark into the sunlight of personal freedom, are being forced back into the totalitarian murk by Communist tanks and guns. The free world has been shocked, appalled and disgusted by this savage and cruel obliteration of all the basic freedoms which we take for granted and which we believe are absolutely necessary for man to retain his individual dignity.

Communism has been touted by some as the wave of the future. It is the ebb tide of the past; something atavistic, cruel, crude, primordial. All of us can now see very clearly that the lightest breath of freedom is something that threatens the Communist oligarchy and must be subdued at all costs. The Communist doctrine fears freedom in the same way as it is said the Devil fears holy water.

Many of us were prepared to believe that Communism was changing over the years; that it was evolving; that it was becoming "suburbanised", as it were, and acceptable.

But the rape of the Czechs shocked us into realising that this was a very superficial judgment, compounded in equal parts of credulity and wishful thinking, and we all see now the Communist doctrine for what it is: a foul denial of all the basic freedoms that make a man a man.

These dreadful happenings in Europe have a very real effect on our political world. I have no doubt, for instance, that they will have a vast effect on the outcome of the United States presidential elections. I think that they will make much more likely an early Federal election. Why? Because quite obviously Communist violation of the Czechoslovakian State and of the United Nations Charter deeply embarrasses the Australian Labour Party. I do not say this in any sense of accusation of any hon. members opposite. I feel very sorry for them; obviously much more so for some than for others. But it is a simple statement of fact that, in the light of events, must be remembered. Because Labour is a left-wing party it will always suffer from the deep-seated apprehension the electorate feels that there is between the Labour Party and Communism an unhealthy but an indissoluble link.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. PORTER: It is not much use hon. gentlemen opposite becoming upset over this fact, which has been acknowledged so often by their leaders. I regret it. I think it is a problem that the Australian Labour Party will always have great difficulty in facing up to. Gentlemen like Mr. Stout, the late Dr. Evatt, and Mr. Whitlam himself, have time and time again referred to this link that exists between the Labour Party and the Communist Party through many left-wing unions, and referred in the clearest terms to the great problem this poses for the Labour Party in winning elections whilst this link exists. I believe that hon. members opposite know in their hearts that they will be affected in electoral terms by what is now happening in Europe. Their party's prospects will always suffer whilst they are tied to a concept of Socialism that makes it impossible to bar the doors or even the windows against entry into their party of fellow-travellers and of Communists.

Mr. Walsh: Communism is subsidised by capital.

Mr. PORTER: The hon. member for Bundaberg has made a very sententious statement, which, like the amendment, means very little. The Labour Party, in endeavouring to justify itself in its stand for Socialism, likes to pretend that its Socialism is something quite different from the Socialism of the Communist Party. I do not think anybody has been able to explain yet—if so, I have never been able to find it and read it and study it—where harmless Socialism ends and where dangerous Socialism of the Communist type begins. Nobody has been able to deny the fact that the essence of any fully planned system is that collective action cannot be

confined to tasks on which everybody agrees without agreement being forced on all, on everything, in order that the task may be done at all. This is why in every country where a fully planned Socialist system operates or has operated there is a system where opposition is suspended and the final sanction of the planner is the firing squad or the hangman's noose. There is no way out of it. All contemporary history proves this. So the Labour Party finds itself faced with an extreme problem whenever Communism, local or international, shows itself for what it is.

I have ranged rather freely over the factors which I believe are changing very rapidly the world of which we are a part. I have talked of circumstances which may be outside our capacity to influence and which will have a very real effect on our electoral aspirations and aims. I suppose all of us must wonder what it means and what will grow out of the changes that are now around us. Where will it all lead in political terms that we can understand? I have certainly no crystal ball to look at, and any prediction that I make is no more valid than that made by anybody else.

Mr. Houston interjected.

Mr. PORTER: The main thing is to survive. I have done that. The hon. member can only hope when his turn comes.

In making predictions I always bear in mind the advice that Winston Churchill gave to a young man who was contemplating political life and who asked him what qualification was most needed. Churchill replied, "Young man, it is the ability to foretell what is going to happen tomorrow, next week, next month and next year." The great man paused for a moment and went on, "And then, of course, to have the ability to explain afterwards why it did not happen".

Forecasts are always difficult things to make. Having surveyed the scene, I feel that I should chance my arm in a small way and make some predictions on what I believe is the shape of political things to come. I think that in this country we are moving towards what will eventually be, in essence anyhow, a two-party system. I also think the parties of the future will have to provide platforms and programmes that look forward and not backward. By this I mean that it will not be enough for parties to rely on a trotted-out ideology or a traditional attitude to win elections. They will have to get away from resting on these things as though they were hallowed writ. They will have to provide something real. I predict, too, that we will see a Labour Party which has sloughed off the dead skin of Socialism. It will have to, or it just will not survive. I believe that the Liberal Party will become much more reformist and innovating. I believe that, as Australia becomes more and more urbanised, the Country Party will become more and more akin to the Liberal Party and the two will merge.

It needs no crystal ball to forecast an electorate which, less and less, considers itself committed irrevocably to this party or that, or to this doctrine or that. Because of this, and because of the increasing role that television will play in political activity, I am quite convinced that personalities will loom much larger in politics in the future than they have done in the past. Without doubt, this is useful and it will tend to improve the median level of political capacity in all spheres. I think that, above all things, the electorate of tomorrow, which is already with us today to a much greater degree than the rather inane interjections from hon. members opposite indicate, will demand political leadership which looks outward and not inward and which cannot be tricked or deluded by easy promises.

We already have an electorate which is sophisticated and informed. I do not think this electorate will accept any aberrations, as it were, that is, blatant gerrymanders of boundaries or feuds inside parties for personal ends. The electorate of today and tomorrow will ask for more than that from its political personalities and parties. It is an electorate that cannot be easily tricked, cajoled or coerced. It can be led, and it will need good leadership. I would say that we would do ourselves, our constituents and this Parliament a grave disservice if we did not recognise what has happened already around us and what is happening more and more with each week that passes. The factors of change are there. They have to be recognised. They have to be dealt with in the most sensible and the most constructive way, and we should all plot our individual and collective courses accordingly.

I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and I am very much opposed to this foolish amendment.

Hon. G. W. W. CHALK (Lockyer—Treasurer) (3.51 p.m.): It was not my intention to enter early into this debate, but I believe that today we have heard in this Chamber more inaccuracies in two speeches than I have listened to during my 21 years in Parliament.

I refer first of all to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. He came into the Chamber today and accused this Government of having sold out our mineral wealth to overseas people. This is the charge that has been levelled against us. He was supported by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in a speech containing not one but dozens of inaccuracies. I shall let some of my colleagues reply to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition because I had deputations and did not hear all of his speech, although I have been told one or two things that he said. On the other hand, I was prepared to leave a deputation sitting in my room when, on the loud-speaker there, I heard portion of the address to this House by the hon. member for Townsville North.

That hon. member charged the Government, first of all, with having sold the mineral wealth of this State for 5c a ton. His next charge was that we had built a railway line which private enterprise would have provided. He then went further and told this Chamber that the only return to the State for the coal that came out of Moura was \$8.50 a ton, which he alleged went into the pockets of the coal-mining company. He proceeded to emphasise that the State itself received only 5c. He then went further and made an additional charge that we had built houses in Moura and in Blackwater, and that we had some type of arrangement with the companies concerned on the basis of a period of 10 years, but that it would be over some 50 years, according to him, that the State would be paying for these homes. He then made what I believe is a statement which, if made outside the Chamber, he would be called upon to prove, namely, that because the name "Thiess" is associated with Thiess Peabody Mitsui, Thiess received favourable consideration in the contracts. He indicated to this Chamber that Thiess received some \$11,000,000 in contracts out of a total contract figure of some \$13,000,000. He then tried to gather what might be termed political propaganda by saying that the grain-grower would not get any freight rates such as the coal-mining companies are getting. Finally, as far as he was concerned, he was prepared to damn the future of this State for a little political and Labour Party kudos.

I am not prepared to allow the speech delivered here about an hour or two ago to go out through the Press to the people of this State without replying to it on behalf of the Government. This is a matter far too serious to Queensland and the Commonwealth to allow that to happen.

Let us analyse each of the charges made. First of all, we are accused of receiving only 5c a ton on mineral output. It is true that the royalty is 5c a ton, and it is equally true that in some other parts of the Commonwealth of Australia royalties as high as 7½ per cent. on the sale value of the product are paid. However, where that occurs all the railway operations, and the whole of the conduct of them and their profitability, are at the disposal of the mining company.

Mr. Camm: And the port.

Mr. CHALK: Yes; the company also has the profitability on the port. Let us see what happens to this \$8.50 which the hon. member for Townsville North says goes into the pockets of the mining companies.

A Government Member: Where is he now?

Mr. CHALK: He has gone home. If he wants to go home, that is his business. His place should be in this House, when I am replying to him. If he wants to go home, I cannot stop him; that is his prerogative.

Mr. HOUSTON: I rise to a point of order. Surely the Treasurer is not denying me the right to ask my colleagues to go where I think they should.

Mr. CHALK: Good on you! If the hon. member wants to tell some of his colleagues to go where I think he wants them to go, he can by all means tell them. I know that the hon. member for Townsville North lives in the Far North, and I am not blaming him for going. The point of the matter is that I am examining where the \$8.50 goes. Of that amount, approximately \$2 is received by the Railway Department for haulage.

Mr. Houston: What is the exact amount?

Mr. CHALK: It is published in the report. There is nothing to hide.

Mr. Houston: You are making the speech.

Mr. CHALK: I am speaking ad lib.

Mr. Houston: You had time to prepare it.

Mr. CHALK: The hon. member can read the agreement. I said that it was approximately \$2. It is \$1.80, on a sliding scale down to about \$1.70.

Mr. Houston: It makes a difference to whether or not the company can afford to pay 5c or 10c. That is the point.

Mr. CHALK: I am going to make my speech in the way that I believe will give this House a fair and intelligent explanation of the whole situation. From the \$8.50, approximately \$2 flows to the Railway Department. There is also a sum up to about 10c which flows to the Port of Gladstone. There is also the amount paid to the employees in wages. To say that the company is receiving \$8.50 is an endeavour to leave in the minds of the people of Queensland the impression that the companies are getting this money and are not spending it in this State. I tell the House now that every cent coming out of the mines of Queensland at present is being returned for further development in this State.

Are those members who advocated that this should have been a private railway prepared to go out and tell that to the railwaymen of this State? It is true that we received an offer by private enterprise to build a railway line. If we had accepted that private-enterprise railway, the whole of the profitability of the railway line would have gone in the pockets of the company. Does the hon. member want to deny railwaymen employment? Does he want to prevent development of his own area? Does he want to deny the people of the area transport on that line? I cannot believe that any member of the Australian Labour Party would get up in this Chamber and advocate things such as those.

The hon. member for Townsville North then went on to analyse the amount of money that was paid.

Mr. Aikens: And the Labour Party gave the Blair Athol company the right to build a private railway line and charged 1d. a ton royalty.

Mr. CHALK: I know. The point is that the hon. member for Townsville North said that not one penny of this money was being subscribed by the company. If we had had to raise the finance ourselves to build this railway line, it would never have been built by the Government. The basis on which it was built was that the State would find half the cost—half the necessary finance—and that the other half would be found by the company. The company cheerfully provided its half of the required cash figure for the railway line and lodged it with the State.

Mr. Houston: As a loan.

Mr. CHALK: As a security deposit, but only repayable on the basis that coal came down the line. Not one cent of the deposit would be repaid if no coal was supplied, and that is the position today.

Mr. Houston: What interest?

Mr. CHALK: As the coal begins to come down the line, there will be a refund to the company of an amount related to each ton. At the end of the contract period the Government will have a railway line that has been paid for and will have involved the State in only half the outlay that it would have if we had had to find all the money ourselves. In return, the company will have received the money that it borrowed, and we will have paid the interest on that borrowed money. Surely this is a sound basis on which to finance a project that the State itself could not finance unless it received that money; surely it is sound business to have the profit from the haulage on that line; surely it is a sound proposal to continue to employ railwaymen who otherwise possibly would have had to leave their jobs. Surely the Australian Labour Party is not out to reduce the number of railway employees; surely it is not out to have a private railway line on which the charges can be whatever the company might like them to be. These are the things that have to be explained.

I believe that the hon. member for Townsville North knows the facts only too well. He made reference to the amount of interest that was paid to the company during the period of the security payment. What he said was true. How many hon. members have built a home, or whatever it might be, and had to raise a loan? They have had to take delivery of the loan. We took delivery of this money; we used it. As the money was spent on the railway line, so we paid the accounts. In the meantime, we had the use of the money that was put up by the company. I cannot believe that any hon. member on the Opposition benches would condemn the basis on which this financial transaction was carried out; I know that no hon. member on this side of the Chamber would condemn it.

I will go a little further. The Government was then accused of having provided homes for the workers. Surely that was a sensible act on the Government's part. What we did was this: we said to the company, "Look, here are homes for the people; but because of your venture, which perhaps may not succeed, we will expect from you a guaranteed rental for these homes over the period of the contract." Is that not sound business? Apparently the hon. member condemns us for providing homes for the people who live at Moura and Blackwater. How can any Labour man come into this Chamber and put up such an argument?

Now, let us have a look at the next charge, which was that because the name "Thiess" is associated with Thiess Peabody Mitsui, Thiess received favourable consideration in contracts.

Mr. Row: A scurrilous statement!

Mr. CHALK: It is a scurrilous statement. The hon. member knows as well as I do that tenders were called for every contract, and with one exception Thiess was the lowest tenderer and he carried out the work. To say that Thiess got \$11,000,000 is scurrilous. Thiess did not get \$11,000,000 for work done. He got contracts and he spent the money with Queenslanders carrying out a job for the benefit of Queensland. How long are we going to have that type of propaganda put over to knock this State?

I do not care what the Opposition say in relation to any dealings I have had, but I do care for Queensland. Only recently I have had the responsibility of going overseas and endeavouring to assist in other developmental projects in this State. We have at present a good name overseas as a stable State, but when people read the type of tripe that was put over in this House today, when investors are looking to Queensland, believing it to be the State of the future, when they see the type of Socialistic propaganda that is put over by the Labour Party, are they going to race into this State, or will they say, "What is the future?" Are they going to say, "We will not invest in Queensland, because if there is a change of Government we will be faced with a Government of socialisation, a Government that, on its own words spoken in this House, believes the very type of dealing we are engaged in is selling out Queensland?"

As far as I am concerned, and as long as I occupy the position I do, I will sell Queensland on the basis on which it has been sold over recent years, and we will develop this State. This type of propaganda is not only to the disadvantage of the Government but to the disadvantage of the country as a whole.

Reference was made to the latest deal with Utah. My colleague the Minister for Mines will have an opportunity during this Address-in-Reply debate to reply in a much fuller manner than I have. I am speaking ad lib because I know the background of this matter and what it means to this State. Here also was a company that was considering whether

it would invest in this State. Do not let us fool ourselves; New South Wales and other countries in the world are seeking the coal trade of Japan. It is true that Japan will buy on the cheapest market—and I do not blame any country for doing that—so that the responsibility of providing the requirements of that country rests entirely with the country that has the raw products.

Utah have been looking at several countries in the world today. They have a limited amount of money for speculation. The transfer of American finance to Australia is not easy; the transfer of Euro. dollars is much easier, and consequently, because of that, there was a possibility that this company would be able to spend some \$80,000,000 in Queensland if we were able to come to a basis of a coal contract. Here is another area, a coal field situated some 140 miles west of Mackay that would remain undeveloped unless a rail facility was provided.

Here is a coal field, which, when rail facilities are provided, will return a very handsome profitability out of transportation. Yet the Opposition wants us to insist on a private railroad; it wants us to hand the working of the railway over to private enterprise; it wants us to have a private line there that will not be for the use of the people.

I went to the United States and argued for days to ensure that we had the same type or deal with Utah as the one written with T.P.M., as I had an inside knowledge of the profitability that is coming to this State because of the operation of our own coal line. The hon. member for Townsville North said that there was no profit to the railways in hauling coal for \$1.80. All I would say to him is this: if those companies who have made deals with us were fully aware of the profitability that is coming from the coal haulage they would not be too anxious to enter into further contracts at the freight rate that it is.

Why is it that the companies have gone into Western Australia and fought to have their own railway lines? Do not tell me that if we are losing money on our State-owned railway lines these people would want to build something that would turn out as a loss. People in Western Australia are building railway lines there not because they want to show a loss, but because there is profit in it. We want that profit for the State; we do not want it going into the hands of the company. I want that money so that we can save on our railways, so that there can be a profitability in our over-all operations, and so that we can continue to further dieselise and improve the services and continue to employ every man who is presently employed in the Railway Department. Yet the Opposition want to give this away. I cannot follow their argument. All I can say is that what has been done has been done in the interests of Queensland.

Mr. Houston: That is your opinion only.

Mr. CHALK: It is the opinion of most sensible Queenslanders, too. But the point of the matter is that anyone who is prepared to sit down and analyse this position, not with a biased mind towards it but with a mind prepared to analyse it carefully, will agree with me. I believe that if the Australian Labour Party were over on this side of the Chamber it would try to drive the same bargain, because I believe that it knows very well just what this means to the State. But because it suits its own political ambitions to try to knock this State, it is prepared to continue to condemn.

Mr. Houston: Tell me one thing. Why isn't it possible to get 10c a ton royalty?

Mr. CHALK: The point of the matter is that there is at present very little margin of profitability in the operation, and, as far as the haulage is concerned, I would rather take the basis of its profitability, which is known to me and to my Government, than have a fixed rate of, say, 10c a ton royalty. There is a point where there is some doubt about what the company can make out of coal production.

The hon. member for Townsville North said that Thiess got 20c out of every ton of coal that was exported. What an inaccuracy! Thiess gets 20c only after the company is operating at a profit, after a certain tonnage of coal has been exported. If hon. members know anything of the situation at all at present, they will know that the mine has operated at a loss over several months and Thiess has not got a "cracker" out of it.

Mr. Camm: It won't get anything.

Mr. CHALK: It will not get a "cracker". Yet we have these statements condemning a Queensland company.

Mr. Hanlon: When we asked you a question about it you said you did not know anything about it.

Mr. CHALK: I have answered every question the hon. member for Baroona has asked. The point of the matter is that the situation is clearly defined.

I rose only to refute the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Townsville North because I believe the actions taken by this Government, its conduct in the development of the Moura mine and its conduct in the development of Blackwater, have been such that it has provided fast development for this State. We have 115 miles of railway line that we would never have had but for this scheme, and we will have 143 miles of new railway line from Goonyella to Mackay some time in the very near future. These are the things that count.

Finally, let me emphasise one other point, because in the concluding remarks of the hon. member for Townsville North he appealed, as it were, to the man on the land. He said, "The railways will carry coal for \$1.80 a

ton but what will they carry your wheat for?" Next season's crop of wheat from this area will be carried for a freight rate equivalent to 115 miles whether it goes round the long way or down the short way. That represents something like a \$2-a-ton reduction for the grower. Hon. members opposite cannot tell me that those people have not benefited. They cannot tell me that the development of this line has not meant a lot to the people of that area.

Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt: They are not conversant with the area.

Mr. CHALK: They are not conversant with the area. The hon. member for Barcoo knows it. I am not drawing him in on it. He knows the situation, but his leader and his deputy leader raised the argument. I am prepared to be fair with the hon. member for Barcoo. He knows the situation.

Mr. O'Donnell interjected.

Mr. CHALK: It is up to the hon. member; he knows his district.

The point of the matter is that this is development. Hon. members opposite cannot say that we can carry wheat, picking up two or three trucks here, and two or three trucks there, and carry it for anything like the same rate as that for trainloads of 2,000 and 3,000 tons coming down in a one trainload shuttle service. That is where the economies of transport come in.

I hope that the people of Queensland will pay due heed to what has been said by the Leader of the Opposition and his deputy in this House today. If they do that and judge the situation for themselves, I am prepared to allow what this Government has done to be judged by the people of this State.

Mr. Houston: They will do that.

Mr. CHALK: They will do that, and they will do it sensibly. After all, it is by our record and achievements that we want to be judged.

Mrs. JORDAN (Ipswich West) (4.19 p.m.): I rise today to speak in this debate and to support the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I know that the great majority of the people in my electorate of Ipswich West would agree largely with what they have had to say today and would agree with the criticisms of the Government in relation to the agreements that have been made with overseas firms. They would agree also with the analysis of what this Government has done in past years. It was rather amusing, or perhaps it was most congratulatory to the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader, that they were able to bring the Treasurer from his haunts, or his deputation, to answer what they said today. Apparently he felt that there was a case to answer.

I believe that he did have something to say to this House, and I draw his attention to "Hansard" of 18 September, 1962, where

the late Ernie Evans also felt that he should say something to his ministerial colleagues and to the members of this Parliament relative to the agreement that was made at that time. Mr. Evans, on page 471, said—

“Under the provisions of Part IV. of the agreement the company is required to survey and build a railway from the coal-field to the port, that is, from the neighbourhood of Moura a distance of 120 miles to the port, which is defined as Gladstone or such other port where coal is shipped by the company. Under Clause 36, the route and plans of the railway are to be approved by the Minister.

The railway is to be constructed within seven years and the company is required to lodge security of £100,000 for surveying and building it. That is not a bond, but will be in cash or in bank guarantee. The sum of £20,000 is to be returned on completion of the survey, and the balance on completion of construction of the railway.”

On the following page, dealing with the same matter, he continued—

“Clause 38 provides that the Governor in Council shall have the right to acquire the whole of the railway as a going concern after 42 years. The purchase price must not exceed one and one-tenth the cost of the railway. We put in that clause because we have been faced with a considerable period of inflation, and there must be a stopping point on the value of that line at the end of 42 years.”

Again, on the same page, he said—

“Clause 47 stipulates that the railway is to be used for the transport of coal and the company's employees and goods, and that it shall not be used for public transport, nor shall fares or rates be charged except with the approval of the Governor in Council, as provided by Clause 48. The Governor in Council may restrict the carriage of any persons or goods, or class of persons or goods.”

That is entirely different from what the Treasurer has tried to tell us today. Apparently by some means or other he and the Government have a different interpretation of that agreement and of what Mr. Evans meant when he felt that he must put the truth of the agreement before the Parliament and his colleagues, as he said, to justify his trip overseas.

I shall leave any other debate on this matter to other speakers who live nearer to the area and have visited it and know more about the matter than I, although it is a matter of considerable interest to me because it has been the activities in these areas that have caused the gradual decline in the use of coal from the Ipswich coal fields. That, of course, has affected the workers in the coal-mining industry in Ipswich, so it is of tremendous importance to me.

Before proceeding with any other matters with which I am concerned I should like to express my continuing loyalty and that of

the people of Ipswich West to Her Majesty the Queen. I offer congratulations to the Governor and Lady Mansfield on the way they are carrying out their duties in Queensland. They are certainly demonstrating that Queenslanders can do an excellent job in this high office. I wish them well for the future.

I also offer my congratulations to the new Premier, Honourable J. Bjelke-Petersen, although, with all other members of the House, I very much regret the circumstances which brought about the change. I also extend to the new Minister for Works and Housing, Honourable A. H. Hodges, congratulations on his elevation to the Ministry.

I listened with much interest to the Governor's Opening Speech and agreed with much of what he said about Queensland's role in the Australian economy. I was, however, most disappointed at the meagre references to legislation proposed for this session of Parliament. There was a very brief list of four Bills, and very brief references to what they were about. With all that has been said about Queensland's potential and development and changing social and economic patterns, one would have thought that the Government would have wanted to indicate to the people, in this important speech at the opening of this session of Parliament, its cognisance, by means of an impressive list of proposed Bills, of the requirements and problems of the State, and how it intended to get on with the huge job that lies ahead in these constantly changing times.

The daily Press has given us some idea of legislation which it indicated the Government would introduce, much of it being ratification of Federal legislation affecting the State. Silence prevailed on a number of these matters in the Governor's speech. All too often it is per medium of the Press that Opposition members learn of what is being done, or is to be done, by the Government, and Parliament is ignored. There is certainly more and more government by regulation, and I do not believe that that is good. No political party—indeed, no Minister or member—is always wholly right or wholly wrong on every matter. Debate often brings out points that have not been considered or even thought of, and I think it is a great pity that Governments are tending to veer towards such dictatorship, with fewer and fewer people making important decisions not only here but in many other places.

Certainly problems today are much more complex than they were. As more knowledge is gained and development moves at a faster pace, specialist advice is often required. However, it is sometimes found that a specialist is knowledgeable only in his own field, and, as a result, the whole picture often becomes clouded in a number of parts. I feel that legislators must be very wary on this point and view things from the wider perspective, lest we regret the day certain decisions were made which could not be adjusted later.

With the mass publicity media of today, I feel that it is often the unimportant things that get the main headlines, whilst the things of real importance to us all and to the State do not get enough publicity. Only the sensational seems to make the headlines. Nowadays we seem somehow or other to have lost our perspective in many of these things and, although there are many who realise this, we seem to be able to do little about it. However, it was pleasing to hear the Governor say in his speech that the Government reported to him that the health of the Queensland economy was excellent. I hope that this healthy state of our finances will mean that there will be greater assistance for decentralisation of industry. Decentralisation must be a strong feature in our planning, because the continuing drift to the capital cities must be arrested if we are to really hold and develop this country.

One of the most important problems facing Queensland is the lack of employment opportunities in country towns, and even in provincial cities, for people in all employable age groups, and particularly for young people, many of whom find that they achieve a good education but still cannot get a job in their own areas or even in an area reasonably close by. Although some explosive development is now taking place in a few areas of the State—we have heard quite a lot about it this afternoon—there are very many areas that are crying out for assistance to get industries, large or small, established so that they can hold the people they have and so that their young people can be assured of jobs in their own district and not have to travel, of necessity, to the capital cities. Pick up a local newspaper in many provincial cities and country towns in Queensland and one will read the same story. They are all crying out for new industries. The cry is the same in Northern New South Wales, in Lismore, Casino, Kyogle and many other towns. The Department of Industrial Development certainly has a very big task in trying to attract industries to provincial areas, accelerate their establishment, and encourage and assist the growth of existing industries.

Over the last couple of years Ipswich has been affected by redundancy resulting from dieselisation of the railways and mechanisation of the mines and, as a result, has not progressed at the same tempo at which it progressed over many, many years. But in spite of Government policies and the lack of assistance in overcoming the problems of redundancy in the railways and in the mines, Ipswich is recovering from the setback it received as a result of the time of the change in methods in both industries coinciding. It is still a solid city and has a steady growth factor.

Housing continues to grow, and this is always a firm indication of a city's expansion. Last financial year—1967-68—the total amount spent on housing in Ipswich was \$5,299,414, of which \$4,920,274 was spent on new buildings and \$379,140 on additions. Of

the amount spent on new buildings, \$3,506,422 was for new houses, \$1,252,902 for other new projects, such as factories, schools, community projects, etc., and \$160,950 for new flats. The total expenditure on buildings in Ipswich in the financial year 1966-67 was \$4,036,062, so there was an increase of \$1,263,352 over that figure in 1967-68. Going back a year further, the total expenditure on housing in the financial year 1965-66 was \$3,380,647. Therefore, there was an increase of \$1,263,352 in 1967-68, an increase of \$655,415 in 1966-67, and \$336,721 in the year before that. Those figures speak for themselves and show that the acceleration of building almost doubled in the last financial year. This, as I said, I think is a very good indication that, in spite of Government policies in railways and mines, Ipswich is continuing to grow.

Nevertheless, Ipswich needs a greater variety of industry to give employment for young people, particularly girls. It needs expansion of heavier industries to provide jobs for those affected by redundancy. I feel that much more could be done, and should be done, by the Government, to offset the hardships of those affected by redundancy. In most instances, one wage-earner out of work means a whole family affected. To my way of thinking, there has not been enough foresight or planning by the Government in this question of redundancy, nor has enough consideration been given to the direct effect on the business community in the over-all picture of the problem. I feel that the Government has let us down in this regard.

In making my maiden speech in this House two years ago, I spoke on this question and emphasised the effect that Government policies in relation to railways and railway workshops were having in the area. The fact that the Ipswich Railway Workshops had more and more become a repair shop while contracts for new work went to overseas firms was a matter of concern to all sections of the community, and was very short-sighted. I said then, and I say it again today, that where once there was security of employment there is now fear as to who will be the next to go. This feeling of insecurity has spread, and the business community is now conscious of the effect that this watering down of railway work for Ipswich has had.

Perhaps one of the worst aspects of the lessening of the number of tradesmen employed is the allied reduction in the number of apprentices indentured and trained. With the passage of time this has become apparent and is a matter for regret. For many years the railway workshops played a major role in the training of apprentices and also influenced the number to be trained from year to year. After completion of their training many of these lads went over to outside industries—into private enterprise—and often progressed to leading positions there. That was an accepted fact

by the Government and the Railway Department, and by private enterprise in the community itself. The railway workshops were recognised as an excellent training ground for these young tradesmen and it was a role the State provided and, as I said, accepted. But that is not so today, and more is the pity. More and more private enterprise is resisting the taking-on of apprentices, putting forward the excuse that they are not economic and that they cannot afford them. One small but growing manufacturer of ironwork in Ipswich recently went so far as to say publicly that apprentices should study at night in their own time and that employers should not have to give them time off in the day-time to pursue their studies. That is a retrogressive step indeed and is indicative of the outlook of a number of employers as they achieve and chase bigger and bigger profits.

I still believe that electrification of the suburban railways would have been the answer to many railway problems, as well as helping the mining industry around the local areas. At the same time it would give a faster, cleaner means of transport to suburban travellers. There are experts who agree with this claim.

Ipswich is fighting back on this question of redundancy, and because it concerned over-redundancy a public committee was set up in Ipswich several months ago comprising very wide representation. It included the mayor and the aldermen of the city council, representatives of industry, including the mining industry, and representatives of many of the trade unions. That committee requested the then Premier, the late Mr. Pizzey, to receive a deputation, but as he was going overseas he referred the matter to the Deputy Premier, Mr. Chalk, who eventually met the deputation on 3 June last.

After hearing submissions put forward by the deputation he promised that he would consider the matter and would let me know what the decisions were. The hon. member for Ipswich East was overseas at the time. Although some 2½ months have elapsed, not a word has been heard from the Treasurer.

There has been a lot of buck-passing on this matter between the Federal and State Governments. The Queensland Government took the matter to the Loan Council, but nothing has been heard since, so apparently the result was not good. If it were we would certainly have learned of it, at least through the Press if not directly from the Government.

Mr. Hayden, the Federal Member for Oxley, in May this year asked the Federal Treasurer, Mr. McMahon, for the Federal Government to provide a special grant to provide work for these unemployed men because of retrenchments in the mining industry and in the railways in Ipswich. Mr. McMahon replied on 14 May that any such request for Commonwealth assistance for such a purpose would need to come in the first instance from the State Government. The letter was a perfect passing of the buck

back to the State, and it was as wordy a letter as one could get in reiterating facts known to all who had even the smallest interest in such matters. Perhaps I should read parts of it, if only to show the thinking of the Federal Treasurer on this important question of unemployment in Queensland.

He wrote to Mr. Hayden—

“At the outset, I should point out that any request for Commonwealth assistance for such a purpose would need to come, in the first instance, from the State Government. As local authorities are constituted and function under State laws, the Commonwealth takes the view that it is the responsibility of the State Governments to determine the financial resources that should be available to these authorities. For this reason, it has been the general policy of successive Commonwealth Governments not to make subventions directly to or on behalf of local government authorities. Thus, if any grant were to be made for the purpose mentioned, it would be to the State Government on the basis of a request made by that Government.”

He then goes on—I will not quote it in detail—to point out how unemployment assistance is given to those out of work and how they should register.

When I read the letter I thought how utterly ridiculous it was. He had not told us a thing we did not already know, and when I showed the letter to Mr. Chalk at the deputation he said, “Yes, that’s right.” Of course we knew it was right—the deputation knew this—but what we were trying to obtain was some extra help from the Federal Government, through the State, for the alleviation of unemployment owing to redundancy in the city of Ipswich. What a negative approach! How does one get through to people in these positions of importance? Apparently the Queensland Government was not able to get through to the Federal Treasurer, either.

Now that the Government has indicated that its finances are buoyant, perhaps Ipswich can hope in the not far distant future for some extra grant from the State Government to the Ipswich City Council to cover this transition period with its problem of redundancy. I appeal to the Premier and the Treasurer to give favourable consideration to the suggestion of a special grant, which could perhaps be given for sewerage work. I believe this is one of the most realistic ways to help surmount the difficulties which have arisen, and which continue to arise, in the Ipswich area.

Only a couple of weeks ago Queensland Woollen Mills dismissed seven men, and I hear that more are to go. Sutton’s Foundry as it was—it is now Annand & Thompson—in the same week gave notice to six men, and there, too, it is rumoured that more men are to be dismissed.

Ipswich as a city realises that it must itself do something to encourage industry to come there. Some months ago, as a result of suggestions put forward to the city council in a letter from the Ipswich West A.L.P., the council made a decision to offer certain incentives to encourage new industries to Ipswich. These included cheaper land for industry, water rate concessions for five years, the erection of billboards at the entrances to the city to notify people passing through what was available, and also to spend money on advertising in some of the leading southern newspapers. This, I hope and understand, is to be carried out in conjunction with the Department of Industrial Development.

In recent weeks the Ipswich City Council, in conjunction with the Ipswich Chamber of Commerce and Industry, decided to establish a Promotion and Research Bureau to be led by a full-time officer, whose major responsibility will be to encourage industry to locate in Ipswich. The city council provided \$5,000 for this purpose in its recent budget, and the Chamber of Commerce has launched a full-scale campaign to raise its \$5,000 share of the necessary finance for the establishment of such a bureau.

Ipswich has long held the honour of being a highly industrialised and solid city, and it is proud of its record. These latest moves should help to keep Ipswich on the map as a progressive city, pushing its claim for more industry as the tempo of development increases and more and more industries come to Queensland. Ipswich feels it has as much to offer as most other cities; indeed, a lot more. Some of the major provincial cities are on the list for the Department of Industrial Development's attention and I hope that Ipswich will also be added to that list.

It was most interesting to read in the Press lately that the Department of Industrial Development is also giving incentives to industry to come to Queensland. These include certain financial help, concessional freight rates, the provision of fully-serviced Crown land for industry in provincial cities and special allocations for housing where required.

I believe that the development of the industrial estate at Wacol will be of as much benefit to Ipswich as it is to Brisbane. As industry comes to the area, workers employed there can live in Ipswich and travel to work at Wacol without having to brave such traffic hazards as they would encounter coming from Brisbane. This is part of regional planning—planning for an area, not just for one city or town. I feel that regional planning is becoming most vital in Queensland. I agree with the recent statement by the Federal Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Gough Whitlam, that there is a need for a Federal regional development authority to work in conjunction with the States.

Talking of planning, I again put before the Government the need for a new railway station at Ipswich. The railway station there must surely be the most depressing, dilapidated and dirty railway station that one could find anywhere. In a question last year I asked if there were any plans for a new railway station at Ipswich and was given a flat "No plans" answer from the Minister for Transport. Perhaps the train smash at the Ipswich Railway Station on 10 July last might cause him to reconsider the matter, because he and his officers know quite well that with the inadequacy of the set-up there—the lack of lines for shunting and the bottle-necks that occur many times a day—there are constant close shaves and regulations and rules have to be constantly broken to keep both passenger and goods trains moving. I know that this is a fact because my late husband was a signalman there and many was the headache and many was the worry that he had because of the inadequate facilities at the Ipswich Railway Station and its environs. A few more minutes that afternoon and the train involved in the accident would have been loaded with school children who were waiting on the platform to board the train. Must there be a major accident before something is done?

Unfortunately, and I repeat "unfortunately", little damage was done to the platform. It seems that the station just cannot be broken down or burnt down and it will not even rot away. Perhaps we could interest the Treasurer in having some of the solid platform blocks moved to his new Helidon station along with the blocks moved there recently from the so-called new platform at the new station started at Ipswich about 30 years ago and never finished, or perhaps I could interest him in taking it up to Moura or Blackwater or some other place. I can assure him that we will not sell it to him; we will give it to him "for free"—soot, peeling paint-work, indeed the whole works, lock, stock and barrel. Perhaps we could even have our local transporters take it up there for him. By such means we can perhaps hope to get a new railway station at Ipswich. I assure the Treasurer that we would not be difficult about giving the station to him, even though Ipswich may, in his opinion, be difficult politically, as he stated at a recent Liberal Party convention at Ipswich.

Apparently we are difficult because we vote A.L.P. in the three levels of Government. The Treasurer said that night that Ipswich would have greater opportunities if it had a voice inside the Government rather than have representatives outside looking in and criticising. I remind the Treasurer that that very attitude was a catch-cry of the Liberal Party in the last election campaign, and apparently we will have the same candidate with the same catch-cry in the State election campaign next year. The cry of "Vote for us or else" does not go over in either Ipswich East or Ipswich West. I can assure the Treasurer and the House that I

will not be hanging on the cliff waiting for the result next year, as I was three years ago. Perhaps I will be re-elected with a larger majority than has ever been obtained in Ipswich before. That is not my ego talking. I am relying on concrete facts and what is said around the area. Indeed such cries as "Vote for us or else" smack of partisan Government, and I do not think that they are very wise statements to make. The people of Ipswich will continue to vote A.L.P. because they know that it is a party which bases its policies on the needs of the people and humanitarian principles.

I believe that what happens to people in this fast-moving technological age has not been sufficiently considered. The impact of change on people has been neglected, and there are many throughout the world who think that. Indeed, that was the theme of the Duke of Edinburgh's Study Group when they met here in Australia and, as the various groups visited parts of this country, they studied this subject here. I had some interesting discussions with some of them whilst they were here, and they told me that this aspect of the effect on people of technological and scientific progress is world wide but that Australia was further behind than were many other countries in realising it and doing something about it. "You will have the benefit of learning from the mistakes of others", they said to me. That is as it may be, but what of the interim period? And must we always follow others? I believe that we have people who could take a lead if we really wanted them to.

In the short time left to me, I want to refer to matters relating to women. I was going to say, "concerning" women, but they do not concern only women; they concern all of us as a people. For women, I feel that the tide is turning. Indications of this have been given by the Government, and it was pleasing to learn that the Government intends this session to amend legislation dealing with the employment of married women in the Public Service and the teaching service.

The last 12 months have seen a definite leap forward in the fight for the removal of discrimination against women in the matter of salaries and conditions of employment in several fields in this State. Salaries of women teachers are to be lifted by yearly increments over four years till they receive the same salaries as male teachers. Improvements have also been gained in a number of other areas. Step by step the goal of equity is being achieved. When I became a member of this House I had a private member's motion placed on the Business Paper concerning discrimination against women. This year I did not put such a motion on the paper because I felt, following the progress that has been made, that the thin edge of the wedge was well in the doorway, and I presuppose that discriminations will now quickly wither away and all the prejudices will fade into the past.

I like to believe that my entry to this House had a little to do with the altered attitude to members of my sex, and that now other women will be treated as individuals, just as I am here and as men have been for so long. Daily more and more women are making very worth-while and excellent contributions to the improvement of our State and community generally, and I know that there are many in this House who realise that.

(Time expired.)

Debate, on motion of Mr. McKechnie, adjourned.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

COMMONWEALTH AID FOR ABORIGINAL WELFARE

Hon. V. B. SULLIVAN (Condamine—Minister for Lands) (4.59 p.m.), by leave: I am sure that hon. members will be interested to learn that in the last few days I have had discussions with the Commonwealth Minister in charge of Aboriginal affairs, who has indicated that an amount has been allocated in the Federal Budget to assist the various States with their programmes directed to the assimilation of Aboriginal Australians.

Hon. members realise that Queensland for many years has carried alone the burden of Aboriginal and Islander welfare and has developed all possible avenues in the encouragement of Aboriginal Queenslanders to live as fellow-members of the broad social structure of our State; and let me say that the response by Aboriginal and Islander Queenslanders has been more than gratifying because, of the total estimated population of some 50,000 people of Aboriginal racial origin, almost half have developed and chosen a way of life which necessitates only some measure of welfare activity. The Commonwealth Minister has indicated to me that the Commonwealth proposes to set aside \$10,000,000 in an Aboriginal Trust Fund this year, of which half would be for capital projects and half would be expended in the specific fields of housing, health and education.

It has been indicated that the capital fund of \$5,000,000 would operate on the basis that allocations would be made by the Federal Government after processing by the Commonwealth Office of Aboriginal Affairs for Aboriginal ventures (either corporate or individual) which appeared to be economically viable, and it is the Commonwealth's hope that most of the applications would come forward on the recommendation of the State concerned. It was further indicated that the State would be involved in prior consultation with Commonwealth authorities relative to the uses of the capital fund, which will be a revolving one so that moneys from it would be repayable on agreed terms in respect of each individual project.

It was further conveyed to me that the remaining \$5,000,000 would be for non-repayable grants, and the Commonwealth proposed to split it between the States approximately in proportion to their Aboriginal population, and Queensland's share would be \$1,450,000, while other allocations are—

New South Wales	..	\$775,000
Victoria	..	\$225,000
South Australia	..	\$350,000
Western Australia	..	\$825,000
Tasmania	..	\$25,000
Northern Territory	..	\$1,000,000

leaving \$350,000 for later allocation.

The allocation of amounts between the three functions of housing, health and education is subject to some adjustment in accordance with the individual wishes of the States concerned, and it will be necessary to place detailed proposals before the Commonwealth in conformity with certain principles which have been enunciated by the Commonwealth authorities. The Commonwealth authorities have been given an assurance by the Government that the Commonwealth contribution will be a net addition to and not a substitute for the normal expenditure by the State on Aboriginal welfare from State funds. Hon. members will agree, I am sure, that it is most heartening now to have this indication from the Commonwealth of positive participation in the programme of Aboriginal development, and there is no doubt that, although the amounts did not reach the magnitude hoped for, it is a start and we would hope that in future years this will increase as programmes develop.

Finally, I am sure I am speaking for all hon. members of this House in expressing appreciation of the contribution made by the late Premier, Hon. J. C. A. Pizzey, and his successor, Hon. J. Bjelke-Petersen, M.L.A., during their respective terms in office as Minister in charge of Aboriginal and Island Affairs, and, too, I should like to add a word of commendation for the capable and competent manner in which the Director, Mr. Pat Killoran, has handled his rather difficult assignment.

I might mention that some of the accusations made by the Leader of the Opposition will be answered by me some time during the Address-in-Reply debate.

Mr. Houston: You must admit that I got quick action as a result of my statement.

Mr. SULLIVAN: The hon. member is just as ill informed on that as he was on minerals.

Mr. Houston: It brought quick action.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The House adjourned at 5.4 p.m.