

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 6 OCTOBER 1970

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 6 OCTOBER, 1970

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

**AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND
BANKING GROUP BILL**

Assent reported by Mr. Speaker.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

**DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY; MINISTER FOR
LANDS AND MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL
DEVELOPMENT**

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier) (11.4 a.m.): I desire to inform the House that in connection with the present overseas visits of the Minister for Lands and the Minister for Industrial Development, His Excellency the Governor has, by virtue of the provisions of the Officials in Parliament Act 1896-1969, authorised and empowered:

(1) The Honourable Ronald Ernest Camm, Minister for Mines and Main Roads, to perform and exercise all or any of the duties, powers and authorities imposed or conferred upon the Honourable the Minister for Lands by any Act, rule, practice or ordinance on and from 25 September, 1970, and until the return to Queensland of the Honourable Victor Bruce Sullivan.

(2) The Honourable William Edward Knox, Minister for Transport, to perform and exercise all or any of the duties, powers and authorities imposed or conferred upon the Honourable the Minister for Industrial Development by any Act, rule, practice or ordinance on and from 26 September, 1970, and until the return to Queensland of the Honourable Frederick Alexander Campbell.

I lay upon the table of the House a copy of the Queensland Government Gazette Extraordinary of 24 September, 1970, notifying these arrangements.

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

MINISTERIAL EXPENSES

RETURN TO ORDER

The following paper was laid on the table:—

Return to an Order made by the House on 23 July last, on the motion of Mr. V. E. Jones, of expenses of Ministers for the period 1 July, 1969, to 30 June, 1970, inclusive, showing each separately and in detail.

27

PAPERS

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

Reports—

Operations of the Agricultural Bank, for the year 1969-70.

Queensland Institute of Medical Research, for the year 1969-70.

Operations of the Sub-Departments of the Department of Health—"Eventide" (Sandgate), "Eventide" (Charters Towers), "Eventide" (Rockhampton), and Queensland Industrial Institution for the Blind (South Brisbane), for the year 1969-70.

Chief Safety Engineer, Chief Inspector of Machinery, Scaffolding, and Weights and Measures, for the year 1969-70.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Proclamation under the Clean Air Act of 1963.

Orders in Council under—

Racing and Betting Act 1954-1969

The Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments Act of 1959.

The Harbours Acts, 1955 to 1968.

Water Act 1926-1968.

The State Electricity Commission Acts, 1937 to 1965.

Regulations under—

Children's Services Act 1965-1970.

The Apprenticeship Act of 1964.

Report under the Legal Assistance Act of 1965.

Balance Sheet and Profit and Loss Account of Queensland Trustees Limited, for the year 1969-70.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

**"HIPPI" COMMUNITY IN NORTH
QUEENSLAND**

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the statement by Dame Zara Bate in *Sunday Truth* of September 20 that hippies conducted a "love in" commune near Cairns, that they drugged themselves with mushrooms, that the mushrooms "sent you off" and that the effect was much better than alcohol?

(2) Is he aware that she gave a detailed description of the mushrooms which makes them easily identifiable and stated that their consumption was legal?

(3) As these remarks are alarming and constitute an encouragement to young people to obtain and eat these mushrooms, should a person such as Dame Zara Bate be allowed to influence young people in social and moral matters through a newspaper column in this State?

(4) Will he discuss with the management of the *Telegraph* the advisability of this column being continued?

Answers:—

- (1) "Yes."
- (2) "Yes."
- (3) "Whether one agrees with flamboyant sensational publicity or not, the matter is beyond the ambit of existing legislation and control by regulation."
- (4) "No."

TEACHER—OFFICER RELATIONSHIP, EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

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

(1) Is he aware that the head teacher of a large school near Brisbane recently commented favourably on relations between the Department of Education and head teachers while attending a meeting of head teachers and as a result of these comments was invited to discuss his remarks with officers of the Queensland Teachers' Union and the head teacher declined the invitation?

(2) Is he aware that a union official has subsequently advised the head teacher that he is being officially instructed by mail to appear before the union executive within a specified time?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "I have been informed that a head teacher attending a departmentally-arranged meeting of primary head teachers commented favourably on the officers of the Department and suggested that it was 'hitting below the belt' to describe them as bureaucrats. I also am informed that the head teacher concerned has been asked to discuss his statements with officials of the Queensland Teachers' Union. While I have no desire, nor indeed any authority, to intrude into the domestic affairs of the Queensland Teachers' Union, I would comment that over the past few years some officers and members of the union have criticised Regulation 73 of the Education Department Regulations. This Regulation directs that teachers should not actively take part in public meetings for the discussion of the merits of the State system of Education or its administration. A similar Public Service Regulation applies to all public servants. I am sure that Honourable Members will agree that my Department, despite considerable provocation at times, has shown great good sense in the administration of Regulation 73. Recently, the Queensland Teachers' Union made an official approach to me to have Regulation 73 eliminated from the Regulations of my Department. In view of the very co-operative relationship which exists

between the large number of teachers I meet and my Department, I would be most disappointed to find, as these reports suggest, that the union was inconsistent enough to request that Regulation 73 be eliminated and at the same time to appear to take exception to one of its own members commenting favourably on the relationships between teachers and officers of the Department."

LIGHTING OF SOUTH-EAST FREEWAY

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

(1) What is the estimated cost of lighting the south-east freeway?

(2) What will be the annual power requirement and cost?

(3) As freeways are designed for continuous traffic flow, is it necessary to provide street lighting?

(4) Why is it necessary to light directional signs on freeways and main arteries where such signs are of reflectorised material?

(5) Will he consider effecting economies by providing reflectorised signs which are unlit?

Answers:—

(1) "The cost of the lighting system, including poles, ducting, cables and lights, is estimated at \$237,500."

(2) "Power requirement—90 kilowatts each hour of operation. Estimated power cost (Tariff 15)—\$7,000 per annum."

(3) "Yes."

(4) "Provision for lighting of signs is a prime cost item in the contract. It was included because it is an accepted practice. However, Main Roads Department engineers are currently investigating its value. If it is found to be not necessary for Brisbane then it will not be installed."

(5) "See Answer to (4)."

PROSECUTIONS, DEMONSTRATION AT QUEENSLAND UNIVERSITY

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

(1) Following the battle between radical students and police at the University when police were assaulted, injured, prevented from leaving the campus and subjected to indignities, insults and obscenities, have any arrests been made and with what result?

(2) Has only one person been proceeded against by way of summons?

(3) Is it expected that further summonses will be issued and, if not, what are the reasons for not taking further action?

Answers:—

- (1) "No arrests have been made."
- (2) "Yes."
- (3) "There is a possibility of a further summons being issued."

COST OF POLICE SUPERVISION, VIETNAM
MORATORIUM MARCH

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

(1) When contractors hauling earth, gravel and building materials are required to cross footpaths to large construction or building jobs, are they required to pay the cost of police who attend to such duty in the public interest?

(2) At organised functions, particularly entertainment, where a large number of people are expected, are the promoters or those holding the permit required to obtain and/or pay for police attendance?

(3) In view of the estimated \$10,000 additional cost incurred in providing police in Brisbane because of the moratorium march through inner-city streets on September 18, has an account for this amount been sent to the holders of the permit and/or the organisers of the march?

Answers:—

(1) "When it is essential for large mobile cranes, fork lifts and other mobile traffic units to be operated on or across footways, particularly near large construction or building jobs in areas where there is a large movement of pedestrian and vehicular traffic, it is necessary for a permit to be obtained from a Superintendent of Traffic. In these instances one of the conditions invariably imposed by the permit is that the permittee employs a police officer at his own expense."

(2) "They are not required to obtain the services of a police officer but if they do they are responsible for the expense involved."

(3) "No."

COMPREHENSIVE MOTOR VEHICLE
INSURANCE, S.G.I.O.

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

With regard to the operations of the State Government Insurance Office, what was the (a) number of comprehensive motor vehicle insurance policies current, (b) total premiums received from such policies, (c) number of claims and (d) amounts paid out in respect of these claims for each of the years 1967, 1968 and 1969?

Answer:—

"(a) Comprehensive motor vehicle policies current at June 30, 1968 and 1969 numbered 99,780 and 122,556 respectively. I point out that the number of policies gives no indication of the number of vehicles insured, as many policies cover fleets of vehicles. (b) The premiums earned on such policies for the years ended June 30, 1968, 1969, and 1970, adjusted to coincide with the actual period involved, were \$4,533,607, \$5,091,950 and \$6,006,167 respectively. (c) For the same years the numbers of claims received were 25,494, 29,914, and 35,618 respectively. (d) Claims incurred, adjusted for claims outstanding at the beginning and end of the year, together with the costs of the Office, amounted to \$3,645,261, \$5,043,244, and \$5,836,769 for the years ended June 30, 1968, 1969 and 1970 respectively."

SPEEDING BREACHES DETECTED BY
RADAR UNITS, BRISBANE

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

How many motorists were issued on-the-spot speeding tickets as a result of radar traps in Brisbane during the month ended September 23 and how many of the motorists were alleged to have been travelling at 49 miles per hour?

Answer:—

"During the four weeks ended September 23, 1970, there were 1,087 traffic penalty notices issued by radar operators for speeding offences in Brisbane. Of these notices, nine were issued to drivers exceeding the speed limit by less than 10 m.p.h., 1,003 were issued to drivers exceeding the speed limit by 10 m.p.h., but less than 20 m.p.h. and 75 were issued to drivers who exceeded the speed limit by 20 m.p.h. or more. To obtain the number of motorists who travelled at 49 m.p.h. would necessitate an examination of all the tickets issued, and as considerable clerical work would be involved, the expense is not considered warranted."

BUGGING DEVICES

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

(1) Has he completed his investigations into complaints of the use of bugging devices in this State as referred to in *The Sunday Mail* of September 13?

(2) Will the report referred to therein be tabled in Parliament and, if not, what is the reason?

(3) How are these bugging devices used in the State and what business houses and/or premises have them on sale?

Answers:—

- (1) "No."
- (2) "No."
- (3) "See Answer to (1)."

WATER POLICE SEARCH FOR MISSING
PERSONS, REDCLIFFE

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

(1) Did a woman whose husband and son were drowned at Redcliffe on September 14 inform the Redcliffe and Brighton Police of their disappearance at 1 p.m. on September 13?

(2) Was there a delay in advising the Water Police until approximately 5.30 p.m. on September 13?

(3) Did the Water Police then have to apply for permission to use the police boat to search the bay?

(4) Was permission refused on the grounds that the bay was too rough and that overtime would be incurred?

(5) When the boy's body was eventually discovered, was its condition such that expert opinion was to the effect that the boy died by drowning between the hours of 2 a.m. and 5 a.m. on September 14?

(6) Does the evidence suggest that had the police boat been allowed to search when the complaint was made about the missing persons both would most probably have been found alive?

Answers:—

(1) "At approximately 1.30 p.m. on September 13, 1970, a woman reported to the Bribie Island Police Station that her husband and son, who were to have left Clontarf in a 13-ft. boat at 9 a.m. that day had not as yet arrived at Bribie Island. The woman returned to Clontarf to check if the boat had actually left and again reported to the Bribie Island police at 4.30 p.m. that there was no sign of the boat at Clontarf. She had made a search of the boat ramps and jetties between Redcliffe and Bribie Island but could find no trace of the boat. This was the time when it was established that the boat was overdue at Bribie Island."

(2) "No. The police at Redcliffe were making enquiries and organising a search. Weather conditions prevented boats from putting out to sea. When advice was received at 5.15 p.m. that two boat cushions and a buoyancy vest had been picked up off Scarborough, the water police were advised."

- (3) "No."

(4) "The weather conditions in the bay were extremely bad with poor visibility; and as it would take a police launch from three to four hours to reach the search area, it was decided that the water police join in a full scale search at day-break the following morning."

(5) "No. After a post-mortem examination on the boy's body, a certificate was issued showing the cause of death as drowning, and the opinion was expressed that the date of death was September 13, 1970."

(6) "No. The boat which was used by the man and boy was found about half way between Redcliffe and Bribie Island, and it is considered that it would have sunk within an hour of its departure from Redcliffe. Having regard to the very rough conditions in the bay, it is doubtful if anyone could have survived more than a few hours."

PEDDLING OF PORNOGRAPHY AND DRUGS

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

(1) Did he state, as reported in *The Courier-Mail* of September 22, that no action would be taken against pedlars of pornographic literature on the Queensland University campus because it was not sold by the University bookshop or for commercial gain?

(2) As it has been officially announced ministerially that no asylum exists for University students, will his declared policy be the same for all people in the community, i.e., that no action will be taken provided they peddle pornography and push drugs and other obnoxious material for their own gain and not for commercial profit or for a particular firm?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "In this as in other fields, when satisfactory evidence of a breach of the law is available, prosecution proceedings will be instituted."

ALLOWANCES TO STUDENT TEACHERS AND
FELLOWSHIP HOLDERS

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

(1) Will student teachers entering training colleges next year be paid any allowance from January 1 or will they have to wait until after the training colleges commence towards the end of February?

(2) Will fellowship holders also only be paid after University starts?

(3) If so, was this his decision, a Cabinet decision or a departmental decision?

Answers:—

(1) "Commencing students at teachers' colleges next year will not be paid allowances from January 1. Payment will be made from the commencement of the college year, i.e. February 2."

(2) "Fellowship holders both at the University and at the Colleges of Advanced Education will be paid from the commencement of the academic year. This is normal practice."

(3) "The decision to pay teachers' college students from the commencement of the college year was made by the Public Service Board to achieve uniformity in commencing payment of allowances to holders of Government scholarships."

RAILWAY BY-LAWS, SICK LEAVE
CONDITIONS

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

As By-laws 994 and 995, published in the *Queensland Government Gazette* of September 12 have not been tabled and as the amendments were published in "Railway Weekly Notice 37/70" of September 17 and it was stated that they would date from October 1, will he postpone their introduction for one month so that Parliament may be given the opportunity to discuss the amendments which are causing grave concern to all railwaymen?

Answer:—

"No."

POLLUTION OF SKELETON CREEK, CAIRNS

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

(1) Is he aware of the serious pollution of Skeleton Creek near Cairns?

(2) What investigations have his officers carried out into this pollution and is action planned to correct it?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "Officers of the Department of Local Government make regular inspections of Skeleton Creek, the most recent being August 24. Two sources of pollution are known and the Mulgrave Shire Council has previously requested the persons responsible to cease polluting the creek. In addition, at the request of one of the polluters, the Department has prepared a report suggesting ways in which he can avoid this pollution. A further inspection will be made in November, following which the need for further action will be considered."

FISHERIES RESEARCH FUND

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

Further to his Answer to my Question on September 15 concerning fisheries research—

(1) Has his attention been drawn to a Press statement in *The Cairns Post* of September 22 attributed to the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industries when addressing a meeting of the Australian Fisheries Council in Adelaide recently?

(2) Have State Fisheries trust funds been established in other States for two years and has Queensland to date not availed itself of its portion? If not, what was Queensland's share of this year's \$500,000 Commonwealth grant for fisheries research and what amount was received last year?

(3) In view of the future benefits and the need for extension and development of the fishing industry in Queensland, when will the fund be established and acted upon?

Answers:—

(1) "No. My attention however has been drawn to the statement made by the Federal Minister for Primary Industry on this matter following the recent meeting of the Australian Fisheries Council."

(2) "Separate Fisheries Research Funds were extant or have been established in Western Australia, Victoria and Tasmania. The matter is still under consideration by the other States although I understand South Australia is in the course of establishing a separate fund. The amount of \$500,000 mentioned by Mr. Anthony is an amount to be spent by the Commonwealth and not by the States as the Honourable Member's Question suggests. This figure has been arrived at by reference on a dollar for dollar basis, to revenue from fisheries collected or to be collected in the various States and earmarked specifically for fisheries extension, education, research and development."

(3) "In Queensland, fisheries research, extension, education and development is presently financed from Consolidated Revenue. General revenue from fisheries, which is substantially less than expenditure, is consequently credited to Consolidated Revenue. The establishment of a separate fund and the collection of increased revenue from the industry, is waiting upon the passage of Federal legislation in relation to the licensing of prawn processing facilities."

INFECTED HORSES FROM NEW SOUTH
WALES

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

(1) Is he aware that some horses coming into Queensland from New South Wales are infected with itch and some cases have progressed to the bleeding stage?

(2) What precautions are taken to protect Queensland stock from possible infection?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "It has been alleged that itch-affected horses have entered Queensland from New South Wales. I have no confirmed reports of this. It should be remembered in this context that itch in horses may be due to a variety of causes. The most common type, called Queensland itch, is caused by an allergic reaction to sandfly bites. Because it is non-contagious and may occur wherever sandflies are prevalent this condition is not listed as a disease in the Stock Acts. No useful purpose would be served in placing restrictions on the movement of horses affected with such conditions. All stock introduced into Queensland from other States must be accompanied by a certificate signed by the owner and certified by an Inspector of Stock that they are free from disease and have not in the preceding two months been in contact with stock affected with scheduled diseases. After inspection at the crossing place a permit must be obtained from a Queensland inspector to cover the remainder of the journey."

TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS AT STREET
INTERSECTION, GOONDIWINDI

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

(1) During the past two years, what was the incidence of road smashes at the intersection of Marshall and McLean Streets, Goondiwindi?

(2) Has an investigation been made into whether road conditions or other factors at this intersection have been conducive to recent road smashes? If so, with what result?

Answers:—

(1) "Ten."

(2) "Following representations by the local Member, Mr. McKechnie, an investigation has been made of these and only one accident occurred where the road conditions may have contributed. This was due to temporary road excavations."

MARYBOROUGH BYPASS ROAD, BRUCE
HIGHWAY

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

(1) Are plans being considered for the re-routing of the Bruce Highway to bypass Maryborough? If so, when will the plans be completed and work commence?

(2) Where will the new bridge across the Mary River be built and when?

Answers:—

(1) "There are no immediate plans for the re-routing of the Bruce Highway to bypass Maryborough. The possibility of requiring a bypass in the distant future is being investigated as a forward planning project but this work is of low priority."

(2) "This is not known at present."

FISHING PERMITS, MORETON BAY

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

(1) How many (a) permits to fish in Moreton Bay have been granted to and (b) applications have been rejected from (i) foreign, (ii) interstate and (iii) Queensland-based fishing companies and owner-fishers in the last three years?

(2) With respect to the same fishing area, will he ensure that all permit holders are using only equipment allowed by the Department of Fisheries?

Answers:—

(1) "Moreton Bay fishing permits relate to the taking of prawns. This is the first year the permit system has been in force. No applications have been received from foreign based fishing companies or owner-fishers. The position as regards Interstate and Queensland is as follows:—Interstate, 11 permits granted, 4 rejected; Queensland, 184 permits granted, 23 rejected."

(2) "The activities of prawners in Moreton Bay are subject to supervision by the Boating Patrol attached to the Department of Harbours and Marine. I have no reason to doubt that this supervision is not completely effective."

SCHOOL EXPULSIONS

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

How many children were expelled from (a) primary and (b) secondary schools and how many of these were (i) expelled from one school, (ii) expelled from all departmental schools and (iii) placed in care and control of the Children's Services Department during each of the years 1967, 1968 and 1969?

Answer:—

(a) (i) and (ii) There is no record of any expulsions in these categories; (iii) My Department has no record of children placed in care and control of the Department of Children's Services. It is suggested that he might direct any enquiry in regard to such children to the Minister for Health. (b) (i) No statistics are kept by my Department of the number of youngsters expelled from State secondary schools. The policy of my Department is to exclude a youngster from one school if he has committed a serious offence while a student at that school, but arrangements have always been made for his attendance at another secondary school, in order to make a fresh start; (ii) In 1969 one student was excluded from attendance at all State high schools as an ordinary student but an offer was made to enable her to attend evening classes conducted by the Department. This offer was not taken up; (iii) See reply to (a) (iii) above."

PULPING OF EGGS FOR EXPORT

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

(1) Are large eggs pulped by the Egg Marketing Board with under-sized eggs and sold at a loss to Japan? If so, what is the reason for this procedure?

(2) Have large hospitals and other public institutions, including boarding schools, been given the opportunity of buying such eggs?

Answers:—

(1) "In the pulping of eggs for export, the criterion for acceptance is not size but the internal quality of the egg. The Egg Marketing Board markets eggs in four grades, ranging from 24 oz. down to 15 oz. depending on the weight of a dozen eggs. Eggs larger than the 24 oz. grade are normally pulped, but the quantity of eggs smaller than the 15 oz. grade would be insignificant. It is necessary to export eggs, either in shell or as pulp, as production is in excess of Australian domestic consumption. Unfortunately as applies also to other primary products, returns from export markets are lower than from the home market."

(2) "The Egg Marketing Board is prepared to sell eggs at wholesale prices in minimum quantities of fifteen dozen eggs, and hospitals, institutions, and boarding schools purchase on this basis. This applies to eggs in the four grades referred to in (1), but all sizes of eggs are not available all the year round because of seasonal conditions."

HOTEL TRADING FACILITIES ON SUNDAYS

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

(1) Are hotel proprietors empowered to provide normal trading facilities during designated Sunday trading sessions under the new liquor legislation?

(2) Is there any legal objection in these circumstances to a hotel that normally conducts floor-show-type entertainment in its lounge or beer garden providing the same service during Sunday sessions?

Answers:—

(1) "It is optional for a licensed victualler to trade during permitted hours in his licensed premises on any Sunday. Should he wish to do so, he may use such facilities as are available at his hotel."

(2) "Under the law, there is no objection, but in practice, the Licensing Commission in its discretion does not prescribe terms and conditions for entertainment on licensed victuallers' premises on any Sunday. These terms and conditions are necessary before a Court may grant an application for this purpose."

DREDGING, BRISBANE RIVER

Mr. Houston asked The Minister for Conservation,—

Further to his Answer to my Question on September 10, is any payment made to the Harbours and Marine Department for dredging in the Brisbane River? If so, by whom and what amounts were received during each of the 1969 and 1970 fiscal years?

(Originally asked on September 24)

Answer:—

"The revenue received from harbour dues levied on shipping by the Harbour Authority for the Port of Brisbane was \$2,332,940 for 1968-69 and \$2,319,737 for 1969-70. From this revenue \$528,000 was expended in 1968-69 and \$640,000 (including \$110,000 for deepening) in 1969-70, on dredging of the Brisbane River and access channels to berths. Maintenance dredging of berths for private wharf-owners is also carried out by departmental dredges and the actual cost of this work is passed on to the wharf-owner. I lay upon the Table of the House a statement showing the amounts received by the Department of Harbours and Marine for the years 1968-69 and 1969-70, in respect of departmental dredging of berths."

*Paper:—*Whereupon Mr. Hewitt laid upon the Table of the House the statement referred to.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

RADFORD REPORT ON EDUCATION

Mr. HOUSTON: I direct a question without notice to the Minister for Education. Will any recommendations of the Radford Report be implemented in the new school year? If so, which ones?

Mr. FLETCHER: I am not in a position to give, chapter and verse, exactly when the various recommendations will be put into effect. Some of the recommendations that are expected to be operating next year have already been publicised. The rest of the report is in the hands of expert committees and people who advise me. All I can say is that we expect quite a number of the recommendations, especially those with regard to the Junior Public Examination, to be effective as from the beginning of the next school year.

RECEIPT DUTY

Mr. HANLON: I ask the Treasurer: In view of his comments published in "The Courier-Mail" of 3 October on both the practical difficulty of separating, in many transactions, the exempt from non-exempt from receipt duty, and the inequities that would arise from some people paying duty and others not on very similar transactions, will the Queensland Government support at Thursday's special Premiers' Conference the Victorian intention to seek a special Federal grant to replace all State receipt taxes?

Mr. CHALK: I think Sir Henry Bolte will be supporting the proposal I mentioned several days ago. I learned only last night that Sir Henry is in favour of the complete elimination of State receipt duty. I believe there is such a shemuzzle over the Prime Minister's announcement relative to the situation into which the Commonwealth Government has been forced by Senator Gair that the States must get out of receipt duty altogether and there must be some basis whereby the Commonwealth will be able to collect it.

BEET-SUGAR INDUSTRY FOR TASMANIA

Mr. R. JONES: I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: Has he, as the Minister responsible for the Queensland sugar industry and the production of sugar, raised any protest at the proposed establishment of a beet-sugar industry, which is mooted to meet Tasmania's sugar requirements of 26,000 tons per annum?

Mr. ROW: I am aware that there has been some discussion about a proposed beet-sugar industry in Tasmania. Hon. members may recall that a similar industry, which produced about 5,000 tons of sugar, was conducted in Victoria many years ago, at Maffra. I do not think the Tasmanian proposal will get off the ground. However, I assure the hon. member that I am watching the position very closely.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. J. D. HERBERT (Sherwood—Minister for Labour and Tourism): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Friendly Societies Acts 1913 to 1965 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

CIVIL AVIATION (CARRIERS' LIABILITY) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. S. D. TOOTH (Ashgrove—Minister for Health): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Civil Aviation (Carriers' Liability) Act of 1964 in a certain particular."

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT—
RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

(Mr. Ramsden, Merthyr, in the chair)

Debate resumed from 24 September (see p. 800) on Mr. Chalk's motion—

"That there be granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1970-71, a sum not exceeding \$5,093 to defray the salary of Aide-de-Camp to his Excellency the Governor."

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (11.50 a.m.): At the outset, let me comment on many of the statements made by the Treasurer in the introduction of his Budget. He commenced by saying that State Governments under our Federal system have been, and still are, chronically short of funds. Whilst I agree that State Governments are chronically short of funds and that it is due to Federal Government policy, I cannot agree that it is the system that is at fault. I think that federation is a good system; the problem is the application of that system.

Let me remind the Treasurer and his supporters that for many years past the policy followed by the Federal Government has been based on the political philosophy of the Liberal and Country Parties, which are in reality centralist parties. Although the Treasurer complains now about shortage of finance, Australia has been dominated for many years by Liberal and Country Party Governments, both State and Federal. So, whatever the deal happens to be, it is the result of negotiations carried out, in the main, between Liberal and Country Party Premiers, Treasurers and Prime Ministers.

I also remind the Committee that on several occasions there have been reviews of the financial arrangements between the States and the Commonwealth, so that if the financial arrangements are still to the detriment of the States surely the Liberal and Country Party Premiers and Treasurers must bear that responsibility.

The Treasurer said that the time was inopportune for general increases in State taxation and charges. With this statement, I completely agree. However, there are reasons other than those given by the Treasurer. First and foremost, I think, is the fact that quite recently the Liberal-Country Party Federal Government gave the people of this State a real "belting" with taxation increases. The increase in the price of petrol will have a tremendous effect on our transport costs. The added taxation on many items will increase costs for the public, and perhaps the worst feature again is the refusal by both the State and Federal Governments to do something positive and protecting about the vicious increases in prices of essential food items that have taken place in recent times. Not so many days ago there was a steep increase in the price of frozen foods—an increase so large that it was fantastic and frightening. Surely the people of this State could not possibly carry a further increase in taxation and charges, irrespective of whether they come from a Federal or a State Government.

In framing this year's Budget, the Treasurer referred to the fact that the State would have to contend with a massive increase in salaries and wages to Crown employees. It is true that increases have been awarded to both salaried and wages employees, but surely no-one is going to doubt the justification of those increases, particularly as they cover only increases in the cost of living. And to use the words "massive increase" is surely stretching the imagination to the extreme.

The increases granted will even now only be sufficient (particularly for those in the lower income brackets) to cover the additional costs that have been brought about either by the Federal Government's budgeting or by the price rise spiral. In fact, one could say that private enterprise has been allowed to run wild in fixing its own higher price levels.

On analysing the results of last year, the Treasurer blamed two factors. One was the serious drought condition, and the other was the unusually high wage increases that State finances had to bear. Let us consider this question of drought conditions. No-one is denying the fact that Queensland was, and still is, suffering from drought. I am speaking of the period covered by this Budget. I trust that the rains in recent days, even though scattered and spasmodic, will continue and will, as a result, bring great relief to the various affected parts of the State.

But this blaming of drought conditions has been used by the Government in practically every Budget for a long period of time. It is used as the excuse to cover up all other Government shortcomings. Mr. Hiley, as he then was, in his second Budget on 2 October, 1958, said—

"Drought laid a withering hand on the southern portion of the State, to be followed by devastating floods and a cyclone in the North."

Twelve months later, on 20 September, 1959, Mr. Hiley said—

"Drought in the south-western corner of the State continued to cause anxiety."

On 27 September, 1962, looking back to 1959, he said that in that year the Burdekin, Fitzroy, Burnett and Brisbane Rivers had quite good run-offs. He also said that in 1959 there was real flooding of the tributaries of the Condamine. In fact then, although there was drought in one part of the State, other parts of the State had quite useful rains and fresh water in their streams.

However, on 29 September, 1960, Mr. Hiley said in his Budget speech—

"The year which has just concluded was again influenced by drought which, of a lesser severity in extent than that which preceded it, still showed an adverse effect on our pastoral and grain-growing industries."

Remember, Mr. Ramsden, that two years later, in 1962, Mr. Hiley admitted that the major rivers in the State had quite good run-offs.

In 1961, two statements made by Mr. Hiley in his Budget speech were, "Another dry year continued to depress primary output and exports", and, "However, drought swept across all other considerations".

On 17 September, 1962, Mr. Hiley made special reference to two years earlier, when he said—

"The years 1960 and 1961 will have a special place in the weather history of this State. Queensland, even in drought years, is accustomed to flooding on some of its great river systems. Yet, not since 1959 have the Burdekin and Fitzroy, the Burnett or the Brisbane run down to the sea in wrath . . . The year just concluded has been most generous in widespread rains to benefit pastures and cultivations . . ."

On 26 September, 1963, Mr. Hiley said—

"The year which has just concluded will be recognised as one of the most favourable in recent experience. The State generally experienced a good season."

Thus 1963 heard quite a breakaway from the usual patter that we had been given.

The next year, 1964, it was reported on 24 September that several records had been established in primary industries—

Sugar production of 1,648,000 tons was valued at over £105,000,000—a record value;

Wheat production was 22,000,000 bushels, valued at £16,500,000—both record figures; and

The quantity of wool sold at 12 sales held during the year was a record 265,000,000 lb., the value being £13,000,000 above the previous year.

In contrast, production in certain primary industries was affected by drought.

One year later, on 30 September, 1965, the Treasurer said—

“The grim spectre of drought loomed over much of the State.”

He said also, “Despite the drought and reduced prices of wool and sugar, our new industrial development maintained a strong employment demand and a high level of economic activity.”

That was Sir Thomas Hiley’s last Budget before relinquishing the position of Treasurer. Analysis of these various statements shows that Queensland is a State that can expect drought in some parts as a “hardy annual”, and if any area passes through a season without rain, its primary industries are affected adversely. I ask hon. members to bear in mind that Queensland is 667,000 square miles in area, 1,300 miles from north to south, 900 miles from east to west, and large enough to contain the British Isles, France, Belgium, Germany, Italy, and Greece.

The period 1958 to 1965 has seen a mixture of poor and good seasons as far as climatic conditions are concerned. However, the one thing which commonly affected the economy was not so much the drought as the fall in prices, and it was this fall in prices that had the major effect on the economy of country areas in this State.

Following his taking office in December, 1965, the present Treasurer brought down his first Budget on 29 September, 1966. His opening theme for that Budget was that the year 1965-66 would go down in history as the “year of conflicting trends”. He said—

“On the one hand is the serious drought situation, which has a depressing effect on incomes and expenditures, and therefore upon the level of activity in the economy as a whole. And the other, of course, was the industrial expansion.”

In the next year, 1967, Mr. Chalk said on 28 September—

“It is now a matter of history that the promise of those early rains materialised and that, during 1966-67, the drought was broken over most of the State. Indeed, in some areas, extraordinary rains of cyclonic intensity gave rise to untoward damage, although they have assured an excellent season in such localities.”

He did qualify that by saying, “In contrast, the grim hand of drought still lies heavily on some of the remote grazing areas of the State”. He emphasised also the fact that, in that Budget, it was pleasing to note that other

primary industries, apart from sugar and wool, had enjoyed a much better season, the highlight of which was a record winter grain crop.

On 26 September, 1968, in his Budget speech, the Treasurer said—

“I want to say to the Committee that the effects of the drought are now substantially past and, today, it is my pleasure to present a Budget which provides a measure of relief in railway freights and in some avenues of State taxation.”

That was two years ago, I remind the Committee—the Budget immediately before the 1969 State election.

However, after the election, on 25 September, 1969, the Treasurer had this to say—

“For various reasons, especially drought, this has not been an easy Budget to frame. At the commencement of the financial year 1968-69, the Government had hoped that the State would have emerged from the severe drought which had plagued our primary producers for such a long period. Unfortunately, this hope was not realised.”

Quite a contrasting statement to the one he made only 12 months before!

It is my firm belief that, although the drought and its effects are severe in many parts of the State, the Government has been using drought for political ends, as an ever-ready excuse to cover its poor management of the State’s finances. Whenever it is faced with a budgetary problem, the Government blames the drought. Every time people in the West ask for rail concessions, cheaper electricity, or some other assistance, or local authorities want more money, on most occasions drought in some part of the State is blamed for the refusal of the request.

Certainly there is a severe drought, but what practical steps have been taken to avoid the problems created by it? It is not enough simply to try to compensate after the damage is done. Little has been done to improve markets and prices for our primary products. The greatest need of our times is to discover new and lucrative markets for our primary products. At a time when drought is being blamed, the Government is talking of and planning for production quotas in many primary industries.

The other excuse offered by the Treasurer is the unusually high wage increases that State finances have to bear. I have spent some considerable time in checking the wage and salary position as it affects the State Government, so, let us analyse the real position. I assume that all hon. members are aware that the Treasurer sets out his Financial Statements under various headings such as, “Chief Office—Salaries and Contingencies” and then, for the subdepartments, again “Salaries and Contingencies.”

Let us take, for example, some of the most common expenditures to show just how a Budget can be manipulated to produce the effects it is desired to show. As a typical example I refer to page 20 of the Estimates of Expenditure, 1970-71, Department of Conservation, Marine and Aboriginal Affairs. Under the Department of Irrigation and Water Supply are shown the salaries of the Minister (this is taken care of elsewhere), the Commissioner, the administration section (206 employees), and then the engineering section (448 employees). Against each of these is shown the amount appropriated for 1969-70 and opposite that is the amount expended for 1969-70. In the case of the Commissioner of Irrigation and Water Supply the amount appropriated was \$13,725 and the amount expended \$14,323. In other words, the amount expended exceeded the amount appropriated by \$598.

The next combination is for the administration section, where an amount of \$581,019 was appropriated but only \$516,234, in fact, expended. In other words, on these figures the amount expended was less than that appropriated by a total of \$64,785.

For the engineering section the amount appropriated was \$1,967,542, whilst \$1,798,434 was expended. In other words, an amount of \$169,108 was either over-estimated or not spent.

Still considering these three items together, the total appropriated was \$2,562,196. This appropriation for last year was then presented as having an amount of \$218,231 remaining unexpended. This means that for these salaries \$2,343,965 was actually available and not \$2,562,196 as at first indicated.

Totalling the three amounts expended gives a figure of \$2,328,991, which is still \$14,974 less than the original amount appropriated—a mathematical manipulation that would confuse Confucius! However, the juggling does not stop with that.

Another amount came off the appropriation as a Charge to Trust and Special Funds. In last year's Estimates this amount was shown as \$1,576,539, but this is not the amount now shown as deducted by the expenditure. This was only \$1,540,597.

All of this means that for the original 1969-70 estimate of salaries, although spending from Consolidated Revenue was estimated at \$767,426, the actual expenditure was \$788,394—an overspending of \$20,968 on salaries for this department. By this manipulation of presentation, a surplus of \$218,231 was turned into a deficit of \$20,968.

It is easy to prove over-spending or under-budgeting when one has first an unrelated amount taken off the estimated requirement and then alters the amount to come from another account.

Throughout the Estimates, this type of budgeting is to be seen. If we take one example in the Treasurer's own department,

we find that in salaries for the Treasury itself the appropriated amount was \$441,048, after an amount of \$45,663 was estimated to remain unexpended. The amount expended was \$437,750, which was, in fact, less than the budgeted figure.

The main point I wish to make is that, although the Treasurer said that last year's Budget was affected by the unusually high wage increases, I am claiming that allowance for these increased wages was made in the original framing of the Budget and the amount set aside in each section, particularly for salaries, was more than adequate. The deficiency came about by an over-estimate of the amount that would remain unexpended in most cases, and also, in some cases, it is traditional, apparently, to underestimate greatly the salaries to be paid in certain sections.

We must not lose sight of the fact that when the Budget was framed, the Treasurer had an amount of \$3,000,000 included in last year's Budget to cover increases in the Public Service Award and related awards.

A close analysis of the salary expenditure, compared with that which was officially and finally appropriated, taking into account the amount that it was believed would be unexpended, shows the Government over-spending on salaries as only \$798,640.

In three departments alone there were large amounts involved as over-expenditure. In the Education Vote, for salaries for State schools there was an amount of \$2,160,845 as over-expenditure. Apparently this is customary with education, because in the previous year an amount of \$2,625,319 was spent above the estimate for the salaries for that year. In 1967-68 the amount over-spent on salaries was \$1,626,981.

Last year the Department of Primary Industries over-spent \$400,798 on salaries, and the Police Department over-expended its salary allocation by \$403,144.

I do not think that one can really establish the fact that the increase in salaries to public servants was the factor that caused the great budgeting problem. In fact, if the Treasurer cares to look at the Estimates for the Department of Mines and Main Roads he will find some interesting figures. The salaries for the whole department were under-spent by \$16,178, and, more particularly, the appropriated amount for the Chief Office for 1969-70 was \$650,968, but only \$629,603 was expended, with, apparently, no alteration in staff.

I come now to mining expenditure, where we find that the amount appropriated was \$893,685, of which only \$887,803 was expended—again a saving in salaries.

If the Treasurer wants to bring down factual Budgets, he will have to look very closely at these amounts that are taken off the appropriated figures to cover the amount estimated to remain unexpended. In some cases we find that the amount is very small

compared with the total, but in other cases it is quite substantial. For example, for the Chief Office in the Premier's Department the amount appropriated before adjustment was \$213,069. The amount estimated to remain unexpended was only \$4,258; in other words, a reduction of under 2 per cent.

Under the Department of Conservation, Marine and Aboriginal Affairs, the amount appropriated for the salaries for the Aboriginal and Island Affairs Department was \$1,204,618, but the amount estimated to be unexpended was \$162,142, or just over 13 per cent. This is another case in which the amount appropriated was under-spent, in this instance by \$32,644.

As another example, consider the Department of Health. Under the Chief Office, the amount appropriated, according to the requirements of each section or division of the Chief Office, amounted to \$2,918,279, but the amount that remained unexpended was given as \$208,141, which is just over 7 per cent.

For the same department, under charitable institutions and grants, the amount allocated, or suggested, for salaries was \$1,679,681 while the amount estimated to be unexpended was \$40,854, or just over 2.4 per cent.

Finally, I cite a couple of examples in the Treasurer's own department. The estimated amount required for Lands Tax salaries was \$247,064, with an amount estimated to remain unexpended of \$7,596, or just over 3 per cent.

In the three Stamp Duties offices at Brisbane, Townsville and Rockhampton, the amount estimated to be required, for a start, was \$916,405, with an estimated amount to remain unexpended of \$60,334, or approximately 6.5 per cent.

I am sure these examples indicate that there is no set pattern. However, depending on how much is considered will be unexpended, the accuracy of the Budget for a department and, in fact, the Budget as a whole, as far as Consolidated Revenue is concerned, can be affected.

Let us now consider some aspects of the probable ways and means, as given in this Budget. Unfortunately, with my limited staff of three—that is, my private secretary, my typist and my wife—I have not been able to give the documents presented by the Treasurer the complete and close scrutiny they deserve. However, I should like to place on record my personal thanks, and I am sure the party's thanks, for the dedication, hard work and long hours put in by these three people. I trust that some day the Government of this State will realise that the people of Queensland expect an Opposition to be given every opportunity to function in the interests of this State.

Without being personal in deploring the smallness of the staff available to me, I do believe it is ridiculous that an Opposition

should still have a paid staff of only two, when the Government is constantly increasing the staff available to advise it, not only in the field of administration, but also in the field of propaganda, with Press secretaries and trained reporters, and is also introducing the latest types of electronic equipment to quickly analyse figures and facts.

Perhaps the factor that makes me most annoyed is that the staff of the Opposition in Queensland is so much less than the staff available to every other Opposition, both in the State and Commonwealth spheres. In the Commonwealth, there is a staff of 19. In fact, the staff available in Queensland is the smallest in the British Commonwealth of Nations. That is typical horse-and-buggy thinking of a fly-by-night-and-day Premier.

The increase in estimated financial assistance under the new agreement, from \$176,500,000 to \$202,400,000, is naturally very pleasing. So is the \$1,500,000 towards the debt charges and assistance grant, together with the proposed \$15,200,000 towards drought relief.

The Treasurer has indicated that the allocation for drought relief this financial year is in the vicinity of \$18,500,000, with the Vote from our own Consolidated Revenue being about \$3,000,000. This, of course, helps to answer the question why Mr. Gorton is moved to anger when anyone suggests that the State Government is doing so much by way of financing drought relief. He knows very well that the great bulk of the money provided for this purpose is a direct gift from the Commonwealth and that only a relatively small amount comes from State revenue.

This position is quite different from that which State Ministers and members try to tell the people who are suffering from drought. Last year, the Federal Government provided \$13,900,000 towards direct drought relief, which means that the State provided about \$4,000,000 from its Consolidated Revenue.

In the fields of taxation that are important to the State's finances, and particularly those that are taken directly from the public day by day, last year, revenue from liquor licence and permit fees amounted to \$5,555,290. Adding the totalisator and betting tax of \$5,230,684 and the bookmakers' turnover tax of \$1,726,409, the total is \$6,957,093. Adding the liquor income we get a grand total of \$12,511,383, which is no small amount to come out of the pockets of those citizens who happen to like a drink of intoxicating liquor or a bet on the horses. This year it is expected that the total income from these three sources will amount to \$13,718,000. Last year the man on the land gave \$7,169,966, and this year he is expected to contribute \$7,800,000, by means of rents alone, to the Consolidated Revenue of the State.

How do these taxation incomes compare with those obtained from this great boom in mineral and mining operations in our State? It must be remembered that this great mineral wealth is leaving our shores permanently. It is not like the land, which can be re-used. Minerals valued at millions of dollars leave our shores each year, yet the State's total revenue income in royalties and lease rents last fiscal year was only \$5,083,554—less than the income received from those who take a drink, less than the income received from those who like to have a bet on the horses through a totalisator, and much less than we get from the man on the land, our primary producer.

For 1970-71, the estimated minerals income is only \$5,860,000—again less than the expected income from liquor, betting taxes, or rent. One activity of the present Country-Liberal Government which future generations will look upon with shame is its readiness to give away our natural assets for practically no return to this State's Consolidated Revenue.

At this stage I again express regret that the details necessary for a dissection of the amounts credited under mining are not available because the annual report of the Auditor-General has not yet been tabled. It is never available to the Opposition in the presentation of its analysis of the Budget. However, more will be said on this matter when the details are known.

A look at some of the facts associated with mining does indicate what little the State gets. Consider the following three commodities—

Rutile, which has come into prominence recently. I think its current value runs to about \$79.20 per ton. The royalty payable on it is \$1.50 per ton.

Bauxite, which sells at approximately \$5.40 per ton. If it stays in Australia and is processed at Bell Bay or Gladstone we get 5c per ton. If it goes overseas, we receive only 10c per ton.

Coal, for which one price quoted is \$5.50 per ton. Again, our royalty is only 5c per ton. Other quotes for coal are much higher.

Surely these royalties are ridiculous for products which require little effort to mine. Bauxite, once a thin layer of top dirt is removed, is there to be scooped up. The same applies to open-cut coal. Once the top overburden is removed, the natural coal is obtained easily. It is ungarnished reality that nowhere else in the world are natural resources given away so cheaply. As far as coal is concerned, every major existing contract—namely, Thiess Peabody Mitsui at Moura; Utah at Blackwater, Goonyella and Peak Downs; and Thiess at South Blackwater—has had solid price increases granted during the past 12 months, while not one extra cent per ton has been received as State revenue. We Queenslanders are the only people not making money out of our

coal. All we are doing is allowing others, particularly those domiciled outside our nation, to get richer.

Utah, whose 50c shares have bounced up to \$3.60, has shown a quarterly profit which indicates that annual profit in the first year will be several million dollars above the prospectus figure of \$6,800,000. A new scheme to bring Queensland coal production to 13,000,000 tons a year by 1973, compared with the original estimate of 10,000,000 tons, will give an extra \$6,000,000 a year in net profits. It has been estimated that, by 1973, Utah could be earning between \$20,000,000 and \$30,000,000 a year from coal alone.

It is an interesting, yet depressing, exercise to compare what the mining companies and the State receive in terms of hard cash. The figures are—

Product—	Companies	State
	\$	\$
Rutile ..	8,300,000	160,000
Zircon ..	2,600,000	18,000
Bauxite ..	28,000,000	300,000
Coal ..	47,000,000	430,000

It is therefore quite obvious who is getting the rake-off from our natural resources. No wonder the share value of these companies is skyrocketing. In fact, I felt sorry for the Treasurer the other day when he said the Government felt that it should be entitled to \$50,000,000 of the \$400,000,000 profit expected from the Greenvale nickel field. He is happy to receive less than \$4,000,000 from coal worth \$400,000,000. If a person wished to give some advice to the company interested in Greenvale, it would be that if it wants to be allowed to proceed it should pay a substantial amount to the campaign funds of the Liberal and Country Parties. Or perhaps it might be appropriate to offer shares to some Cabinet Ministers.

Let it never be forgotten that royalty is the selling price by the State of the mineral or commodity whilst it is in its natural state in the ground. Perhaps in the case of rutile and zircon they have to be separated from the other minerals in the sand. It is also true that copper, zinc, lead, gold and other minerals of that type have to be separated from the ore-bearing material, but coal and bauxite are in the ground in large quantities. In fact, they are there in massive quantities in whole layers many feet deep, just waiting to be taken out in bulk, washed and used. In no way has the material to be separated, as it has in the case of copper and some other minerals. This surely means one thing—our State is being given away. We are not receiving a just return for our natural wealth.

Let us also recall that in 1961 when the then Treasurer, Mr. Hiley, as he then was, was presenting his Budget, he made quite some reference to the discovery of iron-ore in Central Queensland. This makes one wonder just what is stopping the development of this project. Could it be that the

Government is not keen to have this iron field developed so that our own iron-ore could be processed, because of the opposition that would be expressed by overseas interests who are not keen to have any extensive local opposition to their iron-making? Is it not logical that if Japan can profitably import coal and iron-ore from Western Australia, we in Australia could produce steel every bit as good and as cheaply as it can be produced in Japan under those conditions? We already know that B.H.P. steel is of top world quality.

One of the great needs is a Central Queensland power-house, and we know now how this project is being delayed. The Federal Government prefers to go ahead with a nuclear station in New South Wales than to help with the development of the Central Queensland power-house.

Naturally I intended to make some reference to the proposed receipts tax, but, now that the Commonwealth has decided not to proceed with that tax, little point would be served by referring to it. However, this exercise shows how ill informed State Treasurers really are when it comes to State-Commonwealth financial arrangements. It is obvious that Mr. Gorton treats the States with complete contempt. Surely, knowing the States were framing their Budgets at this time, he could have told them of his Government's intentions.

On the other hand, the State Treasurer should have known that the Gorton Government would capitulate to the D.L.P. pressure group. One of the reasons why this nation is in such a state of internal discord is the degree of minority rule that is being forced on the people. The power that the D.L.P. exercises on the thinking of the Federal Liberal and Country Parties is fantastic, and this is only possible because of the weakness of Government policies. In this State, we have the Country Party—again a minority party—dominating State thinking.

Unfortunately, time will not allow of a further analysis of the probable ways and means. Looking at the expenditure side, under the Premier's Department the striking fact is that the appropriation in 1969-70 for the Official Secretary in the Agent-General's office in London was \$8,453, and he actually received \$12,454. The requirement for 1970-71 is down to \$9,285. The Treasurer might explain why this officer should receive more than the Agent-General.

I also believe that a full explanation should be made of why, under the Department of the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works, there is a proposed reduction in the engineering and technical staff from 66 to 35 engineers. A drastic reduction of nearly half should bring some comments. Although it is estimated that the special works investigation expenditure is to increase from \$91,000 to \$182,000, such a reduction in staff does not support the possibility of the carrying out of further major works in this State.

Perhaps the idea is to pass over all this type of work from the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works to private contractors and engineers.

A feature of the Country-Liberal Government's policy is the number of Government departments that are being investigated by outside consultants. It is rather frightening to think that we have Government departments administered by supposedly competent men on high salaries (in many cases, salaries higher than those of Cabinet Ministers) yet the Government has seen fit to bring in investigating companies. As I understand that the Department of Harbours and Marine is being so investigated, I trust that the Treasurer will have something to say on this matter.

I am also aware of the fact that more and more work that previously was carried out by Government departments is now being given to outside companies. As president of a parents and citizens' association, I have been very closely associated with the recent building of a school assembly hall. Although having no complaint with the hall, which was designed by private architects (in fact, I am full of praise for the hall and very pleased with the co-operation and assistance received), I still fail to see why all this work could not have been carried out within the State Department of Works.

Even if the costs for the efforts of the Department of Works were a charge against the building and the association had to pay some part of it, I do not think it would have taken a highly paid public servant one whole year to design and carry out the work required to get this project designed and completed. The services of the outside architects I have mentioned will cost the association about \$7,000. Surely such an amount would well cover the salary of a public officer who would be capable of doing such a job.

Let me make a short reference to the Public Service Board. Two years ago, this section of public administration came under the Public Service Commissioner. There was one commissioner and his staff. Now, of course, there are three members of the board and their staff, but the operation of the Public Service Commissioner's Department and the Public Service Board administration is not greatly different. In 1968-69 there was an administrative staff of 90 in the Public Service Commissioner's Department, but this year the staff is being increased to 118—an increase of approximately 30 per cent. in two years.

It is quite remarkable that the Government recognises that more staff is constantly required for the administration of the State, yet refuses to apply that same principle to the operation and functioning of Her Majesty's Opposition.

In passing, let me make reference to the State Reporting Bureau and, in particular, pay a very high compliment to those associated with the recording and reporting of parliamentary procedures. I cannot speak too highly of the work of the "Hansard" staff. They have a very difficult job. I feel that I speak now on behalf of the great majority of members, not only on behalf of the Opposition, so I wish to take this opportunity of thanking the members of the "Hansard" staff and congratulating them on their efforts.

I should like to draw the Treasurer's attention to the appropriation for Miscellaneous Services under his department. Of the \$791,000 allocated, only \$57,797 was used. I note that \$556,000 is allocated this year. I ask the Treasurer to explain to the Committee what use will be made of that money. I made a similar request last year, when I asked him to explain why \$750,000 was required to cover the State's share of losses in the operation of the Commonwealth Savings Bank of Australia in Queensland. I am sure all members of this Committee would like an explanation of why this is so.

Concerning education, no doubt the matter most prominently before the public in recent weeks has been the activities at the university, particularly in Brisbane. When it is realised that over \$8,000,000 of public money from Consolidated Revenue is directed to the university as endowment and for research, I believe that the public has every right to look at the activities at the university and at the actions and attitude of those who are receiving, at State expense, the opportunity of furthering their own education.

The university does not exist merely for staff or students to pass a few years of their life at a rest home or holiday resort or in a public forum. My idea of a university is a place where men and women can further their education so that they can be an asset to their State and nation and at the same time, while improving their education, add to their ability to improve their earnings. However, as young people who, in many cases, will be the leaders of the community in the future, I do expect that they will show, even at this stage, qualities associated with leadership. To me, the only people who become successful leaders are those who, in the first place, knew how to accept orders and appreciated the need for obeying such discipline.

Fortunately for this State and nation, the great bulk of university students are decent young people, keen to learn and think for themselves. Unfortunately, there is so much wrong with the administration of our country that students find much with which to disagree. They quickly realise that conflicting standards are being applied. They soon realise that many in high places do not practise what they preach and are resentful

if one queries their judgment. There are laws which are unjust, impracticable, out of date and, in some cases, downright undemocratic. I believe that any person in the community has the right to dissent. I also believe that university students have a right to inquire, to experiment and to question, but they also have an obligation to listen and to analyse.

Unfortunately, a few want all the privileges associated with the university but are not prepared to accept some of the obligations. Let me put it very clearly. I support all those who dissent after careful analysis of the subject under review, but I do not support violence, either implied or applied. I do not support threats and I certainly do not support mob action.

I believe that the university senate has a clear obligation and, if it fails in that obligation, the Government must take action on the senate. As public money and public welfare are at stake, the Government has no alternative.

Let me also make it clear to the Government that the small section of university students and staff who want to take laws and rules into their own hands have no political connection with my party. What their connection with the Government parties, the D.L.P. or the Communist party is, I do not know. I am sure the Premier's secret police are better able to inform him in this regard than I.

Having little occasion to make reference to the financial side of the Department of Industrial Development, let me say to the Government that the Opposition fully supports any moves to bring industries to this State, particularly those that have a high labour content. Unfortunately, as the Treasurer himself said, mining has only a small labour content and primary industries are not now the manpower employers that they were years ago. We also will support the encouragement of industries away from Brisbane. This applies particularly to industries in Central and Northern Queensland.

It is strange to note that, under the Justice Department, the number of employees for electoral registration is going to drop from 30 to 28. No allowance has been made in Contingencies for any heavy expenditure. From this it would appear that the Treasurer is indicating that there is little likelihood of a redistribution, and all that goes with it, this financial year. Surely one would have expected allowance to be made in the Budget (if a redistribution is to be carried out) for the investigation and setting up of a commission, for new rolls, and for an investigation into present enrolments and those persons who are not on the roll.

In other words, all the things that would have to be done for an efficient and honest redistribution would require quite a considerable amount of money. To my way of thinking, an increase in staff is certainly necessary

and, as the contrary is the case, we must wonder as to the real attitude of the Government on this matter. On the face of it, it looks to me as if the Liberals are determined that there will not be a change from 78 seats. For this, I give them credit because there is no justification for increasing the number of members. There is justification for more clerical assistance to members, and for an improvement in members' travel facilities.

Let me say also that whether or not 18-year-olds get a vote should have no bearing on the total number of seats. It could have a bearing on the distribution of those seats, but surely not on the number because, after all, although a member may have 12,000 electors on the roll, he still represents every man, woman and child in his electorate. Although the 18, 19 and 20-year-olds are not enrolled as electors, they are still people living in the electorate, so, by extending our voting, or lowering the voting age, we are not altering the total number of people in the State. All we are doing is altering the number who cast a vote in the State. However, the number who vote does not convey the total number who have to be represented.

Apparently the Country Party is adamant that it wants four extra seats so that it can still dominate the Liberals. It has no chance of dominating the A.L.P., but, by increasing the number of seats by four, it thinks it will be able to dominate the Liberals. As a compromise on this matter is unlikely, apparently the Government has decided that there will not be any redistribution.

If the people of Queensland are forced at the next election to vote on existing boundaries, there should be only one issue at the election—the question of an honest redistribution. There is no logic or justification for having a relatively small country area such as Mulgrave, with 7,000 electors, and, on the other hand, a large country area such as Cook, with 13,000 electors, or, in the metropolitan area, having one electorate with 10,000 electors and another with 21,000. With the shift of population certainly a redistribution is even now overdue.

The Government must be joking when it makes provision for a Fair Rents Office, because I am sure members of Parliament are constantly told of cases of blatant profiteering in rents.

It is hard to believe that there are people who live on the income from dwellings that cost only a few thousand dollars some years ago but now bring large financial returns through the high rents charged—in most cases, from people who can ill afford to pay such high rentals. Of course, this tragedy is added to by the attitude of the Housing Commission, which considers that a person who has a roof over his head, irrespective of his ability to pay the rent, is not to be given any worth-while priority.

Much can be said about the Housing Commission and its policy of refusing homes to those who need them; also about its policy of providing homes for employees of wealthy companies, who could well afford to build their own homes. The original planning in setting up the Housing Commission was to build homes for people, irrespective of their employer, not to build homes for employees of specially selected companies. Although the Housing Commission argues that it is not building the homes for the companies and that the companies are only guaranteeing the rent, monopolies do occur, and this has happened in recent times.

Consider the instance of a certain town where a company wanted to expand and employ more people. From then on, all the homes the Commission built were put under the control of the company, supposedly because the rent was guaranteed. The people who wished to live in that town and work for someone else, or even for themselves, were told there were no rental homes available. In fact, nowadays the great majority of homes being built for rental throughout the State are not put on the open market; they are earmarked to assist certain companies that have the ear of the Government. This attitude, I strongly condemn.

This brings me now to the Department of Labour and Tourism, particularly the Industrial Court and the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. I believe that this State can well afford at least two more Commissioners. In fact, I say quite candidly we cannot afford not to have at least two more Commissioners.

With the record profits that are now being made by various companies, the constant rise in prices, and the obvious profiteering going on, it is only natural that workers and their unions will press for more money and changes in conditions. Look at some recently announced profits, and first, take the banking group. To mention three—

The Commercial Banking Company of Sydney Ltd. lifted net profit from \$4,111,536 to \$4,349,789 for the year ended 30 June.

The A.N.Z. Banking Group showed a net profit of nearly \$15,000,000.

The profit of the Bank of New South Wales exceeded \$15,000,000.

On the lending side (the finance companies)—

Mutual Acceptance had a lift in group net profit of 22.33 per cent. to \$2,154,219.

Mercantile Credits announced this year it had increased group net profit by 27 per cent. to \$2,150,677.

Cambridge Credit Corporation lifted its profit 30 per cent. to a record of \$959,613.

Commercial and General Acceptance reported a 38.9 per cent. increase in group net profit for a total of \$4,120,437.

A.G.C. increased by 23.1 per cent. to give a net profit of \$10,000,000.

Customs Credit Corporation increased its profit to \$5,728,497.

Finance Corporation of Australia lifted its net profit by 32 per cent. to \$2,670,832.

Permanent Finance Corporation, a Brisbane-based financier, lifted profit by 79 per cent. to a record of \$108,903.

Minerals Securities, Australia announced an increase in profit to \$12,707,000. Out of that amount, more than \$10,000,000 was made from share trading.

Oil companies also, as can be seen from the following figures, did not do too badly for the last year—

Caltex, in its refining and marketing operation, made a profit of over \$8,000,00.

Amoco increased its profit last year by 34 per cent. to \$1,899,672.

Shell increased its earnings last year by 43 per cent. to \$26,500,000.

Mobil Oil made a profit of \$8,726,000.

Ampol went to a profit of \$9,500,000.

Incidentally, in the previous year, Shell's profit was \$18,528,000 and B.P.'s profit was \$7,800,000. Last year B.H.P. improved its profit by 20.9 per cent., to a record \$59,796,000, and the Ford Motor Company made a record profit of \$13,500,000. In the retail trade, last year Woolworths made a record profit of \$9,471,000, while Coles made a profit of \$11,104,379.

To illustrate the profits being made, I present the following list:—

	Profit \$
Castlemaine	3,677,571
Carlton & United Brewery	9,426,370
Myers	15,248,000
Waltons	5,224,294
David Jones	5,936,000
Dunlop	11,131,613
Olympic Consolidated ..	3,685,434
Consolidated Rutile ..	2,295,971
Cudgen Rutile Zinc ..	1,758,588
Thomas Nationwide Transport	3,194,994
RepcO Ltd.	7,088,438

Those companies made the profits listed in spite of the times. In recent months there have been extensive increases in the prices of most foodstuffs, including breakfast foods, tinned foods, jams and jellies, canned meats, milk, sandwich spreads, sauces, tinned vegetables, frozen foods, primary products, salad dressings, cakes, tinned fish, ice cream, wines and spirits, cigarettes, tobacco, washing requirements, toothpaste, soap and, last but not least, cosmetics.

One factor that seems to be getting completely out of hand—and it is increasing costs for the consumer—is the cost of advertising by the manufacturer, the wholesaler and the retailer, and especially the extensive, lavish advertising on television and radio, and in the Press and trade journals.

Apart from higher prices affecting the budget of a household, the cost-spiral atmosphere can foster the introduction of sub-standard goods—goods that are poorly prepared and of poor quality. That, again, has the effect of making the manufacturer of the genuine article engage in further extensive advertising campaigns. It is little wonder that high profits and higher living costs force the workers to take stock of their position. They compare their living conditions and standards with those of others in the community, particularly those whose income is outside industrial awards. No wonder they advocate that their unions should take action to improve their conditions. They want more than to read of large profits and to hear their wives complaining about high costs. Naturally, as delay follows delay it leads to frustration, and strike action is advocated.

But for agitation and strikes instigated by unions, the 40-hour week would not have been implemented. Most employees would not have a five-day week. The high standard of living enjoyed by many people today is the result of strikes, although some people who enjoy it did not take part in any strike, and in fact, condemn those who do go on strike.

I was interested to hear one of the so-called expert radio news reporters indicate recently, during one of his frequent attacks on trade unions, that his salary was obtained by his efforts alone, and not by any union action. Of course, people of his mentality would hardly be able to reason that all salaries outside fixed awards have a relationship to the fixed awards. No employer puns a salary range out of the air; employers always have in mind the salaries paid to other people. Employees' salaries or wages are always relative to the average, and that applies particularly to those who do not work under an award.

The Public Service Award is based on conditions of the times, and invariably it follows the wages and conditions of the industrial unions. When an industrial union goes to a tribunal and receives an increase, usually after many strikes, many arguments, and much discussion, other unions and organisations quickly follow suit. Those who are outside these awards and conditions then realise they have lost parity with other sections of the community and apply for an increase.

It is unfortunately true that at the present time we are living in a society in which, in many cases, the wages structure is completely out of balance. I realise that a person who uses skill, exercises concentration, undertakes extensive study and applies himself to the job by accepting responsibility or using his own financial resources, is entitled to remuneration above that of the person who goes along doing a routine job that requires little skill or ability, and certainly imposes no responsibility.

However, it must be remembered that each worker is a human being who, in most cases, is responsible for a family and, as such, is

entitled to remuneration which allows him to live at a standard applicable to our times. That, to me, is the absolute base. This base must allow a man or woman to provide the essentials of our times—decent housing and adequate food and clothing, with something left for recreation. Extra money should then be paid for the extra skills and responsibilities and other factors, giving him or her enough finance to buy the extra pleasures, the extra commodities, and do things that the person on the lower income cannot do.

Unfortunately, today there are those who are on such a low income that they cannot even exist according to our desired standards. On the other hand, of course, we have some whose income is such that it is out of all relationship to their contribution to the welfare of this State and nation.

One of the most unfortunate aspects of our present industrial set-up is that, before a union can have its case analysed and finalised, too much time is allowed to elapse between the application and the hearing. Unions are now well aware that if they want a speedy hearing of a case, industrial action has to be taken.

Surely, then, with more industrial commissioners this would not be necessary. As I said at the outset, unions do not want to go on strike. Men and women do not want to be on strike and lose wages, but under the present conditions it is either that, or else wait months, or sometimes years, before their case can be heard. It is up to the Government to appoint these extra men so that cases can be heard without the need for unions to try to force the issue.

Still dealing with the Department of Labour and Tourism, I come to this farcical set-up of the Commissioner of Prices. Recently there have been blatant increases in prices without explanation by the firms concerned—only a bold statement that the price of a commodity is to be increased. The Government said that it would appoint a consumers' protection council. As has been said on more than one occasion on this side of the Chamber, that promise was made during the last election to counter our promise, the difference being that we had a policy, and we had a plan to make a consumers' protection council work—and it would have now been in operation. All that the Government had was the stolen idea, without any backing action. For this reason it is still trying to find answers and solutions on setting up the council, knowing full well that, if it is applied correctly, it will be a brake on the exploitation of the workers by friends of the Government who contribute so much to its election funds.

On the other hand, the Government has a policy completely opposed to price control. The Labour Party believes that, although every item cannot be successfully price-controlled—and I have argued this frequently—there are those items on which control can be successful.

I have mentioned rents, and I am not necessarily advocating the same basis as that which was in operation previously. But surely some means of control can be found. Surely a person who lives in a hovel has to be protected, particularly when alternative accommodation is not available. The Liberal policy of free enterprise should not extend to exploitation of those who, through any set of circumstances, must of necessity rent their places of living.

The now almost famous icy blast of the 30 per cent. rise in frozen food prices is another example of a situation where price control could be applied quite effectively. Surely only good quality vegetables can be frozen. Therefore, because the quality is constant between the various manufacturers of the base product, or the base ingredients, the only thing which would vary would be the quality of the finished article. So it would be possible to put a fixed price on frozen peas or beans, as the case may be, and the public could then decide which brand they wished to buy, depending on the quality of the product.

Sight must not be lost of the fact that the cost of living is one of the main causes of industrial unrest. Immediately the man of the house finds that his wife is complaining about not having enough for house-keeping, and about not having enough for some necessity or other, he starts considering how to get more money. Years ago the answer was to put his wife to work; to get another job; or to work overtime. Unfortunately, the cost of living—the general cost of just being alive and living in this land—has now reached a stage where these methods are no longer the complete answer. So a man looks at the only way open, which is to get more for his labours.

I have already stressed that strikes were the medium for bringing about improved working conditions. The other day I came across a copy of the Official Rules for Clerical Staff issued by a Sydney firm in the "Year of Grace 1852." That was 118 years ago. Amongst the many rules were some worth repeating here. No. 2 rule was—

"On the recommendation of the Governor of this Colony, this firm has reduced the hours of work and the clerical staff will now only have to be present between the hours of 7 a.m. and 6 p.m. on week days. The Sabbath is for worship but, should any Man of War or other vessel require victualling, the clerical staff will work on the seventh.

"Clothing must be of a sober nature. The clerical staff will not disport themselves in raiments of bright colours, nor will they wear hose unless in good repair."

Another rule was—

"No member of the clerical staff may leave the room without permission of Mr. Ryder. The calls of nature are permitted and the clerical staff may use the garden below the second gate, but this area must be kept in good order."

Apparently Mr. Ryder was the foreman.

Another rule was—

"No talking is allowed in business hours and the craving for tobacco, wines or spirits is a human weakness and, as such, is forbidden to all members of the clerical staff."

One of the interesting rules was this—

"Now that the hours of business have been drastically reduced, the partaking of food is allowed between 11.30 a.m. and noon, but work will not, on any account, cease."

The new increased weekly wages were detailed as follows:—

	Per week	
	s.	d.
A junior boy (that is, to 11 years of age)	1	4
Boys to 14 years of age	2	1
Juniors	4	8
Junior clerks	8	7
Clerks	10	9
Senior clerks (after 15 years with the owners)	21	0

Then, at the bottom in big type, it had—

"The owners hereby recommend the generosity of the new labour laws, but would expect a great rise in output of work to compensate for these near Utopian conditions."

May I say to this Chamber that if it had not been for trade unions and men of firm convictions, men who believed in the equality of mankind, men who believed in the principles associated with the Labour Party and the Labour movement, conditions in this nation would not be what they are today. They would be somewhere between what I have just mentioned and what they now are. Certainly they would be nearer the 1852 standard than the present-day accepted standard.

I now pass to a consideration of the Department of the Valuer-General. I received quite a shock the other day when a communication from this department came to hand notifying me that one of their officers would talk to me with regard to an objection that I lodged in March, 1968, to the then valuation of my private property. From the fact that it was so long ago—over two years—I had mentally given the whole thing away. At any rate, I intend to see the gentleman concerned. But how can any justice be meted out to landowners when over two years elapse between the time of objection to a valuation and the time that a representative of the Department of the Valuer-General is prepared to see them?

In that period of two years the rates have been paid to the local authority. In that period extensive alterations could have been made to the land itself by the owner. In fact, it is almost impossible to think back in many cases and remember the basis of the objection. Certain words are written on the form, but many people would not remember all the factors that they had in mind at the time. Many owners could have sold the property in the meantime and the new owner, not knowing what was in the mind of the person objecting, could be at a complete disadvantage.

I think it is scandalous that a Government department set up to adjudicate on valuations, mainly for local authority rating purposes, takes over 2½ years from the time the objection is made to conduct the first interview. I trust that the Minister will take urgent and drastic action to see that this situation is overcome quickly. Surely when a valuation is made and a person wishes to object to it, at least the substance of his objection should be discussed with an officer of the Department of the Valuer-General, if not within a few weeks from the time of the objection, then within a few months.

I notice with interest that, as far as the police are concerned, just over 40 extra police officers are to be engaged. This is a ridiculous situation in a State that has a shocking crime-solving record, where half the crimes are not solved and many, in fact, are not even investigated.

I know the Minister will say that Queensland's record is as good as that of any other State. I am not concerned with any other State. I have not the figures to disprove his story. As far as I am concerned, the rate of crime-solving in Queensland is far too low. There are far too many unsolved crimes—housebreaking, assault, and the many other indictable offences. As far as grievous bodily harm and murder cases are concerned, unless the person himself confesses, or unless it is obvious who was responsible, there appears to be floundering in finding the culprit and obtaining a conviction.

A very pertinent point was raised a few weeks ago by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. After it was known that there were to be 300 policemen on the streets in Brisbane to control a march, the hon. gentleman pointed out that, although many hours were being taken up in briefing these men and, if rumour has it right, training them, when a vicious murder took place in Townsville nowhere near that number of police were involved and today, as far as the public is concerned, we are still no closer to a solution of that vicious crime.

While we lack evidence showing that we have a very efficient Police Force, there is plenty of evidence to show that we have a very active special and secret Police Force. I must admit that it is not very efficient, because some of the things it has on file

are completely wrong. If anyone were to say outside the protection of this Chamber some of the things which are on that file, those whose names are on file would quickly become wealthy people through successful challenges on the basis of defamation.

One of the most shocking things of our time is the fact that this force is in existence and that its personnel carry out their investigations and activities under the direction of the Government and in particular, in some cases, under the direction of the Premier, against men in highly responsible positions in this land. The latest reshuffle of the personnel of this section is designed only to improve its efficiency as a Government spy organisation.

It is true that, as a nation, we require certain security measures. It also is true that certain people, who are suspect as far as the security of the nation is concerned, should be watched. But surely that is a Commonwealth matter. It is completely wrong that the information in any security file should be available to political leaders and used for character assassinations of those who oppose them politically.

Now let me deal with hospitals. Naturally, I make some reference to the Treasurer's decision in the Budget to increase the hospital fees of private and intermediate patients. These have been increased from \$10 to \$13.50 a day for private patients and \$8 to \$11 a day for intermediate patients, and the increases are to take effect from 1 November. They will make a weekly increase of \$21 in the charge for an intermediate bed and \$24.50 in the charge for a private bed. The total weekly charges will be \$77 for the intermediate bed and \$94.50 for the private bed.

Apparently the Treasurer had in mind that, by increasing these charges, he will get more money from the hospital and medical benefit funds, of which many people are members. Let me point out to the Treasurer that contribution to these funds is voluntary, not compulsory, and that many people are not members of any medical benefit fund. Of course, this could be another ruse by the Government to try to force people to join these funds.

However, be that as it may, the fact is that many women have already booked to go into maternity hospitals after 1 November. These women in particular, many of them young married women struggling to get enough to buy a home and prepare for the new arrival, will have to meet this extra \$21 out of their own pocket, with no chance of getting it from medical benefit funds, because the tables they are now under allow for the present hospital fees but do not allow for any increased fees. I think that, before this measure was introduced, there should have been full discussion between the Treasurer and representatives of the various

medical benefits schemes so that at least appropriate tables could have been formulated to meet the situation.

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

Mr. HOUSTON: Before the luncheon recess I was referring to the Budget proposal on increased hospital charges. Another unfortunate aspect of the Government's decision to increase these charges is that it will be reflected in every private hospital, nursing establishment, old people's home, and every other similar institution throughout the State. These organisations usually base their charges on State hospital charges, particularly intermediate and private charges, so I believe it is regrettable that the Government saw fit to use this method to obtain extra money. As I have said many times, the system of asking people to insure against sickness—on a flat rate, irrespective of income and ability to pay—is not the right way of applying social services of this type.

Let us now have a look at the activities financed from Trust and Special Funds. The first thing that strikes me is that although \$206,000 was appropriated for the Co-ordinator General of Public Works Construction Funds, for the elimination of level crossings, only \$9,483 was expended. Surely something is drastically wrong if the Government cannot get on with the elimination of these dangerous level crossings. Why must the Government always wait for serious accidents before it is prepared to spend money on this method of improved safety? Hon. members will remember an incident in the Woodridge area a few years ago. Although it was well known as a dangerous area, nothing was done until some lives had been lost. I urge the Government to get on with this job. The appropriation for this year is \$199,000. I suggest to the Premier that he makes sure every cent of it is spent on this most important work. We certainly do not want another serious accident at a level crossing before something is done.

Under the University Capital Works Fund—that is, for work on the university and teaching facilities in the Brisbane hospitals for the university—the amount under-spent was over \$2,500,000, again showing that the appropriation of this money in last year's Budget, with the propaganda that flowed from it, was purely and simply propaganda. \$2,500,000 is a substantial amount to under-spend.

Incidentally, turning to the State Insurance Fund, which is under the Treasurer's jurisdiction, the amount appropriated for salaries for the 1,200-odd employees was in excess of that required by over \$50,000. If the Treasurer is correct in his claim that massive increases in salaries had an effect on last year's Budget, surely that effect would have been reflected in the State Government Insurance Office.

On an investigation of expenditure from Trust and Special Funds, it becomes obvious that millions of dollars appropriated last year were not spent, and having regard to some of the fields in which the appropriated money was not used, the under-spending shows a complete disregard for carrying out the intention of the Budget.

Let us have a look at the rehabilitation of the Cairncross Dock. Of the amount of \$1,640,000 appropriated, only \$196,857 was expended, showing that, although the money was allocated last year, there was either no desire to get the job finished or the allocation was merely a blind to make it appear that the Government was keen to do something about it. When the Treasurer presents his Budget the Government is often approaching an election campaign. Promises are made and great sums of money are allocated, but the Budget the following year usually shows that these moneys have not been expended.

Dealing now with the Commonwealth Assistance to Aborigines Fund for the purchase and erection of homes, land acquisition, educational facilities, health services, occasional training and so on, over \$500,000 was unexpended from the appropriation. Surely this is a field in which every cent available to the Government could have been properly spent, because so much has to be done before these people will have an opportunity to enter our society and live at the standard expected by other sections of the community at this time.

Under the Commonwealth Education Fund we find that of the amount appropriated over \$3,500,000 was not expended. The Treasurer has had a lot to say about not getting much from the Commonwealth, but here we have millions of dollars available to us and appropriated but not used.

The Fitzroy Brigalow Land Development scheme is another project that has suffered in the resumption of roads development. Although \$2,400,000 was allocated, less than \$1,000,000 was spent.

In over-all State development, one field that certainly needs attention is electricity supply, yet in the Electricity Development Fund nearly \$1,000,000 out of an appropriation of \$3,800,000 was left unexpended.

At election-time, provision of beef roads is always a good issue. No-one denies that the roads are being built, but of \$7,500,000 allocated last year for the construction of beef roads, only \$5,000,000 was spent.

Next I come to something that, to me, is the greatest tragedy of all, namely, the failure of the Government to use every cent available for the acquisition of land, the development of subdivisions and the building of homes for the people. We find under the Commonwealth-State Housing Fund that over \$2,500,000 available to that fund was not used last year, and even in the Queensland Housing Commission Fund only a little over half the amount allocated

for the erection of homes was used. In other words, \$728,968 was left unexpended, and even in the item Advances to Borrowers and Purchasers over \$330,000 was unexpended at the end of the year. Of the amount available to building societies under the Home Builders Account, \$600,000 was unspent.

These figures on housing indicate a complete lack of Government understanding of the needs of the people. The Government would do well to listen to Labour members when they refer in this Chamber to the acute shortage of reasonably priced, good accommodation. Far too many of our young people are living in sub-standard and, in many cases, high-rental accommodation. Others live in good accommodation, but the rent they have to pay is far too high. Too much of the income of many people is taken up by rentals. As a result, other things have to suffer, and the worst feature, perhaps, is that while people are paying high rents they are not able to save the deposits necessary to buy their own homes.

The Treasurer said that Consolidated Revenue receipts were \$18,000,000 above the estimate. If we look to see how that money was spent we find that \$3,000,000 extra was spent in servicing the public debt and \$5,500,000 was spent on drought relief. A total of \$7,800,000 was budgeted, but \$13,800,000 was received from the Commonwealth. In other words, the extra money spent on drought relief came from the Commonwealth and not from State resources. Further, an extra \$3,000,000 was spent in State school salaries. A total of \$2,700,000 was transferred to the Trust Account for hospital administration, and the great portion of that amount was used for salaries and wages. A total of \$4,200,000 extra was used for the Railway Department, of which \$1,300,000 was allocated to General Establishment; \$1,300,000 to the Southern Division; \$1,100,000 to the Central Division; and \$500,000 to the Northern Division.

The extra money that was available to the State was spent on those few establishments. Although expenditure from Consolidated Revenue increased by over \$18,000,000, the deficit rose from the anticipated \$2,400,000 to \$3,543,939.

Trust and Special Funds expenditure of \$438,071,169 was less than the amount appropriated, by more than \$26,000,000, so that here again the total sum available was not spent.

Surely the Premier, as the person responsible, should take close and more frequent looks at the financial operations of the various Government departments.

I wish to refer to two factors that I believe are of great importance to the State. The first concerns the Department of Education. Without citing the amount of money

allocated for education, I point out that a clear indication has been given of an intention to change the method of teaching, and the subjects taught to children, in our secondary schools in the coming year. Today, I directed to the Minister for Education a question without notice, asking him to explain exactly what the position was. Unfortunately, he referred me to some newspaper statements that may or may not have been published from time to time. When members ask questions they do not take kindly to a Minister referring them to a newspaper statement that may or may not have been published. Surely members should not have to go looking in newspapers for information. I was completely disappointed, and surprised, that the Minister for Education should adopt that method of replying to a question.

In recent times I have talked to many principals and teachers about the implementation of suggestions contained in the Radford Report, only to find complete confusion on the practical side of teaching. I do not think one principal in the State—let alone one teacher—has a clear understanding of what he is to do next year, or what he will be allowed to do next year. Many of them are talking to parents about how things are to be different next year, and I have heard some very wild and outlandish ideas advanced by them about what they are going to teach. I believe that change is necessary, and I agree completely with many features of the Radford Report, but there could be others that require much deeper examination. The Minister for Education has a responsibility to the people of Queensland—and certainly to parents—to state exactly what changes are to take place and what alternatives are to be recommended. It should be remembered that, today, many people are considering what subjects their children will take when they move from 8th grade to 9th grade.

It is all very well to say that teachers will have a lot more freedom. I believe they should, but we still require some organisation in our educational system. We do not want organised confusion, which is what we really have today. It should be remembered that subjects may be changed from time to time, and that students do not always attend one school. Many parents follow occupations in which they are subject to transfer, such as the teaching service, the banking profession, the railway service and the Public Service, and the children must go with the parents. Whatever system we adopt in our schools, an allowance must be made so that a student who transfers from one school to another is not adversely affected.

Mrs. Jordan: Or from one State to another, as happens at Amberley.

Mr. HOUSTON: That is important.

At present we have a problem caused by different standards throughout the State. The department should be well aware of the fact that at one high school, which I have in mind, German was taught as the second language up to Junior. However, when two students I know wanted to continue on to Senior, they were told that no longer would German be taught at the school because the teacher who taught it had been transferred to another school. These students had done very well in German in the Junior examination and wanted to proceed to Senior, but could not stay at that school. We should learn that we cannot have a hit-and-miss system.

I remember full well that, not many years ago, the then Minister for Education, with other Ministers and their supporters, told us that the system that was then being introduced—that is, the present system—was the best system ever introduced in Queensland. They said it would revolutionise the education of our young people and turn out young geniuses from every school. However, according to the Radford Report, much of what was believed to be correct in those days is wrong. I do not want to see this new system come into operation in such a haphazard manner.

It is only three months till the end of the year and parents are entitled to know now what the Government has in mind. I know that the Government is running into problems at its caucus meetings. The Liberals are fighting among themselves. Traditionally, the Liberals and Country Party members fight at caucus meetings, but that is no reason why such an important matter as education should be held up. I hope the few remarks I have made will bring the Government to its senses, and that the Minister will make a ministerial statement tomorrow outlining the exact position, so that principals and teachers will not continue to make statements that are not factual.

I regret that the Minister for Transport is not in the Chamber. I am sure that the Treasurer, as a former Minister for Transport, will understand the point I make and pass it on to the present Minister. I refer to the new policy in the granting of private hire-car licences. The Department of Transport, through the Commissioner, has issued a new rule that any motor-car more than four years old cannot be used for private hire. This is one of the craziest regulations I have had the misfortune to read and to try to understand.

It is all very well to say that a four-year-old car is too old for this purpose. Surely it depends on how the car has been handled, whether it has been knocked about, and what make of car it is. I tried to draw the Minister's attention to this matter in a question I asked on 10 September, which set out the position clearly. I mentioned that many four-year-old cars were highly priced and that their owners, when they purchased them

new, intended to use them for many years. Many people in high places, with plenty of finance at their command, keep their cars for longer than four years.

It is completely ridiculous for the Government to say that a four-year-old car is too old for use as a private-hire car. In his reply to my question, the Minister said—

“Up to the present the Commissioner for Transport has not received any application in respect to a Rolls Royce, Bentley or a Mercedes Benz. The charges by a licensed private hire car operator are not controlled and could increase or decrease proportionately with the class of vehicle contracted.”

That is a crazy reply. One operator who tried to file an application for such a car was told that he could not do so because his car was four years old. The Minister, in his reply, said that when an application was put in, it could be considered.

I ask the Treasurer to use his influence with the department, and certainly with the Minister for Transport, to have each application decided on its merits. A four-year period could be used as a recommendation or as a yardstick, but it should not be the final condition. Surely if a car is well kept and is in good mechanical order and condition, the owner should have the right to use it as a private-hire car.

Mr. LICKISS (Mt. Coot-tha) (2.35 p.m.): For 1½ hours hon. members have been subjected to a very dull and dreary speech from the Leader of the Opposition. It contained many contradictions and was dull even to the extent that he appeared to have no interest himself in what he was saying. There must be something, I suppose, worthy of comment in a speech lasting 1½ hours. The Leader of the Opposition demonstrated a sad lack of financial knowledge, and showed that he has a very shallow grip on the State's financial matters and an inability to come to grips with the problems facing the State.

A couple of remarkable statements made by the Leader of the Opposition are significant and worthy of mention. In dealing with the Federal system, he said that the A.L.P. supports such a system. That is very interesting indeed, because his Federal leader is stomping the hustings trying to create the impression that the States have outlived their usefulness. I shall comment further on that matter during my speech.

I think I should draw the attention of the Leader of the Opposition to just what the Federal system is, because I am sure that he does not understand it. Surely it is a clear measure that places the people of Australia under two distinct Governments, each sovereign and independent within its own sphere of operation. The Federal system envisaged by the Leader of the

Opposition is probably contained in part of the platform of the A.L.P. The part to which I refer reads—

“3. Amendment of the Commonwealth Constitution—

(a) (i) to clothe the Commonwealth Parliament with unlimited powers and with the duty and authority to create States possessing delegated Constitutional powers;”

Whilst hon. members opposite purport to believe in the Federal system, they will rewrite the system to their own liking if they ever have the opportunity to do so. They will take complete power unto themselves into a central Government and create administrative centres. As I mentioned once before, they would be something like Mr. Calwell's 57 regional States for Australia, each with delegated powers and controlled entirely by a centralised form of Government.

The Leader of the Opposition went on to say that the Treasurer, like previous Treasurers, had mentioned the drought as a reason why State finances are down. If the hon. gentleman had been listening to the A.B.C. news today, he would have heard that the Regional Director of the Weather Bureau had stated that the present drought is the worst in the State's history, even worse than the drought at the turn of the century.

Mr. F. P. Moore: The “present” drought? How long has it been in existence?

Mr. LICKISS: The present drought is still existing.

Mr. F. P. Moore: Of course. It was at the time of the last Budget, too, and you ended up with a surplus.

Mr. LICKISS: The hon. member is noted for his wordiness, but he says very little.

Attention has been drawn to the fact that the State depends upon gifts from the Commonwealth Government. Here again is an indication of socialistic thinking—the sort of thinking that will be handed out if ever members of the Opposition party attain the Treasury benches in Canberra and in this State. They seem to believe in fact that these moneys are gifts from the Commonwealth, and not State moneys in any case. I should like to place on record here and now that Queensland, of all the States of the Commonwealth, has done more to provide the essential exports the return from which has created the balance of payments from which the southern States were able to develop their industrial capacity. I do not think that fact should be overlooked. I do not believe that these so-called gifts from the Commonwealth are gifts at all; I believe that they are the due right of the State. I shall comment further on that matter also.

Let me now canvass a couple of other points raised by the Leader of the Opposition. In defence of strikes, he said that it is strike action that has enabled workers today to enjoy a very high standard of

living. Later in his speech he went on to say that the people of Queensland are not enjoying a very high standard of living. He will read that in his proof tomorrow—a contradiction within itself.

He then went on to deal with the profit motive. To him "profit" is an unholy word that no-one should ever mention. Of course, with his brilliance in economic affairs, he does not relate profit to capital invested. These are all matters that one would expect to hear at a very elementary stage of debate in a high school.

Mr. Houston: Why don't you oppose me in Bulimba again?

Mr. LICKISS: The hon. gentleman can contest Mt. Coot-tha and see how he goes.

Mr. Houston: You ran away from Bulimba.

Mr. LICKISS: The hon. gentleman got the shock of his life.

I support the Budget and commend the Treasurer for his presentation of it. Under his guidance the format of the Budget shows a marked improvement, and it gives a more meaningful presentation of the State's economic situation than that given by former Treasurers. I am sure that any fair-minded Queenslander, realising the present particularly difficult economic environment, will accept this Budget as a well-considered and thoughtful approach to the financial requirements of the State.

One can well imagine the chaotic situation that would have existed a mere decade or so ago under similar circumstances of economic gravity in certain sections of the rural economy. The present situation speaks volumes for the steps taken by the State Government in diversification of activity and emphasis on the secondary component within the economy. The mineral development will, of course, continue to improve the finances of the State, and it is to this sector, in terms of resource development, that Queensland can look with anticipation for spectacular progress and growth. This will have a direct benefit on the economy of both the State and the nation. In a nutshell, Queensland is fortunate to have been able to broaden its economic base, and, under the management of this Government, it is doing that at a great rate.

Naturally, the Treasurer has had to trim his expenditure according to the expected capital resources available. It would be easy, I suggest, to imagine the more spectacular growth incentives that could, and would, have been provided under normal climatic and price situations. However, it is rather a useless exercise to contemplate what spectacular horizons could have been opened under normal conditions. The situation certainly is not normal, and I believe that all hon. members can take satisfaction from the obvious economic growth taking

place in this State at this very moment, with the beneficial effect that has on its economy and its people and their standard of living. It speaks well for the role played by the Government in the management of the affairs of this State under such conditions.

One would be insensitive not to realise the Treasurer's dilemma when he had to decide whether to stay within the bounds of his known capital resources or to venture into a deficit-budgeting situation in order to sustain, and in fact to stimulate, the present growth trends in this State. I support the action that he has decided to take in that regard. I should like to devote some time to certain aspects of the presentation of the Budget, and what I put forward is in the spirit of being constructive and not in any way destructive. I trust it will be accepted in that spirit.

The Treasurer will recall that several years ago I put forward a number of suggestions relative to ways in which, in my opinion, the presentation of the Budget could be improved and made more meaningful. I believe that the format has varied and is a substantial improvement on the format adopted by former Treasurers. It is now much clearer and easier for hon. members to interpret. However, to me, it still falls short of what I think is required in a number of respects, apart from setting out the various deficits and credits in the three major categories of accounts.

I believe that a Budget should contain a complete run-down on the current economic conditions and, more importantly, the short and long-term prospects confronting the economy. This is essential, I believe, if those who are interested, particularly intending industrial investors and businessmen generally, are to gain a full understanding of the environment in which they are expected to operate. Clearly, anyone reading the Budget as it was set out in the past would find difficulty in deriving that picture.

On this occasion, one could certainly gain the impression that the State had experienced a very serious drought—indeed, a most dreadful drought—over a large portion of the State, and that this had adversely affected the farm sector with subsequent repercussions on the State's economy as a whole. Everyone would accept this without argument, and, tragic as the drought is, we must not lose sight of the fact that Queensland is no longer predominantly rural orientated. I should like, therefore, to emphasise that a large proportion of the State's capital, labour and other productive factors is engaged in non-farm activity and one may like to know just where the State is heading in relation thereto.

In recent years the State has benefited materially from an inflow of such factors, and a continuation of growth is dependent on a sustained inflow. Of course, in turn, this depends on expectations and confidence

that such growth will be sustained. Without a clear picture uncertainty is created, with a resultant retarding effect on growth. In other words, if private enterprise is to plan with confidence, it is the Government's responsibility to provide a clear and detailed picture of the trends in the economy. In my view there is no questioning the fact that the Budget is the most authentic and the only proper vehicle to be used by the Government in conveying such a picture to the public, and this should contain not only the current but also the prospective guide-lines.

With respect, I believe that there is room in the Budget to cater for these requirements, but in making this statement I do not detract in any way from the value and the form of the Budget as presented. Admittedly there is a deficiency of statistics, on other than the national level, designed to show measurements and aggregate components of public and private expenditure. No doubt, in due course, these will be forthcoming on a State basis, but in the meantime there are nevertheless sufficient figures available to provide an improved coverage.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wharton): Order! Hon. members of the Opposition and the hon. member for Hawthorne, there is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr. LICKISS: Personally, I feel that it should not be left to management consultants to provide the business community with analyses of current economic conditions and forecasts. This should be done by the Government, and in the Budget. I should like this matter to be considered.

Recent events, at both Commonwealth and State levels, once again tend to highlight the inflexibility of Commonwealth-State financial relationships. In the short term, we again witness the weaknesses in national stabilisation policies. In recent months monetary and fiscal measures have been implemented to combat inflationary pressures. Being national measures, these were uniformly applied throughout the whole of Australia.

Let us look, firstly, at the monetary action taken. The application of more stringent credit measures takes no account of the fact that economic conditions vary from State to State at any given point of time. There is no question that, at the time when these measures were adopted, a very tight labour situation prevailed in Victoria and New South Wales, and there were other strong indications of excess demand. On the other hand, in Queensland the situation was not nearly so tight. Further, this State was already experiencing a depressed situation in the farm sector, with a resultant dampening effect on the whole economy. It is true that the non-farm sector has sufficient strength of growth to offset this, but not to the extent that it could continue to do so in the face of measures to slow down its growth.

Obviously, then, in States that are predominantly industrially orientated, conditions can and do differ from those in Queensland, where the economy is in a transitional stage.

One of the industries that are particularly affected by these measures is home-building. Whereas the trend in all other States was strongly upwards, dwelling construction in this State had remained at a steady level for approximately 18 months. In these circumstances, obviously home-building activity can go only one way, that is, downwards.

The combination of monetary and fiscal measures designed to curb consumer demand has affected sales in the fields of consumer durables, in which there were already weaknesses. The application of national blanket policies along these lines highlights the lack of sophistication, and indeed weaknesses, in too much centralised control. The lesson to be learned from this is that ways and means must be found for States to have much greater control over economic conditions in their respective areas of responsibility. If this is not done, the State Governments become nothing more than local authorities. This would probably be a popular expectation of hon. members opposite, but it is most unacceptable to those on this side of the Chamber. Obviously, short-term stabilisation policies, uniformly applied by Commonwealth Government, contain too many weaknesses in the modern social, economic and political environment of Australia.

If we consider the long term, we see that the same situation arises. Clearly the future rate of growth of the nation will depend more and more on the development of our national resources. Queensland is blessed with a wide array of such potential wealth. In recent years the Queensland Government has done an excellent job in encouraging the utilisation of these resources, but here again the limitations on what the Government has been able to provide by way of infrastructure has been set by the availability of capital. It is quite clear that this State is destined to play a major role in the future rate of national development via the medium of the establishment of large-scale, internationally competitive industrial complexes. I suggest that it cannot fulfil this role in an adequate manner within the inflexible financial strait-jacket that binds the arrangements between the Commonwealth and the States.

Mr. Tucker: Who wrote this for you—Charles Porter?

Mr. LICKISS: I write my own speeches. I do not get Tom Burns to write them, as the hon. member does.

The danger inherent in any trend towards centralism is the surrender of worth-while development to parochial areas of strongest political pressure. One only has to look at the political attitudes of hon. members

opposite, with a centralised form of government as their main aim, to realise how badly Queensland would fare under that system. The great bulwark against this has been the proper implementation of the Federal system—the Leader of the Opposition might like to listen to this—comprising Governments, Federal and State, each with respective and independent sovereign powers. If a council of State Governments was required in the past, it is vital now to ensure proper development of a healthy political environment in Australia.

There must be a national awareness of the need for Australia to develop its natural resources if we are to survive. From this must flow a greater allocation of capital, with the encouragement of labour towards the development of such resources, than in the past. At the State level, if we are to correctly orientate such development we must pay greater attention to regional development. I have repeatedly stressed in this Chamber that our future pace of development will depend more and more on regional considerations. In other words, it is essential that we devote more and more time to regional planning and development. Only in that way can we achieve integrated development in primary, secondary and tertiary activities, which, to me, reflects proper, balanced development.

Whilst there must be greater flexibility in the financial structure of our Federal system, it is well to remember that, in a rapidly expanding economy, capital will continue to be a scarce commodity. It is therefore essential for capital to flow into those channels which will provide us with the maximum reward for our efforts. We cannot afford to delay much longer.

Whilst on the general issue of regional planning, it is interesting to note that the Leader of the Federal Opposition, Mr. Whitlam, is literally stomping the countryside advocating his socialistic form of regional planning. However, any resemblance between the type I envisage and his form is in name only. What Mr. Whitlam is doing—and one cannot blame him—is to use this system of regional concept to hasten the death of the Federal system and, in accordance with Labour's avowed policies, to abandon the States as presently constituted and vest sovereign power in a central Government in Canberra. What was said of the American Federal system can be said equally of ours: it was a bold, wise and successful attempt to place the people under two distinct Governments, each sovereign and independent within its own sphere of action. This is necessary to preserve proper government in Australia, because liberty, public interest, effective representation and local approval of local legislation are associated with a diffusion of power upon which the Federal system is based. I say quite categorically that this is contrary to the advocacy of the socialists opposite.

I think it was de Tocqueville who said, "Democratic institutions are most likely to fall beneath the yoke of centralised administration." I point out that we in Australia are dealing with, and living under, a Federal system, with two distinct forms of government, each sovereign and independent within its own sphere; and here the operative and important words are "sovereign" and "independent".

The Leader of the Federal Opposition, and obviously the Leader of our State Opposition, would have people believe that not only would a Federal Government led by them deal with State Governments, but the Federal Leader of the Opposition is on record as saying that he would treat with local government direct, on an equal basis. That is interesting to contemplate, because it means the undermining of the sovereign powers of the State. Yet, today, the Leader of the Opposition said that he believed in the Federal system. Someone is amiss somewhere; there is a misunderstanding of what the Federal system really means.

I suggest that the perambulations of the Federal Leader of the Opposition are designed to hoodwink the people; they are designed to undermine the very system that our forebears set up, under which, in partnership, we should go ahead with our Federal colleagues. If one reverts to the statement of the methods to be adopted by the Labour Party, one notes again that the intention is to clothe the Commonwealth Parliament with unlimited powers and with the duty and authority to create States possessing delegated constitutional power. No doubt that is the very reason why the Federal Leader of the Opposition is selecting the local government level to undermine the State's authority and sovereign powers. This is just another manoeuvre on Mr. Whitlam's part, working on the principle of the end justifying the means, to implement the socialistic A.L.P. policy of the destruction of the Federal concept and the abolition of the States as we presently know them. He knows that this is essential if socialism is to succeed.

What would he then propose, having gained absolute sovereign power in Canberra? I suggest he would probably make the 57 States or regions in Australia subservient to the central Government. A former Federal Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Calwell) advocated this. So all this glib talk of a regional concept is far divorced from what I, and I believe my colleagues on this side of the Chamber, envisage. We envisage regional planning set up under the sovereign powers of the State. This will in no way hamper the functioning of the Federal system.

Mr. Whitlam's periodic perambulations through this State must be a cause of great concern and embarrassment to the State Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Houston), who must feel that he is between the devil and the deep blue sea. He is a potential State Premier and a member of a party with

political aims to destroy the very State he hopes to lead and govern. It is not what Mr. Whitlam says in tripping round Australia that counts; it is the party requirement and policy that he would have to implement that should concern Australians and Queenslanders.

I trust that we will soon see implemented in this State a healthy system of regional planning, a proposition well within the scope of our Federal system, one designed to co-operate with local government, and, more particularly, one without the insidious and unacceptable results which would stem from socialist Labour's platform and policies, which I suggest are designed to destroy the very Federal system under which we live.

I support the Budget and commend the Treasurer on its presentation. I believe that he has had to make many important decisions. It is well realised in State budgeting that the idea is to balance the Budget. However, on this occasion, as on a previous occasion, he has put the State first—as one would expect of him—and has brought down a Budget which, although limited in additional resources, is designed to stimulate the growth of Queensland.

Mr. BOUSEN (Toowoomba West) (3.3 p.m.): Might I, at this stage, say how noticeable it is that the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha was the first Government speaker in this debate.

Mr. Hinze: What is wrong with that? Somebody has to be first.

Mr. BOUSEN: It is probably indicative of the result of the rumpus that recently took place in the Liberal Party. I am surprised to learn that the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha has overwhelmed the hon. member for Chatsworth and has become the Government's shadow Treasurer. He has obviously been promoted following the rumpus in the Liberal Party and has put the hon. member for Chatsworth out of the running and, because this is the Budget debate, he has been given first call to speak.

Mr. Hinze: Why would we want a shadow Treasurer? We have an excellent one already.

Mr. BOUSEN: You never know; you might lose him.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wharton): Order! I cannot hear the hon. member for Toowoomba West because of the interjections on my right.

Mr. BOUSEN: I previously submitted a case on behalf of the Queensland Sub-Normal Children's Welfare Association requesting an increased grant or subsidy to assist in meeting the salaries of teachers attached to its centres. The Budget discloses that a grant has been approved. Although this will be of great assistance, I point out that, in my opinion and that of the association, the whole of a teacher's salary is a Government responsibility.

These teachers are now paid 83½ per cent. of the State award rate, and next year it is hoped to increase their salaries to 93 per cent. of that rate. In 1972 it is hoped to put all teachers in the association on the full award conditions enjoyed by teachers of the Department of Education. Larger subsidies will then have to be approved, of course, or the Government will have to take over the responsibility of paying the full salaries of teachers employed by the Queensland Sub-Normal Children's Welfare Association.

I have also mentioned previously another charitable organisation, namely, the Blue Nursing Service, and its difficulty in raising sufficient finance to pay the salaries of its nurses. As a consequence of that situation, the Blue Nursing Service requested a further \$400 a year for each nurse. However, it received only half that amount. If this service is unable to raise additional finance, there will be, in the final analysis, redundant nurses and the loss to the community of the service that they can give.

Government members fail to recognise that the education of all children, and the care of the sick and infirm, are responsibilities of the Government, and that, if it were not for the community outlook and the spirit of goodwill of those who form themselves into charitable organisations such as the two to which I have referred, the Government would have to find millions of dollars a year and not the paltry few thousand now contributed to the Queensland Sub-Normal Children's Welfare Association and the Blue Nursing Service.

Another matter that I have raised from time to time by way of questions is the need for a second opportunity school in Toowoomba. What I am seeking is the building of such a school on land owned by the Department of Education in Toowoomba West. Nothing has been done about it, despite the fact that when the last figures were taken out, some 50 children were waiting for admittance to the present opportunity school. Again I submit that the proper education of these children is the Government's responsibility, and it can be met only by providing opportunity schools for them. It is well known that when these children have to assemble in classes with other children who are so much brighter than they are, teachers cannot devote to them the great amount of time that backward children require. The consequence is that to some extent their education suffers. The only way of giving full and proper education to backward children is by providing opportunity schools for them.

I now wish to deal with some railway matters. I regret that the Minister for Transport is not in the Chamber, because the remainder of my contribution will concern matters that come under his jurisdiction. On 5 March last I asked the Minister for Transport if the Railway Department had

received a complaint from the Toowoomba City Council concerning delays at level crossings at Russell, Margaret, Herries and James Streets because of long trains fouling those crossings, and what action would be taken to eliminate the delays. The Minister replied that he was not aware of the problem but would have it investigated.

In the face of that reply, both the General Manager, Toowoomba, and the Commissioner made statements, one in "The Downs Star" as far back as 22 October, 1969, and the other in "The Toowoomba Chronicle" on 11 November, 1969, that there could be no alteration to the present system despite the complaint made by the Toowoomba City Council.

I shall quote first from the article that appeared in "The Downs Star" on 22 October, 1969. It said—

"Overpasses Cheaper than Shifting the Railway—Railway Chief.

"The general manager of the Railway Department's south-western division, Mr. D. Mendoza, has suggested that the City Council might consider building road overpasses at central city railway crossings.

"Mr. Mendoza said that any move to re-project the railways would be a costly project of doubtful economic benefit.

"He was referring to a decision by Monday night's City Council meeting to write to the Minister for Transport, Mr. Knox,"—

I ask hon. members to note that this was in October last year, yet on 5 March this year the Minister denied any knowledge of the matter—

"asking him when it would be possible to eliminate the crossings from the city centre.

"In raising the matter, the Mayor, Alderman Nell Robinson, spoke of the traffic problems caused by trains which were sometimes so long that they held up traffic at two crossings at the same time.

"Mr. Mendoza said it would cost millions of dollars to re-route the railways from the city centre, and such a move would also require major alterations—if not the removal of—the railway station.

"Under the circumstances, if the Council felt the traffic problem was serious enough, it might consider the construction of overpasses, as a cheaper and quicker alternative to re-routing the railway tracks."

On 11 November, 1969, an article appeared in "The Toowoomba Chronicle" under the heading "No Plan for Removal of Rail Lines from Centre of City". It read—

"The Railway Department has told the City Council that it has no plans to remove the railway line from the centre of the city.

"But the Mayor (Alderman Nell Robinson) said yesterday she had not given up hope of eventually having the line relocated.

"At last month's City Council meeting, Alderman Robinson instigated a move to have the line shifted.

"On a motion from the Mayor, the Council wrote to the Commissioner for Railways (Mr. Lee) and asked if an alternative route could be made for the line.

"It was her feeling an alternative route should be found.

"She said trains were getting 'longer and longer' and blocking city traffic.

"At yesterday's General Purposes Committee meeting, a letter was received from the Railway Department advising the department had no plans to alter the line at present.

"Alderman Robinson said, however, she had had talks with the State Treasurer (Mr. Chalk) and the Member for Toowoomba West (Mr. Ray Bousen) on the matter during the week-end.

'I am confident now that, in time, the change I proposed will come about,' she said.

'I feel that Mr. Chalk was not against the idea and that it could be investigated at some stage.'

"Alderman Robinson said the matter would be taken further.

'It is not my intention to drop it by any means,' she said."

I agree with the mayor of Toowoomba that these long goods trains do hold up road traffic on two crossings at once. They also hold up pedestrian traffic. In fact, they cause serious obstruction to a free flow of both motorised and pedestrian traffic.

However, I do not agree that the present Toowoomba-Wyreema main line should be closed. It has not outlived its usefulness, but it is my considered opinion that it should be used solely for passenger trains between Toowoomba and Warwick and for the short essential shunt trains that run daily to serve the R.A.A.F. depot, known as 7 Stores Depot, at Harristown, and the sidings of the State Wheat Board, the city council, and the Caltex Oil Company. In addition to these sidings, stock sales are held regularly at the sale yards at Harristown and these require an almost daily service to that siding. There is also a possibility of a siding having to be built at the local abattoir at Drayton. Consequently, great use would be made of the line between Toowoomba and Wyreema.

The General Manager of the Railway Department in Toowoomba has suggested that the city council might build overpasses over these crossings. I do not agree that street overpasses would solve any problems in this regard, and, because of that, I think I should submit what I consider to be a sensible alternative.

Having dealt with the problems on the main southern line to Warwick and the need to retain the line because of required services, I now submit to the Government that the

only possible alternative to cope with long trains is the rebuilding of the Gowrie Junction-Wyreema line, which previously went through Charlton, Westbrook and Wellcamp to Wyreema. This line was inconceivably, and without any imagination or justification, closed down, if my memory serves me correctly, on 1 December, 1959, by the Country-Liberal Government of this State.

Mr. F. P. Moore: Who was the Minister?

Mr. BOUSEN: The Hon. G. W. W. Chalk was the Minister who did this. I am coming to that shortly. The line was completely pulled up by November, 1960. The point I want to make is that I was attending a social function at Helidon in November last year and sitting at the refreshment room table with me was the Treasurer, Mr. Chalk, and the mayor of Toowoomba, Miss Robinson. When I raised this question with the hon. gentleman, he agreed with the mayor and me that the greatest mistake the Government ever made was to close down the line and pull it up, and that something would have to be done about it.

This line should be rebuilt on the original site, or perhaps resurveyed somewhere adjacent to where the old line ran. Then, all through goods and livestock trains from Toowoomba to Warwick or vice versa would be directed over this route. The difference in the distance between Toowoomba and Wyreema on the route I have mentioned and that on the main southern line between Toowoomba and Wyreema would be slight. Consequently, if the new link were built, there would be very little difference between the running times of trains between the two points—either Toowoomba-Wyreema or on the main southern line.

The rebuilding of this line would have other advantages. For instance, livestock trains from the West to Wallangarra or vice versa could conveniently bypass Toowoomba by using this obviously shorter route.

I now want to deal with the Toowoomba marshalling yards and the congestion that takes place there because most of the roads in the yards are too short to handle the long trains to which we are now accustomed. I also raised this matter by way of a question to the Minister on 28 August, 1969, when he agreed that there was some congestion in the yards at Toowoomba and that investigations would be made with a view to providing alternative yards somewhere in the vicinity of the existing yards.

I am now given to understand over the bush telegraph system that new marshalling yards are to be built at the old locomotive depot at Willowburn. While I have not sighted the plans, I believe they are available in the general manager's office at Toowoomba. I am firmly of the opinion that here again congestion problems will occur as the new marshalling yards will also contain a number of dead-end roads. I might further say

that I was very disturbed to think that these plans had been approved without any notification from the Minister or the department to me. I was given no opportunity to view the plans to see if they were satisfactory to the employees and the people I represent.

As I said before, I feel that the proposed yards will have some shortcomings, particularly in the handling of long trains. I believe that the only way to facilitate the ingress and egress of trains is to build two very long dispatching and receiving roads parallel with the main western line. If that were done, trains from Brisbane could go round into the long marshalling road adjacent to the main western line, where they would be received by the shunting staff for breaking up and marshalling. The same thing would apply to long trains arriving from the West. They could come straight into the long roads without interfering with other work that might be going on in the shunting yards. The money that is to be spent will be wasted unless the Government goes further and does the complete job as I have suggested.

I believe, too, that the Willowburn station yard should be extended and new roads built round the station for stowing wagons. A few years ago I submitted plans to the general manager at Toowoomba to cover the alteration of the Willowburn station yard. Those plans were drawn up by Mr. Walter Ogilvie, a retired station master who was recognised as one of the most competent railwaymen in the State. For many years he was station master at both Toowoomba and Willowburn, so who better than he could give us an idea of what is required in the shunting yards? Now is the time to look at the plans. If this suggestion was implemented it would be of advantage to the department and prove economical. Empty stock wagons could be stowed and cleaned at the Willowburn yards instead of in the Toowoomba yards, which are situated in the centre of the city and are unhygienic.

I make these suggestions with the full knowledge that a certain amount of shunting would still have to be carried out at the present location to cope with production from the Toowoomba Foundry and the flour mills, with freight stored in the goods shed, and with passenger trains. The present shunting yards would need to be retained to serve those customers of the department.

I am firmly of the opinion that if long receiving and dispatching roads were built parallel with the main western line, if the Willowburn station yard was enlarged, and if the loco depots were converted to marshalling yards, the needs of Toowoomba would be met for many years to come.

The Government is spending large sums of money on television advertisements proclaiming that the railways are a partner in Queensland's progress. Toowoomba is a very important city, the third largest in the State, and the railways could be a

partner in its development. A construction of the lines that I have suggested and an enlargement of the Willowburn station yard would alleviate the traffic congestion that now occurs at the level crossings in the city.

I wish to refer now to the Treasurer's comments about freight rates on certain commodities. He has engaged Beckingsale Management Services to investigate rail freights. This is indicative of an incompetent Government. It will blame somebody else for something that it is not game to do.

In 1959 this Government engaged Professor Hytton, from Tasmania, to investigate the railway system in this State, but what became of his investigation after this Government had spent thousands of dollars on it? It did not even see the light of day, and nobody knew what his report contained. Next the Government engaged Ford, Bacon and Davis at a cost of over \$200,000. While their report recommended an increase in the number of managerial positions in the Railway Department, it disposed of the lower-paid workers by closing down branch lines and introducing dieselisation and mechanisation. This affected quite a number of tradesmen and semi-skilled labourers who became redundant and were forced to seek employment outside or accept transfer to country areas.

The Government has now commissioned another investigating body, Beckingsale Management Services, to investigate the railway service, because, as I have said, it has not the guts to tell the people what it intends to do. It is hiding behind the skirts of this firm, which will charge thousands of dollars to investigate the railway system and the Government's mistakes. That is a shocking indictment of the Government.

If one of our primary industries is entitled to freight concessions, it is the grain-growing industry.

Mr. Chalk: Labour increased rail freights nine times in 11 years, while you were an official "stirrer".

Mr. BOUSEN: That is right. The Labour Party was not afraid to tell the people that it had to increase freight rates. This Government has not the stomach to do it. It has to get someone else to do it.

Mr. Chalk: I did not increase them.

Mr. BOUSEN: No, but you will when someone tells you what to do. The Government has to wait for someone to tell it what to do.

Mr. Chalk: This is the first time you ever admitted that you raised the rates nine times in 11 years.

Mr. BOUSEN: The grain-growers have made a number of applications to the Treasurer and the Government for some consideration in freight rates, but on each occasion the Treasurer has been adamant in

refusing any concessions. To outline the feeling of grain-growers, I refer to reported statements by Mr. Price, president of the Grain Growers' Association, at a meeting held on 30 September, reading—

"Promise of Freight Aid Broken: Price

"The State Budget's failure to include freight reductions is, in the opinion of the Queensland Grain Growers' Association President, (Mr. Les Price), a repudiation of a pledge.

"In his report to the quarterly meeting of the Q.G.G.A. conference in Toowoomba yesterday he said that on three occasions he had been given an undertaking that relief would be forthcoming.

"He had, on the growers' behalf, actually agreed to the standing over of some relief last year, on the grounds that, firstly, it would have been only a token amount, and secondly, that it seemed a responsible attitude in view of the conditions at that time.

"To me the failure of the State Government to bring relief forward to this Budget is nothing less than a repudiation of a pledge, and surely we should be able to expect better than this from the people who run a State." Mr. Price said.

"There was little doubt that the excuse for evading this issue would be the pending release of the management consultant's report. But he asked was this report based on relevant facts, or was it nothing more than pre-election propaganda? The acid test would be whether or not this document was made public, or at least made available to interested parties.

"Mr. Price's report continued, *inter alia*—

"After lengthy discussions with a majority of Cabinet Ministers, at which there was general agreement that the anomaly did exist, I am convinced that none of the Ministers, other than the Minister for Transport, and the State Treasurer, would know the magnitude of the anomaly, or the profitability level of grain haulage.

"I believe it is past high time that grain growers questioned the sincerity and the capacity of those people elected to represent them.

"We have few alternatives but to await the outcome of the Beckingsale report, but if this fails to bring relief, we must obtain justice one way or another.

"These charges are a savage sectional tax imposed under a Government monopoly, and as such must surely be abhorrent to the majority of Australians who pride themselves on having a sense of justice."

Mr. Chalk: You support the Government monopoly, don't you?

Mr. BOUSEN: No, not always.

Mr. Chalk: You don't support the railways?

Mr. BOUSEN: Not always.

Mr. Chalk: You were the greatest "stirrer" that the railways ever had.

Mr. BOUSEN: I did not mind doing that; I did not mind being called a "stirrer" on those occasions. Because of the tyrannical legislation that this Government implemented, the railways needed somebody like me to stir them up.

Mr. Chalk: You were the greatest "stirrer" ever. You were about as popular as Baldwin.

Mr. BOUSEN: That is right. It is people like us who get under the Government's hide. They just can't take it.

Mr. Chalk: I couldn't take you anywhere.

Mr. BOUSEN: I know that. I would not go, either.

Reverting to what I was saying, another meeting was held the next day, the report of which is headed, "Grainmen Reject Forceful Action on Freight Rates." The grain-growers held a meeting, again in Toowoomba. The report reads—

"The proposal put forward by the Dalby District Council of the Queensland Grain Growers' Association at the State Council meeting urged 'forceful action to press claims for freight justice by picketing the eight to 10 flour mill outlets in Queensland and the State border gates to eliminate the supply of flour to bakeries.'"

These people are so stirred up—

Mr. Chalk: Did you carry a red flag?

Mr. BOUSEN: Yes. I have carried one on many occasions. I have led the Labour Day procession more times than the Treasurer has led a Liberal procession. This indicates what the people thought of me as a leader.

The report continues—

"Dalby District State Councillor, Mr. E. W. Skerman said the proposal was the result of strong feeling among Dalby district growers concerning the failure of the State Government to give freight relief in the recent Budget.

"It was an indication that they had reached 'the end of their tether'.

"He said it was an indication that they were tired of talking about seeking justice and now they wanted some action."

Mr. Chalk: Read the last paragraph of it.

Mr. BOUSEN: It reads—

"Mr. A. E. Staal . . . said while he did not agree with the action proposed, he was sympathetic towards the growers who had been prompted to send in the resolution."

Mr. Chalk: That spoils your argument. He said he did not support it.

Mr. BOUSEN: But he is only one, and the rest of them—

Mr. Chalk: It was not carried. Give us the whole of it. Do not give us half of it.

Mr. BOUSEN: The grain-growers are not like railwaymen, who have no alternative but to take strike action to get their just deserts or have their demands met. The grain-growers are entitled to some freight-rate concessions. They elected this Government to do something for them, and the Government has refused. Now, they do not want to "buck" the Government they elected.

There is another transport matter that I wish to raise. It relates to the large wheat shed on the main line between Herries and James Streets, Toowoomba. This shed should be removed from the centre of the city and built in an outer suburb. The building is dilapidated, unattractive, and mice-infested. Because grain is stored in it for long periods, it has become so mice-infested that people in the adjacent residential area have complained about the prevalence of mice. It is an eyesore in the heart of the city. It is a disgrace to have such a dilapidated building in a residential area. The land on which it is situated is a good, level area and would be useless to the Railway Department once the wheat shed was removed.

Perhaps the city council, in conjunction with the Minister for Transport, could build a modern bus terminal there—and here again I prevail on the Treasurer to undo the purse strings. Toowoomba sadly lacks a bus terminal. Buses now run interstate. The Government gave Toowoomba bus services permits to run to the South Coast, to Millmerran, to Dalby and to Chinchilla in competition with the railways, yet it did not provide any terminals for the passengers.

Mr. Chalk: Haven't you heard about McCafferty's terminal?

Mr. BOUSEN: That seats only a section of the people. We want one to seat all the people.

Mr. Chalk: You want a socialistic terminal?

Mr. BOUSEN: Of course I do. The Treasurer wants to give all the money to the big fellows; we want it distributed evenly among all the people.

There is no place for interstate and country buses to load and unload or for passengers to board or alight. In one place this holds up traffic; as soon as a bus pulls up, no traffic can move east or west along Russell Street. Traffic banks up along Russell Street and around into Neil Street. If an interstate bus stops at a travel agency in Margaret Street early in the morning before business houses are open, the passengers on the bus have to wait on the footpath till the business houses open at 8.45 a.m. No seats or toilet facilities are provided for them. I strongly urge the Minister to give consideration to the building of a modern bus terminal on the site I have mentioned.

I now want to deal with the matter of sick leave for railway employees. This morning the hon. member for Tablelands asked the Minister for Transport—

“As By-laws 994 and 995, published in the Queensland Government Gazette of September 12 have not been tabled and as the amendments were published in ‘Railway Weekly Notice 37/70’ of September 17 and it was stated that they would date from October 1, will he postpone their introduction for one month so that Parliament may be given the opportunity to discuss the amendments which are causing grave concern to all railwaymen?”

The answer was a short and sweet “No.”

For some months now the union has been negotiating with the Minister for Transport to bring sick leave provisions for railway employees into line with those applying within the Public Service. The Minister informed the deputation at the first meeting that there would be an amendment, and that they would be advised in writing when it was available for publication. They then arranged to meet the Minister on 16 September but, rather than meet the unions concerned, the Minister telephoned them and said that he was not available for a meeting. In the meantime he had already brought in a by-law concerning sick leave, and had had it published. After publishing the by-law, he asked the unions to meet him on 25 September. I understand that he met them last Friday week, after the by-law was published, but no decision has been given.

We feel that this matter is urgent for railwaymen, and that there should be some debate on it in this Chamber. As I have already mentioned, without any reference to the unions the Minister amended by-laws 690 and 888, which govern sick leave for railway employees. The by-law now states that should an employee be off work for three days consecutively, or an aggregate of three days in one year, he must produce a doctor's certificate. That is an amendment to clause 39 of by-law 690.

This provision is quite impracticable. If my interpretation is correct, an employee who had one day off in February, one in June, one in August, and one in December, would have had four days off in one year, and would have to produce a doctor's certificate. This would be impracticable. No doctor would issue, in December, a certificate covering a man's absence on sick leave in January, February and March, unless he was the doctor who saw the man on each occasion. Previously a person could have three consecutive days off at any time without having to produce a doctor's certificate. The by-law provided that the general manager, or the head of a branch, could ask for a certificate covering any absence through sickness, and that provision still exists. On the interpretation of union officials, application of

the present by-law is impracticable. An employee could feel well in the evening, go to bed, and, during the night, become ill and incapable of going to work in the morning. He could formerly have had three days off work without producing a certificate, and would have been paid. The new provision takes that right away completely. If an employee has three days off in 12 months, he has to provide a certificate. As I said, it would be impossible to get a certificate if he had not seen a doctor. How does the Minister suggest that the by-law is to be enforced?

Rule 7 (c) says—

“When an employee is off duty through illness and the absence exceeds three days, he shall supply to his Head of Branch a certificate from a duly registered medical practitioner certifying to the nature of the illness and the period or approximate period of unfitness for duty.

“For shorter periods the Head of Branch may, in his discretion, instruct that a certificate be supplied.”

There is a let-out in 7 (c). If the head of a branch wants a certificate because a man was off duty for from one to three days, all he has to do is tell the man concerned to go to a doctor and produce a certificate. So there is no need for the new by-law that is to take effect as from 1 October.

In addition to what I read in Rule 7 (c), the words “exceeds three days in the aggregate in any one calendar year” have been included. This makes it compulsory for a man who is ill for three or four days during any part of a year to produce a certificate, yet the rule provides that a certificate shall be supplied only if necessary.

In relation to clause 39 of by-law 690, it is provided that if the period of absence does not exceed three days, or three days in the aggregate in any one calendar year, the head of the branch may dispense with a medical certificate. Those words “or three days in the aggregate in any one calendar year” are additional to those contained in clause 39 of by-law 690. Again, it says that the Commissioner or the general manager can demand at any time, if he so desires, that an employee shall supply a certificate. It may be an absence of only one or two days, but the rule provides that the Commissioner or general manager must request that a certificate be supplied.

In its present form, the by-law is superfluous and cannot be implemented. To give hon. members an illustration, I point out that between Charleville and Quilpie, a distance of 140 miles, there are only two train services a week, on Wednesdays and Saturdays. There are doctors at Charleville and also one at Quilpie. If a railway employee between those places wishes to get a medical certificate, he must become ill on a Wednesday or a Saturday so that he can go to a doctor in Charleville or Quilpie. He could go to bed feeling

quite well and wake up next morning with dysentery or some other complaint. He may be sick for only one day and go to work the following day. How on earth could he get a certificate? But at the end of the year, if he has had four days off, according to the by-law, he has to produce a certificate for the days he was off earlier in the year. Under the rules of the Australian Medical Association, no doctor will issue a certificate under those circumstances, so I ask the Treasurer and his Cabinet colleagues to see that the by-law is withdrawn or redrafted.

Mr. HINZE (South Coast) (3.44 p.m.): In making my contribution to the debate on the Financial Statement for 1970-71, I first extend my congratulations to the Treasurer. There should be no doubt in the mind of any Queenslanders that the hon. gentleman has done a remarkably good job while occupying the position of Treasurer of this State. The year 1969-70 was a very difficult one, and it is an indication of the ability of the Treasurer and his officers that they have been able, under such trying conditions, to produce a reasonable Budget for us to debate in this Chamber.

It is customary to comment on the contributions made by hon. members who have preceded one in the debate, and I wish to refer briefly to two points made by the Leader of the Opposition in which I was interested. Firstly, the hon. gentleman said that the Government was using the drought only as an argument. He went back over many years to show that that is what we have always done in relation to droughts. This could be true; it is indelibly written in "Hansard". We have obviously had the droughts through these years. They are something we have to live with. As one previous speaker said, the Meteorological Bureau people have said that this is the worst drought on record. It must therefore have an effect on the Budget.

The other point that the Leader of the Opposition briefly mentioned and in which I was interested was redistribution. I have some figures here on redistributions that have taken place. In 1935 there were 62 seats.

Mr. B. Wood: They tell me that some of your electorate will finish up in Cook.

Mr. HINZE: If I am the representative, they will have good representation for a change. I repeat, in 1935 there were 62 seats, and although the population, which then stood at 971,300, had not increased that year, there was an increase of 30,700 in the period between redistributions. I am pleased to see that the hon. member for Baroona is here, because his father was then the very capable Premier of this State. In 1949 there were 75 seats. This is where members of the Labour Party must have their tongue in cheek when they say that we do not need an increase in the number of seats. In 1949 they increased the number of seats by 13, from 62 to 75, for an increase in

population of 201,000. Hon. members should keep that figure in mind. The population at that time was 1,170,300.

The next redistribution took place in 1958.

Mr. Jensen: Who gave you that brief?

Mr. HINZE: Like all sensible members, I rummaged through the library and got the information for myself. It should be interesting for the hon. member. It will be easy for him now. He can quote my figures, which are factual. In 1958 the number of seats was increased from 75 to 78 for an increase of 279,000 in population, which then totalled 1,449,300.

Coming now to 1970, the increase in population is 336,100 without including the 18-year-olds, of whom we believe there will be 100,000 in Queensland to receive the right to vote. This would put us in the position where we would have very close to an increase in population of 500,000, yet the A.L.P. members claim that there is no need to increase the number of seats. They will have to take their tongue out of cheek because in 1949, when the population increased by only half that number, the A.L.P. increased the number of seats by 13.

Mr. Tucker: Are you in fact really talking to Mr. Chalk?

Mr. HINZE: I am commenting on the statement of the Leader of the Opposition and referring to the fact that if hon. members opposite claim we are not entitled to an increase in seats, and if they also claim a basis of one vote, one value, it is a very hollow argument they are using. I am quite sure they are not sincere in their argument and that it would be best for Queensland if they came out in the open and admitted it.

I now wish to refer to a number of matters contained in the Financial Statement. The most impressive one that I noticed immediately was the increase in railway receipts. We hear much about royalties and the fact that we are giving Queensland away. On the other side of the ledger, because of the agreements and arrangements resulting from the very capable representations made, it was possible to increase receipts in the Railway Department to \$105,903,000, or \$4,000,000 in excess of the estimate. Revenue from the haulage of minerals reached \$28,100,000, almost \$8,000,000 in excess of the amount received in the previous financial year.

The next point the Treasurer emphasised was the basic-wage and award increases that were granted during the year, which cost Consolidated Revenue an amount of \$6,900,000 compared with the Budget provision of \$3,000,000. I am not against anybody receiving reasonable increases in salaries or wages; I am only pointing out their effect on the Budget.

The Treasurer referred to the allocation of \$11,000,000 on drought relief. He said that the allocation rose to \$16,800,000, or \$5,700,000 in excess of the amount provided.

I commend the Treasurer and the Under Treasurer on their representations concerning the betterment factor, which will increase by 50 per cent., from 1.2 to 1.8, from 1971. This will have a great effect on Queensland's financial position.

The Treasurer referred to the state of the economy and the plight of our primary industries. I am a primary-industry man and represent an area that relies largely on primary industries. Hon. members do not need any reminder of the plight of almost every primary industry in this State except the meat industry. It is necessary to produce the type of meat that is required by the United States market, which has placed very stringent conditions upon the importing of Australian meat. A number of countries have been taken off the U.S. market's import list. That fact must worry us, and we must ensure at all times that the meat industry, which appears to be the only successful primary industry, is protected. A number of hon. members have referred to the sugar industry and have claimed that it is in a buoyant state. However, the sugar industry did not get out of trouble in one year. We all know what happened. It appears to be coming back to something like the type of industry that it was for so long, but we cannot say that it is again a prosperous industry. I remind hon. members that it has only now started the long climb back up the hill.

In referring to freight rates and the mining industry the Treasurer said that even the increase of almost 40 per cent. on last year's mineral output was not sufficient to offset the fall in rural production. When talking about drought relief it is necessary to look at what we do. The Premier said that assistance has been provided in 17 ways. He said—

Rail-freight and road-permit concessions had been granted on stock and fodder;

Subsidies had been paid on road-transport costs;

Loans had been granted through the Agricultural Bank to dairy farmers, graziers, grain-growers and miscellaneous primary producers;

A scheme had been introduced to purchase wheat for fodder on terms;

Registration fees had been waived on drought loan mortgages;

Stamp duty had been waived on drought loan documents;

Interest rates were left unchanged on established drought loans;

Grants had been made for the part payment of local authority rates;

A Crown rental reduction of 30 per cent. had been given on certain sheep properties;

An extension of time had been granted and an instalment payment allowed on the payment of Crown rental arrears;

An instalment payment had been allowed on arrears of freeholding purchase dues;

A seed-wheat scheme had been introduced;

A remission of interest had been granted on succession duties;

Drought-affected dairy farmers participating in the dairy pasture subsidy scheme had been assisted by offering fertiliser grants; and

Under the same scheme the Government had approved the carry-over of planting from last financial year to the present.

All those concessions are very good in their own way and resulted from representations to the Government by statutory bodies on behalf of primary industries and accepted by both the State and Federal Governments. However, I ask whether they represent the complete answer. In the last five years the Commonwealth and the States have provided \$40,000,000 for relief. Is that the right way to tackle the problem? If I were engaged in an industry in Brisbane and it was ravaged by fire, I would be covered by fire insurance and loss-of-profits insurance. I would not ask the Government for assistance; I would be covered by an insurance scheme. I have said previously that it is high time that the Commonwealth and the State—

Mr. Bromley: Are you going to call for a national insurance scheme?

Mr. HINZE: I am calling for a national insurance scheme covering disasters. For the life of me I cannot understand why we cannot get one. It would apply not only in drought periods, which are virtually continuous. It would apply also to floods and a number of other eventualities. I cannot understand why Governments in Australia cannot decide on such a scheme when they are providing \$40,000,000 anyhow, which is not the answer.

Such a scheme would do away with charity, which farmers do not want. They want to stand on their own feet in an industry that they know is reasonably safe. At present the western areas of Queensland are in a shocking state, with third-generation families having to leave their properties on which there are mortgages of \$200,000 and \$300,000. How can any man expect his family to stay on a property under those conditions? Quite the reverse to what we want is happening in Queensland. Whenever I speak I emphasise that, in a big State such as this, we do not want a continuous drift of population to the city. We have to keep people away from the city by doing everything possible to get them into an industry with safeguards against drought. So far as I can see there is no problem.

but we cannot convince the various Governments of this although they have already allocated \$40,000,000 over five years.

I now wish to refer to Mr. R. J. Hawke and his reckless attitude to our established courts. He is setting out to divide the nation between the have's and the have not's.

Mr. Davis interjected.

Mr. HINZE: You can speak later.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Houghton): Order! The hon. member will address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. HINZE: If Mr. Hawke took a leaf out of the book of his predecessor he might get somewhere.

Mr. Davies: Who was his predecessor?

Mr. HINZE: Mr. Monk, for whom I had a fair amount of respect. Mr. Hawke, who is a well educated gentleman, believes that he should engage in collective bargaining. He has decided that unions should approach an industry which it is believed can afford to pay increased rates, make an agreement on wages and adjustments, and then coerce other industries by saying, "If you are not prepared to pay you will not get labour. You have to be in this." That is collective bargaining. The unions have recourse to the various Industrial Courts, which are worth retaining. If R. J. Hawke is leading the unions into collective bargaining, we in Australia are in for a hell of a bad time. In his Financial Statement, the Treasurer referred on a number of occasions to wage and salary adjustments.

Mr. Bromley: You are still against increased wages.

Mr. HINZE: I am opposed to anybody who is not prepared to accept the courts that were established to make wage determinations. Hawke is intent on bypassing the courts.

Mr. Bromley interjected.

Mr. HINZE: He is bypassing the courts, and the hon. member knows it.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Houghton): Order! The hon. member for Norman will desist from interjecting.

Mr. Bromley: Did you say "insist"?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Norman will refrain from persistent interjections. Otherwise, I will deal with him under Rule 123A. I make it quite clear to the member for Norman that I am now warning him.

Mr. HINZE: If Mr. Hawke runs rampant and continues on his merry way with wage increases, he must realise that the consumer will pay in the end. Money does not grow on trees. Last night on television, when he was asked about primary industries, his attitude seemed to be, "Let them go to hell."

All he is interested in is the mining industry, or any other industry which he can claim has the ability to pay, and then he coerces the rest of the industries into paying like amounts, which they cannot afford to do.

I refer to a company with which I have a very close association, namely, the South Coast Co-operative Dairy Association. Farmers were responsible for the formation of this company in Southport to employ people. This year, under present conditions, wages and salaries will increase by \$100,000. If anybody suggested an increase in the price of milk or ice cream, or in frozen peas as happened the other day, it is the consumer who must pay in the end.

Somebody has to get around to telling Mr. Hawke that all he is doing is affecting the consuming public or driving little companies, like the one I referred to, into the arms of big monopolies controlled from London. If this is what Mr. Hawke wants, he is going the right way about it. Somebody should get to him and tell him that he has to look at the economy of the State and of Australia and not go along to one or two selected companies and claim they have the ability to pay and then coerce other industries into paying up or getting out.

I have every reason to doubt Hawke's sincerity. Is he really working in the interests of the worker? Is he indulging in a self-glorification programme and using the workers and free enterprise as the vehicle, or is he in fact in the pocket of big overseas companies and working, with sinister intent and by premeditated action, in forcing Australian industries to seek financial backing and eventual take-over from huge overseas combines in order to protect themselves from the avariciousness of Hawke's nefarious dealings in collective bargaining?

I now refer to an article that I read in the Press. It was written by Sir Percy Spender. Everybody knows that he is a very intelligent gentleman and a qualified constitutional lawyer. He said that it would possibly be a good idea for the States and the Commonwealth to get together, with an independent chairman, to consider Commonwealth-State financial problems, rather than "cut up the cake," which is the term he used. Obviously, the Treasurer will comment on this statement.

Sir Percy also made a strong plea for greater participation by the people in the process of democracy. I shall read what he said. I want to get it into "Hansard" because I agree with it.

The article reads—

"Except in a limited sense it cannot be said that the people participate much in the democratic processes of parliamentary government," he said."

"In Parliament itself, little deviation from the party line was allowed in voting.

'Every member of each party comes under the party Whip, which he obeys except at his political peril or disadvantage,' he said.

'Could not something substantial be done to give more responsibility to and usefully occupy members of Parliament who are not Cabinet Ministers?'

I have said previously that I believe it is desirable to appoint select committees of Government members, or all-party committees, to inquire into various matters of public interest. If it is not accepted that there should be all-party committees, then at least there should be Government committees. Sir Percy Spender went on to say that he believes that committees could play a much more important part in dealing with legislation before Parliament, and issues of public concern, and he would like to see in the House of Representatives all-party committees with power to call for information and report to Parliament. Short of all-party committees, he can see no reason why committees should not be set up within the Government parties. I agree with that entirely, coming, as it does, from so eminent a gentleman as Sir Percy Spender.

I want to make some reference to the position of back-bench members of Parliament, including Opposition members. I listened the other day to the Minister for Health referring to the report on the Blue Nursing Service, and part of what he said was that it had been decided that the State Government subsidy of \$1.50 a bed a day should be withdrawn. That was a fairly serious thing to do, and the point that I make is that I do not know whether the decision was a departmental decision or a Cabinet decision. I do not believe I was present when such a decision was made. I appreciate, of course, that, in Executive Government, Ministers and the Cabinet must have the right to make such decisions.

Mr. Bromley: But they make too many of them.

Mr. HINZE: They make decisions in matters such as this every week; they must, to keep democracy functioning as it should. We do not want departmental government. We want the type of government to which we all subscribe—democratic government—and it is possibly time to have a look at the position throughout Australia to see if there are any changes for the better that could be introduced.

Having made those comments of a general nature concerning the Budget, I now wish to have a little Cook's tour of my own electorate. After all, the Budget debate affords us an opportunity to refer to matters of interest in our own areas. I have said previously, and I repeat now, that I cannot convince any Government department of the necessity to provide funds for use in an area that is developing as rapidly as the Gold

Coast. In all departments I can indicate, if necessary, a lack of funds for particularly important jobs. I suppose everybody else can do that, too. However, when an area is developing as quickly as the Gold Coast, surely special consideration must be given to it.

I refer first to the Department of Health. There is a hospital at Southport, and I shall quote from the report of the medical superintendent. I received it yesterday, and in it he said—

"Twice in recent days it has been necessary to make a second Ward round in the evening to find patients to discharge in order to obtain a bed for patients already waiting in the Casualty Department for admission, and for any acute emergencies that might occur during the night. Naturally, these patients would have already been discharged in the morning if the medical officer had really considered that they were ready for discharge. Soon it will be that none will be found to be discharged and we will have to refuse admission here with some regularity because no bed is available."

He later said—

"On two separate occasions since the last board meeting I have made a survey of the patients in Wards 1 and 2, having in mind whether or not they were suitable for accommodation in the Nurses' Quarters, as suggested at the meeting."

That report bears out the point I am making. It is obvious that Government departments—not only one department, but all departments—are not providing in a developing area such as the Gold Coast the services to which we claim every Queenslander is entitled.

The electorate that I represent is 20 miles long. It has no rail service. Pensioners living at Coolangatta cannot get free service at the hospital at Southport, so virtually every other hon. member is better off in that respect than I am.

The strength of the Police Force on the South Coast is becoming a matter for serious concern. In newspapers last week and the week before, hon. members saw reports relating to the lack of police protection on the Gold Coast. Being close to the State border, the area has some difficulties that are peculiar to it. With a large influx of population, it is to be expected that a certain number of people for whom the police in southern States are looking would come to the Gold Coast. I remind hon. members that 70,000 people are established permanently in the area and that 30,000 transients stay on the Gold Coast—a total of 100,000 people. There are 80 policemen, or one policeman to every 1,200 people.

Mr. Bromley: It would be less than that, because you have to take into consideration those policemen who are on long service leave or sick leave.

Mr. HINZE: The hon. member for Norman has made a good point. He suggests that there would not be as many police as I thought, and I am prepared to accept his interjection as part of my argument. The information that I have shows that in Toowoomba, Townsville and Ipswich there is one policeman to each 700 people, so I believe that the Gold Coast has only half the number of police that it is entitled to. However, an increase of 40 would satisfy me for the time being.

The roads in my electorate have the highest traffic density in the State. No doubt hon. members read recently that the death and accident rate on Gold Coast roads is very high. Hooliganism is prevalent, and a report appeared in the Press yesterday that a person owning property in Surfers Paradise said he would give \$300 to anyone who gave him information that would enable him to locate the people who were destroying his property. If the stage is reached where people have to offer money to protect their own properties, surely the point I am making is valid.

I refer now to the Department of Harbours and Marine and quote from various statements that have been made. This is the first—

"The 'Pin is a hazard. Jumpinpin may be a great place to fish, but it's a horror to navigate.

"The intricate maze of bars, channels and islands is so confusing in places that newcomers would not be surprised to see a marine Minotaur rear its ugly head."

No funds are being spent in the Gold Coast area by the Department of Harbours and Marine—at least, not in keeping with those spent in the rest of the State.

Another statement is—

"Harbours and Marine aim to have a boat harbour within an easy day's run all the way to Cairns. Their deputy chief engineer, Frank Wilson, gave us a run-down on their progress so far."

I am now drawing a comparison between the Gold Coast and other parts of the State. Here is another statement—

"Started in 1962, Manly is now half-way in its development with 150 moorings and another 350 to come. Cost so far is \$½ million in improvements.

"Work has started now on reclaiming additional land for several power and sail clubs.

"Cabbage Tree Creek, Sandgate, home of the Queensland Cruising Yacht Club, will ultimately have \$½ million in improvements.

"Work began in 1965, and 70 per cent. of a new mooring basin has been dredged. A road system and parking layout is to come.

"Scarborough is the base for Moreton Bay's largest trawler fleet and is within easy runabout range of Moreton Island. Work began in 1968 and so far about one-third of the \$600,000 price tab has been spent.

"Foreshore reclamation now is in progress.

"Mooloolaba was the result of a search for a new pilot station for Brisbane.

"At a final cost of about \$2,000,000, the harbour will have 30 acres of moorings."

Mr. Ahern: It is very good, too.

Mr. HINZE: My friend from Landsborough says it is very good. I am pleased to see this type of development in my colleague's area, but the point I am making is that every area in the State other than the Gold Coast is receiving these allocations of funds. Shortly, I intend to put in a very strong claim for the harbour at Currumbin.

The article continues—

"The development of Fraser Island's tourist trade will hinge on the Urangan boat harbour. Moorings still are to be laid as work started only two years ago. Final cost: \$½ million.

"Construction starts this year or next on a \$650,000 harbour at Burnett Heads at the mouth of Bundaberg's Burnett River."

Even the hon. member for Bundaberg gets a chop out of it.

To continue—

"Further north, Rosslyn Bay, near Yepoon, is about to have another 300 feet added to the breakwall. The project started in 1967. Final cost: \$200,000.

"Dredging begins soon on a 100-boat mooring area within Mackay's outer harbour for small craft. A separate harbour was considered but a 20 ft. tidal range made it too costly.

"Another harbour within a harbour is Bowen. A mooring basin in the lee of Magazine Island so far has cost \$150,000. Another 40 moorings are to come.

"One of the biggest harbours on the coast will be Cairns. Construction should start this year with the emphasis on tourist facilities. Final cost: \$600,000."

Mr. R. Jones: They have been promising it to me since 1965.

Mr. HINZE: I do not take anything away from any other member. If the hon. member gets this I am pleased for him. I am only making the point that every other area in the State is adequately catered for while the Gold Coast, on which we pride ourselves as being the tourist capital of Australia, has extreme difficulty in convincing the department that it is an urgent

matter for funds to be provided. I make a plea today. I want to see the Treasurer or the Minister in charge of Harbours and Marine make sure that in next year's Budget an allocation is provided to commence a harbour at Currumbin. I want to see this next year at the latest.

An amount of \$14,000 has been allocated for research at the university to test the flow in the Currumbin Creek estuary. I believe that Professor Gordon McKay is now prepared to indicate to the Government that it could safely go ahead with the necessary work at Currumbin. One can appreciate the wonderful difference it would make to the Gold Coast if it had a deep harbour. People who go over the bar take their lives in their hands. Almost every second week one hears of boats capsizing on the bar. It is a shifting area, with no rocky foundations.

It is not possible to spend any large amount of money on the Southport bar, and the only safe and sensible location for a harbour is Currumbin. The cost of the south wall is approximately \$200,000, and it is imperative that the Department of Harbours and Marine allocate funds for that project next year. It is possible that the complete scheme will be a very costly one, but Professor Gordon McKay has indicated to me that the total scheme could be self-supporting in that a fairly large area of land at the mouth of Currumbin Creek could be reclaimed and become valuable. That would offset the cost of the scheme.

We have heard a good deal about the Delft report. About a month ago I was told in answer to a question that the report would be released at the end of September. We have now entered October, and I am told in response to my inquiries that the report could be released at the end of this month. We on the Gold Coast have been waiting a considerable time for that report because we want to learn the answers to our problems relative, first, to erosion and, second, to the ocean outfall for the sewerage scheme. I want to make sure, though, that I do not read of the report in the Press before I am told about it officially. As the democratically elected member for the area, I want to know something about the report fairly quickly. I do not want to pick up a newspaper one day and read about the report. That will not be satisfactory to me. From inquiries I made yesterday I understand that the report contains three volumes and they are being printed. Apparently Mr. Diephaus, who is in charge of the Delft Laboratories, has done a good job.

I think I have proved that almost every Government department suffers from a lack of funds, and I can continue to prove it in the remaining time allotted to me. I turn to the Main Roads Department and refer particularly to the Gold Coast Highway. I suppose that is as good as any highway in

the State; nobody could deny that. It has a very high traffic density and is the outlet for almost 1,000,000 people in Brisbane. If they do not go to my colleague's area on the North Coast they come to mine on the South Coast. I am not jealous of my colleague; if he can get a few visitors up there, good on him. However, the remainder of the people want to come to the Gold Coast; therefore, we must provide good roads.

Approximately four or five years ago we lost our railway line. There is no use going over all this again; it is no longer there. I can remember that in the discussions that took place at that time we were told that a four-lane highway would be constructed to Coolangatta. The latest estimate made by the Main Roads Department is that the highway will be completed by 1975. We have been told that costs are getting ahead of us and we are not getting the work for the money; yet we are already five years behind in the programme of road works on the Gold Coast. Again I make a plea to the Main Roads Department to give serious consideration to constructing the six-mile link between Nerang and Reedy Creek, south of Mudgeeraba, which would take a large amount of heavy traffic away from the 20-mile stretch of road through Surfers Paradise and along the coast. I have always claimed that what I refer to as the back road through Mudgeeraba and Nerang down to the border should be built. Every week I receive letters from constituents in Surfers Paradise and Broadbeach who complain about the heavy traffic in that area. Only last week a man rang to tell me that a drain had been dug across the road in front of his home, that it had not been filled in, and that the heavy trucks rumbling past have caused cracks to appear in his brick home. That is not good enough for a tourist area.

Mr. Jensen: Are you saying that the Main Roads engineers are donkeys?

Mr. HINZE: I am not saying anybody is a donkey. I have the greatest respect for Colin Bird and Walter Drake. They have been personal friends of mine for a long time, and particularly when I was chairman of the Albert Shire. They are extremely capable men. The only point I make is that some notice should be taken of the local people. Nobody asked my opinion about this matter, but if the missing link was built it would carry a lot of heavy traffic, including fully laden mineral trucks from across the border that rumble through this tourist area at all hours of the day and night. They cannot possibly observe the speed limit of 35 miles an hour when they have to pass through 20 sets of traffic lights.

It is quite obvious that building this missing six-mile link would be much better than all the talk about a freeway that we will get in the dim, distant future. I should say that at least 15 years will pass before it is built, and hon. members can imagine the

chaos on the coast road by then. I admit I am not an expert in these matters. I have often been told, "We cannot take much notice of you; you wouldn't know; we have experts to advise us." That is fair enough, but I make a plea to the Main Roads Department to build this six miles of road from Nerang to Mudgeeraba.

At one stage an origin and destination survey determined that many people wanted to travel through Surfers Paradise. We now have a lighting problem, and people telephone me weekly asking, "Is it possible to have more lighting on the highway?" In reply, the Minister or the department says, "Do you want roads or lights? Make up your mind." In a city such as the Gold Coast, which extends for 20 miles, and has a heavy traffic flow, the department should provide some lighting for the local authority. The Gold Coast City Council should only be required to provide lighting for people who live in the area. As hundreds of thousands of tourists travel through the area, it is reasonable and legitimate for the local authority to submit to the Main Roads Department that more funds should be allocated for highway lighting.

Many accidents have occurred on the very dangerous pedestrian crossing at the Miami Hotel. I make a plea to the Main Roads Department to build a pedestrian island for people crossing the road there. Although a zebra crossing is provided, someone will be killed there shortly if some improvements are not carried out.

I have been told by officers of the Main Roads Department that a strict State code governs signposting, but David Fleay, of Burleigh Heads, wanted the right to erect a signpost bearing the words "Fauna Reserve" so that tourists coming to the area would know where the reserve was.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. HINZE: It might be privately owned, but we should make things as easy as possible for tourists travelling through the area. If a person wants to erect a signpost showing the way to a tourist attraction, it would only be reasonable and sensible for the department to permit it. However, the department's attitude is "Our function is to move traffic from point A to point B; we will only allow the destination to be shown on a signpost."

Mr. Hanlon: When people travel up and down the highway looking for a place, they clutter it up.

Mr. HINZE: That is so.

A new four-lane highway has been built past Tugun, and elaborate signs have been erected to Wagawn Street and another street. However, picturesque Currumbin Beach, which many tourists would like to visit, has no sign pointing to it. As a result, people cannot find it, and they drive past. All I

am asking is that consideration be given to small details such as that, particularly in tourist areas.

I was a little disappointed not to find tourism mentioned in the Budget. I claim that this industry will become worth \$100,000,000 a year to this State. To arrive at that figure, I adopted a figure used by Mr. Morris when he was Minister for Tourism and added what I believe has been the increase since then. Admittedly tourism may not be as valuable as mining, but it is not too bad, and we should consider increasing the allocation for promotion. \$203,000 is nowhere near enough. Every State is after the tourist dollar and this industry is highly competitive. It is the main industry in my area. I am not casting any reflections, but I would have liked to see more recognition given in the Budget to the wonderful tourist industry.

I picked up an off-street parking ticket—

Mr. Chalk: You picked it up?

Mr. HINZE: Somebody sent it to me. It is a Tasmanian ticket and I propose to read what is on it, because it is interesting. It reads—

"You are therefore liable to prosecution for an offence against Section 704 of the Local Government Act.

"However because you are the Driver of a Vehicle carrying a mainland registration plate it is not proposed on this occasion to take legal action against you nor to require you to pay the composition fee of \$1, which is the usual penalty for this offence. Council hopes you enjoy your holiday in Tasmania and does not wish it to be marred through the need to pay a fine for overparking."

This indicates the point I am trying to make, namely, that every State is after the tourist dollar, and the tiny island State of Tasmania does this so that the tourist does not leave the island in a bad frame of mind because he had to pay a parking fine.

I pay particular reference to the good job the airlines are doing in promoting Gold Coast activities. I have here their June-July 1970 publication, which devotes four pages to the Gold Coast. I commend T.A.A. and Ansett Airlines on this publication. I understand 85,000 copies are sent by post to members of travel groups and junior airway groups, and that 13,000 are held in reserve for the counters of T.A.A. booking offices and travel agents, etc.

The mayor of the Gold Coast, Alderman Bruce Small, undertook the greatest promotion activity by any individual, certainly in local authority, in the past couple of years. Two years ago we had our erosion problems and our accommodation houses, which we must have to meet an influx of up to 150,000 people, were only 50 per cent. full. Alderman Small kicked off this promotion campaign and he, some of his aldermen, and some of

his meter maids travelled to every mainland State, Tasmania, and New Zealand. Other promotion tours are projected.

This local authority is doing a wonderful job and deserves every encouragement. It conducted a survey which indicated that about 1,000,000 visitors will come to the Gold Coast from Sydney, Melbourne, and other cities during the next 12 months. That is a very high figure, and we should be proud of the promotional work done by this local authority. When we do get visitors, we want to make sure that they have all the amenities that we claim to have for them. We do not want them to be restricted in the amount of water they can use, and we do not want them to be without police protection. There are gravel roads within about 10 miles of the Gold Coast. One does not see gravel roads within 10 miles of Melbourne or Sydney. When I was chairman of the Albert Shire Council I made representations to have the Reedy Creek section sealed, but it has not yet been sealed. That is not good enough.

I do not know whether all hon. members saw the recent newspaper article concerning the possibility of using hovercraft in Queensland. I have a recollection of either the Treasurer or the hon. member for Albert making some reference to the use of helicopters or hovercraft. Sunday's newspaper referred to a proposal by a Sydney firm named Hovercraft Development Pty. Ltd. to use hovercraft for a passenger service between the Brisbane airport and the Gold Coast, and the Coolangatta airport and the Gold Coast. If the firm makes representations to the Government, I hope the Government sees fit to give it every encouragement. I cannot see at this stage how a hovercraft costing \$300,000 could be profitably employed, and some assistance may be required from the Government. The company has apparently conducted a survey and believes that the hovercraft can be operated profitably. If it is possible to get operations by this firm started, hovercraft travel from Brisbane and Coolangatta airports to the Gold Coast will be another tourist attraction.

Whilst on the subject of transport, I wish to refer briefly to the right-of-way rule. This morning, whilst travelling to Parliament House, I saw a utility barge in from a side road across three lanes of traffic. Under the law as it stands, it had right of way. Right of way is accepted throughout Australia—I do not know about the position in other parts of the world—but I think it is wrong that a driver can leave a secondary road and barge straight across four traffic lanes on a main highway. If I had hit his vehicle, I would have been in the wrong because he had right of way. When the Minister for Transport is dealing with road problems, and this matter particularly, I ask that he give some consideration to the marking of secondary roads. This morning three lines of traffic had to stop as this fellow barged in, without any

thought for others and the possibility of an accident, because he had right of way. I should like the Minister to consider that point.

I now want to refer to the Coolangatta airport. I now believe it necessary for the Department of Civil Aviation to scrap the idea of local ownership of airports. Asking local authorities to take over airports might be all right in some small areas, but in the case of the Coolangatta airport it is impossible, because of local differences over the Queensland-New South Wales border, to get the local authorities concerned and the Commonwealth department to agree, and the matter goes on and on with no finality in sight. The present Coolangatta terminal is a disgrace. We are booming the Gold Coast to the extent that we will attract 1,000,000 visitors, yet they will have to pass through an old terminal in which there is no room to swing a cat.

I suggest that the D.C.A. scrap the idea of local ownership and proceed to develop the Coolangatta terminal as an airport, possibly in conjunction with the airlines. I believe that it would be reasonable for the D.C.A. to approach the airlines and ask if they would be prepared to build a terminal on the condition that they were given the right to have their booking offices somewhere near it.

Mr. Davis: You were in favour of local control last year.

Mr. HINZE: I know I was. If I am wrong, I do not mind admitting it. I do not mind somersaulting if it is in the best interests of my electorate that I should change my thinking.

I suggest to the D.C.A. that it should approach Ansetts and T.A.A. to build the terminal and amortise it over a number of years, and I think it would be a very good idea for the airlines to provide buildings at the airport for bookings and reservations. It has been forecast that by 1978 there will be 30 Ansett planes coming into Coolangatta from Sydney and seven from Melbourne each week, and T.A.A. will have a similar number, so there will be 74 services each week from the two main airlines. Ansett's traffic alone was 43 per cent. higher in August this year than in August last year, and the traffic in August 1969 was 28 per cent. higher than in 1968. That indicates the good job that the airlines are doing. The publication of the brochure that I have here is warranted, and they are already reaping their reward. Congratulations to them! All I say to them now is, "Design your terminal at Coolangatta for the benefit of the people who use it."

I commend the Treasurer for the contribution he has made to the funds of the Department of Education and particularly for the greatly increased amount that has been allocated for education in this year's Budget. Of course, hon. members will have an opportunity later to discuss the departmental estimates.

Recently I received a book entitled "School Power in Australia". I do not know whether other hon. members have seen it, so I shall read the foreword, which is in keeping with my beliefs. It says—

"In the past two or three years there have been political disturbances in secondary schools in all States."

This morning an hon. member asked the Minister for Education a question about an attack on a teacher by two students, and what I am reading bears out that this sort of thing is happening.

The foreword continues—

"There have been sit-down strikes by school students, demonstrations outside Government buildings, and the organised jeering of teachers and head-masters. The most concentrated set of incidents was during the Vietnam Moratorium of May 1970 when some students were suspended from school, 400 students walked out of school to join in Moratorium activities, and at one school in Sydney. . ."

(Time expired.)

Mr. F. P. MOORE (Mourilyan) (4.44 p.m.): Before speaking to the 1970-71 Budget, I wish to comment on the speeches made by the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha, who commended the Treasurer for his presentation, and the hon. member for South Coast, who commended the Treasurer for his ability. I should say that possibly the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha was referring to the Treasurer's speech, and that possibly the hon. member for South Coast was referring to his acting ability, because the hon. gentleman is an actor, possibly a Shakespearean actor.

In the Financial Statement, the Treasurer indicated that the expected deficit for 1969-70 had been exceeded by \$1,059,584, and he reiterated that the serious drought was the cause of the higher deficit. We do not deny that a drought could be the cause of a deficit, but we all know that this drought has been with us for a number of years; in fact, for over a decade.

Mr. O'Donnell: Since 1957.

Mr. F. P. MOORE: That is true. In last year's Budget the Treasurer showed a surplus of \$58,914, thus proving beyond any doubt that the Government's decision to act was left until it was too late. It finally reached the conclusion, in the 1969-70 year, that if help was not given it would lose the support of many country people. The Treasurer can refute it if he wishes, but I claim that the Government left the giving of substantial aid to primary producers generally, and particularly those affected by drought, far too late. The Government has finally decided that most of the primary producers in the drought areas have had their backs broken by the load they have had to carry.

Let us not kid ourselves, as the Treasurer did in his romancing in the 1969-70 Budget when he said that royalties were not the be-all and end-all of mining benefits to this State. I claim that equitable royalties on our mineral wealth would have put this State in a more buoyant condition. What hypocrisy it is now for the Treasurer to say, as he was reported to have said, that he wants at least \$50,000,000 instead of \$29,000,000 that the Greenvale nickel mining companies have offered! He and the Premier have given our mineral wealth away up to this stage and now they have developed a "get tough" attitude to save face. The Treasurer says that without the increases in mining activity and secondary production the State would have suffered more. I claim it need not have suffered had a "get tough" attitude been adopted prior to 1966.

I have noticed that if he is hit below the belt on a few points the Treasurer resorts to nonsense in his reply. I recall that in the 1969-70 Budget debate he saw fit to quote the figure of .23 per cent. of Consolidated Revenue spent on education that I was reported as having used. In reply let me inform him that I have learnt a lesson on the need to check pulls of speeches made in this Chamber. On that occasion I was not able to check the pulls the next day. When the Treasurer in his reply mentioned .23 per cent I checked "Hansard" and saw that it was reported that an hon. member had interjected. I can tell hon. members now that the interjection was made by me but was not recorded as the Treasurer did not receive it. I should like to make it quite clear to the people of this State and to the Treasurer that I am willing to accept his rebuffs and his dexterity in twisting the truth and will present the same argument again relative to the 1970-71 Budget estimates for education.

On the figures I have here—which will be checked tomorrow morning to see that I am reported correctly—the Treasurer will claim that the estimate for education in 1970-71 is approximately 12.6 per cent. greater than it was in the 1968-69 year. I admit that this is true but again point out to him that the \$98,500,000 appropriation for 1969-70 against the probable expenditure from the Consolidated Revenue Fund of \$444,600,000, represents .23 of the total. I repeat, it is .23, or 23 per cent. As I told the Treasurer last year, I am willing at any time to give him a lesson in mathematics. The Treasurer is a bag of wind when he is on his feet, but if he listens to me he may learn something.

For this year the appropriation for education is \$114,700,000 compared with a total appropriation of \$489,400,000. Again I tell the Treasurer that this represents only .23, or 23 per cent. of the total.

Recently the hon. member for Chatsworth said that the amount spent in this State on education was a good deal lower than that spent in other States, and that is correct.

I remind the Treasurer that he thinks he is kidding everyone by saying each year that he is increasing expenditure on education. He has kidded, deceived and conned this State, and he thinks he can get away with it. If he is going to do anything worth while for education he must spend a greater percentage of the whole, otherwise he is not progressing at all. My advice to him is to survey the amounts expended in comparable States and try to lift his expenditure on education to that level.

Last year I claimed that an insufficient amount was spent on teacher education. To use the Treasurer's term, this was a boo-boo. Ever since I have been in this Chamber I have heard the Treasurer blurt and shout his way out of trouble; however, he is not getting out of this, because I am ignoring his blurts. With dexterity in words, which he has acquired over the years, he has distorted the truth. Again I repeat, as I have said on many occasions, that education is the most essential basic industry. No other industry can produce a greater increase in the gross national product. If we are going to improve education we must begin with teacher training. When we read of the measly amount of \$10,000 that is appropriated for the Board of Teacher Education we can see that not too many reliable country teachers will be appointed to the Board, because of that amount only \$2,000 is allowed for travelling expenses.

In Monday's issue of "The Courier-Mail" under the headline "Education System is Antiquated" an Englishman states that the Australian schools are not good enough for teachers or children. The man who made that statement is Mr. David Holbrook, a writer and critic and at present lecturer in English at Jesus College, Cambridge. That is a statement by an outside critic on the problem of education.

Another point I should like to bring forward is the expenditure on the four teachers' colleges of \$6,234,154, compared with \$15,730,304 required for universities. I cannot see any grants from the Commonwealth Government in the State appropriations for teachers' colleges, but the amount required for universities of \$15,730,304 contains an amount of \$7,204,534 provided by Mr. Bury in his estimates and are outlined by the asterisked items at the bottom of the estimates by the Treasurer. Consider the increase from \$272,263 to \$332,734 for equipment and incidentals, to be divided four ways between the teachers' colleges. What will each college be able to do with a little over \$80,000 a year, and still stay abreast of modern education, which it is trying to introduce?

The position of colleges of advanced education is interesting, too, particularly the \$41,900 allocated for the Board of Advanced Education. That amount, compared with the \$10,000 allotted for the Board of Teacher

Education, seems iniquitous. However, if we consider the \$5,368,015 allotted for the institutes at Brisbane, Rockhampton and the Darling Downs, plus the Queensland Agricultural College and the Queensland Conservatorium of Music, we realise what unbalanced allotments have been made to the various spheres of education. I repeat that there is only one alternative: as other State Treasurers have seen fit to increase their percentage allocation, this State should do likewise.

Most lecturers and teachers at the Teachers' College are equipped to carry out their duties as teachers. I believe they are better equipped than their counterparts at the university. At least they can impart knowledge and set a good example by their actions. Over the years, universities have apparently become institutions—possibly because of the large numbers attending—with a policy of, "Here is the work; understand it if you can; if you can't, then fail." I will not speak about discipline again this year but I must comment on the carryings-on of some of our university students. The other day I read, "Dissent is not sacred, but the right to dissent is." Some of these people have lost sight of the motives for which they are dissenting. That is where they have gone wrong. If they feel they have the motive, I believe that they are legitimately doing something that is right. However, I have read of cases, and seen them, involving rabble-rousers and ratbags who are only out for notoriety. If these minorities—and they are only minorities—do not get notoriety they will not go too far in their actions at any time.

It will be seen from the Treasurer's Financial Statement that plans are being made relative to a new rural training school on the Lower Burdekin. Where is the foresight in that action? The Government is only trying to prevent the seat being lost to the A.L.P. The present member came to the post in the 1969 election over 2,000 primary votes behind the Australian Labour Party candidate. The Government is now trying desperately to keep him in office and has decided that the next rural training school will be built on the Burdekin. The two established rural colleges are situated in areas with sparse rainfall, on terrain not dissimilar to that of each other. We know that the Lower Burdekin has a low average rainfall, and we have heard the hon. member for Burdekin crying on the Government's shoulder about the low rainfall and the lack of water. If the Government had shown any foresight at all, it would have chosen a wet-weather area. Does the Government neglect establishing a rural college in the coastal wet areas of the North where the cattle-fattening industry flourishes—and it flourishes particularly in the Mourilyan electorate—because all but two of the northern seats are held by the Australian Labour Party? It is about time the Government stopped playing politics in making such decisions and established rural colleges in

differing areas, so that students graduating from them would have a general knowledge of varying conditions throughout this fair State of ours.

Colleges have been established at Longreach and Emerald, so that facts can be compared. However, I feel that the Far North, particularly the wet-weather area, is the most suitable location for this new school. Selection of the Lower Burdekin is not only ludicrous but shows lack of foresight. The Government should reconsider its decision, while it has time, because it has not chosen a wet-weather area in which to establish one of the first three rural training schools.

On 29 July, I asked the Minister for Education a question relative to the mileage rates paid to bus proprietors for the carriage of school-children in Queensland and in New South Wales. The Budget discloses that these bus proprietors have to wait until 1971 to receive the proposed increases in rates. I believe that the Government is diddling them and that the increases should be payable immediately. The Minister for Education, in his reply, said that for up to 20 miles the Queensland rate was 19c per mile and that the New South Wales rate was 23c per mile, a difference of 4c a mile; and that for up to 50 miles the Queensland rate was 23c per mile and the New South Wales rate was 28c per mile, a difference of 5c. The difference gets progressively higher until it is 9c per mile for 57 miles or more. What do the Liberals, who believe in competition and free enterprise, think of those anomalies? Apparently as long as they do not affect their own pockets, everything is all right. But these rates belong to the dark ages, and I suggest that the Treasurer implement the new rates immediately, not in 1971.

Whilst on the subject of education, I must mention the building of a new State school at West Innisfail. On 19 August, 1969, I asked the Minister for Education—

“(1) Have plans and specifications been drawn up for the establishment of the West Innisfail State School which is to replace the already-condemned Goondi State School?”

The answer to that part of my question was—

“No. The proposal for the establishment of a new school at Innisfail West to replace the existing Goondi State School was included in the Draft Educational Works Loan Programme for the 1969-70 financial year but because of the limited funds available in relation to the many major projects listed, the work cannot be undertaken during the current financial year. Consideration will not be given to the preparation of plans and specifications until funds are available to permit this project to be undertaken.”

If a new school was warranted in 1969-70, why is it not warranted in the 1970-71 works programme?

The Innisfail primary school is at present overcrowded, and has poor playing facilities. This school uses the local council ground, leased by the Innisfail Rugby League, as a playing field. Earlier this year I wrote to the Department of Education requesting at least aid in keeping this ground in order. Again I received the reply, “No, it is not departmental policy to do that.” The Innisfail Rugby League would never show any disfavour to the Innisfail State school by denying them use of the field. The Innisfail Rugby League maintains the field, at high cost. I bring this matter forward again to show that the Innisfail primary school has no playing facilities, and that the school is in itself inadequate.

Because the Goondi State school has been condemned, the provision of a new school in this area is necessary. I believe that Goondi, Innisfail, and the area known as Sundown are deserving of new State schools. I stress that I represent all the people in my area, irrespective of their political colour. Another important point is that the area at West Innisfail is large enough to accommodate the children of both the Innisfail State School and the Goondi State School. I therefore request the Government to consider this proposal. As it has not been considered in the works programme for 1970-71, which I believe is unwise, I request that it at least be given consideration this year and started early in the 1971-72 year.

I now pass to the necessity for the immediate provision of a science laboratory at the Tully school. The Treasurer stated that the laboratory was to be provided under a Commonwealth grant. To this date, no start has been made on this project. When I attended this school's speech night last evening, I was not troubled by building foundations because there were none to trip over. I have made representations on this matter to both the Department of Education and the Department of Works, and heaven knows how many times I have been to those departments on it. I emphasised its importance in my Address-in-Reply speech in 1969. I repeat: it is of the utmost importance that more laboratory space be provided because the children at the Tully State High School are not receiving the required number of practical periods in science subjects. Although the Government has provided in the Budget for the building of new laboratories, I again urge that the work should be begun as soon as possible.

While speaking of the Tully State High School, I should like to mention also the lack of home science and manual training facilities at the school. It is no good the Minister's talking to me of priorities. I have been to the Department of Works and the Department of Education and obtained a list of priorities. I believe that the Tully

State High School, because it has been in existence for eight years, should be provided with these facilities. The only high school that should take precedence over it is the Atherton State High School. Hon. members could not guess who represents the Atherton area. It is, of course, the hon. member for Tablelands, Mr. Eddie Wallis-Smith, who is a member of the A.L.P. Opposition. As I said earlier, A.L.P. members of this Assembly represent all the people in their electorates, irrespective of their political views, and I strongly urge that home science and manual training sections be provided in the high schools at Tully and Atherton as soon as possible.

I shall inquire into the additions that are being made to the secondary department at Babinda, because provision is made for them in the Budget. Heaven help the Government if they include a home science or manual training section!

I turn now to the estimates of expenditure from Trust and Special Funds—1970-71, and I wish to deal particularly with the Forestry and Lumbering Fund, details of which appear on page 101 of the Estimates. On looking at the various headings of expenditure, one finds that there is not one item for which the expenditure reached the appropriation. That seems wrong. For 1969-70 the appropriation for access roads was \$300,000, but actual expenditure was only \$198,382.

If one looks at the Cardstone Road, which is held and maintained jointly by the Department of Forestry and the Northern Electric Authority, one sees a road on which money could have been spent to enable the residents of Cardstone, the forestry workers, and residents in the area generally, to make a safe journey to Tully. Hon. members will recall my request to the Government to develop the road from the coastal cattle fattening areas to the inland. That road itself is now trafficable for many people. Although there is not a suitable width of road at the top, it is still worth developing for its scenic beauty alone.

Problems are created on the forestry road through to the bridge at Cardstone by the cattle running between the grids on the road. I speak from experience on this problem. I was invited to officiate at a function at Cardstone and it took 1½ hours to travel the 29 miles. At three stages of the journey we found ourselves surrounded by large numbers of cattle, and we had to get out of the car and move the cattle as if we were drafting them.

Mr. Lee: That is not what they told me.

Mr. F. P. MOORE: You are still in your nappies. You would not know how to draft cattle. You might know how to draft a bulldozer but that is all.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsden): Order! I remind the hon. member that he is addressing his remarks to the Chair. I am not in nappies.

Mr. F. P. MOORE: The hon. member has metal brains just like the Treasurer has. As this Government has given cattle interests the right to run cattle on this road, I suppose it will take the responsibility if, in an emergency, this hazard prevents a person from getting to Tully on time. In the wet season we receive an average rainfall of 172 inches, and the gravel surface is a big enough hazard without having the cattle adding to it.

I do not think that N.E.A. employees should be subjected to these problems, nor should the timber or forestry interests. If this "H" road in its entirety was declared a State road and developed as such, it would be a major step towards decentralisation in Far North Queensland.

Reverting to the road from Cardstone, this is again a forestry road and some at least of the large surplus of appropriated moneys for access roads could have been spent on the road from Tully to the Cardstone township. Although the forestry and timber interests are using the "H" road at the moment, this road if developed would reduce the journey from the Kareeya Power House to Koombuloomba Dam site near Ravenshoe by about 100 miles, thus giving small crop producers on the Tablelands access to the coast. Even if Mourilyan Harbour was not developed it would give them a far shorter journey to the nearest port of Townsville. I have digressed a little about this road, but the initial point is important and one cannot see why this particular department under-spent on every item mentioned.

In the same report one sees that this department under-spent on reforestation. It spent \$5,130,000 of the appropriated sum of \$5,269,000. In my electorate alone we could have used the \$139,000 under-spent. I recall making representations on behalf of the Johnstone Shire Council about the possibility of this council undertaking a small reforestation project. Bill Reid, then a councillor in the Johnstone Shire Council, had the foresight to want to undertake this project and Councillor Roy Dixon supported him, but to no avail. I suppose the Treasurer, with his dexterity in words, will again have some excuse, but how can he reconcile under-spending on every item? I repeat that I am willing to accept the rebuffs and kicks. He can do his utmost, but at least I do not misconstrue the truth.

The Forestry Department of Queensland called tenders for the clearing of 200 acres in the Cardwell-Kennedy area for reforestation. I have the figures here and can show the Forestry Department and the Treasurer that they could have spent all of the \$139,000 in this area. Three tenders were received. The lowest was in the vicinity of \$38.50 an acre for clearing, windrowing and burning. The highest tender was \$41.50. If three contractors in Far North Queensland are within \$3 of each other, would not that indicate that the amount is near

the correct one? Yet the Forestry Department decided that it was too dear, so the money was not spent. If the Treasurer could explain it, I suppose he would say that this, again, is good management. Anyway, I wonder if the milling interests, in particular the smaller units—

Mr. Chalk: I wonder how the electors put up with you.

Mr. F. P. MOORE: At least I am not a bag of wind like you, you four-eyed ape.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsden): Order! I do not know to whom the hon. member has referred as a four-eyed ape.

Mr. F. P. MOORE: I was not referring to you, Mr. Ramsden; I was referring to that person over there with glasses, the Treasurer.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! That is a completely unparliamentary phrase. I ask the hon. member for his unqualified withdrawal.

Mr. F. P. MOORE: I shall withdraw it, but if he wants to give it he can take it.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I will not have cross-firing with the Chair. Will the hon. member either continue with his speech or resume his seat.

Mr. F. P. MOORE: I wonder if the milling interests, in particular the smaller units, think about this matter. With royalties and other charges they have been paying through the nose for ages.

I turn now to a problem that confronts hon. members relative to salaries and allowances, and I make no excuses for my deliberations.

Mr. Rae: They are not yours; they are Jack Stanaway's.

Mr. F. P. MOORE: I should like to reply to the hon. member for Gregory, who has not got much between the ears, as I learned when I did a tour of Longreach and spoke over the radio station and received a letter from the manager saying that it was quite a fair effort. If the hon. gentleman has no brains between the ears I cannot help it.

In my own parliamentary caucus I raised the problem of obtaining air transport to Brisbane and return. My caucus placed the matter before the Treasurer and requested a car allowance, which was refused. I shall explain the problem that existed and the one that exists now.

When I entered Parliament I had to travel from Tully to either Cairns or Townsville to board a plane for Brisbane. My wife, with two young children, would have to take me either to Cairns or Townsville and then return to Tully.

Mr. Chalk: Haven't you got a train?

Mr. F. P. MOORE: I will come to that in a minute and elaborate on that point. When I arrived back at either Cairns or Townsville my wife would have to come to pick me up. The return journey between Tully and Cairns is 200 miles, and between Tully and Townsville it is 240 miles. Hon. members who live nearer Brisbane have to travel by car, for which I understand they obtain an allowance. We northern members have to travel by plane and then make long journeys by car. My colleague the hon. member for Tablelands faces the same problem, although his journey is shorter than mine.

Mr. R. Jones: Bill Lonergan has the same problem, too.

Mr. F. P. MOORE: He would have it also. The time of arrival in Cairns by plane is after 8.40 p.m. and after collecting baggage the departure time from the airport is near 9 p.m. That was the situation in the past.

The only change is that I can now board a small aircraft at Innisfail in the morning and come to Brisbane, but that means a 4 a.m. start from Tully. As no plane can land at night at Innisfail, to return from Brisbane I must go to either Cairns or Townsville. I maintain that, in order to undertake my parliamentary duties effectively, I should be in my electorate as much as possible. But, on my fortnightly \$176 net and my allowance, I have my chance and Buckley's of doing it effectively because the cost is too great. My bank balance has never been more unhealthy, nor have I any Comalco shares.

I have a young family and my son has just come home from a long stay in a Cairns hospital, under a specialist's care. I must say that every family is confronted with these problems. I am only presenting a case for the ordinary country politician. We are faced with medical bills as is the ordinary person in the country. Even a parliamentarian under these archaic conditions has a battle to survive when he receives a bill for over \$300 excluding the specialist's fee. I often wonder how the ordinary basic-wage earner survives. In the last 18 months we have seen judges' salaries rise substantially, and the wages of leading public servants are higher than those paid to Ministers who are in charge of the departments in which they work.

A Government Member: What is your point?

Mr. F. P. MOORE: My point is that apparently, under these conditions, Parliament is a place for people who have alternative incomes, like the Minister for Local Government who won a ballot before it was drawn. A person who may be elected to this Assembly—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsden): Order!

Mr. RAE: I rise to a point of order. I find the hon. member's words completely offensive. They are untrue and in my opinion are completely out of order. I ask him to withdraw them entirely. It is quite wrong for him to say that I drew a block before it was balloted for. I think it is a pretty rotten state of affairs when a member of Parliament makes such a statement.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind hon. members that Standing Order No. 120, amongst other things, says that all personal reflections shall be deemed highly disorderly. The point of order taken by the Minister is in order and I ask the hon. member to withdraw his statement as requested.

Mr. F. P. MOORE: I withdraw it, but it is only a repetition of what I have heard in other places.

Mr. Chalk: You are a low-down skunk.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. F. P. MOORE: Mr. Ramsden, I point out that I had to withdraw a statement in which I called the Treasurer an ape. I want a withdrawal without qualification by the Treasurer.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Treasurer to withdraw his statement.

Mr. Chalk: I withdraw the statement. I said the hon. member was a skunk, but I withdraw it.

Mr. F. P. MOORE: I called the Treasurer an ape, and withdraw it also.

A person who may be elected to Parliament from a position that he cannot continue to undertake after his entry to Parliament definitely suffers financial loss. Such a situation could lead to serious problems. We hear of graft and corruption, and situations like this lead to graft and corruption, particularly if a politician is a member of the ruling party, and I am not casting reflections. If a politician is in a responsible position the problem could arise. I recall a report in one of our newspapers which stated that the politician's lodgings cost \$3 a week and meals cost 50c each with 30c for breakfast. However, the same article neglected to mention that a country member keeps a family in a home in his electorate. It must be remembered also that we pay for our lodgings whether we use them or not. That is another important point, even though the cost is minor.

Legislation introduced by Sir Francis Nicklin provided for a review of parliamentary salaries every three years. This is anomalous to parliamentarians, particularly those who have no alternative income, because no retrospectivity is granted. I have seen the fight to enable workers to enjoy better conditions and equitable returns. I make no

excuses for saying that we will not attract over-all representation in Parliament until these anomalies are corrected.

I would not dare to offer a suggestion on what amount should be paid, but I do say that Federal politicians are much better off than Queensland politicians, and the State politician undertakes a good deal of the Federal politician's work. I am fortunate in having Mr. Bill Fulton representing the northern half of my electorate and Senator Jim Keefe representing the southern half. The State politician with no provincial city in his electorate is placed in a difficult situation because nearly all of the Commonwealth and State offices are situated in the cities.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr. F. P. MOORE: The hon. member for Yeronga is trying to butt in all the time. He has other income and owns racehorses and claims taxation rebates on stock feed.

The phone bill is a heavy burden carried by a State country politician. All in all, this Parliament should have a good look, during this session, at salaries, allowances and conditions of politicians. I have no fear in facing my electors and asking for an equitable salary and allowance to carry out my duties. I will always fight for their conditions and support them to the utmost.

Mr. PORTER (Toowong) (5.33 p.m.): The Committee is discussing what is a very good Budget framed in very difficult circumstances. We have experienced years of drought, which is now officially dubbed as the worst drought that the State has known. Despite this fact, it is a Budget with a small deficit, so small as to be barely noticeable. What is demonstrated clearly in the Budget is the depth, diversity and strength of the State's commercial and industrial growth over recent years. In normal circumstances, these developments would be fiscally very clearly apparent and, in fact, despite the severe handicaps under which so many of our primary industries are operating, we have a Budget that is as near to being balanced as any rational person could expect.

I imagine, after listening to Opposition debaters, that in fact the Opposition, too, thinks it is a pretty good Budget. Even though Opposition members feel they have to say the appropriate rude and fierce words about it, they have done this in such a pedestrian and lack-lustre way that they—and this includes the Leader of the Opposition—have indicated that they regard this as a very difficult Budget to speak against.

We are discussing a Budget which has been framed in unique circumstances because, as the Treasurer said when he presented it, he was not able to count definitely on some millions of dollars required for the State's revenues.

Mr. Hughes: The Opposition has not put forward one constructive suggestion.

Mr. PORTER: No. The hon. member for Kurilpa is correct when he says that the Opposition has not put forward one constructive proposal. We heard some unpleasant words used, which does nobody in this Chamber any good.

To have a Budget presented in which the State Treasurer is unable to be certain that some \$4,000,000 on which he must count will be available to him is, to me, indicative of the very parlous state into which the sovereignty of the States has fallen, and the steady deterioration of our Federal system. Indeed, I do not know if "steady" is the correct word; perhaps "accelerating" would be better.

My colleague the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha, when speaking earlier in this debate, suggested that the Budget might also, with advantage, become something of a White Paper that would indicate to the community at large, particularly the commercial community, something of the thinking of the Treasury in terms of economic trends. The way things are going in the Federal system, the sad fact is that the role that the State Budget plays is becoming smaller and smaller in terms of determining the economic health of the State.

We do have a fiscal problem. It will be solved this year; the Federal Government has announced what it will do to assist us in terms of making good the amount that will not be available because of the non-passage of the receipts duty legislation. But, although the problem will be solved this year, this solution does nothing whatever to deal with the root cause of the problem. In doing what is proposed, we are treating symptoms and not causes. Whilst we have this tremendous imbalance, of which I have spoken so often in this Chamber, between the central Government and the State Governments, we are certain to stumble from problem to problem, from crisis to crisis, from confrontation to confrontation, till the problem is solved in some sort of rough way, or until the Australian scene becomes a political disaster area. I repeat that it will not matter whether it is a Liberal-Country Party Government or a Labour Government that is in office here or in the Federal sphere; the circumstances are inexorable, and they will have the same effect no matter which Governments are in office. In this regard, I am inclined to commend Sir Henry Bolte, who has thrown down the gauntlet in terms of challenging the Commonwealth's fiscal supremacy. We may not all agree with the way in which he has done it, but at least he has made an attempt to force some sort of solution on the central Government.

There is no doubt whatever where Liberals stand, or should stand, in this matter of the Federal system and the sovereignty of the States, because only a few months ago the Federal Council of the Liberal Party, after many months of painful self-appraisal at the

Federal level and in the various States, redefined its political philosophy as it applies to the Federal system. This gave quite unambiguous guidance to all Liberals on the way in which a Federal system should operate in order to accord with the fundamental tenets of Liberal belief. It called for the return to the States of the right to share directly in income-tax collections, with, of course, acceptance of political responsibility; or, alternatively, the transfer to the States of a right to impose some form of growth tax. This Federal Liberal Council paper also called for the reimplementation of section 96 of the Commonwealth Constitution so that it would operate in the spirit in which it was intended to operate. By that I mean that the intention was the granting to the States of Commonwealth subsidies and other payments without strings attached to them.

To me, all this is crystal clear and does not require a great deal of explanation. I therefore find it difficult, as a Liberal, to reconcile what we see happening in another place with what is clearly the requirement of my party's philosophy, and the decisions of my party taken at its Federal level and, in similar terms, at our own State Liberal convention held in June of this year. I have said often enough before—there is little need to say it again—that Federalism in this country is endangered because too many people are making the right noises about supporting it but in fact acting in a way that is designed only to tear it down.

We are having propagated the spurious notion—I regard it as quite a pernicious doctrine—that if Australia is to grow as a nation, this can happen only with one central Government making all the decisions and having acceptance of these decisions on an across-the-board basis. It is suggested that this is the sort of thing that happens in Great Britain. They have one Government; it makes central decisions; everything works out well. We should remember, of course, if we are to compare ourselves with other countries, that our Federal system was designed specifically to provide the checks and balances against the undue use of power which in fact exists in the constitution of the United States of America, on which ours was closely modelled. But, of course, we do not have here the checks and counterbalances that exist in the United States of America, where there is the division between the executive and the legislature, and in Great Britain, although there is a unitary parliamentary system, they have a long tradition of a very powerful and well-based system of local government that we do not have in this country. The Labour Party's programme of trying to perpetrate some half-baked system of regional bodies and to do away with the States would be, to me, the worst of all possible worlds.

Under our system, we have the central Government and the States, so that we have these two interacting on each other to ensure that power is properly dispersed, is not centralised unduly and, being centralised, is not improperly used. This, of course, was the purpose of the Constitution.

I am totally a Federalist and, as I say, my party is also totally Federalist in its philosophy. Not so long ago an eminent Federal parliamentarian, the Honourable David Fairbairn, gave an address to a group of Young Liberals in Perth, and he pointed out three reasons why he believed the Federal system was necessary for Australia and why it should be enhanced, protected, and sustained. His first reason was that the Federal system provides, as I have pointed out, a check on the power of any Government—the Commonwealth acts as a check upon the States; the States act as a check upon the Commonwealth—and if the system operates properly, it provides necessary diversity without unnecessary disunity.

Secondly, the Federal system is suited to Australian conditions. Australia is a country of immense size. We have enormous distances; we have a population that is largely concentrated on the coastal rim. Indeed, the population of the two southern States of New South Wales and Victoria represents virtually half the population of Australia, and one has only to ask oneself: if there were only a central Government, with all the power concentrated in the one Government composed of a majority of representatives from a relatively small part of the Australian continent, which section of the Australian continent would be most likely to derive benefit from the decisions of that central Government? I do not think there is any doubt that a central Government will inevitably tend to react to where the pressures are most intense and most persistent.

And so I regard Federalism as essential for a country as large and diverse as Australia because it will produce decentralisation of administration. It will give opportunity for more and more people to take part in the processes of government, and in an age when government is being alienated from the people, when more and more people, particularly the younger people, are becoming cynical and suspicious of what they regard as the establishment—the system—it is vitally necessary that as many people as possible have a close and direct relationship to the processes of government.

The third reason Mr. Fairbairn gave in his talk in Perth for supporting a Federal system was the practical side—and it is pretty practical, too, because we have a Federal system in name, if not in fact. We have it in name and we are not likely to get rid of it easily in name. The whole history of referenda in this country indicates a very strong and inbuilt resentment by the Australian electorate towards any growth

of central power, so that any attempt to amend the Federal system through the ballot box is literally foredoomed to failure.

Of course, we are seeing a tremendous erosion of the Federal system through back-door methods, but in a formal sense there has never yet been—and I prophesy there will not be—any successful attempt to change the present Federal system. And so I regard these as three very good reasons why we support a Federal system.

Unfortunately, the Federal system in this country has been vastly eroded by the centralisation of financial power. This has been achieved over the years by a number of unfortunate decisions in various places. I suggest that those who framed the Commonwealth Constitution did not for one moment envisage that the words they wrote—words designed to ensure that the partnership between the States and the central Government would remain strong and viable—would be construed to provide the meanings that have turned Australia from a country of seven Governments literally to one of one Government and seven vassal States.

Mr. O'Donnell: They may have been concerned only about tying the States into the Federation.

Mr. PORTER: I do not think the hon. member for Barcoo is correct. I think the men who wrote the Constitution were men of stature, capacity and vision and they tried hard to ensure that they had a workable system. The fact that they failed is no fault of theirs. I believe the failure lies in the way in which the words have been interpreted over the years and I believe that, to a large degree, we must look to the decisions of the High Court for providing the present pre-eminence of the Commonwealth in the financial field.

There seem to be three vital decisions which have helped to bring about today's situation. These are decisions that are pertinent to every State Budget. It is impossible for a State Treasurer to contemplate framing his Budget without having regard to the framework—the reference under which he is permitted to operate—formed by these decisions.

There was, for instance, the historic decision of the High Court in 1908 that surplus revenues could be paid into the Coal Consolidation and Investment Reserve Fund. Prior to that period under section 94 Commonwealth surplus revenue had to be paid monthly to the States. That High Court decision said that the Commonwealth did not have to pay over this surplus revenue but could tuck it away and keep it for other, later, different purposes.

Then there was the High Court decision in 1926 regarding the Federal Aid (Roads) Act which held that the Commonwealth could, if it so desired, grant financial assistance to any of the States, under section 96, on such terms and conditions as the Commonwealth Parliament thought fit. This was even if

the Commonwealth Parliament did not have any specific powers to make laws in those fields in which it was making grants, but by virtue of that High Court decision it could say to the States, "We will give you this money to be spent in precisely this way."

Finally, there was the famous decision of 1942, the uniform taxation decision, which, with subsequent decisions over a number of years, provided the Commonwealth with absolute priority over the States in the collection of whatever can be considered as income tax.

Mr. O'Donnell: There was one thing that was not written into the Constitution, and that was stabilisation of thought.

Mr. PORTER: I look at Labour's policy and wonder whether it has not just that in mind should it ever get into office.

These decisions have had tremendous and far-reaching effects on the Federal system. Since 1908 the Commonwealth has ensured that there have never been any surplus funds or surplus revenue; it has been able to put them away for various uses. The grants to the States have become increasingly attached to so many strings that the Commonwealth can now tell the States precisely what they shall do in so many ways. For instance, there is the quite ludicrous situation in which the Commonwealth Government can tell a State Government how wide a corridor in a university building shall be. As well, there is the extraordinary situation in which the Commonwealth Cabinet has more than doubled in the last 20 years, and all the extra Cabinet posts that have been created in the Federal field have been duplications of services that exist in the State sphere. By using section 96 the Commonwealth has been able to say to the States, "Use this money this way, or else you don't get it." This is one of the reasons why I am one of those who are most reluctant to see this State go to the Commonwealth Grants Commission.

Mr. O'Donnell: It is the most objectionable section in the Constitution.

Mr. PORTER: It is a detestable section, but it would not be so if its words were made to mean what obviously they were originally intended to mean.

In addition, there is the problem of income tax. The decision that prevents the States from having access to income tax has cut completely across the principle of independent and sovereign authority for the States. Since 1942 the Commonwealth has reimbursed the States with some of the money it has raised from income tax and other taxes. As we know, originally this was called a reimbursement grant, but now the title has been changed to "financial assistance". A constant kind of brain-washing is going on from the Commonwealth sphere to suggest to us that whatever they give us they are in fact giving out of tremendous

generosity of heart. I was rather disturbed to hear the Leader of the Opposition talk today about a gift to the State from the Commonwealth. We are given nothing by the Commonwealth; these moneys are as much ours as the Commonwealth's. I resent bitterly and deplore this constant suggestion that the Commonwealth has a natural right to money and that then, out of the goodness of its heart, it may, if it wishes, give us some grants for particular purposes, like a rich man giving crumbs from a full table.

The fact that the States have been kept out of a growth tax—and income tax is a real growth tax—has pushed all the States into the parlous situation of moving into tax fields where under normal circumstances undoubtedly they would not want to go. The State Governments know that many of these tax fields—taxes that deal with the growth of gambling, and receipts duty, which the Treasurer had to implement in this State—are unpopular with large sections of the populace, and that they will attract nothing but political animosity by imposing these taxes. However, the States have no option. Denied access to a growth tax, we are pushed into these fringe, unpleasant areas. This will happen more and more as each year goes by, unless we change the financial pivot of the present system.

It is interesting, for instance, to reflect that every time there is an adjustment in wages the States are worse off and the Commonwealth is better off. Recently the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission awarded a weekly wage increase of \$1.35, which added some \$23,000,000 to State Budgets through additional payments to State employees. Under the formula, the subsequent increase in tax grants to the States from the Commonwealth was \$9,000,000, so the States were therefore \$14,000,000 worse off. But the increase in the tax yield to the Commonwealth Government from income and pay-roll tax was \$40,000,000. The Commonwealth had to pay an extra \$17,000,000 in wages to its employees. By a strange coincidence, the net result of this transaction was that the States were \$13,000,000 worse off and the Commonwealth was \$13,000,000 better off. That happens with every increase in wages and costs in the community.

The payment of the salaries of university professors raises another interesting point. The whole system of grants from Canberra for universities is based on certain terms and conditions laid down by the Australian Universities Commission. Late in 1967 this Commission increased the base salary of a university professor by \$1,600 a year. On that formula it was necessary for the State Government to find \$1,039 for each professor's salary, and the Commonwealth \$561. Of course, the result was inevitable. On his increased salary the professor would pay income tax of \$902 and the university paid pay-roll tax of \$40. The Commonwealth

therefore made a net gain for each professor of \$381, and for each professor it cost the State \$1,039. That is typical of the fantastic and impossible situation in which the States now find themselves because of this dreadful perversion of the Federal system.

While it may be desirable to set up inquiries, as has been suggested in other places, to try to find a new formula for making the Federal system operate better, I am inclined to believe that the time for committees and formulas has gone. I believe that it is high time the States got together to consider whether they should not institute a referendum to change the Constitution to make sure that its words mean what they were originally intended to mean, and cannot be subject to such interpretation by the High Court as totally changes the viability of their meaning. If the six States decided to introduce a referendum to change the Federal Constitution in this way, it would be a very daring Federal Government indeed that wanted to withstand it. I suggest that this is one of the ways by which the Federal system might be preserved.

Having spoken on the Federal system, to which I have referred so often in this Chamber, I now want to say something about mining in Queensland because the Budget leans on the mining growth in this State, and I think all future Budgets, at least for the years ahead that we can foresee, will also lean very heavily on the industrial growth which is largely stimulated by the development of the mining industry.

I wish to commend the recent statement by the Minister for Mines in which he spoke of the problem that the mining industry may find itself in because of the very nature of its activities and the propaganda that has been generated about it. It may find itself in a situation in which public support has moved away from it. It would be sad, indeed, if valid and necessary mine development was inhibited because public opinion—perhaps misdirected, but nevertheless existing and therefore not to be overlooked by political people—suggested that some mining activities were undesirable.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.15 p.m.]

Mr. PORTER: I think it is accepted by most people that the role of mining in our community, and indeed in our society, can very easily be misunderstood. I suppose this is due, in part, to the nature of the industry and the fact that its operations can scar and affect large tracts of country; but perhaps in larger part it is due to the build-up that has been going on against mining companies here. And I think members of the Opposition are culpable in this to some extent, picturing them only as greedy entrepreneurs who are anxious to make Australia a huge quarry in order to add to the great wealth of overseas combines.

It is unfortunate that this picture should be unnecessarily built up, but with these factors operating—and they do operate to some degree—I believe it is essential that mining companies should do their utmost to merit public approbation. I suggest, in all humility, that this is not done merely by hiring big-time public-relations operators. In my view mining, more than most industries, has to be cognisant of the great fear that many people now have that we are paying too high a price for what is loosely called progress, and that the heedless rape of our environment for private profit is no longer acceptable.

I was very interested to receive—I am sure other members of the Committee received it—an environmental quality bulletin put out by the Australian Mining Industry Council. This expresses the council's philosophy on environmental quality. It reads—

“The components of the natural environment—mountains, rivers, lakes, and natural flora and fauna, soils and minerals, even deserts and clean air, are national assets which in the interests of science, health, recreation and the quality of life warrant conservation.”

These are fine words and, coming from mining interests, need to be heeded.

Another section reads—

“The Australian Mining Industry Council supports the ordered development of natural resources in such a manner as to ensure that the highest possible environmental quality is maintained.”

Nobody would possibly disagree with that.

Another section reads—

“The protection of the natural environment and the satisfaction of man's varied and expanding cultural and material needs offer two desirable goals. Activities concerned with the achievement of these goals involve constant interplay and sometimes conflict.”

I think this is something of an understatement.

Another small quotation from the document reads—

“The community—individuals, industry, governments—should be aware that any shift towards either goal means some modification of the other.”

This provides me with an opportunity to speak about Cooloola. I think that the problem I have been posing, and the problem recognised in that bulletin by the Australian Mining Industry Council, is well exemplified in the problem of Cooloola because the question of mining all, any, or none of the Cooloola Sands Mass has become, for the people of this State, a testing point, a confrontation if you like, where high-sounding semantics no longer serve and where fine phrases tend to wither away in the harsh hot glare of reality. Here is a case where

there has been a great deal of argument, and how would one interpret here the excellent words of the Australian Mining Industry Council's bulletin? What is a proper balance of resources? What action is best for all, not best for a few and for companies? What does give us the greatest return in the long term and not just the short term? Sir Winston Churchill once said that there was no-one more eloquent than a politician attempting to equate public good with private advantage. I think the same thing applies to the eager entrepreneur.

A great deal has been said about the emotionalism of some conservationists who were able to "sell" the Cooloola issue to an extent that the State is disadvantaged through a decision that has been taken. I think that all who are involved in the argument on this matter—and this exemplifies the problem that may have to be faced in other places—should remember that those who promote conservation do not do so for private advantage. The same cannot be said for those who promote mining, so the arguments always need to be taken in that context.

Normally there would be no point in repeating the arguments advanced over Cooloola since the Government's decision has been made clearly, explicitly, and with the firm undertaking that the decision, once made, would be honoured. But over recent weeks this State, and this Parliament, has been subjected to such a massive United States-style campaign of lobbying and intimidation that it might be as well to recapitulate briefly some of the salient points.

The first thing that we must remember in dealing with the conflict of mining interests and public interest in the Cooloola area is that we are not dealing with an ordinary area. One concedes that in some areas mining can comfortably co-exist with public interest. In the case of Cooloola, we are dealing with a special area. We are dealing with an area that is the only relatively undisturbed example left on the Australian mainland of an ecological whole—a subtropical rain forest; a eucalypt forest; a heath vegetation—that is large enough for scientific, educational and recreational purposes.

It is unique not only to Queensland but to Australia. What is more, it is within driving distance of a city. It has an unsurpassed diversity of trees, flowers, vegetation, rare birds, fauna and so on. There are over 500 flowering shrubs in the area, and over 200 species of birds. And, of course, it is a unique, enormous source of fresh water, but only whilst the soft sandstone underlying it, and the impervious peat layers, remain intact. Of course, it has high dunes up to 700 feet, and coloured sands that have no parallel in the world.

We are therefore not talking of mining operations in an ordinary area where, after the mining company has been through, some

kind of degraded vegetation can be induced, or it can be prepared for housing sites or road works, as has happened in other places. The hon. member for South Coast will know that. That type of work can be done very successfully; but we are not talking about that kind of operation.

I would say that there is an overwhelming weight of community and expert opinion that believes that the Cooloola area should be left intact; that it is not a place where we should allow mining interests to obliterate something that is unique and a quite precious heritage. I shall not go through all the names of those who hold that view. Most are known to hon. members. They include eminent academics, men from the staffs of Government departments, and, oddly enough, also included is the name of the agronomist for one of the major mining companies, A.M.C. He is Mr. P. B. von Groenou. In an article published in "The Australian" of 2 May of this year, he admitted that they could not replace the natural species that were destroyed by sand-mining, even on flat ground. Let it be remembered that he is head agronomist for the company that works from Stradbroke to Tuggerah Lakes and has had infinite experience in this work. He said that they have to make do with Rhodes grass and Rhodesian kazungulu, and they get the scrub effect by liberal use of acacias, coastal oaks, and tea trees. Mr. von Groenou said—

"At the moment we cannot replace rain forest. The composition is too complex. We do not know the sequence in which plants originally grew. Unfortunately it appears that it could take hundreds of years to return a true rain forest."

Incidentally, the companies did not call that man as a witness at the hearing in the Warden's Court.

The suggestion has been made—it is one that must always be considered; we must not be harsh in dismissing the claims of miners to mine in areas—that some mining can co-exist with these areas because of the capacity to restore the land to something of its original content. I wish to say this: that nowhere in the world have sand masses of any height been restored adequately; nowhere in the world have sand dunes of more than 120 to 150 feet in height, with more than a 10 to 12 degree slope, been revegetated successfully, let alone restored. The mining companies claim, for instance, that they have made such restoration in the Myall Lakes area north of Newcastle, where they have been working for some years, but that, of course, is denied very vigorously by the New South Wales National Parks Association.

Perhaps members of the Committee will be interested to know that a controlled test has been going on for 18 years, conducted by the agricultural section of the University of Queensland, in the Beerwah National Forest. There has been a large section there under a controlled experiment since 1952,

and in that area some 80 per cent. of the shrubs and plants growing in the Cooloola area can be seen. Now, in two controlled areas, one section was fertilised, the other left alone. Remember, nothing was disturbed. No bulldozers went through this and tossed it upside down; no salt water ran through it. All that was done was to apply superphosphate to one area at 200 lb. to the acre.

What has happened in 18 years? I will tell hon. members what has happened, and the results have been published in the "Australian Journal of Botany" for everyone to read. The natural species have literally vanished. The fertilised area has seen the growth of crude, coarse grasses, and the plain fact is that any suggestion by the mining companies that, by preparing topsoil areas and putting fertilisers into them, they can hasten the return of the natural growth is complete rubbish. That has not happened anywhere, and in this controlled experiment it has been shown that it will not happen because the addition of fertilisers and trace elements completely changes the organic nature of the area. So what was there before will die, and it certainly will not come back again, and the prospect of restoring areas is nil.

When we consider the problem of sand-mining co-existing with an area such as Cooloola, we have to bear in mind that what is said about restoration must be taken with a considerable grain of salt. Indeed, when one talks with the representatives of the mining companies—and I have done so—one finds that they are very cagey about using the word "restoration" or the word "rehabilitation", and they even become rather coy about suggesting how much revegetation they can do or the type of it. There is no doubt that a certain type of degraded recovery can be made; but to suggest that in any sense after a complete sand-mining operation the companies can restore anything remotely like what was there before is not borne out by one fact that anybody can produce.

I went to some trouble to go over to North Stradbroke Island, a place that has been mined for 20 years. It once had an 18-mile swamp that was a breeding ground for birds and wildlife. That 18-mile swamp has now been degraded to a few waterholes. I have a photo of myself standing in the middle of it, and it is like the Sahara. One can go down to the beach and smell where the peat water has come out. In other words, the mining operation has pierced what should have been impervious layers of peat and the water has leached away. Exactly the same would happen in the Cooloola area. Therefore, the suggestion that there could be co-existence in that area with some mining is, I think, an extremely doubtful proposition, to say the least. I heard the hon. member for Clayfield say, "They would pull the plug out", and that is exactly what would happen. Once that has occurred I am afraid there will be no putting it back.

I began by saying how necessary it was for mining, above all other industries, to retain public approval. This is necessary because we depend very largely on mining in this country and will continue to do so for many years to come. It is most important that the mining industry as a whole should not come under any cloud of unnecessary suspicion, because the very nature of our activities, as I say, could well alienate necessary support.

I suggest that spokesmen for sand-mining companies, since the Government's Cooloola decision, have done the whole of the mining industry a great disservice. They have certainly not advanced their own case because we have seen an organisation on a massive scale, obviously costing a tremendous amount of money, being done, of course, by big-time public-relations people whom I could name if I wished, including the organisation of motor cavalcades and the rest of it, and much of the argument used has been deliberately misleading. Most of it is blatantly hysterical and deliberately designed to confuse a simple issue.

I say here and now that not one new jot, tittle or iota of fact has been introduced to add to the background and knowledge that was available at the time the decision was made, so, for me, there is nothing to reconsider. If new and vital evidence is produced, then I might have to think over recomittal, but not until then. As I say, to date, not even a vestige of one new fact has been produced. All we have had has been intimidation on a grand scale—something new to this State and something I have never struck before in 30 years of close association with politics.

We have had three threats: one, that the United States Government would intervene because we are stopping them getting scarce and vital strategic materials; two, that we changed the rules in the middle of the game and that this would frighten away mining investment; and three, that if we do not change the decision the Government will be sued for millions of dollars.

The hon. member for Clayfield, by way of a question, indicated on the first proposition that it was a strange dependence the U.S. Government had on this scarce strategic material when half of it was going to European and Iron Curtain countries. In any case, I would point out that there is evidence that there exist in the off-shore areas, just off our beaches, ample reserves of the scarce and apparently valuable materials.

In the "Southern Miner" of 17 August, 1970, there is a report of a paper by two gentlemen, presented at the Sixth Annual Conference of the Marine Technological Society in Washington, which says that over a period of four years a highly successful exploration system has been evolved, constructed, tested and used off the eastern coast of Australia. They say that beyond possible doubt the sea floor off the east coast of Australia contains a vast low-grade

reserve of rutile, zircon and ilmenite which, in the face of diminishing world reserves and increasing demand, could be mined. The feasibility studies indicate that economies of scale, not possible on shore can be achieved off shore, using a dredge with a throughput of 5,000 tons of sand per hour.

So, any suggestion that our decision should be reconsidered in order to meet commitments or to preserve an industry apparently reaching the hour of its Waterloo, because we have decided against letting it into Cooloola, is rubbish contradicted by the known facts. Let them mine below low-tide mark. Nobody is going to argue about that. Let them mine and replenish the beaches—there is plenty of material there—rather than destroy precious assets.

Mr. Wharton: Do you think that might pull the plug out of the sea?

Mr. PORTER: If we pulled the plug out of the sea we would have more things to worry about than Cooloola. Part of the argument that has been advanced in recent weeks, namely, that the Government's decision on Cooloola will cut off the operations of certain companies in their prime, will pose dire hardship to people who, in good faith, invested a tremendous amount of money in equipment, and will pose great hardship to certain local communities, is very difficult to reconcile with the annual reports of Cudgen R.Z. Ltd. and Consolidated Rutile Ltd., which are two of the companies concerned, published in "The Courier-Mail" of 30 September. These reports revealed that in the year's operation Cudgen R.Z. had produced approximately 40,000 tons of rutile and an equal quantity of zircon, and that at June, 1970, Consolidated Rutile had proven reserves—obviously not at Cooloola, because they have not got it—of 572,454 tons, rutile and 514,365 tons of zircon, and Cudgen R.Z. had reserves of 560,670 tons of rutile and 603,000 tons of zircon. At their present rate of production that is enough to keep them going for at least the next 15 years. Those are proven reserves that they already have. I suggest that the story of grave emergency if they are not able to mine the few thousand acres at Cooloola does not bear lining up with their own directors' statements at their annual meetings.

The suggestion that we have changed the rules in the middle of the game and will frighten away mining investment is so much rubbish. The Mining Act is clear and specific. The companies had an authority to prospect, which does not give a pre-emptive right to a mining lease. The Premier has already said this. An authority to prospect has never given a right to a mining lease in this or in any other State, and there is ample legal precedent for this. There are both High Court and Full Court decisions on the subject. The famous Mills case is ample indication that any company that

believes that, because it has an authority to prospect, it will automatically get a mining lease does not know its law.

As for the final threat that has been made in recent weeks, that is, that if the Government does not change its decision it will be sued for many millions of dollars, this is something of a robber-baron technique. I believe that this type of pressure is not only very inimical to the interests of the mining industry in general but is also a gross affront to this Parliament. If we had in existence a privileges committee, which we propose to institute in the near future, I believe there would be every reason for bringing before the Bar of this House any person who made that type of threat.

I am old-fashioned enough to believe that a member of Parliament has not only a right but also an obligation to speak for his constituents and to make policy decisions according to his judgment and conscience. When members of the Government parties vote, as is their preserve, their right and their responsibility, according to judgment and conscience, they accept whatever flows from that decision; but they must not be subject to the kind of overt threat, "You will change your decision to the way we want it or else we will sue you for some \$40,000,000," as has been suggested in one newspaper.

Mr. Murray: "Or supply finance to defeat you in your electorate."

Mr. PORTER: That is another one. They can try that one and see how they go. Argument, protest, objection and petition are legitimate vehicles for those who want to change declared policy, but outright threat is damnable. When any entrepreneur tries to tell me as a parliamentarian and member of the Government that I will reverse my decision on a major policy matter in his favour or else be sued for millions of dollars, my answer is flat and explicit: sue and be damned!

I recommend that we act now to ensure that mining interests and environmental quality do not meet in more head-on clashes of the type we have had in Cooloola. That sort of clash is not good for anybody, and we certainly do not want too many Cooloolas. In my view, the problem arises because the industry is forced to work under mining statutes whose concepts have changed very little in 70 or 80 years, when the relevance of mining and environmental protection was very different from its relevance today.

It is high time that the Acts were brought up to date to enable mining interests to operate acceptably and effectively within a modern frame of reference. I recommend to the Government that, in order to achieve this, it take a leaf from the book of the Western Australian Government, which has set up a committee to inquire into its Mining Acts. Its terms cover a host of features,

the whole point being to try to update the Acts and bring them into line with what is required of mining in this second half of the 20th century.

One of the major points of inquiry for this committee is mining in relation to conservation, ecology, preservation of the balance of nature, and preservation of the environment. We, as a Parliament and a Government, and the mining industry, as a very important sector of our economy, would all be well served by a committee of this nature which would endeavour to ensure that we do not have the type of harmful confrontation that we experienced in the case of Cooloola.

Mrs. JORDAN (Ipswich West) (7.42 p.m.): I rise to support the Leader of the Opposition in his criticism of the barrenness of the Budget introduced by the Premier. As I listened to the Treasurer's speech I waited for evidence of the progress he has talked about each year at this time, but to me it seemed a real depression Budget—one that could be expected in times of acute depression—yet unemployment, so statistics tell us, is low.

It seems that the great mining boom in Queensland has not given the Treasurer or the Government much aid in swelling the coffers of this State. The mining companies get the main rake-off, as we on this side of the Chamber have warned repeatedly for some years. It is now evident that there is considerable and growing opinion which, with Labour Party thinking, questions the way in which the Government rushed into selling our minerals to overseas companies at such low royalty payments. They were certainly sold at bargain prices to those companies; they were give-away specials without a thought for providing some Australian equity. Even the Commonwealth Government was not happy about that, and from time to time it offered many warnings and much advice.

Certainly our mineral development has saved the State during the widespread drought that we have been experiencing for some years. But how much better off would the State have been with higher royalties, let alone some Australian equity. It seems that the Treasurer himself is now having a change in outlook about letting Queensland's assets go too cheaply, and is demanding a bigger share of the profits from the company planning to develop the nickel deposits in North Queensland. Let us hope that the increased demands he is making meet with success and that they will alter the whole future pattern, thus giving Queensland some value in return for its mineral resources.

On the matter of the new Commonwealth-State financial arrangements, the Treasurer, while expressing some gratification at the improvement for Queensland, is nevertheless critical of the Commonwealth. We also

heard from the hon. member for Toowoong some criticism of the Commonwealth Government relative to Commonwealth-State relations. Actually, there is still much doubt and the controversial receipt tax dilemma remains unsolved. It seems that perhaps it will even be thrown out, and now that the Premier of Victoria, Sir Henry Bolte, has thrown a spanner into the works and has thrown down the gauntlet to the Federal Government, the whole financial relationship between the States and the Commonwealth is in question. The situation will be watched and followed with keen interest in view of the coming Senate election and the possible effect it could have on that election.

It is the Commonwealth who collects the income tax and who has the say on who gets what. Up till now, the States have gone cap in hand to the Loan Council. The stage has been set, and each State has gone through the action of playing a role to get more money, but it has been a hollow performance which has brought little change from initial decisions of the Commonwealth on each occasion. Are we now to witness some change in roles and in performances? Will the protest be made and noted, with a return then to the old familiar pattern? It is certainly an interesting exercise, as I said, with with Senate election in the background.

There is much dissatisfaction by more and more people with the Liberal-Country Party Government in Canberra, just as there is much criticism of the present Queensland Government, and the open disagreements between Governments of the same political colour in the two areas, Federal and State, augur well for a Labour Senate victory.

The Treasurer did not waste time giving the Budget a name. Each year that I have been a member of this Parliament we have been treated to names such as "Queensland's March to Progress" and then a couple of "Push Ahead" Budgets. However, those names subsequently proved to be misnomers, and perhaps the Treasurer thought it wiser to stick to reality and simply state the plain facts, which added up to a deficit Budget. It is not that I object to a deficit. At any level of Government or business, or even on the home front, it is sometimes necessary to budget for a deficit. It can be good reasoning if it is planned.

But if State Governments are faring badly in their allocations from the Federal Government, local authorities are even worse off in what they get from the State Government. Local government is required to provide more and more for the people as each year goes by, yet the State is gradually cutting down its contributions to local authorities. Subsidies have been reduced progressively since 1961. I well remember the day when, as a delegate to the 1961 Queensland local authority conference, I heard Sir Thomas Hiley, the then Treasurer, tell delegates from all over Queensland that

there would be decreased subsidies for local authorities and warned them that subsidies would be reduced progressively from then on. Such has been the case from that date, and the path of local government has become progressively harder. Councils, particularly in the provincial cities, are hard pressed to provide even the most elementary needs of the people, let alone some of the more modern amenities such as civic centres, swimming pools and libraries. They cannot even keep up with the roads that need to be built and they are always running a long way behind demand.

At the recent local government conference in Mackay, the Treasurer, it would appear from Press reports, told delegates to have a look at their own houses and put them in order. There may need to be an investigation and reorganisation of some local authorities.

Mr. Chalk: Start with Ipswich.

Mrs. JORDAN: For a start, I would like to shove out the council that is there now and put a Labour council in. That would be the first move to make. I will guarantee, from what is going on at present, that the Labour Party will be back in office after the next election. There will also be a State Labour Government in office before that time, too.

Any savings that could possibly be made by local authorities as a result of an investigation would be a mere drop in the bucket compared with what is required. Such an outlook certainly gives little encouragement to the many councils whose members, in the main, do a sterling job, with meagre recompense and little thanks or appreciation, and have to contend with a great deal of criticism. From personal experience as an alderman over a number of years, I know how demanding such representation can be, and I also know that it is getting harder and harder as costs rise and demands grow. The population expansion into the outer suburbs intensifies the demand for facilities, and it is continually a matter of priorities and pressures.

The Treasurer in his Budget speech urged local authorities to hasten to raise their loan moneys, as the money market was very difficult this year. A sorry outlook indeed for local authorities! It seems to me that perhaps some councils may not be able to raise their loan allocations, and that the Government should in some way or another become an agent or instrument for co-ordinating the availability of money that could be channeled to fulfil the loan allocations of local authorities. It is little use deciding the loan allocations to be allowed for various councils if those councils find that they are unable to raise their allotted quotas. This is a matter that will have to be watched if money continues to be tight and as hard to raise as the Treasurer has warned.

Many local authorities are now requiring private land-developers and subdividers to provide roads and reticulated services, and even, in some cities, sewerage, because they cannot now afford to provide these facilities from the public purse, as was done in bygone years. Many councils now have by-laws covering these matters. Indeed, it has become necessary for councils in fast-developing areas to adopt this practice if services are to be provided in the "suburban sprawl", as it is termed nowadays.

But this does force up the prices of allotments. Developers have to pass on to the purchaser these additional costs and, with constantly increasing costs, the over-all cost of obtaining a home rises. This is the direct result of the financial plight of local authorities that, under the present method of local government finance, cannot hope themselves to provide all the services and facilities that the people require.

What I have said concerning local authorities leads me to speak now on the need for more low-cost housing. There are many people in our midst who cannot afford to purchase a home, and also many who cannot afford the rentals charged for private rental homes. The number of deserted wives with children, who have housing problems, is increasing. Widows with families are in this category, too, as are also many aged people who, for some reason or other, have never been able to obtain homes of their own.

I see many tragic cases of such people who cannot get rental housing at a price they can afford to pay. Indeed, many cannot get rental housing at any price. In my electorate of Ipswich West there are very few Housing Commission rental houses for civilians. Although there are perhaps more Housing Commission houses in my electorate than in any other electorate in Queensland, these, in their hundreds, are for Air Force personnel only, under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. Applications from civilians have been increasing, but no rental houses are available for them.

However, I was extremely pleased to be notified recently that 25 rental houses for civilians are to be built in Ipswich, in the suburb of Leichhardt, on very good ground in a very attractive area. It was a pleasant shock indeed, in view of the almost complete lack of such housing in my electorate, to receive such a notification. It seems that the Housing Commission has realised the need for rental houses in Ipswich. I have spoken of that need many times since I have been a member of this Assembly. Although I have no objection to the number of rental houses that have to be provided for defence personnel at the Amberley R.A.A.F. base, I have said all along that the civilian population of Ipswich should not suffer because of that and that there should be an allocation of rental houses for them.

There is some difficulty in providing adequate housing for people whose economic status effectively excludes them from the existing framework of rental housing finance. The private sector will not provide it, so it is a need that the State Government must fill. That situation needs to be examined. A number of pitiful cases have come to my knowledge—women with children, facing an ejection order and with nowhere to go. The wheels of the Housing Commission move fairly slowly in most cases, and the waiting list is very long. Some of these women owe rent where they have been living and are unacceptable to the Housing Commission because they are bad rental risks. However, they are human beings who need a roof over the heads of their families. Very often the small amount of money they receive precludes them from paying high rentals in full and at the same time feeding their families. The situation has arisen in Ipswich that, because of the call by defence personnel for rental houses, rentals for existing houses have been forced up and people on lower incomes cannot afford what has now become the average or normal rental for a house in Ipswich.

Very often the prolonged illness of either themselves or their children contributes to their impoverished condition, and I wish that there were hostels that catered temporarily for such families until other accommodation could be found. The need for accommodation of that type is urgent. Indeed, this week a person came to me who felt her case was so hopeless that she was threatening to take her own life. There was sickness in the home, a lack of money, an ejection order against her, and no other accommodation available. Cases such as that make one think twice about the responsibilities one has and about what should be done to help people in such a situation. Perhaps the Housing Commission could look into the possibility of providing temporary accommodation of that type in the bigger centres. After all, it is done for migrants when they first come to this country and is continued until they are assimilated. Why not some such scheme, in a small way, for our own extremely needy cases? I ask that such a hostel be considered by the Government in some of the major centres where it is known that the need is great.

I now want to make a few comments on the help given to women and their families by the Children's Services Department. The number of deserted mothers requiring help is fast increasing, and I know that the department is flat out trying to cope with all that it has brought to its notice. I must commend the department for the humane work being done by its officers and the staff and for the co-operation they give to me and, I know, to other members. But there are still those in the community who need help and do not know what is available to them. Quite often many precious weeks are lost and much hardship endured before they come into contact with someone who can direct them

towards help-giving sources, be it through the local member or direct to the Children's Services Department.

No advertising effort is made and no brochures or leaflets are available to let people know what help they can get. Of course, one of the reasons for the lack of publicity, particularly by State Government welfare services, is the fear that such publicity would result in an impossible rush on their services. I have suggested before in this Chamber, and I still feel, that the situation could be much improved if a social welfare officer was situated at least in the larger provincial cities, even if only as an information service. Decentralising such information services and making the information more personally available would help to overcome ignorance, suspicion and fear and would lead to the more urgent needs being met more quickly.

Some of the councils in Victoria and New South Wales are providing social workers to assist such people and direct them to the services available. I understand that the Lady Mayoress of Brisbane, Mrs. Jones, is currently interested in providing a social worker for the Brisbane City Council and that her committee will contribute towards the salary of such a worker in Brisbane. She is to be commended for her interest, initiative and humane concern.

While most councils could not afford to employ a social worker, particularly under their present financial arrangements and with such little help from the Government by way of subsidies, they could perhaps provide a feasible alternative by having information displayed in their health offices informing people in need where they should go to ascertain what help is available. This would require only a few posters or leaflets, and would at least be the beginning of what could later develop into a more co-ordinated service between State and local authority departments.

Recently a number of people in Ipswich who, over a period, had been investigating the level of need in that city, decided to set up the Council of Social Services of Ipswich. After much preliminary work it has now got off the ground, but those people are still in the throes of learning what is available. They are finding that rather difficult to do in the State sphere. I have been helping them all I could, but as no brochures or leaflets are available from State departments, except from the Housing Commission, as there are in the Federal sphere, it is very difficult to know what is available. They plan to provide, among other things, an advisory service on social welfare and to act as a co-ordinating body between private organisations in the field of social welfare. It is a very good move, and I hope that they will be able to assist in alleviating the poverty and distress that exist in Ipswich. A recent survey showed that in Brisbane one

person in eight lives in poverty. That percentage is too high to enable us to be satisfied about the situation.

I was pleased to learn from the Treasurer that the extensions to the Ipswich maternity hospital, of which the Minister for Health has spoken so often in this Chamber over the last few years, are at last included in the Budget. These extensions were promised by the Minister for Health first in 1968, so I welcome the fact that the work is now to be done. However, the Budget does not mention the replacement of the dilapidated and outmoded kitchen block, which has been promised for many years, as has the erection of a new block to house the X-ray and pathology departments.

Some weeks ago I spoke of these matters in the Address-in-Reply debate after the A.L.P. Health Committee had inspected the Ipswich hospital and other hospitals, and, after inspecting the Ipswich hospital, had made certain statements about the condition of some of the hospital departments including the kitchen, X-ray and pathology departments. A long list of improvements to be carried out was given by the hospital board to "The Queensland Times". The list looked an impressive one, but it was only political play. If only the proposals contained in that newspaper report were to become reality. However, they were only sketch plans that were being examined, and, in the Minister's words, the proposed buildings would be constructed subject to the availability of money. That is the old story that we hear so often year after year.

The extensions to the maternity ward, which I hope will now become an accomplished fact, were spoken of in 1968 as if they were to be constructed immediately. They have been the subject of a continuing story that made people in Ipswich expect that they would be started at any moment; however, it went on and on. Therefore, it was with some surprise that I saw the erection of those extensions included in the Budget.

I am afraid that I have not yet fully conditioned myself to interpreting correctly Ministers' answers to questions relative to planning, particularly the answers given by the Minister for Health. In future I must remember to multiply the time factor by at least three to get some idea of when building programmes and improvements might be carried out. For several years before things are done the Government makes publicity play out of them, and I am afraid that many people are not awake to the Government's action. I would save myself and others a lot of disappointment as time drags on and nothing is done if I could adapt myself to the Government's attitude. If ever publicity was used purely for propaganda purposes, the publicity given to the grandiose plans for the Ipswich Hospital and plans for other places throughout the State really takes the cake.

Apparently the Ipswich Hospitals Board fell for the Minister's story and was under the delusion that the work was in the offing for quite some time before it was eventually approved. The dedicated staff of the Ipswich Hospital tried to maintain a decent service under difficult conditions. I know that the same conditions apply in many areas and that it is a matter of priority. But I do not wish to see our Queensland hospital system collapse. Our public hospital needs should receive a much higher priority than they do at present. They certainly would get a much higher priority under a Labour Government. That day may be nearer than some Government members think, taking into account public dissatisfaction with so many of the Government's decisions and the Government's inaction in some important fields.

The Government has shown a lack of interest in price rises, not only recently, but for some quite considerable time. It has taken no action, and, relevant to the recent, huge, blatant rise in the price of frozen vegetables, it displayed very decisively that it would do nothing. By its lack of action, it was apparent that the Government even approved such methods of price fixing. Even the Federal Restrictive Trade Practices Act has not been invoked, and is seemingly useless. Apparently it, too, was formulated for election propaganda purposes. In the State field, an election promise was made to set up a consumer protection council. Although some 18 months have passed nothing has been done to establish such a council although we have experienced the biggest price increases in our history. Is it any wonder that the worker agitates for higher wages. That action is forced on him through the savage erosion of his pay packet by constant price increases in food and the basic necessities of life to maintain his family.

I have spoken previously in this Chamber about the plight of many low-income families. The time is long overdue for the Government to take a searching look at the whole price spiral. Methods used to date have obviously failed and the situation continues to worsen year by year. It seems to me that a new approach is needed and an inquiry could help considerably in finding a solution. An increase in wages or salaries gives only temporary relief to those employees directly involved. All employees do not get simultaneous wage increases. It is a staggered follow-on procedure and, each time there is a wage rise, advantage is taken to impose a further price rise. Pensioners and those on fixed incomes are on the losing end every time. Workers are forced to agitate for higher wages. Imagine how their living standards would deteriorate if they did not. Constant price inflation is a menace to the economic and social stability of our State and indeed of Australia.

It is of paramount importance that the basic causes be ascertained and revealed, and that action be taken to solve the problem,

which is increasing at a blatant and fast tempo, before it is too late. Does big business call the tune even for Governments in this as in some other directions? Recently, Woolworths issued an edict that price rises would have to be justified to them or they would refuse to handle items which they believed were being unjustly increased in price. While this is a commendable action, it will not solve the over-all problem.

Investigations carried out by the Federal Government prior to the introduction of the Restrictive Trade Practices Act, and which led to the introduction of that Act, showed that there was a need for protection. In 1963, Sir Garfield Barwick, the then Federal Attorney-General, said—

“Many examples come to hand which suggested injury to individuals with no overall benefit to the public . . .

“The reason why persons engage in restrictive trade practices is that they seek by the practices to obtain protection against insecurity and instability. At times, the avoided insecurity or instability is no more than the ‘insecurity’ or ‘instability’ which is the normal concomitant of effective competition—an insecurity or instability which in itself promotes initiative, enterprise, inventiveness and vigour.”

The type of practices to which he referred—and many were outlined in the publication “Australian Proposals for Legislation for the Control of Restrictive Trade Practices and Monopolies”—exist in the commercial world itself. These are between the manufacturer and the reseller, the reseller and the reseller, and the trade association and trade association.

Putting aside all questions relating to the necessity or otherwise for legislation to deal with restrictive trade practices, the Federal Government legislated to maintain freedom of action, faster competition and our system of free enterprise. If the Federal Government found it necessary to lay down guidelines to protect manufacturers and resellers from other manufacturers and resellers, how much more necessary is it to lay down guidelines to protect consumers against manufacturers, sellers, advertisers, etc.?

We are still awaiting the implementation of the State Government's promise in the most recent State election to set up a consumers' protection council in Queensland. Even many retailers in this State expressed approval of the setting up of such a council and made a submission to the committee of inquiry set up by the Government. That committee seems to have bogged down, and we hear very little of it now.

Mr. Chinchin: You will hear something soon.

Mrs. JORDAN: I hope so.

In October, 1969, the Retailers' Association secretary went so far as to say that the ones who suffer most are those who can least afford it. They are so eager to get goods on credit and on hire-purchase that they do not attempt to haggle. We all know that prices, particularly those of electrical goods, are inflated to allow for trade-ins. In discussions on this question, some retailers have told me that if they do not go along with the system under which people think they are getting a bargain when they are allowed a trade-in on an inflated price, the manufacturers cut down supplies to them and the trade that they would otherwise receive goes to the stores that give allowances as trade-in figures. This is an aspect of high prices and trade practices that should not be allowed. A consumer protection council could go some of the way towards protecting and educating the consuming public. It is not the complete answer, but it would be at least a start and would show up some of the practices that are now prevalent.

In the Address-in-Reply debate I spoke of some of the unusual things, such as paint removers and lice eradicators, used in the flavouring of ice-cream. Whilst it appears that the companies concerned are not operating in Queensland, nevertheless, according to the Health Minister, who got the Government analyst on the job after I had spoken, some of these things were used in making the flavouring of ice-cream, but not in quantities that would be detrimental to health. I was pleased to be told that by the Minister, and I believe that such testing should be constantly carried out to protect the public and not done only when such a matter is raised in this Assembly or in other places. Certainly he thought that he “did me over” in that respect, but I do not mind taking it if I can get an answer that shows that the public is being protected.

This evening I wish to make some adverse comments on the nutritional content of some well-known breakfast foods sold in America and, in particular, one very popular brand that is sold in Australia. I refer to Kellogg's. On looking at the Australian products of that company, I see that they are made in Australia, in the southern States, so perhaps the accusations made in respect of the American products cannot be made against those produced in Australia. Nevertheless, I feel that we should be sure that what was found in America, as a result of the inquiries of a Senate committee set up to investigate this matter, is not found in Australia. I hope that after I have said what I have to say on this subject the Minister for Health will have some of these breakfast foods analysed, and will let us know if their nutritional content is good. This would show that we have a better conscience towards the health of the people,

especially our children, than is apparently the case with breakfast food manufacturers in the United States.

I have here an article that appeared in "The New York Times" of Friday, 24 July, 1970. It is headed "Food Expert Calls Many Cereals Lacking in Nutrition", and it says—

"An independent expert on hunger charged today that 40 of the 60 leading dry breakfast cereals were so low in nutritional content that they constituted 'empty calories'.

"The charge, with brands identified, was made before a Senate consumer subcommittee by Robert B. Choate Jr., a former Nixon Administration consultant on hunger, who testified as a private person. He describes himself as a citizen-lobbyist on the issue of hunger."

The article continues—

"Mr. Choate called for a Senate investigation of the cereal industry's policies, its advertising programme and the 'strange policies of the relevant regulatory agencies.

"Let me assure you, after your powerful statement, that we will do just that," responded Senator Frank E. Moss, Democrat of Utah, the chairman.

"I urge American consumers to take heed," Mr. Moss said. "No longer can mothers blithely send their children off to school after serving them a bowl of their favorite cereal, confident that they are full of nutritious body-building food."

Later it continues—

"Mr. Choate's basic charge was that while major cereal companies had developed highly nutritious dry cereals, they continued to promote less nutritious brands, especially to children.

"The nutrition content of 40 of the 60 cereals he studied is so low 'they fatten but do little to prevent malnutrition,' he said. 'For a budget conscious family, they are a bad nutrient investment for the dollar.'"

Later again it continues—

"But a sample study, Mr. Choate said, shows that the bottom 40 cereals 'fail as a complete meal even with milk added.' That is true, he added, even if the amount of cereal eaten is doubled.

"The over-all study produced four categories of cereals. Three cereals have high nutritional content, Mr. Choate said—Kellogg's Product 19 and General Mills's Kaboom and Total."

None of those is available in Australia. The article continues—

"He was critical of the 40 remaining brands, a list including the five best sellers. These are Kellogg's Corn Flakes, which Mr. Choate ranked No. 38; Kellogg's Rice Krispies, ranked 39th; Kellogg's Sugar Frosted Flakes, ranked 58th. . .

"His rankings were based on a graph showing how much of each of nine nutrients is contained in each of the 60 brands."

I point out to the Committee that Kellogg's Corn Flakes had very little protein, very little calcium, and very little iron.

Mr. Chalk: Do you have your milk warm or cold with these?

Mrs. JORDAN: Take your choice.

The article later continues—

"Following a survey of cereal advertising on Saturday morning children's programs. . . he said that children were being 'counter-educated away from nutrition knowledge.'

"He said that they were being misled by intense television advertising, by gifts and prizes and by a reliance on sugar flavourings."

Advertising of that type is being done here, and although the Treasurer might find it funny, or even hilarious, I, as a woman, do not find it in the least funny that our children could perhaps be lacking in nutrition because of the actions of these food companies.

Mr. Chalk: You do not look lacking in nutrition.

Mrs. JORDAN: I hope that the Minister for Health does not take the same attitude as the Treasurer does to the nutritional needs of children.

Mr. Chalk: He has Kellogg's All Bran.

Mrs. JORDAN: All Bran is also low on the list of nutritional value.

Honourable Members interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. R. Jones): Order!

Mrs. JORDAN: It is shown on the chart provided by Mr. Choate. I do not think it is the least bit funny. Perhaps it typical of the Treasurer's attitude to all the matters that concern Queenslanders, even to the Budget that he has brought down and the items in it.

I hope that the Health Minister will have not only Kellogg's breakfast foods analysed but other brands on our Australian markets as well, and that in analysing them he will find that their value is good. If the finding should prove otherwise, then I hope he will have the backbone to take steps to bring about an improvement and not treat it as a laughing matter as the Treasurer has done.

If a child is not getting adequate nutrition, sickness follows and interferes with its development, both physical and mental. Indeed, malnutrition affects behaviour, concentration and responsiveness and it is too important a matter for us to be apathetic about or laugh about.

Mr. WHARTON (Burnett) (8.31 p.m.): I wish to compliment the Treasurer on the Budget he has presented in a very difficult year. There is no question that it is a difficult year, and the great test of a Government is to come through a difficult year with the approval of the public. This is what we have done this year and, no matter what the A.L.P. says on this score—

Mr. Davies interjected.

Mr. WHARTON: It depends on where one goes. If we followed the hon. member for Maryborough we would hear stories that would bamboozle anyone and we would not have a true reflection of public thinking as the hon. member tries to insert silly nonsense in the public mind. This is a great shame, because we have a Treasurer, a Cabinet and a Premier of whom the State can be really proud. They have shown what we can do in really difficult times, and that is the great test of government.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. WHARTON: This is only one of the problems that arise and, for the sake of the A.L.P., I think we should emphasise the effects of the drought. They would not know that the State has experienced a drought. To hear them speak in this Chamber one would wonder whether a drought existed. I assure the Committee that the people of this great State have suffered severely from the drought, not only currently but in most of the year under review. Around Christmas time we had a break with some rain, but this was again followed by drought, the seriousness of which is reflected in the Budget that the Treasurer has presented.

In my electorate the drought has been very severe and farmers have had few crops. The dairying industry particularly has been badly hit, and some growers have not harvested any grain at all this year. The unfortunate thing is that this drought has been so prolonged. The losses suffered as a result of it will affect not only the current year but future years as well. Farmers have to recoup their losses in the years following droughts and this affects the whole economy of the State.

I am sure that I speak for everyone in the State when I express appreciation of the fact that \$16,000,000 has been found for drought relief. That is a substantial, even an abnormally large, sum of money. I hope it will not be required again, but I feel sure that I speak for many people when I say that those who have received some relief from these drought measures appreciate the Government's action. I want to convey this to the Committee because too often we are critical; too often we complain of this and that and neglect to give credit when it is due. I think credit is due to this Government for what it has done by way of drought relief.

Mr. Bennett: We are budgeting for a deficit, not a credit.

Mr. WHARTON: I will have something to say about this later. The hon. member is a hard-hearted barrister. However, we might be able to soften his heart a bit and make him appreciate that what has been done has been in the best interests of Queensland.

Mr. Bennett: I would like to agree with you, but I cannot.

Mr. WHARTON: The hon. member would if he were not so hard-hearted.

I feel that we went further than normal drought relief in our assistance to local authorities. We made available grants to maintain employment in country towns, and this has been a very important exercise. Everybody suffers from drought. As well as the farmers, the small businessmen and local authorities also are hit. Everyone faces some problem that arises from drought, so the allocation by the Government of funds to local authorities has helped people to maintain employment. If people are employed continually a good turnover in business must result, and that lessens the impact of drought on the community.

Of course, there has been the problem of who should share in these grants, who should receive half rates, and so on, but the Government has given a certain amount of relief to ratepayers which has helped local authorities to get their funds in. The Government's action has had a twofold effect. It has enabled people to pay their half share of rates and local authorities to maintain their work-force, which is important to any community.

Mr. R. Jones: Have you heard of R.A.M.—the Rural Action Movement?

Mr. WHARTON: I have heard of a lot of things, but I have not heard much from the hon. member for Cairns.

I was interested to hear the Leader of the Opposition deliver his speech today. One problem that confronts the community is the payment of high wages. It affects the State Government because it is one of the biggest employers in the State. The payment of high wages has an effect on the Budget and upon the economy.

Mr. Bennett: Are you against high wages?

Mr. WHARTON: I listened to Mr. Hawke and to the Leader of the Opposition cry about low wages and claim that the workers would have to strike. They condoned strikes and said that they were necessary to obtain higher wages. The Leader of the Opposition quoted figures showing that many years ago workers received a few pence a week, and he claimed that higher wages had been obtained for the working class by the A.L.P. We are certainly paying the price now. In addition, he said that the A.L.P. had achieved the 40-hour week. I say that is the worst thing that has happened to this country. I say quite sincerely that the introduction of the 40-hour week was a tragedy for this

State, for the simple reason that we gave ourselves more time to spend the little money we had.

Mr. R. Jones: Do you think we should go back to a 48-hour week?

Mr. WHARTON: It would not hurt a good many people to go back to a 48-hour week. They would benefit from their employment and would have less time to waste their money. As well, it would give a great boost to industry and would achieve a good deal more than the 40-hour week has achieved.

Mr. R. Jones: What about a 56-hour week?

Mr. WHARTON: That is a stupid question.

The Leader of the Opposition quoted a whole list of companies that had made large profits, as if it is a crime to make a profit. Even a man on wages makes a profit.

Mr. Davies: He could not make a profit under your Government.

Mr. WHARTON: I certainly could not make any under the hon. member's Government. I worked under a Labour Government and I starved, in spite of the fact that I worked day and night, seven days a week.

Mr. R. Jones: What did you live on—cornflakes?

Mr. WHARTON: No. The A.L.P. took the calories out of cornflakes.

Mr. Bennett: Did you go on strike?

Mr. WHARTON: No. I would never strike.

In this morning's Press we read a long dissertation by Mr. Hawke about workers going on strike to force their employers to increase wages. All that would do would be to add further to the inflation that already exists, yet hon. members opposite complain about inflation. We all complain about inflation, but the A.L.P. will never put it where it belongs. It and the trade union movement strive to increase costs and wages to a level that industry cannot afford.

Mr. Davies: Didn't you belong to the A.L.P. at one time?

Mr. WHARTON: No, I did not.

In line with the drive for increased wages by Mr. Hawke and the A.L.P., it is to be noted that Queensland is faced with an increased wages bill of \$700,000 compared with an increase of \$300,000 last year—more than double the increase. The increase in wages for Queensland Bacon Pty. Ltd. will be \$70,000, but it cannot increase the price of its goods as Opposition members will howl about not being able to afford them. That means that the farmers will get less for their pigs.

The general run of industry—the important industries in the State—will be seriously affected by increased wages. Queensland Bacon Ltd., which employs 400 or 500 people, will be affected, as will other industries employing fewer workers. Industries in country towns are finding it extremely difficult to meet increased costs imposed on them by the actions of Hawke and members of the A.L.P., who control the activities of the unions. They will price themselves out of business by killing the goose that lays the golden egg, when there will be no business for anybody.

An Opposition Member: Rubbish!

Mr. WHARTON: It is true. It can be seen happening every day. I know of businesses that have had to retrench staff because they could not afford to carry them. Some of the bigger companies may not be in difficulties. Others have made profits and have used them to provide further employment, yet Opposition members criticise them.

Mr. Jensen interjected.

Mr. WHARTON: I am certain the hon. member does not worry about anything.

Wages and costs will be further increased by the mooted introduction of adult wage rates for 18-year-olds. I believe in encouraging youth to accept responsibility. No-one is keener than I about seeing them discharge it well.

Mr. Davies: What age do you favour for adulthood?

Mr. WHARTON: I favour the age of 20. I think that is a fair and reasonable age at which any youth can discharge the responsibility to vote, or any other community responsibility. I favour adulthood at 20 years of age because young men are then eligible for National Service and have to accept other responsibilities to their country. I am well aware that the matter of adult age is related to section 41 of the Commonwealth Constitution, which has yet to be resolved. I want to be like the Cooloola boys and get in early. If we say that 18-year-olds are to receive an adult wage, will that not impose a heavy cost on our industries, which already face grave problems? We are living in a rather affluent society so far as our youth is concerned. Do we not also have an educational problem in that many of our young people are still receiving education at that age? Will there not be repercussions on our apprenticeship system? Do we not want to encourage people to work?

Mr. Davies: Tell us the Government's decision.

Mr. WHARTON: The hon. member does not know what the Government's decision is. He is trying to inflict a decision on us because the South Australian Government has made a decision that it should be 18. The hon. member would say, "Make it 16."

Mr. Davies: Cabinet made that one.

Mr. WHARTON: They did not make the decision at all; it is subject to ratification.

A former speaker said that insecurity was one of the things that made people strive for higher wages. One of the big problems confronting businesses and wage-earners is lack of security.

The hon. member for Ipswich West referred to price control, but of course she did not mention wage control. She expressed concern at the recent abnormal rise in the price of frozen vegetables. I should like hon. members to appreciate some of the problems that exist in this industry. A number of growers in my electorate were not paid for their peas which were used in the frozen-food trade. Many of them are owed as much as \$10,000 because the processor had to hold the peas in his store. He could not get enough for them to get his money back and pay the growers. We must be realistic when we talk about wage control and price control. Like the consumer, the farmer has to live, and we must have some equality in order to give security.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. WHARTON: It is fair enough if that is done, but Opposition members come in here and claim it is a tragedy. If these people go broke there will be no peas—and no calories in Kellogg's cornflakes.

Mr. Davies: Why does fertiliser cost so much? Do you blame wages for that?

Mr. WHARTON: Wages have a bearing on it; they have a bearing on all things, as the hon. member would appreciate.

Mr. Davies: Are you paying me a compliment?

Mr. WHARTON: I am always paying the hon. member compliments. He does not always accept them.

Another great problem confronting the Government is increased interest rates. The bond rate has risen to 7 per cent., and this reflects itself in the Government's costs. It will cost us an extra \$1,250,000 to service the public debt. This money could otherwise be spent on providing services or reducing the deficit. I shall say something about that later on.

The Agricultural Bank has received an increased allocation, but it is only \$500,000. It is a matter of great concern to me that banks, particularly the Agricultural Bank, have the problem of trying to finance the farming community.

Mr. P. Wood: At 7½ per cent., too.

Mr. WHARTON: This is true, and I can quote the reason. We have to pay 7 per cent. for the money so that we can release it. The Agricultural Bank, because of its overdraft limit of \$20,000, cannot provide the kind of finance necessary for normal farming operations today. These figures were

set some time ago, and since then costs of materials and property development have risen. The Government has done great things through the farm water supplies scheme, but we still have to obtain finance from the Agricultural Bank and we cannot obtain the amount that is necessary to develop a farm today.

Mr. Jensen: Why is it 5 per cent. under the dairy industry reconstruction scheme and 7 per cent. under other schemes?

Mr. WHARTON: It is a special allocation. If the hon. member had been in the Chamber when the legislation was introduced he would realise that. It could probably be granted interest free on occasions, too. Why do we get drought relief money at 3½ per cent.? This is a special allocation to reduce the price of export butter and to try to increase the over-all income of farmers. We, as the State Government, are not able to borrow Commonwealth Reserve Bank funds at that rate.

Mr. Jensen: The Agricultural Bank should be able to get it cheaper.

Mr. WHARTON: No-one would be happier than I if we could do this, but we are caught up in rising interest rates. If the Agricultural Bank increased its limit to \$40,000, there would either have to be an increased injection of capital into the bank or fewer borrowers. If changed conditions are to be met in agriculture, the financial limits of the Agricultural Bank must be increased to amounts within which primary producers are able to operate.

Mr. Jensen: The Government is not trying to help farmers. They won't give the Agricultural Bank more money.

Mr. WHARTON: On some occasions the hon. member for Bundaberg talks a lot of rot, yet at other times he talks sense. On this occasion he is talking a lot of tommy rot, because the Government is trying hard, within the limitations of monetary control, to do all it can for primary producers. No Government could help farmers more than we have. I know, and I have seen, what has been done. I am well aware of the mess that this State would have been in if the A.L.P. had been in control.

Mr. Casey: Farmers would have been better off than they are now.

Mr. WHARTON: I do not think so. The present living standards of farmers are far above those of years ago. The same goes for the living standards of workers. I suppose the hon. member would say that workers are no better off today than they were years ago. The whole community is better off than it was, and we hope that conditions for all become better. The aim should be to get the highest possible standards of living for all.

As I said before, the value of production in the agricultural and pastoral industries for 1969-70 showed a decrease of 13 per cent. on the returns for the previous year, and this is reflected in the finances of the State. Last year we budgeted for a deficit of \$3,500,000 and this year we have budgeted for a deficit of nearly \$6,000,000.

Mr. Bennett: Can you tell us why?

Mr. WHARTON: It is simple enough. I thought the hon. member would be able to read and study the Budget. If he cannot do that, it would merely be a waste of time trying to convey anything to him. If he cannot read, I am sorry for him. If he cannot add, again I am sorry for him.

Under the circumstances, I think it is sound to do what the Treasurer has done in the Budget. Nobody likes to think that each year the State budgets for a larger deficit. Later I hope to raise a few points that may help to overcome some of the problems to be met in the future. As a layman I believe that we cannot continue to budget for larger and larger deficits. We have to cut our cloth according to the measure, and I sincerely feel that the taxpayers of this State cannot contribute any extra revenue through taxation. I think it is better to cut our cloth according to the measure than to impose additional taxes.

The railways have proved profitable for the Government. I think all hon. members, irrespective of the side of the Chamber on which they sit, will agree that this is something at which the Government should aim. Much capital has been infused into the railways, and they have met the demands made on them. Because of drought conditions, primary industry has not contributed its full share to railway revenue, but the mining industry has. Approximately \$35,000,000, or one-third of the total railway receipts, was obtained from the carriage of minerals. That is a real contribution by the mining industry.

The Government must be complimented on encouraging mining to this State, and on the development that has taken place in all parts of Queensland. We have a developing State, with the introduction not only of capital but also of people, and what has been done is reflected in the Budget. Mining is apparently the profitable section of the State's activities, the less profitable one now being primary industry. If therefore rail freights are to be increased, I think that the increases should be borne by the mining sector, or by those who can afford to pay them. I am certain that I speak for all my electors when I say that primary producers cannot afford to pay increased freight rates, and that if there are to be increases they should be paid by the mining industry.

Under the Budget an amount of approximately \$1,000,000 has been provided under Treasury votes to supplement the

Stock Fund. That is quite a substantial sum, and it is not normal to make such an allocation. On the other hand, what else could be done? I ask all members: what can be done for primary industry when it is fighting desperately against drought? The Government has done the correct thing in this transfer of funds so that stock levies do not have to be increased at this devastating time.

Mr. Davies: You resign and we will soon show you how to handle the problem.

Mr. WHARTON: That would be the only way in which the hon. member would get over on this side of the Chamber. I hate to think what would happen if he did. An A.L.P. Government would have to resign to get away from the problems.

Mr. Jensen: You will be stood up by Porter before long.

Mr. WHARTON: I do not intend to say anything about Cooloola, but I wish to speak for a moment about the attitude of the Government, and the credit that is due to it, in making some additional contribution to the Blue Nursing Service and other similar services. The amount made available by the Government has been increased from \$1,100 to \$1,300 for those engaged in home-nursing services, and its contribution towards the salaries of trained nurses has been increased to \$2,000. People in these organisations do a wonderful job, and if the Government was called upon to provide similar services it would have to obtain additional funds from somewhere. If people are willing to do a job, every assistance should be given to them, and I am very glad to see that these subsidies have been increased. A number of my constituents receive attention at the Pioneer Nursing Home at Bundaberg, and I am pleased that it will receive an increased allocation.

The Creche and Kindergarten Association is also worthy of assistance. It is being run by very dedicated people who have their hearts in the right place. They are assisting the younger children so that, when they go to school, they will be able to benefit to the full from the education system that the Government has provided.

I remind the Committee that the Vote for education has been increased by 16.94 per cent. In my opinion, such an increase is warranted. The Government has recognised the intense demand for educational facilities and, within the limits of the funds available to it, has done a very good job.

Turning to my own electorate, I appeal for the construction of a high school at Gin Gin, which is a town with a large number of children attending secondary school. With the construction of the Monduran Dam, it will be the centre of a huge irrigation scheme, and probably the number of children in the area will increase. Other towns with a smaller population have a high school, and

I hope that, from the additional funds allocated for education in the Budget, it will be possible to provide a high school at Gin Gin.

Irrigation is very important to my electorate. I am sure the hon. member for Bundaberg will agree with me on that point. This year the Government will spend \$1,250,000 on the construction of the Monduran Dam and I appreciate very much the fact that it is to become a reality. Considerable difficulties were encountered in the early stages, and \$750,000 was spent on surveys. That money would have gone down the drain if the work had not proceeded, and I thank the Premier and the Minister in charge of irrigation—

Mr. Bennett: You should thank the A.L.P. We put pressure on the Government.

Mr. WHARTON: I have never heard so much rubbish! I should like the hon. member to go into court and swear to the truth of his statement.

As I said earlier, this irrigation scheme is very necessary in my electorate. For many years the sugar industry has suffered from droughts and frosts. The underground water supplies have diminished, probably because of excessive use, and now the construction of the dam is under way. I appreciate the Minister's part in getting approval for the project—I believe in giving credit where it is due and criticism where it is justified—and I compliment him on ensuring that the scheme will at least get off the ground.

I remind hon. members that the Federal Government also made funds available. The State Government could not have got very far in a \$47,000,000 scheme without its assistance. As the Commonwealth has come in and made it possible to start phase 1 of stage 1, I commend both Governments, State and Federal.

I again put in a request for the Gayndah weir. I know the Minister is weary of my saying this, but he is not hard of hearing.

Mr. Jensen: The people of Gayndah will be pleased to hear you say it.

Mr. WHARTON: Not only will they be pleased; they deserve it. It is well over two years since the Wuruma Dam was built with the idea of servicing water for those below it. Unfortunately there is no water in that dam, and there has not been since it was built. Had the Gayndah weir been built those below it for at least some distance down would have had an annual water supply as the Burnett River has run annually. Unfortunately, we cannot look into the crystal ball and decide what is best. The Government in its wisdom decided for the Wuruma Dam and if we get some rain we will be all right. But if we do not, we will still be in trouble and we need the Gayndah weir.

I had the opportunity last week of seeing the Snowy Mountains scheme and I was very impressed with the work that has been done there. It is remarkable what can be done—in other States as well as in Queensland. I pay tribute to the Snowy Mountains Authority for the work it has done in Queensland. We have used its services to some extent in the Burnett and in other areas of the State and its assistance has been of great value. I suggest that there is real scope for irrigation work on a large scale throughout this State, and I know of no authority whose assistance we could better engage than the Snowy Mountains Authority. I accept that it certainly knows how to spend money. But it also knows how to provide water storage, and I saw the benefit of the electrification that resulted from its work in New South Wales.

We talk of national parks, conservation and what-have-you, and in this Chamber we have listened to long orations from the hon. member for Toowong and the hon. member for Clayfield, who are both quite knowledgeable about what has been done in Cooloola and what has been achieved by the National Parks Authority. At Lake Eucumbene, when the area was flooded some hills remained protruding from the water and formed islands. The area is under the control of the National Parks Authority and on some of the islands there are emus, kangaroos and so on, but they have barely enough to eat. I wonder how sincere some of these people are when they speak about doing this or that, and conserving this, that and the other thing. I listened to the dissertation this afternoon by the hon. member for Toowong and his plea for Cooloola. He still keeps on about it as though he is not feeling secure and fears there might be a change of pattern.

Mr. Jensen: He is worried that if Cabinet changes its decision he might have to cross over to this side.

Mr. WHARTON: I was wondering what all the worry was about. I have never heard of any proposal to mine the high dunes or the coloured sands at Cooloola. I was surprised to hear the hon. member say that there had been no suggestion of any alteration in the decision, yet he complained bitterly that somebody might take the coloured sands and the high frontal dunes. I understood from the case submitted to us that these parts were not to be touched, and that mining would be restricted to certain areas. I hope, when we have Cooloola well established, that there will be some sand for these two hon. members to play in and make sand castles in.

I should now like to discuss the receipts duty tax, which is one of the problems the Treasurer has had to face. I can appreciate his problem. He thought that he had some money; then someone said he did not have it and then somebody else said he might

have it. Apparently quite an amount of confusion exists on this matter. I do not want to add to it. After Thursday we might have some clarification on it. In the meantime, I suggest we play the same old game in the same old way and in the same old spirit.

Mr. Bennett interjected.

Mr. WHARTON: No, I do not think so. I think he will have his answers, but there are a couple of problems connected with the receipts duty tax.

Two aspects of receipt duty concern me. One is the steep increase in the tax and the other is the inconvenience caused to people who have to collect it. Those who have to pay the tax are required to be tax-gatherers. There are people in this State who are sick and tired of being tax-gatherers for the State and the Commonwealth. An employer knows that he is required to stamp his wages book, collect the tax from his employees, prepare a return and make a payment to the Taxation Commissioner. In a sense he is a tax-gatherer, but he receives no compensation for being one. Of course, big companies can employ additional staff to do that work, but many small business concerns cannot. They will be faced with extra work.

I want the Treasurer to bear this problem in mind, because there must be a simpler way of collecting revenue. People hate paying tax, and when they are forced to pay it they hate still more having to get down on their knees and do all the work without receiving any compensation. Small businesses would be overwhelmed by the work involved in the collection of taxes for the State and Commonwealth Governments.

Mr. Bennett: Do you think it should be abolished?

Mr. WHARTON: Yes, I do. There must be a simpler way of raising \$4,000,000. There are various ways of collecting tax without people realising they are paying. But they will know they are paying this one, and those who will be required to collect it will know well and truly. If we are forced to have this tax, certain exemptions should be provided for the frivolous type of transaction on which tax is payable at present. It is wrong that every transaction should be subject to receipt duty. If the Federal Government takes over the collection of this iniquitous tax, it should make the frivolous transactions exempt from it.

In certain organisations with which I am associated the employees are not required to pay this tax, but the dairy farmers have to pay it on their receipts.

A Government Member: What happens in Honolulu?

Mr. WHARTON: In Honolulu a tax rate is set, and sales tax is paid separately by everyone. A price is paid for the goods, and in addition a sales tax is imposed.

I compliment the Treasurer on his Budget; he could not introduce any other type of Budget at this time. However, I am concerned for the future. We must raise funds somehow to alleviate our position. I sincerely hope that the bad seasons will end. I look forward to that day and the resultant effect on our economy.

Some of the small activities that do not bring in a great deal of revenue could be abolished, and it might be worth while trying to raise extra funds in new ways. The Treasurer conducts the financial affairs of the State and he is required to raise money from various sources, but I believe that land tax could be eliminated, as it has been in New South Wales. It does not provide a great amount of revenue. We could also give some relief in probate and succession duties. To counter that, we could seek increased revenue from the mining people. If we are to have national parks all over the State, we might raise taxation from that source.

I realise that the Treasurer has only a cake of a certain size to cut, and that everyone must get a slice of it. In future, he might have to readjust the slices for different people so that justice is done to everyone.

The hon. member for Ipswich West said that local government required more finance. We are all aware of that. I appreciate the problem confronting local government, but I also appreciate the problems confronting the State. The Treasurer has no additional funds tucked away anywhere that he can allocate to local authorities, therefore additional funds must come from the Federal Government. I have here a letter from a Burnett local authority reading—

“Re: Local Government Finance

“You would already be familiar with the many and varied problems which confront local government. One of the major difficulties, presently hampering the development of local authorities areas, is the lack of finance. This Council has sponsored several resolutions, at local government association conferences, seeking the implementation of a more equitable system of financing local government. Copies of papers delivered at various times are attached.”

The suggestion is then made that I bring this matter to the notice of the Government, which I am now doing. As I see it, the problem could be tackled by the States calling a conference and going to the Federal Government, because the Federal Government has said, “If you present a case we will deal with it.” A motion was passed by the Local Government Association in these terms—

“That this Association ask the Premier of Queensland to take the necessary steps to arrange a Premiers’ Conference for the specific purpose of discussing the problems

of financing local government in Australia, and that each District Association in Queensland be asked to sponsor a similar resolution."

This motion, in somewhat similar terms, was also passed—

"That the State Treasurer be requested to include in the Budget each year a suitable amount of funds to be distributed to local authorities as a direct grant, the utilisation of this grant to be at the discretion of the local authority."

In a sense, those are good resolutions because they spell out local government need of finance. I feel that the Treasurer will reply that we, as a State, do not have the funds, but, I submit to him that local authorities seem to think it worth while that they should go to the Federal Government and ask for a special grant for themselves.

A Government Member: That would break down the whole concept of the Federal system.

Mr. WHARTON: That may be so. I appreciate that comment, but I should like the Treasurer to indicate what he thinks about it. He may be able to explain the wide ramifications of the Commonwealth-States financial agreement.

It would not be out of place for me to compliment the Treasurer and the Premier on the arrangements made with the Commonwealth. They do not meet the bill for everything we have in mind but, under the circumstances of our relationship with the Commonwealth, the case they presented was worth while, as were the results they achieved. While I do not agree entirely with all the procedures, I do say that if we have to comply with them the Treasurer and the Premier have done something worth while for Queensland.

I make these suggestions because I have been asked to do so, and no doubt the Treasurer's reply will be appreciated by the local authorities. While they could probably best handle this matter, as we play a part in the over-all financial arrangements with the Commonwealth perhaps it would be better for the State to handle it. Local government must share in some special grant to meet its increased costs. The way in which local authorities can raise funds is limited, being mainly based on the valuation of land. If the present seasons and rising costs continue and their economy becomes worse instead of better, they will need extra assistance. This must come from the Commonwealth Government.

We are not overjoyed in presenting this Budget, but it is the best that could possibly be presented in such difficult times. It is a test of good government and the Government has excelled itself in this field.

Mr. B. WOOD (Cook) (9.15 p.m.): In any House of Parliament, the Budget provokes an important debate. In this Assembly, the Budget is a major factor in setting the tone of the State for the ensuing year. It is the occasion when the Treasurer reviews the condition of the State; and he did this. In his speech a fortnight ago, he said that the Budget was framed against an economy that is tragically drought stricken. He also said that the Budget provides for a continuation of the general expansion of services.

However, to me, his review reads more like a list of excuses for the Government's poor showing. He placed great stress on the drought and on increased wages, claiming that they were responsible for the Government's difficulties. This morning, the Leader of the Opposition showed how inaccurate some of the Treasurer's statements were. However, I admit that a drought is responsible for many of the Government's problems—a drought of imagination and thought on the part of the Government!

The Treasurer also blamed the Commonwealth for some of his difficulties. He said that the cost inflation caused serious problems to the State. He also said that the inadequate level of financial assistance grants provided by the Commonwealth, and a lack of growth revenue available to the States, were major restricting factors. I think that in these respects he is right.

The Premier and the Treasurer return from the conferences in Canberra in some sort of dilemma. They are given a poor deal in Canberra but they cannot say so. If they did, they would appear to be poor bargainers. On the other hand, they cannot claim that they did well, because they did not. They go south full of threats and fire, and return with vague statements about doing the best they could; and the best is not very good.

At the outset, I said that the State Budget is important. But, even to Queensland, it is much less important than the Commonwealth Budget, which dominates the State Budget. The Commonwealth determines Queensland's economic policy; certainly, recent Federal Treasurers have tried to determine our economic policy, with somewhat limited success. Whether we stagger into a recession or rush into inflation is decided by the Commonwealth Government. It sets the conditions under which the State has to work.

The State Treasurer could have made some economic impact in this State by imposing severe increases or cuts in State taxation, but this impact would still be insignificant compared with the impact of the Commonwealth Budget. The State simply follows the economic trends dictated by the Commonwealth Government.

In my Address-in-Reply speech I said that Australia is a prosperous country and that this prosperity is not shared equally by its people. I believe that the same remarks apply to the States. The prosperity in Australia is created in the States, yet the Commonwealth reaps the benefit and the States are hard pressed to get any sort of share of it, hence the difficulty that the Treasurer outlines. The State Treasurers are allowed very little flexibility in what they do with their Budgets. Basically, then, the Treasurer's Budget is a housekeeping budget; its major job is to allocate the available money to best meet the demands made for it. The Treasurer admitted that when he said that he had to prune the suggestions of the departments, and that he is always chronically short of funds. It appears that the State is mainly an administrative agency for the handling of money.

If, however, the States are short of money, the shire and municipal councils throughout Queensland are in a position that is much worse. I believe that quite a few members will be making reference to the plight of shire councils during this debate, especially as I suppose most of them have received communications from shires expressing their concern. The shires have fewer avenues of income than the States. If the Commonwealth is hard on the States, I believe that the State is itself much more severe on councils. In recent years the debt of the Commonwealth has been reduced. The debt of the State has been increased four times. But the debt of councils has been increased 10 times. Their position is indeed bad.

What worries me even more is the fact that the problems of councils come back to the ordinary person. By way of rates, additional heavy and unwarranted burdens are placed on those who can least afford them. Both State and Federal Governments must do something constructive about this matter, more particularly perhaps the Federal Government as the State Government is itself hard pressed to obtain the money that it wants. Other Governments must not simply leave the problem of raising finance to councils, because all that councils can do is pass the burden on to the poor old ratepayer and taxpayer who is the one who cops it all.

In the last Federal Budget the Commonwealth Treasurer reduced income tax on low and middle-income earners. That was not a bad step, although I do not agree with the Treasurer on what constitutes a middle-income earner. He seemed to regard middle-income earners as those in the salary bracket from about \$15,000 or \$20,000 to \$32,000 a year. I would not by any means regard those amounts as middle incomes.

Following that income tax reduction, I believe that the Commonwealth Government should give some assistance to taxpayers, especially low-income earners, by way of assistance to shire councils to enable them to avoid rate increases. I do not believe that

the State Treasurer is entitled to complain about his treatment by the Commonwealth when his treatment of councils is equally mean.

To me, one of the most pleasing of the very, very few pleasing items in the Budget was the increase of \$2 a week that is to be paid to Aborigines and Islanders employed by the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs. That will be of great assistance to those people. I should hope that the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, who is now in the House, will see fit to exert whatever pressure is necessary to ensure that this increase is granted every Budget in the coming years. The increase of \$2 is not large, but, bearing in mind the wages received by Aborigines and Islanders, it is a large amount to them, and it will go a long way towards making life easier and better for them.

I have here a list of wages from one island, and I shall give hon. members a few examples of the wages that were paid before the increase of \$2. A teacher of some standing received \$37.05 a fortnight, and included in that was an allowance for his wife. A junior teacher received \$18.45, and a quite junior teacher \$16.20. A clerk—I know this man; he is very competent and would do a good job—received \$10.45. The man responsible for sanitation received \$27.50 a fortnight, and the janitor at the school received \$6.20 for his part-time job.

Mr. R. E. Moore: Where did you get these figures from?

Mr. B. WOOD: From the island.

Mr. R. E. Moore: I doubt it.

Mr. B. WOOD: It is one of the islands that the hon. member visited.

Mr. R. E. Moore: That is what I thought.

Mr. B. WOOD: Perhaps the hon. member has trouble recalling it.

Mr. R. E. Moore: Not a bit.

Mr. B. WOOD: I know that the hon. member has trouble in recalling things. I recently travelled with him on the good vessel "Melbidit". While we were on it, he told me that he had been born at sea. What he did not tell me was that he had been at sea ever since.

Mr. R. E. Moore: Thank you very much.

Mr. B. WOOD: These are the figures, and I am gratified that they are being increased. Although the amount is small, at least the percentage is fairly high.

I know that the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs has been encouraging Aborigines and Islanders to accept their responsibilities. That is admirable, but it is virtually impossible to accept responsibilities without the means to do so. On more than one occasion I have approached the

department about repairs to houses. I have been advised that it is preferable that the people do the repairs themselves. They have no means of doing them. Sometimes Aborigines are criticised for providing poor food, but they have not always the means to buy all the food they need. They are urged to take their place in society. While they live on reserves under the present conditions, receiving relatively low wages, they cannot readily move beyond the reserve. That is why the rate of pay is of particular importance.

The Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs urgently requires additional money, but I see in the Estimates this year that in the financial year 1969-70 over \$133,000 was not spent from the Aborigines' Welfare Fund and that over \$500,000 was not spent from the Commonwealth Assistance to Aborigines' Fund. In the preceding year, \$850,000 remained unspent. I am not sure what the purpose behind that is, but when a department urgently requires more money, I can think of any number of ways in which it could be spent.

In looking through the Estimates I came upon another department in which money allocated for the financial year was not spent. I refer to the Department of Works and Housing. For instance, the Commonwealth-State Housing Fund had an unspent allocation of more than \$1,600,000, and the Queensland Housing Commission Fund had an unspent allocation of \$1,100,000. I believe that, with the urgent need for housing in this State, that money should have been used. Additional housing is one of the greatest needs of this State. I speak with considerable experience, because on Monday I signed my life away to a bank for quite a number of years for a house that I am about to build.

Mr. R. E. Moore: You should not spend beyond your means.

Mr. B. WOOD: No. I hope I have not spent beyond my means, and I shall have something to say later about my parliamentary means.

While I am mentioning housing I want to put the point of view of people who live in the North. The cost of housing in Townsville and north of that city is considerably higher than in the southern part of the State. This causes considerable hardship to people like myself who have a certain amount of money, who are able to borrow a certain amount but who, because of the extra cost of building, have to still bridge the gap between the money available and that required. I believe there is good reason for the Queensland Housing Commission to make more money available for loans in the northern part of the State than they do in the southern part.

Mr. Tomkins: What about the West?

Mr. B. WOOD: And in the West, although I am not familiar with costs out there.

Mr. Murray: What is the cost per square in North Queensland compared with that in South Queensland?

Mr. B. WOOD: I should say it would approach one-third to one-half as much again. Because I am interested in this matter, I have recently been looking in the newspapers and have noticed that large companies seem to be able to build houses at a considerably cheaper price than I can build for in the North. Of course, further north, on Thursday Island, the cost of housing is quite prohibitive.

Mr. P. Wood: They just do not build houses up there.

Mr. B. WOOD: They do not because they are not prepared to spend the money. Recently in Mareeba the Department of Works and Housing refused to accept a number of tenders for houses because it thought they were too dear. They were certainly too dear on southern prices but not on northern prices.

Last year in this debate I made some reference to housing on Thursday Island, which is by far the worst in any part of this State if not in any part of Australia. Nowhere else is housing so urgently required. I think people who have travelled up that way will agree with me. I have seen some pretty poor shanty towns, some very unhappy places where some of our indigenous people live, but at least in those places they do not have to pay rent. On Thursday Island very high rents are charged for the most appalling accommodation and if money has remained unspent it is a source of regret to me that it was not spent on Thursday Island.

The Minister for Works and Housing told me in answer to a question recently that he would institute a survey within his department to check the housing needs on Thursday Island.

Mr. P. Wood: He should have asked you; you could have told him quick smart.

Mr. B. WOOD: I suppose his departmental officers wanted to know. I certainly have been to almost every home on Thursday Island while campaigning there for the election.

Mr. Murray: Your colleague from Nudgee would not be too happy about the houses on an island here.

Mr. B. WOOD: That may be so. I should like to cite a case I came across recently of a lady on Thursday Island. This Islander was married to a European who died earlier this year. While married, the couple, with their children, had the use of a house supplied by their employers. When the husband died she was naturally asked to

leave. The employers were very sympathetic and it is only now that she has been finally told that she must get out. But there is nowhere on the island where this woman can go. She has looked hard; I have looked hard; many of my friends have looked hard. A great number of people have searched for accommodation for her but there is nowhere she can go.

Mr. Davis: Where will she go?

Mr. B. WOOD: I do not know. Her problem is worse than some because she has been living in good accommodation and will probably finish up in some little shanty somewhere on the back of the island, which would be most unsuitable. This is not her problem alone. A number of married teachers on the island wish to stay there, but no accommodation is available to them. The result is that the school suffers because a number of the more mature teachers are unable to stay there.

On previous occasions I have spoken about many problems associated with Thursday Island. A number of them are caused by limited resources in the area and the low number of jobs available for the people, and consequently large-scale migration has taken place from the Torres Strait area to the South. This has raised social problems in the Torres Strait area in that families have lost husbands and fathers, who have gone away and return only occasionally. It would be preferable if those people did not have to go away to find work.

The Torres Strait islands are of considerable strategic importance to Australia. They form the border between Australia and our neighbours to the North, Indonesia and what will in due course be an independent Papua and New Guinea. It is important for both Queensland and Australia that the islands are well populated and thriving and that there is ample evidence to show that Australia desires them; therefore, both the Queensland and Commonwealth Governments have a great responsibility to see that the islands are developed.

Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt: It would be fair to say that they want to stay with Queensland and do not want to go to Papua-New Guinea.

Mr. B. WOOD: That is right. The Minister and I have sampled the opinion of Islanders very carefully. All Islanders want very much to remain part of Queensland. Recently a politician in Papua, who thought that certain islands should be handed over to Papua-New Guinea, made a certain move, but the Islanders were very much against it, and they received my whole-hearted support.

On previous occasions I have spoken about the need for airstrips on a couple of the islands where work has commenced but is held up at present because only heavy

machinery can do it. I hope that those airstrips can be completed in the near future and that it will not be long before I will be able to fly to Yorke and Badu Islands.

I wish to refer to the rejuvenation of Thursday Island as the centre of the Torres Straits. What I have in mind is basically a matter for the Commonwealth Government, but I hope that the State might look at it seriously and, if it sees fit, take it up with the Commonwealth. I believe that Thursday Island should be declared by the Commonwealth as a tax-free port. Certain advantages always accrue to any place so declared. To Thursday Island would be attracted a considerable number of people and a large amount of trade. I have in mind the provision of goods at cheap prices. Perhaps they could be free of sales tax or import duties, or both, or perhaps a fairly low level of taxation could be applied to them, so that people would journey from other parts of Australia to Thursday Island simply to buy goods cheaply. The provision of low-priced goods would bring people to the island.

Mr. R. E. Moore: They would drink all the water if they went there.

Mr. B. WOOD: I noticed that when the hon. member was there he did not drink any water but seemed to have some substitute. The influx of people to the island would generate considerable activity. A great number of people would be employed in commercial firms and in accommodation houses. At present the accommodation that is available on the island is not at all adequate to cater for any influx of visitors. Even a couple of planeloads overtax the present accommodation.

I do not see why the Government should not offer inducements to companies to establish a hotel on the island. Ample inducements are available, and there are plenty of precedents. For example, the Department of Industrial Development offers inducements to entice industries to this State. It might appear at first glance that the Commonwealth Government could lose certain tax, but it would really lose nothing. Looking at it another way, the Commonwealth might provide subsidies by way of reduced taxes for people going there. That would be preferable to the subsidies presently paid by way of social services.

The greatest benefit to be derived would be the generation of more activities. I believe that the idea is quite feasible and I hope the Government will give its encouragement. Perhaps the Government might investigate the possibility of encouraging companies to establish business there. Great benefit could flow from such a policy. A similar situation prevails at Norfolk Island and in many other places throughout the world, always with benefit to the place concerned.

While talking about the Torres Strait area, I should like to refer briefly to the festival of the Coming of the Light. Next year is the 100th anniversary of the arrival of the first missionary in the Torres Strait area. Each year the church on Thursday Island celebrates this occasion, but so far it has been unsuccessful in having a holiday declared for the festival. I should hope that for the 100th anniversary of the festival the Government will see fit to grant a holiday.

Mr. P. Wood: I do not think the Government realises the importance attached to this festival in the Torres Strait area.

Mr. B. WOOD: That may be, but the Islanders certainly place tremendous emphasis on it.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: Which church is involved?

Mr. B. WOOD: The Anglican church. A special holiday could well be declared as no show holiday of any sort is granted. I cannot see any reason why, at least next year, a holiday should not be granted.

I now want to deal with one of the most neglected constituents in my electorate, and also one of the most deserving. I refer to Mr. Bill Wood. I receive an allowance of \$400 a year to fly to various points in my electorate, yet it costs \$105 return to fly between Cairns and Thursday Island. If my electorate was 50,000 square miles in area I would receive \$500 a year. It contains 49,850 square miles, so that I miss out by 150 square miles.

Mr. P. Wood: Is the size measured in total area, or only land area?

Mr. B. WOOD: This is the other needle that hurts. Only the land area, so the Premier informs me, is taken into account.

Mine is the sole electorate in Queensland in which a member needs to cross water constantly. I know that the Mackay electorate contains some tourist islands, but Green Island is in my electorate. Regular pleasure launches ply between those islands, but I have to fly over the sea to visit the centre of a large population. I do not think that my flying over the sea to reach these places is very different from Wally Rae's flying over desert areas to reach certain parts of his electorate. The only difference is that my area, sea and all, is more heavily populated. I think it is rather unjust that the sea over which I fly is not included in the over-all area.

Mr. P. Wood: Not only is it unjust; it is plain stupid.

Mr. B. WOOD: Of course it is.

In addition, my electorate includes the major part of Cape York Peninsula, which remains the only large area of Queensland that is inaccessible by road. There are a number of Aboriginal reserves in this area and the only way to get to them is by plane.

The voting population that I visit by plane is approximately half the total population of some Country Party electorates. Therefore, it can be seen that it is a large and important number of people.

The Premier has told me that the system cannot be changed, even though certain conditions relating to Cabinet travel have been changed. I am afraid that at the moment I owe the Clerk of the Parliament \$135 which I overspent last year. I signed up for a house the other day and I am financially embarrassed, so I hope he is a patient man.

I thank the Minister for Aboriginal and Island Affairs (Hon. N. T. E. Hewitt), who on one occasion offered me a lift to Thursday Island when he took a charter flight there. This was of great assistance to me. He made another offer to me today, which I appreciate.

Mr. Hanlon: Try him out for the \$135. He might help you out there.

Mr. B. WOOD: If he cannot give me the \$135, he might give me a good tip.

The other day I was offered a seat on a plane which will be going up for the Bamaga Show later this month. The offer was made through the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs. The plane will be carrying Mrs. Bjelke-Petersen, who is to open the show. I will be in the islands at that time, but I shall certainly accept a lift back and be grateful for it. I do not want to appear ungrateful, because I am not, but I feel somewhat hurt because this charter flight, using a twin-engine plane for two days, will probably cost about \$400—the amount I am allowed for a whole year.

I now make a plea on behalf of certain employees of this Parliament for whom no provision is made in the Budget. I refer to the wives of most hon. members. This Parliament and the community at large do not realise the work that is done by our wives.

Mr. R. Jones: They are unpaid secretaries.

Mr. B. WOOD: That is right.

I shall be going away shortly on a trip through only one small section of Torres Strait, which I cannot do in less than two weeks. In that period, my wife will answer the telephone, which rings often; she will, on occasions, initiate action on my behalf, as when I am away for a fortnight things cannot wait; she will send out answers to people who are waiting urgently for them; she will represent me at certain functions; and she will record what is said by people who come to the door wishing to see me. I express my thanks to my colleague the hon. member for Cairns (Mr. R. Jones), who has often assisted my wife to handle the problems of my constituents during my absence. This next trip is only for a period of two weeks. Of course, I have been away for longer than that, and there are many occasions when I am away for between two

and three weeks, or less. At times I am away for a few days somewhere in the peninsula. On those occasions, my wife, as is the wife of every member in similar circumstances, is an unpaid employee of this Parliament. I am surprised that members have allowed this to go on for so long. Some people are critical of our alleged high salary. In most cases, however, the electors get two servants for the price of one.

Mr. Row: That applies particularly to Ministers. I am away five days each week.

Mr. B. WOOD: That is right. At the same time, I would say that some Country Party and Liberal members do not understand the volume and variety of work that can come to a member. Some members represent electorates that have comparatively few electors, are small in size, and are affluent, and I believe that they do not know the great number of problems that can come to members representing electorates of a different type. I hope they will take an interest in what goes on. Ministers perhaps see at least portion of the volume of work to be attended to, but they do not see all the work done in other channels. I hope that Budgets in future years will provide proper facilities for country members.

I now want to refer briefly to the need for two high schools for which provision does not seem to have been made in this year's Budget. Land is presently being set aside in Mossman for a high school. I think there could be a few problems with this land because it is cane land and fairly expensive. The number of students at the high-school top in Mossman is now quite sufficient to warrant a high school. There are in this State a number of high schools with fewer pupils than would attend a high school at Mossman, which is a thriving cane-growing area. It is a district that will grow not dramatically but steadily, and a high school would play an important role in its development. The burden on the head teacher of the school at Mossman is quite heavy. He has to administer the primary school and the high-school top, and he has in addition a considerable number of Aboriginal pupils who, because of their background, present special educational problems. I doubt if there is another head teacher anywhere in Queensland who has to work as hard as the head teacher at Mossman works. He has quite a variety of problems.

Mr. R. Jones: He is very competent.

Mr. B. WOOD: Yes, he is. I believe that now is the time for a high school to be established there. I am pleased that the Minister for Education is in the Chamber, as I know that he will listen carefully to what I have to say and advance the cause of this high school.

I have also raised previously the need for a high school at Stratford. This is an outer suburb, though not actually part of

the city of Cairns. An area of land has been acquired at Stratford, and some time last year an investigation was made into the future high school requirements in Cairns. I take issue with the result of that investigation. I believe that its finding was that the next high school should be built on the southern side of Cairns, perhaps at Woree. I live in this area, and I know that the major growth in Cairns outside the central-city area will be to the north, along the beaches, and in the area from Stratford north. Already there are sufficient children travelling to town from that area to warrant the establishment of a high school, and it is an area of rapid growth. I shall be writing further letters to the Minister asking his department to have another look at that problem.

While the Minister is in the Chamber, I will mention another matter. Recently I wrote to the Department of Education asking for the appointment of a janitor-groundsman to the school at Coen. It is quite a small school, and there is no other school for hundreds of miles. I recall that the reason given for the refusal was that there was no Class I or Class II school nearby from which a groundsman could be released to go to the school at Coen. In a country area, there is good reason to expect that a local citizen might have time available and be able to put in one day a week or one day a fortnight that similar small schools enjoy if they are close to a larger school.

Mr. Fletcher: How many children are at the school at Coen?

Mr. B. WOOD: Not very many. It would be between 12 and 20. I think they should have the same rights as other children attending similar small schools close to the city. If it is possible to find someone who will do the job—and I know it is—he should be asked to do it.

Mr. Davies: They should not be penalised because they live in a lonely bush town.

Mr. B. WOOD: No, that is correct.

In the Budget debate last year, I mentioned the Bloomfield track, that road of sorts that goes from Cooktown to Mossman close to the coast. I believe that the most beautiful country in Australia lies between Cooktown and Mossman. I was pleased recently to see an announcement by the Minister for Lands that four more national parks had been dedicated. In his announcement, he stated that the Department of Lands had now accepted 11 of 20 suggestions made by Dr. Webb. That is fine, but I think that the Minister would have reason to be even more proud if he announced the dedication as a national park of Dr. Webb's No. 1 priority. That is an area of about 33,000 acres south of Cooktown, between Thomas Point and Rattlesnake Point, running west to Mt. Finegan. After all, it is only the size of a reasonably large cattle station.

My colleague the hon. member for Salisbury asked a question about it earlier this year. He was told that the suggestion was not being proceeded with as there was some interest in the area for development, also that it was a valuable source of timber supply and was potentially valuable for mining. I know the area quite well and have travelled through a good deal of it, and I know the very few people who work in it. I ask the Minister to consider these points, which were raised in the first place by Dr. Webb. This national park would contain 9 miles of coastline, and there are not many miles of coastline incorporated in national parks in Queensland. The area is also the northern extremity of the tropical humid zone in Australia. It is an area of transition from the plants and animals of the warm temperate zone to those of the humid tropics. Generally, the proposed park avoids areas of potential exploitation by miners and is virtually undisturbed. Additional new land development means clearing, and this is an area which, like Cooloola, should not be disturbed.

I think that it has a great future not too many years hence when tourists begin moving through it—I do not know when that will be; the Minister for Main Roads has been quite discouraging—when the coastal link is opened. Perhaps it will be opened one day. I think this area should be gazetted as a national park for that day.

I want to show the Committee a picture that was taken of one of my friends who ran into trouble on one of the roads in my area. I also looked for a picture that I took when a vehicle I was in went through a bridge not far from the Bloomfield track. This is a sample of a bridge crossing over the Laura River.

Mr. R. E. Moore: Move that it be incorporated in "Hansard".

Mr. B. WOOD: It would be a good idea. It indicates the difficulties we have in moving around the peninsula. What I want to say about the Budget and roads is that in the peninsula a good deal of money is being spent on beef roads. The overwhelming amount of money being spent in the area is Commonwealth money and I should like to see the State increase the amount of money it spends in the area. It does not spend nearly enough. I do not agree with matching grants with the Commonwealth but this is one instance where it may not be a bad thing.

I am grateful to the Minister and his officers in Cairns for the information they give me and I hope that in next year's Budget and subsequent ones I can see that the Minister for Main Roads is spending more of Queensland's money in this area. I have here figures that show the relative spending of Commonwealth and State money, but because of the time, I will not read them out. Roads in this area are very important.

Development is restricted because the road system is restricted. Access to the area by road is a primary requirement. Roads will bring development and in time will pay for themselves.

I said before that this remains the only large arable area in Queensland unserved by roads, and I believe a special effort by the State Government is required to improve the situation. When this is done I may not complain so much about the lousy allowance I am given for air fares in the area.

I want now to lend some support to a number of my colleagues who have complained about steps under way to take container cargoes to Brisbane—especially export meat—but I am only going to mention one aspect. I looked at the Estimates under the heading "Department of Industrial Development" and I saw that last year \$300,000 was unspent in the Assistance to Industries Fund and that \$1,500,000 was unspent in the fund for industrial estates. The Government apparently could not see where to spend this money and it allowed some initiative to be lost.

Mr. Chalk: It would not occur to you that it was contracted liability for work under way?

Mr. B. WOOD: This might be so, but how much of it will again carry over to next year? The point I want to make is that I can imagine the glee with which the Minister for Industrial Development would announce new industries that would employ 50 to 200 or more men in a variety of centres, and the way in which he would describe the increase in business, trade and prosperity it would bring, as well as encouragement to other industries. That is precisely what the Government is working against by allowing, as seems likely, meat export to be concentrated on one central point. It does not make sense to me. The Government says that it wants more development, yet it does nothing to stop this serious loss. This makes a mockery of its statements about decentralisation. But it is still not too late for the Government to assert itself. The Department of Industrial Development will have to work hard indeed to make up for that loss.

To me the Budget has been depressing. It shows that the Commonwealth Government is prospering at the expense of the States and then squandering the money that it gets on undesired wars and shoddy aircraft. While this is going on the people who are responsible for their country's prosperity are suffering, firstly, because of the inequities in our economy and, secondly, because the States and the local authorities are starved by the Commonwealth and are forced to impose additional hardships on the people.

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 10.7 p.m.