

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**THURSDAY, 13 OCTOBER 1966**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## THURSDAY, 13 OCTOBER, 1966

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

### REPORT ON PARLIAMENTARY LIBRARY

Mr. SPEAKER laid on the table the report of the Parliamentary Librarian on the activities of the Parliamentary Library for the year 1965-66.

### QUESTIONS

#### OCCUPIED BEDS, ROYAL BRISBANE AND PRINCESS ALEXANDRA HOSPITALS

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

How many beds were occupied at Royal Brisbane and Princess Alexandra Hospitals, respectively, at June 30, 1965 and 1966, in (a) public, (b) intermediate and (c) private wards?

*Answer:—*

“The numbers of occupied beds were as set out hereunder:—

#### ROYAL BRISBANE HOSPITAL

	Public Wards	Inter-mediate Wards	Private Wards
At June 30, 1965	858	40	10
At June 30, 1966	853	34	12

#### PRINCESS ALEXANDRA HOSPITAL

	Public Wards	Inter-mediate Wards	Private Wards
At June 30, 1965	993	150	Nil
At June 30, 1966	959	151	Nil

There are no private wards at Princess Alexandra Hospital.”

#### THURSDAY ISLAND WATER SUPPLY

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

As the acute shortage of water at Thursday Island causes heavy restrictions to be imposed on residents and business people there, what plans are in hand for a more permanent supply?

*Answer:—*

“I am informed that the present position insofar as relates to the water supply at Thursday Island is normal for this time of the year.”

## MEANS TEST, SCHOOL HEALTH SERVICES

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

Will he consider an alteration more in keeping with the present wage structure and cost of living rather than the means test of the basic wage or \$240 per annum per member of the family, as shown on Form S.H.S. Dental 1, School Health Services?

*Answer:—*

“Consideration is being given to a review of the relativity between the basic wage and the \$240 income per annum per member of the family in view of the changes in the basic wage since these scales were established.”

## CROWN EMPLOYEES AND ALCOHOL ON ABORIGINAL RESERVES

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

(1) As Section 15 of the Aborigines Regulations makes it an offence for any person to be in possession of alcoholic liquor on an Aboriginal reserve, does this apply to employees of the Crown?

(2) Is it intended to take disciplinary action against those employees who continue to violate the section?

*Answer:—*

(1 and 2) “The areas on which staff residences are erected are not part of the Aboriginal reserve but are reserves for Departmental and official purposes. Section 15 of the Aborigines Regulations, therefore, does not apply to Crown employees who occupy these residences.”

## TINAROO FALLS DAM AND MAREEBA-DIMBULAH IRRIGATION AREA

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

In view of the need for increased water consumption during the tobacco-growing season over the next two months in the Mareeba-Dimbulah Irrigation area, (a) what is the present level of the Tinaroo Falls Dam from the top of the spillway, (b) what percentage of the capacity of the dam does the present supply represent, (c) what is the present inflow rate and (d) how does this compare with the rate of water being released for irrigation and hydro purposes?

*Answer:—*

“The information sought in respect of Tinaroo Falls Dam is as follows:— (a) The present water level is about 22 feet below spillway level; (b) the volume of water in the storage is 178,200 acre feet or some 54 per cent. of total storage volume; (c) present inflow into the storage is approximately 27 cusecs (cubic

feet per second); (d) the releases currently being made are 121 cusecs to the channel system and 222 cusecs to the river for irrigation and hydro requirements. The Irrigation Commission is maintaining a close watch on the storage situation but does not anticipate any problems with supply during the current tobacco-growing season.”

## CIVIL DEFENCE ORGANISATION

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

(1) Has his attention been directed to the apparent weaknesses in the air raid warning systems at Darwin as reported in Mr. Lockwood's long articles published in the *Telegraph*?

(2) What is the air raid warning system for the City of Brisbane and other Queensland cities which could be classed as potential targets?

(3) Have police stations, which are staffed twenty-four hours per day, facilities to sound local warnings?

(4) What arrangements have been made for railways, factories, churches, ambulance and fire brigades to repeat warnings authorized by the Police?

(5) What arrangements have been made to repeat warnings by the New South Wales civil defence organisation in Queensland border towns?

(6) Is he aware that the New South Wales civil defence organisation now has a salaried staff of thirty-six officials?

(7) When is it intended to increase the present staff of three of the Queensland air raid salaried personnel?

*Answers:—*

(1 to 5) “I would refer the Honourable Member to paragraph (6) of the reply given to him on Thursday, October 28 last, namely:—

“National policy upon civil defence is determined by the Commonwealth Government and it is a responsibility of that Government to give technical and other advice upon this matter, to advise as to the scale and form of enemy attack, and to lay down the principles of civil defence. As large sections of community services come within State legislation, it is necessary that the States enter into partnership with the Commonwealth in implementing its civil defence policy. Civil defence planning in Queensland has been undertaken upon the advice received from the Commonwealth Government and upon the basis of its appreciation of the international situation. There are still vital matters of policy and procedure upon civil defence to be determined at high Commonwealth level. One of these is the general matter of warnings upon which there have been special

investigations by Commonwealth officers embracing inquiries in America and elsewhere overseas'.

Further action in respect of warnings is a matter for general national implementation upon the advice of the Commonwealth Government."

(6 and 7) "The Answer given to the Honourable Member on August 31, 1965, when he raised this self-same matter, applies with equal force today, namely:—

"The staff of the Civil Defence Organisation in New South Wales is not a suitable criterion for the basing of comparisons with the staffs of civil defence organisations of other States.

"For one thing, the population of New South Wales is much larger than that of other Australian States.

"Moreover, the Civil Defence Organisation in that State attends to rescue and allied work associated with floods and other disasters. In Queensland, this is a service which is undertaken by the Police Department."

#### SURVEY OF UNDERGROUND WATER SUPPLIES, MARY VALLEY BASIN

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

(1) Will he arrange for one of the Irrigation Commission's drilling plants to investigate, determine and record the extent, location, quantity and quality of underground water supplies in the Mary Valley Basin, particularly in the country around Maryborough?

(2) Will he secure the assistance of the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Authority in the investigation in order to assist the Irrigation Commission?

*Answers:—*

(1) "The drilling plants at present operated by the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission are fully committed to investigations which are considered to warrant urgent attention and there is a considerable programme of further investigations which have been promised to landholders in other districts. No funds are expected to be available for work in the Maryborough area in the 1966-67 Works Programme. Consideration will be given to this work in drawing up the future programme in conjunction with existing commitments."

(2) "The assistance of the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Authority is being obtained again this year to assist the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission on certain investigation work. However, the funds allocated to the Commission will not permit the Authority being also employed on any investigations in the Mary Valley area."

#### SPILLAGE FROM MOTOR TRUCKS, CAIRNS

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

(1) Is it an offence for a person to drive a vehicle upon a road with insecurely fastened loadings or to cause anything to be deposited upon a roadway in a manner likely to cause damage or constitute a danger?

(2) If so, does bulk fertilizer or other such bulk commodities spilled on roadways come within such designation?

(3) Will he take appropriate departmental action to prevent such spillage of loadings within the area of the City of Cairns?

*Answers:—*

(1) "It is an offence for a person to drive upon a road a vehicle upon which the loading is not securely fastened, and it is also an offence to deposit upon a road certain things likely to cause damage or danger."

(2) "In each case a decision is dependent upon the result of investigations."

(3) "In the event of any information as to the commission of such offences being supplied to the Inspector of Police, Cairns, or to the Commissioner of Police, the complaint will be investigated."

#### LEADERSHIP OF OPPOSITION

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (11.10 a.m.): I desire to inform the House that I have been elected Leader of the Opposition, and that the hon. member for Townsville North, Mr. P. J. R. Tucker, has been appointed Deputy Leader.

**Hon. G. W. W. CHALK** (Lockyer—Acting Premier) (11.11 a.m.): On behalf of hon. members on this side of the House, I extend congratulations to the hon. member for Bulimba who, as he has announced, has been appointed Leader of the Opposition, and also to the hon. member for Townsville North on his appointment as Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

It goes without saying that the responsibilities of the Opposition in any Parliament relate not only to the party in Opposition but also to the general operations of the Parliament. I feel sure that the two hon. members who have been elected to these important offices within their party will endeavour to maintain the high standard for which I believe this House is noted. So far as their own ambitions and those of their party are concerned, naturally they will at all times endeavour to put forward the point of view to which they subscribe. That is their responsibility and duty, and we on the Government side will always regard the views expressed by them as those of the people whom they represent.

On behalf of each member on this side of the House, I congratulate the new Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I think it appropriate to add that we hope they remain for a long time in the offices to which they have been elected.

### SUPPLY

#### COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT— RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

(Mr. Rae, Gregory, in the chair.)

Debate resumed from 11 October (see p. 846) on Mr. Chalk's motion—

"That there be granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1966-67, a sum not exceeding \$3,700 to defray the salary of Aide-de-Camp to His Excellency the Governor."

on which Mr. Houston had moved the following amendment:—

"That the Item 'Aide-de-Camp, \$3,700' be reduced by \$2."

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT** (Chatsworth) (11.18 a.m.): Budgetary planning in the framework of modern government activity does much more than merely outline anticipated expenditures and revenues. True, it does this, and, by observing these orthodox procedures, it affords opportunity to examine the financial administration.

But the injection or withdrawal of Government funds influences, as it is intended to influence, the national economy. In Commonwealth budgeting, therefore, the state of the nation's economic health influences greatly the contents of the final document. Among the obvious objectives of monetary policy are, on the one hand, the stimulation of business activity at times of unemployment and, on the other hand, the reduction of excess demand for services and goods at times of full employment. The oft-referred-to credit squeeze was, of course, applied to achieve the latter purpose. Though this was criticised vigorously in terms of timing and in terms of severity—in retrospect, I associate myself with some of that criticism—its purport was right and proper.

The raising of social service payments, variation of taxation rates, imposition of higher sales tax rates, public works expenditure, and variation of interest rates are all devices employed for purposes other than those they ostensibly served. Additionally, by the manipulation of the special accounts provisions of the Banking Acts the Commonwealth wields great influence on currency liquidity. The Commonwealth Budget viewed in these terms has widespread ramifications. It does, in fact, set the tempo for the nation's economic development.

The State Budget, limited as it is to a narrow area, must of necessity have a lesser impact. Nevertheless, within the bounds of that State it can stimulate or depress, provide incentive or dampen enterprise. The days of

*laissez faire* are far behind us. Governments of today are too involved, too complex and too integral a part of over-all administration to be able to stand aside.

Therefore, today we find ourselves in consideration of the Budget brought down two weeks ago by the Treasurer, the Honourable Gordon Chalk. One should, at the outset, pay a compliment to him for the document he presented. It was precise and well-prepared; it was a courageous document and one in keeping with the tempo of the times. The Budget on the whole provided for a revenue of \$324,864,000, with expenditure of \$324,836,426 and a nominal surplus of \$27,574.

Against this Budget we now have a censure motion moved by the Opposition. It is interesting to remind the Committee that a censure motion has in fact been moved, because while it was indicated in the speech of the hon. member who now holds the position of Leader of the Opposition, and while it was seconded, scant reference has been subsequently made to it, and Opposition speeches on the Budget, in fact, contained little censure at all.

The hon. member for Bulimba, in moving the censure motion, delivered certain generalities and comments. He indicated that there had been certain rises and certain falls in income and expenditure. But in my view, anyway, he arrived at no conclusion by which we can consider ourselves other than very lightly censured indeed.

Of course, he was supported by the hon. member for Baroona who, in his usual competent and penetrating style, in parts of his speech gave members of the Government some food for thought. He also attempted to tackle the problem and, to his satisfaction and the satisfaction of his party, launched some degree of censure against the Government. But other hon. members opposite simply manipulated their own parish pumps. The hon. member for Barcoo developed the theme that he thinks Mrs. Jones is a good Australian. Therefore, I have the temerity to sit in judgment on members on that side of the Committee. We found again the same lack of objectivity that seems to highlight too many speeches in this Chamber.

I think it is a great shame that hon. members cannot more often remove their thinking, their activity and their outlook from the areas of their own electorates. There are great problems facing the State, and lack of objectivity and the attitude of "I'm all right Jack" pay little respect to the Committee and, indeed, to the whole of Queensland. I think it would be of greater usefulness if more objectivity were demonstrated by all members on both sides of the Chamber. I do not sit in judgment on members of the Opposition alone.

Referring to the speeches of hon. members opposite, I think it would be reasonable to assume from the speech of the hon. member for Cairns that we could rectify all the

economic ills of Queensland by providing in one fell swoop everything that the electorate of Cairns wants. His approach to the problem is not as a Queenslander trying for an over-all fair deal, but as one who thinks that the money should be devoted to Cairns and Cairns only.

The hon. member for Toowoomba East developed a useful and helpful contribution. Having heard him speak for one hour in a most constructive fashion about the problems of education I thought it was rather ironic realising that he was participating in a censure debate, to hear him describe himself as a friendly critic. There are occasions when it is useful to have a friendly critic, but, in my book at least, when an Opposition is moving a censure motion against the Government it is a case of all stops out. The hon. member's speech typifies the Opposition's approach to this censure motion.

I put the proposition to the Committee that in fact this censure motion is a sham fight only. It is presented here, not really in an attempt to censure the Government, but in an attempt to remove the spotlight from the problems that the Australian Labour Party presently faces. It is an abortive attempt to shift emphasis from its own problems which, at this point of time, are immense.

The weight of my speech this morning will rightly be developed and rightly devoted to the Budget and the censure motion that the Opposition has moved against the Government. Before developing comments on those two matters I think there are certain things that should be said, and certain things that must be said, about recent events in the ranks of the Opposition. In saying that, may I first of all support my Leader in his words of congratulation to the new senior office bearers in the Opposition. The positions they now hold are responsible ones; they are positions of dignity and worth and, in a parliamentary sense, they are vital positions. These men are now charged with great responsibility, and in parliamentary terms I am pleased indeed to support the congratulations that my Leader has offered to them.

Having said that, I want to reflect a little upon the election within the Labour Party that took place yesterday. Although the Australian Labour Party believes to its own satisfaction that it has made the right decision, I think we should talk in terms of what the people of Queensland may think about this and what—

**Mr. Newton:** Are you worried already?

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** Not even a little bit.

The newly elected Leader of the Opposition follows a man who was well respected—he commands our good wishes and our warm regard at this particular point of time—but who, nevertheless, nine years ago went on record as saying, "Like it or not, wise or unwise, the course is to endorse official

Labour decisions." During the nine years that he has led the Labour Party in this House, to my knowledge at least he did not see fit on one occasion to deviate from that line in any way at all. When we consider that statement with the statement of Mr. Egerton who, on one occasion, indicated that the role of a politician is to do what he is told, I think it is a reasonable question to ask the newly elected Leader of the Opposition whether he will now declare himself in those terms. I believe that there is a clear onus, a clear responsibility, upon him to state in clear and unambiguous terms what his attitude is to his own party machine and whether he, too, under all circumstances, wise or unwise, will endorse the directions and policies handed down by his party. This should be—indeed, must be—ventilated.

**Opposition Members interjected.**

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** I hear a useful interjection from the hon. member for Maryborough. I am happy to deviate from my speech to answer him. For the first three weeks of the Address-in-Reply debate I sat quietly on the back bench here and listened to continual reference to three-cornered contests, which, of course, are a domestic problem for the Government parties. Three-cornered contests had particular interest to me because I was a member of the Liberal Party executive, which made the decision on three-cornered contests. Therefore, there are many things in this issue that have particular impact and particular reference so far as I am concerned.

For three straight weeks I sat here. I did not cry; I did not complain; I did not whinge. I took it—and I can take it—and I say to the Opposition, particularly to the hon. member for Maryborough, who interjected, that he in turn must sit back like a man and take a little of the same medicine.

The simple fact is that the people of Queensland want a clear declaration from the new Leader of the Opposition on this matter. It is reported widely, it is speculated upon—indeed, I think there are few who argue about the proposition—that the Leader of the Opposition has come through representing a further win for the Left wing of the Labour Party. I put it in these terms: I believe that his win represents another sad chapter in the catalogue of Labour's lost opportunities. I bear the hon. gentleman no personal animosity, but I am entitled to reflect upon his election. I do so in these terms: the hon. gentleman has capacity and I believe he will do well as Leader of the Opposition. Nevertheless, he comes here, in my book at least, as the darling of the Left wing of the Labour Party, and that, for his own party and for the people of Queensland, is not good.

I wish only to make some passing mention of this matter—I will get away from it quite soon—and refer to what I consider to be the

Labour Party's lost opportunities. One contender—not necessarily the only other contender—for the position of Leader was the hon. member for Baroona. The family name of "Hanlon" is known, respected and revered throughout the length and breadth of Queensland.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** (Mr. Rac): Order! I have been informed by the "Hansard" staff that they are having great difficulty in hearing the hon. member. I ask your hon. members to please be quiet.

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** The hon. member for Baroona, bearing as he does a respected and revered name, would have been well received and well accepted by the people of Queensland. He is young, knowledgeable and experienced; he holds an economics degree; he is an expert in finance; he is an independent thinker, not hidebound by out-moded dogmas and not subjugated by influential pressure groups. In a kindly fashion, I say I believe that once again the Labour Party has lost its opportunity. But it is the Labour Party's decision, not mine.

I content myself on this theme with two final remarks. First, I believe that the hon. member for Baroona is ultimately destined to be the Messiah of his party; his star will rise and it will be he who will lead his party to good fortune. Second, I make the observation that, six weeks before a Federal election, the Labour Party finds itself led Federally by the saddest tragedian who has ever graced the Australian political scene, and in State terms its members find themselves led by a willing captive of the Trades Hall. It is no wonder that today we are faced with a censure motion whose only purpose is to try to remove emphasis from the internal problems of the Labour Party.

Having made those comments I now return to the Budget, because I view a censure motion seriously and I wish to make some observations on the Budget. There has been some little comment about deficit budgeting from those who have tried to develop the argument that, on this occasion, the Government should have budgeted for a deficit to meet its problems. I put the proposition to the Committee that there must always be an eventual day of reckoning and if we budgeted for a deficit this year, combined with the Budgets of previous years our problems would not be solved at all; they would only be delayed to another date.

It is useful to remind hon. members that the accumulated deficit for the last two years was \$7,500,000. That is the worst accumulation since the 1928-39 period, when the accumulated Budget deficits totalled \$16,608,900. It is useful to remind the Committee that this was ultimately reduced by recourse to Trust and Special Funds.

Let us think a little about this question of budgeting for deficits. "Hansard" is a useful record to refer to on occasions to see

if there is some consistent line of thinking, some consistent line of reasoning, and some consistent line of presentation upon these problems. I have had recourse to Volume 224 of "Hansard", where I found a speech by the then Leader of the Opposition, who spoke in one speech in these terms—

"The attitude of the Opposition has been that in times of prosperity there should be a balanced Budget."

And later—

"I believe it to be good, sound policy to attempt to balance the Budget in times of prosperity and that Budget deficits should only be resorted to when economic conditions are not bright."

Finally—

"It is not good financial policy to budget for a series of deficits."

On this occasion we have accepted his advice and decided not to budget for a series of deficits. And we are still not right! It seems to me that we cannot win politically.

There is a challenge here, not for the Government, but for the Opposition—to justify the censure that it wants to level against the Government. To justify its censure the Opposition must do one of several things: it must establish that the extra money is not needed or, conversely, that the extra money can be raised from other sources; or say that the proposed extra services should be curtailed or completely dispensed with.

If the Opposition wants, first of all, to explore the question of raising extra money from the Commonwealth—and of course we all know that the Commonwealth Government is the whipping-boy in these things—let us investigate and see whether the Labour Party was any more successful in getting more money from the Commonwealth Government than we have been. This is the record of this Government in the raising of revenue from Commonwealth sources: under the 1965 Financial Assistance Agreement Queensland's base annual grant was increased by \$2,000,000, and a further \$2,000,000 will be added each year for the five-year period.

Escalation factors also apply to this special increase. In cold, hard fact this recognition by the Commonwealth Government means an additional \$36,000,000 to Queensland between 1965 and 1970, and in the future negotiation of agreements the State starts off on the higher basis. It is useful to relate that argument to the proposition developed in the Treasurer's articles in "The Courier-Mail" of recent time.

But that is only one avenue through which the Commonwealth is channelling special assistance. Over the past three years the Federal Government has provided extra cash

for major project developments totalling \$34,833,300. That sum has been provided for the following works—

	\$
Beef cattle roads . . . . .	12,100,000
Fitzroy brigalow lands . . . . .	4,500,000
Coal-handling facilities at Gladstone . . . . .	400,000
Mt. Isa railway project . . . . .	15,116,000
Weipa port development . . . . .	2,717,300

In addition, we have the promise of further funds for the future. Finance for the development of further Fitzroy brigalow land is approved, as well as future funds for beef cattle roads.

In our term of office—this is a pertinent and significant fact—we have succeeded in obtaining this special assistance at 19 times the rate achieved by Labour. We have successfully impressed upon the Loan Council Queensland's need for a greater share of the governmental loan programme.

In 1956-57, Queensland's allocation was 11.58 per cent. of the Australian total. As a result of constant agitation, we have succeeded in having that figure lifted to 12.65 per cent., and, on the total Government loan programme of \$590,000,000 in 1965-66, the increase in percentage allocation represents an additional \$6,400,000 to Queensland each year for capital works.

Taking this matter a little further, our semi-governmental loan-borrowing programme has been increased from \$44,598,000 in 1962-63 to a figure in excess of \$48,000,000 in 1965-66. In addition, the State arranged special allocations for facilities for the bulk handling of sugar at Cairns and Mackay amounting to \$7,700,000, and, for sewerage works in Brisbane at Wynnum and Manly, \$1,900,000. Posing the question, "Could the Labour Party have had better access to Commonwealth funds?" I answer in the negative; I say that it could not.

Let us now look at the proposition of which the hon. member for Baroona was a little critical, namely, that the State Treasurer has not seen fit to live on the doorstep of the Federal Treasurer. I reflect adversely upon Mr. Askin and Sir Henry Bolte who, having won their "marbles" at the Premiers' Conference, were not big enough to say, "That is the 'cut-up' and that is how it has to be." Instead, they cried and whinged and, even though they are of my political colour, in my book they get no kudos at all. I am critical of them, and I also sit in judgment on the Prime Minister for having met them. Meetings to consider loan allocations should be held on the basis of all Premiers being present, so that no suggestion of subsequent hand-outs can be made.

One poses the final question, "If the Labour Party is critical of additional taxes, would it perhaps have raised probate and succession duties, which were left well alone by the State Treasurer?" It is reasonable to suggest that they may have done so, because I have read a little of Labour

Party policy on this form of taxation. I compliment the Treasurer on not touching this type of taxation, because it is one form on which I have very real reservations. I put it to the Committee that saying that the Labour Party could have raised more money from other sources is sheer humbug.

Let us now explore the proposition that services could have been reduced, or no extra programmes embarked upon. That is a useful line of argument. Would the hon. member for Toowoomba East have been willing to cancel the 300 Senior scholarships, the science scholarships, or the recruitment of 300 additional trainee teachers? Perhaps my friend from South Brisbane would be willing to veto assistance to independent schools, and perhaps the baritone from Salisbury might be happy to postpone the provision of a new primary school at Acacia Ridge. That would give the electors of Salisbury something to sing about.

Of course, the nagging interjector from Maryborough may placate his electors and tell them to forget about the new workshop building planned for that area. Let me put it to the Ipswich members that they go to their electorates and argue against the increased contribution of \$150,000 to the coal-miners' pension fund, and perhaps my good friend from Port Curtis will put back into the till the \$11,000,000 presently allocated for the Moura-Gladstone railway line. Whilst in magnanimous mood, perhaps my friend from Belmont, to whom I pay a compliment for his handling of the Opposition's attack on Bills dealing with housing, would be prepared to tell the Treasurer to keep the extra \$1,729,000 allocated for housing. If hon. members opposite say that the extra money is not needed, I should be interested to hear which projects they suggest should be cut back.

Could it be that the metropolitan members of the Labour Party would be willing to forgo the \$3,000,000 expenditure on the implementation of Stage I of the Wilbur Smith Report? I think it is reasonable to speculate upon the fact that, while the Liberal Party's policy relative to the Wilbur Smith Report was concise, clear, and well put, the Labour Party made only passing reference to it in its policy speech. Let me contrast what was said about the Wilbur Smith Report in the policy of the Liberal Party with what was said about that report in the policy speech presented by the Labour Party. The policy speech of the Liberal Party was in these terms—

"Already the Government has adopted in principle Stage One of the Wilbur Smith Traffic Plan for Brisbane and has undertaken to find from its own resources \$36,000,000 of the required expenditure of \$54,000,000. Notices of resumption of several properties in the Vulture Street-Stanley Street area have been given. Survey and foundation testing for the Gardens-Kangaroo Point Bridge has been commenced. Testing of the river-bank area of

the Domain has been carried out, and discussions are now proceeding with owners of buildings affected by the Expressway construction. It is anticipated that tenders will be called early next year for the first section of Riverside Expressway, which will function as an underpass on the river bank below the northern end of Victoria Bridge."

Turning to the policy speech of the Leader of the Opposition, one finds this terse comment—

"Attempts will be made to examine ways and means of providing funds outside the channels now available."

The Liberal Party was so positive and the Opposition was so vague that it is reasonable to say that, if the Opposition cut back on some expenditure, this may have been the item of expenditure that it selected, and that its solution of the Brisbane traffic problem would be to allow it to strangle itself to death so we could all get out and start again. The scheme would fail because Labour cannot and will not indicate how the expenditure would be controlled.

In terms of positive thinking and trying to look at Queensland with unbiased eyes, I invite hon. members to look at the supplement printed in "The Australian" recently. I think it is reasonable to say that if there is a newspaper in Australia that is objective in its approach and tries to see things in an unbiased way, it is "The Australian", and I support it. If one turns to that supplement, one finds on the front page, "One thousand million dollars of industrial impetus—that's what Queensland is getting today." It then refers to future plans, and contrasts the revenue from industrial development with that from primary production. And it is useful for us to be reminded of that fact. Later it says—

"It has not attained as yet the degree of diversification that exists in some other states, but it is significant that in 1964-65, for the first time in history, secondary and rural industries made equal contributions to the State's output—46 per cent. each. Mining accounted for about 7 per cent."

Turning to the second page, one sees—

"Railways

"With the reluctance of an 1890 steam engine the state is puffing into a \$100 million programme of spending . . ."

On later pages there is reference to "Gladstone, the town of extremes where everything is happening—and fast"; "Townsville—it is drawing wealth and expansion to it just like a magnet"; "Rockhampton—on the verge of a new era of growth"; and "Money—it's coming in from all over the world."

I should point out to hon. members, too, that somehow or other our good friend Mrs. Jones has got her photograph into this supplement.

Further on in the supplement there is an interesting table showing who is spending what in Queensland. It seems that the

Labour Party is the only one that is critical of what is being done. Here is tangible evidence of what the investing public and spending public think of Queensland, evidence of all the confidence in the world in a booming State. We have here 142 listed projects with a wide variety of public works. We find also included in the 142 some 49 private companies engaged at this point of time in capital expansion totalling \$675,580,000.

There is no censure there, but supreme confidence in the future of this State under competent administration. It is a useful exercise to browse through this supplement and to find the diversification under which capital expenditure is taking place. One could labour this at great length, but just to make a few random selections to demonstrate the diversification, we have scrap metal, chemical fertilizer, synthetic ammonia plant, stationery, gas, mineral sands, brewery, cement, bauxite, copper, prawn processing, railway locomotives, and so on.

Having said that, I now want to make some reference to the actual contents of the Budget. Little has been said up to this point of time about the variation in railway freights. Attempting to be honest and objective, I naturally regret the necessity for this upward rise and I readily concede the fact that there will be some impact on costs. But it is useful to remind ourselves that this is only the second variation since 1957, and our policy on railway development is a useful one to read and be reminded about.

Turning to the Deputy Premier's policy speech once again, we read this with respect to railway development—

"Today, the railways are a profitable undertaking. Their services have improved. Today railway men have security of employment. It is the proud boast of this Government that during its term of office, not one permanent railway employee has been dismissed, other than where a misdemeanour has occurred—and then the employee had the protection of appeal.

"Improved efficiency has enabled the department to meet every wage increase since 1960 until now without passing increased costs on to the customer. Improved efficiency on long distance haulage has enabled cheaper contract rates to be quoted for the bulk handling of many commodities. Loads of up to 2,000 tons are now being hauled compared with a maximum of 650 tons in 1957."

Additionally on this aspect, we should refer to rehabilitation, on which the policy speech says—

"Rehabilitation of the Mount Isa Line has now been completed at a cost of \$55 million—\$5 million less than the original estimate.

"Construction of a new 115 mile rail link between Gladstone and Moura coalfield at a cost of \$27.5 million is now well in hand. This line will not only handle

increased export coal, but will be available for the transportation of all goods to and from the area, and must play a vital part in the development of Central Queensland.

"Improved amenities have been provided for railway employees, and as a result of an amendment of the Public Service Superannuation Acts, railway employees are now able to enjoy the benefits of superannuation."

That is our story on railways. We are now imposing the second increase in railway freights in nine years. In nine years the Labour Party made nine variations—nine increases as against our two.

To continue—

"When we took office in 1957, Queensland's railway system was well 'in the red'. It was rapidly losing the 'battle' with road transport. Nine times in nine years the then leader of the Labour Party, who was the Minister for Transport, increased freights or fares, thereby driving business on to the trucks of road operators—in other words the policy of Labour was to price the Railways out of existence. Hundreds of railwaymen were threatened with dismissal notices at the time of the change of Government."

The comparison is there. We are now implementing our second upward variation of rail freight charges in nine years. In nine years of Labour administration there were nine upward variations. It is a useful comparison.

The primary producer, of course, is hurt to some degree by an increase in railway freights. He is hurt because his production must of necessity be sent to the ports, and there again he has to bear the cost. We acknowledge this. But, on the other hand, the primary producer, if he is activated by any sense of fairness and any reasonable sense of recognition of assistance when it does come, should have a look at what the Commonwealth Government, which, after all, is our political ally in another place, has done for him. He should look at the superphosphate bounty and the nitrogenous fertiliser bounty brought down in the last Federal Budget.

These bounties have been very useful to the primary producer. I venture to say that they have helped his production and helped him contain his costs. The purpose of the superphosphate bounty was to awaken an interest in and stimulate the use of superphosphate as a means of improving the productivity of farmlands deficient in phosphorus. The standard bounty rate of \$6 a ton was extended for a further period, until 31 October, 1969, and the estimated cost of that bounty in 1966-67 is \$28,000,000.

The new nitrogenous fertiliser bounty, which has been implemented for the first time, will be helpful to a number of primary industries, especially sugar-growing and fruit and vegetable production. It was decided to

introduce the bounty on nitrogenous fertilisers in addition to that payable on superphosphate. The rate of bounty is \$80 a ton of the determined nitrogen content of naturally occurring sodium nitrates and products manufactured from inorganic chemical nitrogen. The bounty will be payable during the period 17 August, 1966, to 31 October, 1969. Its cost in a full year is estimated to be \$5,600,000. If the primary producer wants to sit in judgment of this Government on the freight rises, let him at the same time acknowledge the assistance he is receiving from the Commonwealth Government in this way.

This Government has a fine record—an outstanding record—for assistance to local government. In terms of granting subsidies and non-repayable loans it leads all the Australian States in the acceptance of this obligation. Having heard many speeches in this place now, I am bound to say that there is little gratitude for, and scant acknowledgment of, this assistance.

I feel that in developing this point it would be useful for many people to have a better realisation of the problems of local authorities. There could be some useful investigation by local authorities in terms of looking for new fields of taxation. I believe there are fields that could, and should, be exploited by the local authorities in their own rights. I do not, however, intend to develop that point at great length. I will have some observations to make upon it at another time.

The simple fact is that local government has received great help, and again the knockers of the Treasurer's Financial Statement might try to indicate where they feel that spending on local government might be cut back. I should be surprised to hear any of the advocates of local government in this place say that these subsidies should not be paid. Let me point out this Government's record of assistance to local government. From 1 July, 1963, to 30 June, 1966, subsidies amounting to \$33,900,000 were advanced to local bodies for capital works.

Queensland easily leads all other States in its scheme of subsidies to cities, towns, and shires and other local bodies. The amount made available in Queensland each year exceeds that of all other States combined. In our eight years of office to 30 June, 1965, subsidy payments to local bodies increased by 94 per cent. over the previous eight years of Labour Government—from \$44,000,000 to \$85,200,000, an increase of \$41,200,000.

That is generous enough assistance in itself, but that is not the only field in which local government has been dramatically assisted. We have seen to it that local government raised 100 per cent. of its approved debenture allocation—the huge sum of \$324,324,000. In the last eight years of Labour's office the shortfall in raising was \$25,387,000 in a programme of \$210,000,000. Together with applicable subsidy, this shortfall meant a

tremendous loss of developmental expenditure in this State. We have not wasted our opportunities in this regard.

It is somewhat ironical that local authorities have received this degree of assistance and that possibly the image of the present Lord Mayor of Brisbane is so high because of the assistance he has received from a Government of our political colour.

I wish now to make some reference to motor vehicle registration. I am not unmindful of the burden that motorists bear these days. Their costs continue to rise and, together with many other categories of taxpayers and ratepayers, they will soon reach saturation point. However, I hope that the motorists in this State, particularly those in this city, are realistic people, and the firm undertaking that the Wilbur Smith plan will be implemented—in fact, Stage 1 is now under way—is, I think, some balm to them. In the course of time they will see that their money has been spent in a useful and attractive fashion.

I have tried to deal with the basis on which the Government could be censured for its financial administration, but I can find no grounds whatever. The Government has been courageous; it has marshalled its funds properly and has met the cost of rapid expansion that is our right and our heritage.

It is a simple proposition that a cut-back in revenue expenditure must certainly cut the work force as well. I imagine that the hon. member for Baroona particularly would accept the economic proposition that expenditure generates income, and if we cut back public works spending the effect is greater than the mere fact that public expenditure is reduced by \$X million. Men are put out of work and, in turn, their spending power is reduced, so we have an ever-widening circle.

When revenue is cut back the work-force is cut back. The great challenge can be met only if money is available, and money must be found in the fields of taxation available to the Government. Because of the taxation structure that has prevailed since 1942 the fields in which we can move are restricted. As a person who calls himself a Federalist, I say this with some regret. I say as I have said on past occasions, that I hope the Federal system may one day be looked at critically and constructively so that the State Government may have greater responsibility in the raising of money and be a sovereign Government in its own right instead of the sham, shadowy substance that we presently have.

To summarise the position, I support the proposition put to the Committee by the Treasurer when he said that this is a "push-ahead" Budget. It is a Budget that meets the needs of the time; a Budget that provides for expansion in this great State; a Budget,

in effect, that will allow us to chug along with Chalk and get on with the job of developing this great State.

The censure motion must fall flat because, as I have already shown, it was put forward only as a sham. There is no substance in it, and there are no grounds at all on which the Government can be censured for its present financial administration.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH** (Tablelands) (12.5 p.m.): I rise to support the motion of censure moved by the Leader of the Opposition, knowing full well that I am speaking for a great number of people in a large area. Firstly, I think it is right and proper that through me those people should congratulate our new Leader, Mr. Jack Houston, and our new Deputy Leader, Mr. Perc. Tucker. They were elected in our democratic way, and the rules governing their election would be known to everyone. Members on the extreme Left of the Liberal Party often make accusations as though they had been in the Caucus room and knew exactly what happened. They could spend their time more profitably putting their own house in order. The majority of the members of the A.L.P. in this Parliament saw fit to appoint those two gentlemen. That is the reason they are there, and that is why they will get full support from every member of the A.L.P.

I shall be brief in my remarks about our previous Leader, because a good deal has been said already. I was a railwayman when he was Minister for Transport and I suppose for that reason I came into contact with him more than the average person in the community. We had many common interests, such as transport and railway ambulance. I have a fond recollection of the interest he showed in the activities of the employees of his department. It was with a certain degree of pride that I joined his party in Parliament, and I regret that he has seen fit to relinquish his leadership. Let it be known once and for all that his successor was chosen in the correct democratic spirit. That applies also to the Deputy Leader and members of the executive, whom I congratulate. Particularly do I congratulate Mr. Fred Bromley on his appointment to the executive of the A.L.P. in this Parliament.

I do not intend to waste 15 minutes of my time speaking about other members' speeches. I have enough to speak about without doing that. However, I shall make one or two comments on some of the remarks already expressed. Firstly, the hon. member for Gregory seems to have become Americanised. He wants toll roads. Not very long ago he sat opposite me and mentioned the roads he wanted to see in Queensland saying that he wanted them built by the Government. Now the hon. member wants a panel from this Parliament to approach Mr. Ed. Clark, the Texan who is American Ambassador to Australia, and see if we can get some of the \$250,000,000 he spoke of to build toll roads. While they would be wonderful, by

the time we got them we would have acquired an American accent. In addition, we would be channelling more money from this country to overseas investors.

Although perhaps they overdid it, I think our pioneers showed the way, and I think that we could well emulate them to some degree. They saved and paid for what they wanted. That may be one extreme, and I think we are going to the other extreme if we borrow anywhere and everywhere, from all who are willing to lend to us, without seeming to care about when it will be repaid.

**Mr. Bromley:** This Government would sell our birthright if it could.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** That is quite correct. We will protect our birthright, just as we will protect many other things foreign to the Government parties. If we could, we would also protect our railways.

The hon. member for Chatsworth chided the Opposition for not disclosing specific alternative sources of revenue when censuring the Government for imposing additional taxation. The hon. member should be reminded that only a few months ago, when Government members sought the confidence of the electors, they did not disclose any of the savage increases that have now come to light to finance their programme.

The hon. member also said there was an upsurge in the railway system today. There is certainly an upsurge in freight rates, but not in the number of employees or the miles of railway compared with the situation when the Government took office. There is an upsurge in deficits. The hon. member did not refer to that. Even to the extent of adding at least somewhat to the deficit legacy built up by the Government, the Opposition as a Government would not have aggravated the difficulties caused by spiralling costs, especially for primary producers, by increasing freight charges and associated imposts, nor can it be considered original thinking by the Government to place another tax on motorists as a new form of revenue.

In view of the statements made by the hon. member for Chatsworth, is it any wonder that our Leader moved a vote of censure against the Government? Is it any wonder that hon. members on this side of the Chamber will rise and demonstrate their support of the amendment by showing that instead of giving us what we want for our electorates, the Government is giving us extra taxes, which we do not want? That is the feeling of the public, right from the man in the street to the top businessman.

I speak in this way because I know full well that before very long there has to be an end to these things. We cannot continue as we are. We have had the spectacle, as was mentioned by the hon. member for Baroona, of two States approaching the Commonwealth for an additional hand-out. That attitude will snowball. Who is to say that next year it will not be Queensland's turn to

make such an approach, or Western Australia's, South Australia's, or Tasmania's? Each State will be wanting an extra hand-out from the basket of the Commonwealth Government, which, following the present method, will merely increase taxation so that it can be provided. That is why I sound a warning that this has to stop somewhere. It is no use saying that we are not doing this and not doing that, when all the time we are moving faster and faster towards the position beyond which we will not be able to go.

On looking through the Financial Statement, I have not been able to discover more than one mention—I must be fair and say that I know money will be spent there—of the whole Tablelands electorate. It is second in size, Mr. Rae, only to your electorate of Gregory. It is in the North, and although you have pointed out that the people in your electorate are being hit hard, I suggest that the people in my electorate are being hit equally hard by being forgotten altogether.

The Country Party candidate for Tablelands in the recent election went round saying, "Elect me and I will get you this and that." That is a type of blackmail, because he was implying that the people would not get these things if he was not elected. I shall do my best to see that that does not happen and that the people get frequent reports from me on the additional difficulties that the people of Queensland are suffering as a result of the Government's actions.

As I said earlier, there is only one reference in the Financial Statement to the Tablelands electorate—a reference to the Mareeba-Dimbulah scheme. If the A.L.P. had not started that scheme, which is the life-blood of the tobacco industry, I wonder whether there would have been a scheme there. This is only a "slow boat to China" means of completing it. Under a Labour Government it would have been completed in January 1964, yet \$550,000 is allocated for it in 1966.

Of course, that is only part of the amount allocated for water conservation in Queensland. When the hon. member for Logan was speaking earlier in the debate, I asked him by way of interjection whether he thought that water was more important than roads and he said, "Yes". The total allocation for water conservation in the State in this financial year is \$6,500,000; the total allocation for road construction—this does not include roads that are built by the shires; it covers only beef roads and main roads—is \$34,000,000. Roads wear out. In fact, the hon. member for Logan mentioned the wear and tear on roads in the Redland Shire that are being used by heavy vehicles. Water cannot wear out. It is the one weapon with which we can defeat nature's drought. No-one ever wins a war in the true sense of the word, because there is suffering on both sides irrespective of the outcome, and the people of this country

have experienced recessions or depressions, call them what you will. But with water as our weapon we can win the battle with nature, and everyone will be very pleased if we do.

In the coming 12 months I will continue to stress the need for more and more money to be allocated for water conservation and irrigation. The first speech that I made on water conservation was at a Labour-in-Politics convention. The temperature was 93 degrees. Jugs of water with ice in it were supplied, and everyone wanted water. Earlier in this debate we heard the hon. member for Burnett speak for only five minutes before asking for a glass of water. In spite of its importance, only \$6,500,000 has been allocated for water conservation and irrigation.

The hon. member for Toowoomba East made an excellent speech on education and showed how Queensland is lagging in this field. In the Financial Statement, 18 special items connected with education are mentioned; the total of all the other items is only 20. It is obvious, therefore, that the Treasurer has realised the importance of education, and I want him to realise the importance of water. In the Financial Statement there is only one small paragraph concerning water. I am not getting on the band wagon because everyone else is; I am hoping to get recruits from either side of the Chamber. The Treasurer is the recruit I want, and I want it shown in his Financial Statement.

That is the story of the Mareeba-Dimbulah irrigation scheme, and I should like to link it up with the present workshops that are slowly closing down or, shall I say, reducing their staff. There have been some vicious reductions in staff. I could not call them anything else because, just prior to the election, these men thought they were safe for another 12 months. However, suddenly they received dismissal notices. A number of people are still employed in the workshops.

**Mr. R. Jones:** Which workshops are they?

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** The Irrigation Department workshops at Mareeba.

The Government saw fit to give these men a bit of extra work on the water towers and cable-ways that are to be established on many streams in North Queensland. I should say that these people have the means, the teamwork and the knowledge to do this work very well in Mareeba and I hope the Government will see fit to allow them to do the complete job. At the present time they manufacture the towers and assemble them, but many other parts of this system are still made in Brisbane. If some of this extra work could be channelled to North Queensland in this early stage, it could be done in these workshops. This would enable them to continue operating for many years.

Incidentally, there are several apprentices employed in the workshops. They are young people whom we want to keep in the North.

As a matter of fact, the aim should be to keep these young people wherever their homes are, whether it be in the North or in the South. Opportunities for them are not as great in this area as they are in Brisbane or in provincial towns, and I should like the Government to extend to this workshop the present railway system of apprenticeship with the possibility of allowing these young people to buy their own tools from the department and to pay them off by small instalments from their weekly earnings. By doing this they learn the responsibility of looking after their own tools and they would not be under any obligation to the tradesmen who now have to lend them tools. At the same time, they would know they were getting the correct article at the right price. This is very important and I think it should be impressed not only on Government sources but in other places as well. If the Government gave a lead, the practice would probably extend into private industry as well.

The need for good equipment is just as essential as the need for good tradesmen. A tradesman must know how to look after his tools and be able to use the correct tool for the job. These are important matters, even though they have very little to do with the point I set out to make about the Irrigation Department workshops. I give credit to the men who thought up this idea. It works well in the Railway Department, and it could work for the benefit of all apprentices in Queensland.

There is a big demand for water from the Tinaroo Falls Dam. I was very interested in the reply to my question this morning by the Minister for Local Government and Conservation, who said that the present water level in the dam is about 22 feet below the spillway level. I do not know when that measurement was taken but it is a little short of the figure I have been supplied with. However, I will accept the Minister's figure, as I will accept his figure that the present volume of water in storage represents 54 per cent. of the total capacity of the dam.

In the next part of the Minister's answer we come to a very dangerous statement. Every second for 24 hours of the day 27 cubic feet of water flows into the Tinaroo Falls Dam, but at the same time 343 cubic feet flows out of it. With about 12 times more water flowing out than is flowing in, how long can the dam provide water for irrigation and electricity generation? I think we have reached the danger point. At the end of his answer the Minister said that the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission is maintaining a close watch on the storage situation but that it does not anticipate any problems with supply during the current tobacco-growing season. It is too late to anticipate when the water storage is getting down to 50 per cent. level.

**Mr. Dewar:** Wouldn't you agree that the officers of the Irrigation Department would be better qualified than you to determine matters of this kind?

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** Mistakes have been made so often by men much more qualified and in much higher positions. In other parts of the world national disasters have occurred as a result of wrong information. It is not good enough to be sitting smugly in an office and making flimsy excuses. Such a statement by the Minister should not be necessary, because time and time again we requested and pleaded that the Government go on with the Flaggy Creek scheme.

**Mr. R. Jones:** Which is a supplementary scheme to this scheme.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** Yes. It was part of the over-all Tinaroo-Dimbulah irrigation scheme of the Australian Labour Party. I have asked for this continuously. The hon. member for Cook has mentioned it once or twice, and the dam would be in his electorate. At present we are making one water supply do two jobs and, as a result, the water level is dropping; the output is 12 times greater than the inflow. We are told only that the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission is maintaining a close watch.

**Mr. R. Jones:** The Barron Falls scheme should not have been proceeded with until the Flaggy Creek dam was constructed.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** That would have been very wise; it would have been the Labour Party's policy. It would have kept more people in the electorates of Cook and Tablelands. We have to provide for a very high cost of living, and we must provide for it today. We cannot go to the shopkeepers and say, "In 10 years' time there will be atomic power, so don't worry about anything." A businessman could not run his business in that way, and we cannot run the State's business in that way. We cannot allow these things to happen in a rural community which is so dependent on water that, if there is any curtailment—and this is the important part—our regulation of spraying, there will be a curtailment in tobacco sales, a lower price for the leaf and more trouble in the tobacco industry.

**Mr. R. Jones:** We cannot afford it.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** No, we cannot.

The Minister for Primary Industries has said—and I agree with him—that we have overcome many problems in the tobacco industry. But, for the love of heaven, do not let us make another problem, as we will, if we regulate the supply of water to farmers. When I speak about water, I always mean adequate water. I asked the Minister for Local Government and Conservation how many local authorities had issued water restrictions and how many restrictions had been issued. His answer was typical; he said that was a matter for local government.

In the summer-time we read in the Press in respect of all coastal towns, whether it be Currumbin or Ballina, reports about a

lack of water and water restrictions. If this position continues throughout Queensland it will demonstrate the Government's thinking. The hon. member for Logan referred to the need for a dam on the Logan River. The scheme of which I speak has been pushed aside for years, and has taken second place to other schemes with more popular appeal. I do not believe in giving preference to schemes with popular appeal. We must be realistic. It seems that people living in the cities do not realise how important water is until the need for it is knocking at their door.

The need for water should be viewed very seriously from a health point of view. The Minister for Health, together with other departmental heads, should stress the need for water for human consumption. Water-borne diseases are frequent and when they occur emergency measures are instituted, but they would not be needed if we had regular inspection and testing of the water used by people in the various areas.

Another direction in which the people have been asked to supplement Government assistance is the Queensland Ambulance Transport Brigade. The voluntary work carried out by members of this brigade in training others in first-aid services generally is highlighted by the fact that in every sporting community, small or large, there is always somebody proficient in rendering first aid. In addition, the members of the Q.A.T.B. throughout Queensland must be qualified in collecting money. There are more than 100 centres in Queensland. It is all very well to look at their balance sheets and say that they are in a healthy position. A good deal of their money is usually earmarked for some specific purpose, for instance, a new building, an extra bearer, or an extra vehicle. The cost of rendering this service is spiralling, as is the cost of everything else, and the time is overdue when the Government should revise its thinking relative to the financing of this service.

I understand that a Bill is to be introduced shortly which may level off some of the requirements and needs of the brigade. The main aim of the Bill should be to see that sufficient finance and ample recognition are given by the Government to the Q.A.T.B. The Government has seen fit to reduce from one-seventh to one-eighth the amount payable by it to fire brigades. It is a different story with the Q.A.T.B. The Government pays a flat rate of 10s. in the £1 to it, and 15s. in the £1 to the aerial ambulance. That is not sufficient, because costs are rising and more demands are being made on the public to give, and give until it hurts.

The next voluntary body to which I refer is in the railway service. In the next few days there will be held what is regarded as the "Melbourne Cup" of railway ambulances in Australia. On the 20th of this month, at Port Augusta, a teams competition, with representatives from every State and from

the Commonwealth railways, will be held. There have already been elimination competitions in each State. The time involved is given voluntarily by these men. Queensland railwaymen hold pride of place in the Commonwealth, both as individuals and in team work. This could be called the training ground of many of the best Q.A.T.B. officers that this State has had. Although I cannot speak for other States because some have different systems, in Queensland the Railway Department has supplied many of the very good officers to be found in Q.A.T.B. centres throughout the State.

It is interesting to note that the number of men in the railway ambulance service is increasing. In 1962, 403 men voluntarily undertook the prescribed examination. They devoted their own time to the necessary study and practical work, and presented themselves for examination. Although in 1965 the number had increased to only 427, it must be remembered that the total number of employees is decreasing. Railwaymen have not now the security they once had, so that it is all the more to their credit that they find time to do this humane work.

The team that will represent Queensland in the 1966 competition is from Mayne. It is captained by Mr. Passmore, the other members being Messrs. Ball, St. Ledger, Rankin, Hanley, and Casey. The competitor in the individual event is Mr. Ellison, from Rockhampton. Since the beginning of the competition, Queensland has obtained 11 firsts in the teams event and five firsts in the individual contests, which began in 1951.

**Mr. Davies:** You represented Queensland, didn't you?

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** That is quite correct. I am one of the winners of the individual event; that was in 1952. I hope that an appeal to the Commissioner for increased assistance in this very humane work will not fall on deaf ears. I do not say that these men are looking for added assistance, although they are spending much of their time on this work in a period when so many people have hobbies and time is valuable. The fact that the number of men doing this work is increasing is a tribute to Mr. Hopkins and the staff of the railway ambulance office. I might mention that, apart from Mr. Hopkins, I have known only two ambulance officers, namely, Mr. Austin Price and Mr. Dick Smythe. They were wonderful men who thought of nothing but the improvement of the ambulance service in the Queensland Railways.

It would be wrong to say that results have been better in one part of the State than in another, because, as in so many other fields, opportunities bring out the best in people. Ambulance teams returning home played an important and valuable role at the Tamaree railway disaster. They were on tap, as it were, and carried out their

work very efficiently between Tamaree and Gympie. That completes my reference to the ambulance service in Queensland, highlighting the voluntary work of honorary bearers of the Queensland Ambulance Transport Brigade and the ambulance service of the Railway Department. Other organisations, such as the St. John Ambulance Association and Brigade, which is quite a virile body, also do this important work.

I now wish to mention briefly the wonderful work done in the Outback by the Royal Flying Doctor Service of Australia and the Cairns Aerial Ambulance Service. I know quite a lot about the work of the aerial ambulance in my electorate. It is a service of great importance, and people get in touch with it almost in the same way as people living in Brisbane get in touch with the ambulance service here. A signal goes out to Cairns on Station VKA, which is manned 24 hours a day, and is answered immediately. At first light, sometimes earlier, an aircraft departs for a destination perhaps 100, 200 or 300 miles away and travels over country across which it would take days to travel by any other means. It might even take a week to carry an injured person over it. This will give hon. members an idea how important the aerial ambulance service is.

Although I accepted the challenge of the hon. member for Townsville South and produced a photostat copy of my contribution to the Cairns Aerial Ambulance Service, he still thought it could have been a fraud. Therefore, I asked the Q.A.T.B. at Cairns to clear the matter up once and for all. I have a letter here which says—

“With reference to your enquiry regarding your generous donation to the funds of our Aerial Ambulance Service. We advise that your cheque for \$300.80 (our receipt number 7360) was dated 29th March, 1966, and was banked by us the following day.”

It is signed by G. W. Davison, Chairman, and T. W. C. Briggs, Secretary/Superintendent. There is a postscript which says—

“P.S. When you discussed this with us some time previous you indicated to us that you did not wish to contravene your Party's rule in any way, but as you represented a lot of the territory which we serve by Aerial Ambulance you would be helping us to help the people in your electorate.”

It is signed by T. W. C. Briggs.

That was a very low and unwarranted attack by the hon. member for Townsville South. I did what I thought was my duty, and my donation was appreciated by the Cairns Aerial Ambulance Service.

Getting back to the Financial Statement and considering the increases in rail freights and transport fees, I agree wholeheartedly with the statement in “Queensland Country Life” of 6 October, 1966, that the Budget

penalises primary industries. The increases in State transport permit fees range between 20 per cent. and 87½ per cent. One could not say that that publication was connected in any way with the Australian Labour Party. It is associated principally with the party represented by the hon. member for Chatsworth, who said that members of the A.L.P. were not concerned with the Budget, but were concerned only with their own electorate. Honourable members on this side of the Chamber are concerned with the whole of the State.

I was amazed to hear the hon. member for Gregory mention Section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution, but I have since found out why he mentioned it. Another article in "Queensland Country Life" says clearly that in time the people of the Outback will be trading with Sydney. The Minister for Industrial Development has left the Chamber. I wonder how it will affect his way of thinking when he finds that interstate transports are going to travel from western towns to Sydney and, under Section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution, avoid permit fees and transport taxes and at the same time bypass the very areas that are so dependent on trade and commerce.

In another section of "Queensland Country Life" of 6 October 1966 there is a report of remarks made by Mr. H. V. Tozer, State president of the Australian Primary Producers Union. It is headed "Budget Rises 'Savage'" and reads—

"Savage increases . . . and intolerable burden . . . taxing primary industry out of existence . . . these were some of the comments by the State President of the Australian Primary Producers Union, Mr. H. V. Tozer, on Mr. Chalk's 'push-ahead' Budget."

Those are the remarks of a gentleman who represents the primary-producing community and who could not be said to be closely affiliated with the Australian Labour Party.

**Mr. Davies:** He would not be too pleased with the hon. member for Chatsworth.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** No, he would not.

These taxes are often used to bolster up what we have been led to believe will be a state of continued employment in this State. We should ask, "Is the price too high? Is it too great a burden on the people?" We should also ask, "Is there another means?" The hon. member for Barooka says there is, and asks why we don't face up to it. Surely we should be prepared to go to the head of our family, the Commonwealth Government, and say, "Our house is not in order; we want extra help," rather than place an extra burden on the people of this State and, in particular, on those living in remote areas who are dependent on transport to get their goods to and from market and who suddenly find themselves hit hardest of all.

It takes only a stroke of the pen to place a heavy burden on many people, but it takes a fair amount of statesmanship to find other

ways and means of running the State efficiently. I am sure there are other ways and means of raising this revenue; there must be many other ways, and I am sure there are ways other than those the Treasurer adopted by which he could have satisfactorily drawn up his Budget.

Drought has been mentioned by the hon. member for Cairns, who took the trouble to count the number of times the Treasurer used the word in his Budget. To me, its frequent mention demonstrates that it is being used as an excuse. That is a tactic adopted by the Minister for Industrial Development, who uses any excuse at all for doing something that is not necessary. That is not good statesmanship in the running of a State. Everyone here knows in his own heart that if he wants an excuse for doing something, or for not doing it, he can always find one. Even the electors, if they want an excuse for not voting in a certain way, can always find one, but I cannot see any justification or excuse for hurting the whole of the people of Queensland as is done in the Budget. It is no wonder to me that the people of this State are supporting the motion of censure before the Committee.

Now let us have a look at hospital charges. who will be hurt by this increase? People in every walk of life, including sick people and their families. The increases proposed are from \$6.20 a day to \$8.00 a day for beds in intermediate wards, and from \$7.00 to \$10.00 a day for beds in private wards. What will happen if a person who has to be suddenly admitted to hospital finds that there are no public beds available? That position could confront any one, and that man or woman would suddenly find that he or she was deprived of the benefit of the free hospital scheme. The alternatives would be that such a person would have to be looked after at home, displace another patient in a public bed, or enter an intermediate or private ward.

This is very wrong. It is wrong for the Government to be hiding behind a free hospitalisation scheme when, at the same time, it is putting this added obstacle in the way of the people of Queensland. I know of many instances of people who, after travelling thousands of miles from the North to obtain specialist treatment in Brisbane, on their arrival here have been unable to obtain a bed in a public ward. They have been faced with the prospect of having to pay for an intermediate or a private bed, the cost of which was far too great for them. People in remote parts of the State should be able to obtain specialist services at no greater trouble or cost than that at which they are available to people in the capital city.

The hon. member for Gregory spoke about the shocking conditions out west. He wondered how people managed to live out there. Let us be realistic about this. It is bad enough when these people are in good health; think of what it is like for them when they are ill and require medical treatment

or hospitalisation. Can we not do something to ensure that these people get the same consideration and benefits as people who live in the suburbs of Brisbane or within 60 or 70 miles of the metropolitan area, for whom adequate specialist attention is readily available? People should not be treated any differently simply because they live in remote areas.

The increase in hospital charges is not in the best interests of anyone. Hospital charges should not be the means of deriving extra revenue. Increased charges are causing a feeling of insecurity and frustration to a large number of people in the State. We never know the day that we will need medical services; we never know the day when we will be called upon to provide substantial sums of money to take care of illness. By this action the Government is doing something detrimental to the people of Queensland, but it is hiding behind the suggestion that it has not interfered with the free hospitalisation scheme. It has interfered with that scheme in a subtle way—a way that probably the Government can talk itself out of. I am certain that before very long it will become apparent to the people of Queensland that free hospitalisation has been whittled away to such an extent that it exists in name only.

The reason for the increased hospital charges is obvious in the next few lines of the Financial Statement—

“This increase is estimated to produce an extra \$500,000 in 1966-67 and \$750,000 in a full year.”

The Government is running a business with sickness; it can even estimate the number of people that will use these beds. To fill the Government's cash register there will be more and more intermediate and private beds. Here I make a comparison with the airlines, who vary the number of first-class and second-class seats on a flight depending on the number of passengers desiring to travel first or second class.

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

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** I have been referring to free hospitalisation in Queensland and drawing a comparison between the various types of hospital beds, namely, private, intermediate, and public, and what sometimes happens in aircraft when first-class and second-class passengers have to be accommodated. It is not unusual to see that the barrier in an aircraft separating first-class and second-class passengers has been moved at will. It is to be sincerely hoped that this does not become the practice with our free hospitals scheme. I hope the Government will never reduce the number of public beds in hospitals throughout the State, thereby imposing a greater burden on Queensland people in the cost of medical services.

I now draw attention to two hospitals in my electorate. The first one is the very old hospital at Herberton and the second

is the small hospital at Mt. Garnet, which also is very old. At Herberton there is a doctor and staff at the hospital, but it is no longer a training hospital. In the last 12 months nurses have been deprived of the right to train at Herberton.

**Mr. Bromley:** That would be in line with the Government's policy of generally depreciating the Government's hospital services.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** That is quite right, but it does not mean that it is the correct policy.

A far better service is given by people who intend to make nursing their career than by those who undertake nursing purely as a means of employment. Nursing aides may give excellent service, but they may not have the dedication to their profession that is evidenced by girls who make nursing their career. I have asked the Minister if he will restore the hospital to its old position instead of continuing to down-grade it, with the effect of denying training at the hospital to girls in the district who wish to become nurses. They could be trained at Herberton instead of being forced to leave the district for training. At the same time, this would ensure that patients received first-class attention from dedicated nurses. I make the plea that the hospital at Mt. Garnet be built up so that it can accommodate in-patients. Mt. Garnet is the only area in my electorate that could be classed as an industrial area. The matron has left the hospital, but so far her position has not been filled.

**Mr. Hanlon:** That is imposing a heavy burden on the ambulance centre.

**Mr. WALLIS-SMITH:** That is so. The hon. member for Baroona represents that area on the Q.A.T.B. Every time hospital attention is required the ambulance has to undertake a trip of 110 miles, which makes it absolutely impossible for this centre to balance its budget.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. COBURN** (Burdekin) (2.20 p.m.): I intend to preface my Budget debate speech this afternoon with a brief outline of my impressions of parliamentary procedures after 16 years' experience of them. In no other organisation with which I have been associated—and there have been many in my life—have I seen the same set of circumstances operate as in Parliament. In most of those organisations we enter into a debate to convince members of the committee so that we will get a vote in the way we desire it. That does not take place in this or in any other Parliament which is supposed to be conducted under a democratic system. Almost every question brought before Parliament is decided before it is introduced, so all of our talk is more or less to no avail and is a sham.

The way the whole procedure operates is that a departmental head decides that a certain Bill should be brought before

Parliament. The various committees have a look at it and then it is discussed by Cabinet. I have been reliably informed that when Cabinet arrives at a decision all Cabinet members are required to vote unanimously on that particular question when the matter goes before Caucus. That applies to all political parties. So that in our present Cabinet we could have a vote of seven to six, yet the 13 members of Cabinet must vote unanimously in Caucus, which means that there will be 13 votes in favour when there should be only seven.

**Mr. Richter:** It does not happen like that.

**Mr. COBURN:** I have been reliably informed that it does, and I do not think it is far from the truth. In a Parliament of 78 members a Government could be formed with 40 members. Therefore, in Caucus a majority would be 21. Of those 21, six could be Cabinet members who were originally opposed to a particular question but who are forced by the rules which operate to vote against their own judgment and conscience. Therefore, of the 21 only 15 could be voting as they really think they should. On the vote of those 15 all legislation could be carried in this Parliament because of the pernicious system which exists that members of the Caucus are bound to support the Government in this way on all questions in this Chamber.

We trot out democracy around election-time, but as soon as the election is over we start our parliamentary business again and democracy hibernates until the next election. Then we bring democracy out again as something which is so desirable. The system that prevails, where 15 out of 78 members could be responsible for the passage of all legislation is as far from democracy as the North Pole is from the South Pole. I cannot for the life of me understand why that system must prevail.

I am not opposed to parties; all my life I have worked in close concert with members of parties. What I object to is the pernicious system under which one is made to vote against one's own judgment and conscience. The argument is put forward that there could not be a Government if its members did not have to conform to legislation brought before the House, so that the Government, if defeated on a Bill, regards that defeat as a vote of no confidence. To my mind, instead of regarding it as a vote of no confidence in the Government, it should be regarded only as a vote of no confidence in the proposed legislation. If the majority of members of this Parliament (who are, after all, the elected representatives of the people) think that legislation should not become operative, that, in the name of democracy, is the opinion that should prevail.

Of course, there must be certain exceptions. If a Supply Bill was before the House, I should say, because Supply is absolutely imperative to enable the Government to carry on, that members, because they owe allegiance

to their party, must support the Bill; they must not do anything that would be responsible for bringing down the Government of which they are members. However, whilst they owe loyalty to their party, they also owe loyalty to the people of Queensland, and I say that loyalty to the people of Queensland should transcend loyalty to a party. The cry should be, "People before party", but that does not apply.

Although we make great claims for democracy, today it does not exist in the true sense of the word. About the only country in the world where the will of the people is enforced is Switzerland. If legislation in that country is passed by the Government and does not meet with the approval of the people, the people have the right to petition, provided 50,000 are prepared to do so, to hold a referendum on that particular question, and the decision of the people at that referendum is what prevails. That is democracy, and we have not got it in this country.

On my left is a group of members who, whilst relatively new to Parliament, have found how impotent are back-bench members, even members of the Government party, in matters in this Chamber. Hon. members on my left are interested because they are obliged to follow the decisions of Caucus and hon. members on my right are interested because they have to obey the dictates of their party. There are therefore only a few members who are not accused of disloyalty when they vote in accordance with their own judgment.

**Mr. Hanlon:** Although I am not criticising your general argument, the only difference there is that, because of your small number, your group does not have any responsibility.

**Mr. COBURN:** We have every responsibility.

**Mr. Hanlon:** There is no possibility of your ever carrying the responsibility of government.

**Mr. COBURN:** Far from that being the situation, if true democracy existed in this Chamber our votes would be just as valuable as those of any of the other members—and so they should be. We are here as elected representatives of the people. Although we are elected just as all other members are, and are charged with the same responsibilities, we are told that because we are independents we are of no consequence because our votes do not count. What an awful travesty of democracy that is!

Although the six who form the group on the back bench of the Government parties have not been here as long as I have, they have realised early that, because of the pernicious system that exists under which they have to vote according to Caucus decisions, they have no right to think or act in accordance with their own judgment; they are impotent. They asserted themselves on

one occasion, and I hope they will frequently do so again. I did not agree that their attitude to the particular question under discussion was the right one, but I concede to them the right to exercise their vote in accordance with their judgment, not in accordance with my judgment. It is a very healthy state of affairs when there are at least some hon. members who are moving to see that the vote of a member in this Chamber, not the vote of a member in Caucus, is the vote that is effective. I hope that not six but 47 members on the Government side will think in that way.

People have said to me, "I have been to Parliament. There are only about 18 or 20 in the House out of 78. Some of them are asleep; some of them are talking to those alongside them; some of them are reading newspapers. How do you ever get on with your business?" I said, "There is no need for them to take any interest in what is going on. They have not to make a decision. A decision has already been made, and they need not even know what is going on." In a division, I have sat beside members who have said, "What is the question before the House? What are we voting on?" They did not know, but they knew they had to be there because members of their own party were there.

**Mr. Pilbeam:** Which side were you on?

**Mr. COBURN:** It does not matter; I knew why I had to be there. If hon. members want to be conscripted, I concede that right to them. But I say that a man's mind is too valuable to be conscripted by others, and, if he has a conscience, he can only square up with it by doing the thing that is right.

People have said to me, "Sometimes the members do not go near Parliament." I have said in reply, "They are not missed. Their vote counts for nothing. Whatever is decided in Caucus will be done, no matter what anybody else says." We are not here to convince or to be convinced. We are just here to talk about matters without having any hope of convincing people that they should vote in a certain way. Nobody can argue against that; anybody who has been here knows that it is a fact.

People say to me, "How can you overcome it?" While we have the party system that demands that members vote in accordance with the decision arrived at in their Caucus by, in some instances, only 15 members of this Parliament, we will never get anywhere. That system demands that a man shall vote in a certain way even though he knows he is voting wrongly, even though he knows he is voting against the interests of his own people. We have seen it happen. We have seen legislation in this Chamber that would have been very beneficial to the people represented by members of a certain party—either the Government or the Opposition—but when the division came those members either refrained from voting or voted with their own party

against the interests of their constituents. They did that not because they wanted to but because this pernicious system demanded that they do it. If they did not do what they were told, they would have the threat hanging over their heads of not being endorsed at the next election.

These six hon. members to whom I have referred were accused of disloyalty. If it is disloyal to follow the dictates of one's own conscience and vote in accordance with one's own judgment, I would not mind being called disloyal. As party members, of course, they owe a great deal to their party. They probably are here because they are members of a party. Because of that obligation, under certain circumstances they have to be disciplined; but I do not think that anybody should be disciplined to the extent that he is forced, against his own judgment and his own conscience, to vote against the interests of the State, and that is what is being demanded of hon. members today.

**Mr. Hanlon:** Do you think it would be better if Ministers were not drawn from the Parliament but were answerable to Parliament?

**Mr. COBURN:** I do, very much so. The hon. member means elected by the Parliament instead of by the party?

**Mr. Hanlon:** No, not as members of Parliament, but answerable to Parliament.

**Mr. COBURN:** I do not know about that. I think, first of all, they should be representatives of the people, chosen and elected by the people. But I think that this Parliament should choose them. I think that every decision arrived at in this Chamber should be made not by a group, not by a party, not by a little coterie of people, but by this Parliament; that is, by the people's representatives. Until we can get to a stage where men are given the right to vote in this Chamber in a way that people know their attitude, we will not have democracy. When I refer to "men", I mean men and women; I refer to the human race when I speak of men; I include everyone.

I say we have to get to that stage. It will come some day, when the people demand it. They do not know what goes on here. We must get to the stage where their representatives vote in accordance with their own judgment and are answerable to the people for the vote that they record. Now, of course, the representatives say "This question was debated in Caucus, and you ought to have heard me there. I was the greatest opponent of the legislation. However, the party says I have to support its legislation so I meekly and humbly bowed to that dictate and I voted for the party—but I don't believe in it." These representatives are deceiving the people, because they do not do what they should. In that respect, they are very ineffective representatives so far as the State is concerned.

Those are my impressions of Parliament after a long experience here. It has been very frustrating to realise that no matter what research one undertakes or what effort one puts into any question, it is all to no avail. I should not say "to no avail", because I think it is of value. I think some of the suggestions that have been put forward here have been accepted by Governments of the day and embodied in later legislation without any acknowledgement of the source from which they have been stolen.

**Mr. Dewar:** Wouldn't you agree that if, in a football match, two players decided that they didn't like the way their team was being managed, there would be chaos if they changed sides and played in the other team?

**Mr. COBURN:** Don't mix government up with a football match. Many things happen in a football match that do not go on here.

In discussing this Budget, I repeat my statement here in October 1962, when I said that as a State Parliament we have had taken from us the right to govern in the manner that we deem best in the interests of our people—or it might be more correct to say that we have voluntarily and very willingly given away that right. We are no longer in a position to raise revenue that will be sufficient to provide all the services and give all the assistance and encouragement that we should like to give to those who, if assistance and encouragement were forthcoming, would play their part in the development of the great and richly endowed State of Queensland.

That position has arisen because of the financial agreement entered into by the State and Commonwealth Governments under which the States voluntarily transferred to the Commonwealth Government the sole right to levy income tax. As compensation for the transfer of this right the States receive in lieu taxation reimbursement grants under a formula accepted by them and by the Commonwealth Government. The amount received from the grant is inadequate for the States' requirements, especially in difficult times when, in many cases because of factors over which we have no control, such as drought, their industries are less productive of goods, and, as a corollary, revenue decreases and the army of unemployed increases substantially.

The situation then arises in which the States, because insufficient funds are made available to them and because of the absence of sources from which additional revenue can be derived, cannot deal effectively with their problems unless they receive generous grants from the Commonwealth Government. That happened this year, mainly because of the serious effects of the drought. In those circumstances the States become entirely dependent upon the Commonwealth Government for additional revenue to enable them to alleviate the distress that results.

We now have the spectacle of the Premiers of New South Wales and Victoria meeting the Commonwealth Prime Minister, and probably his Treasurer, in an effort to get from them additional funds to enable those State Governments to carry out their duties effectively. They have no legal right under any agreement with the Commonwealth Government to the extra funds they require. They are short of funds, partly because of the drought and partly because of the small return by way of taxation reimbursement grant. This is a distressing economic condition that exhibits itself in many industries and in many avenues of activity that cannot be continued without more money. So the State Governments are entirely beholden to the Commonwealth Government for the funds which enable them to govern as they should be able to govern without that assistance. They should have a right to a greater source of revenue and a greater percentage of taxation than they are getting at the present time.

The decision whether these grants will or will not be made is exclusively one for the Commonwealth Government, as no State-Commonwealth Government agreement binds the Commonwealth Government to make such grants. We claim that in these circumstances we have a moral right, but as to the effectiveness of our claim, as we have no legal right, the decision must rest entirely with the Commonwealth Government.

My objection to the position as it exists today is that we have no legal right to overcome a situation that needs urgent attention by the State Government. The undertaking of public works to relieve unemployment and for the expansion of public services for the convenience and benefit of the people is, in a large measure, dependent upon the amount of money that the Commonwealth Government is willing to grant to the States in addition to the amount that it is obliged to give them because of the commitments accepted under the Commonwealth-States Financial Agreement. The whole decision rests entirely with the Commonwealth Government. Whether we are to restrict our activities and withdraw some of our necessary services is a decision, not for us as a State Government because we are too poor to put these things into effect, but for the Commonwealth Government, our rich grandparent in Canberra, whose coffers are nearly always bulging.

In these circumstances it is obvious that the States have ceased to be fully autonomous. We can say that we have sovereign rights, but when one has not enough revenue or sources from which additional revenue can be obtained, one has to be more or less a mendicant and go to somebody else begging for the necessary amount to carry on the services of the State. Because of the provision of the most laudable services, such as public hospitals, health, education, transport, agriculture, and the undertaking of land development and irrigation projects, the State's financial commitments will increase

to a marked degree in the future, thus accentuating the difficulties of the Treasury and making the State more and more dependent upon the Commonwealth Government for revenue to which the State is not entitled under the Financial Agreement.

This Government has been particularly active in development. I do not think any previous Government has undertaken a programme of development on the same scale. The result has been that our financial figures are worse than they were before we embarked on the programme. As I see it, we are spending money on productive enterprises that will give the Commonwealth Government much greater income but will give us very little in return for our capital investment.

I have previously referred to what is happening with the Tinaroo Falls Dam, which cost the State Government \$26,000,000. Our return from that investment in the form of land rentals and payments for water scarcely covers the interest on the investment, let alone providing anything for redemption. However, the Commonwealth Government levies excise duties on the tobacco, it gets a greater return from income tax because of the income derived by farmers from the sale of tobacco, and it also gets sales tax. But the State gets only the \$50 a head for each additional resident coming to Queensland as a result of the expenditure of that \$26,000,000. It has always appeared to me that we, as a State, feed the cow, and the Commonwealth milks it and gives us a few gallons back as compensation for the work we do in feeding its very remunerative cow.

**A Government Member** interjected.

**Mr. COBURN:** It is a cow for the State, true enough, but it is also a pretty good cow for the Commonwealth Government under the present circumstances.

After a basic amount has been agreed upon between the States and the Commonwealth, the factor in the formula that is of paramount importance—it is virtually the only factor—in determining the tax reimbursement grant, is population. Under the formula no consideration is given to the vast sums spent by the State, which result in vastly increased revenue flowing into the coffers of the Commonwealth. The States, as it were, provide the capital to establish the business and pay interest and redemption on the money invested, while the Commonwealth receives, through taxation, almost the whole of the profits accruing from the investment. At the expiration of the current Commonwealth-States agreement I believe that some consideration should be given to including in the formula for determining the States' taxation reimbursement grants a factor that will reward the States for the investment of funds in these businesses, which are so productive of revenue in the form of income tax for the Commonwealth Government. At present no consideration at all is given to that factor.

My sole aim is to ensure that our taxation reimbursement grant will be sufficient to enable us to provide every requisite service from money that is ours, as a State, by right, instead of having to go to the Commonwealth periodically as mendicants, cap in hand, asking for a hand-out. I am not unmindful of the fact that on some occasions the Commonwealth has been rather generous to the States in making grants available to them. But they are made not because we have a right to them, but only because the Commonwealth, in its charity, has agreed to give them to us.

**Mr. Sherrington:** Usually in an election year.

**Mr. COBURN:** Yes. The motive may be questionable at times but the whole point is that these grants should be ours by right.

**Mr. Hughes:** If we accept your argument, one of two courses is open. We either go back to where virtually we raise all of our taxes—

**Mr. COBURN:** I do not agree. I believe that uniform taxation is sound policy. But the agreement in connection with that uniform taxation is loaded in favour of the Commonwealth against the States. We should get a more equitable share of the revenue that is produced in this country.

**Mr. Hughes:** If you accept it on that basis, with the industrial development that is taking place in Victoria and New South Wales we could be worse off.

**Mr. COBURN:** I cannot engage in that argument. I am not here to convince the hon. member.

Let us look at the public debt. This will convince us whether it is loaded in favour of the Commonwealth Government or not. When I first came to this Parliament in 1950, Queensland's public debt was £150,595,962. The interest payable, on an average rate of £3 5s. per cent. per annum, was £4,900,850. Today, after 16 years, the public debt is £468,000,000, and the interest to be met on it is £21,000,000 per annum. That must come out of Consolidated Revenue, and thus is not available to us for services that we are required to provide, such as health, education, transport, and agriculture. Since I became a member of this Parliament I have seen the public debt increase by 312 per cent. and the interest by 420 per cent.

After the Second World War the Commonwealth Government had an enormous national debt; it had assumed astronomical dimensions. Today it has no national debt at all. Yet we in this State have a public debt of \$936,000,000. Unfortunately every State is in the same position. But the Commonwealth, because of its favoured financial position, has been able to wipe off the whole national debt. It is owed money by the States and by other bodies.

We must raise loans running into millions of dollars to carry out works in our State. The Commonwealth Government is carrying out work and paying for it from revenue. In his Financial Statement the Treasurer said that public works valued at £217,000,000 were being undertaken by the Commonwealth Government and that the money for them was being taken from Consolidated Revenue. The Commonwealth Government is so affluent that it does not have to raise a loan. Yet we, the poor foundlings, are struggling along trying to supply all the needs of the State and bring about necessary development without the wherewithal. If that does not favour the Commonwealth, I do not know what does. We have not been very well serviced by past Treasurers who have agreed to the conditions that are laid down in the Commonwealth-States Financial Agreement.

**Mr. Dewar:** Whether it is a national or State debt, it is still the same people.

**Mr. COBURN:** No. The Commonwealth has the means to wipe out its debt and it has done so, whereas we have not. If it is the same debt, why don't we ask the Commonwealth Government for some of its revenue to pay our debts? But the Commonwealth Government closes its hand tightly and will not give us anything. Even though it is a common debt owed by the same people, we are still denied the use of £21,000,000 a year interest which we could use on the services for, and the development of, this State. The Commonwealth Government has nothing comparable with that. It has been able to wipe out its national debt, whereas in recent years Queensland's public debt has increased by £20,000,000 a year.

Our interest charge has been increasing at the rate of about £1,700,000 a year. It is not difficult to visualise what a tremendous drag servicing of the public debt will become in the next decade or two unless more satisfactory arrangements can be made between the States and the Commonwealth so that the available money is more equitably distributed.

I should like to say more about the Budget, but no doubt there will be many others who will praise it or condemn it. Although I know that times are fairly difficult, I do not like very much some of the taxes that have been imposed. However, there will be other occasions to deal with them.

I now wish to deal with matters nearer home. My own district of the Lower Burdekin is one of the favoured areas of the Commonwealth. It has been very richly endowed by nature, and we have much for which to be very grateful. I think the Lower Burdekin is an ideal situation for a mill for the manufacture of paper and cardboard from bagasse. For the uninformed, bagasse is the residue of sugar-cane after the juice has been squeezed from it. Sugar-cane is a

unique agricultural product in that it contains within itself the means to produce the power to process it. Every ton of sugar-cane contains from 7 per cent. to 17 per cent. of sugar in solution, known in the industry as c.c.s. The juice of the sugar is analysed by chemists, who determine the percentage of sugar that the liquid holds. That is known as the c.c.s., and on that figure the farmer is paid on a sliding scale.

As I have just said, all sugar juices are analysed to determine how much commercial sugar is in each ton of cane, and the cane is paid for in accordance with that analysis. Some sugar-cane contains only 7 per cent. of sugar, whilst the very best type of cane contains 17 per cent. or even more, but not much more. Cane contains from 9 per cent. to 15 per cent. of fibre, and it is the fibre that is known as bagasse. The cane also contains a little colouring matter, wax, and other foreign matter, the remainder being water.

It will therefore be realised that sugar-cane is a unique product, as each ton of cane received at the mill carries within itself the fuel to produce the power for processing it into the finished product. The manufacture of paper from bagasse was previously considered uneconomic because of the cost of fuel. Now, with improved techniques, different types of fuel for raising steam, improved coal, improved oil firing, and a large increase in the price of paper, entirely different considerations apply to the manufacture of paper and cardboard from bagasse.

Apart from the raw product, which is mainly softwood, the main requirement of a paper mill is an adequate supply of water. With its wonderful water supply, this is where the Burdekin comes into the scheme. From the mighty Burdekin, which is the largest river in the State, enormous quantities of water, almost without limit, can be supplied.

**Mr. Dewar:** You made this speech 16 years ago.

**Mr. COBURN:** No, I did not. However, even if I made it 56 years ago, it would still be a good one, and some day we might wear down some of those with all the money to the point where they are prepared to invest in this profitable industry. I should like the Minister for Industrial Development to assist me in this matter; in fact, I intend to see him personally and discuss this matter with him in greater detail.

We also have on the Burdekin adequate supplies of electricity—again under the control of the Minister for Industrial Development—at a tariff equal to that which operates in the cities. On the Burdekin, therefore, we have the three requirements—the raw material in the form of bagasse, all the water we need for the mill, and power as cheap as that which can be obtained in the city.

I emphasise that the Burdekin can, if required and if provision is made, provide an adequate water supply. I understand that the New Zealand Kenleith timber mill at Rotorua uses 15,000,000 gallons of water daily and processes about 2,000 tons of logs. That indicates what a very important part water plays in the production of paper.

It would be impossible for any one district to supply the requisite bagasse, and it possibly would have to be railed to the site of the paper mill from other sugar districts. Ayr, it will readily be conceded, is ideally situated, being almost equidistant from Cairns and Mackay. Approximately 13,222,000 tons of cane is harvested annually from Mackay to Mossman, and this, if the fibre content was 7 per cent., would give 925,540 tons of bagasse. If the fibre content was as high as 15 per cent., it would give 1,983,300 tons of bagasse. We can assume that the mean would probably be the quantity available—that is to say, it would give more than 1,450,000 tons of raw material for processing into tons of paper and cardboard ends.

**Mr. Bromley:** What is done with the bagasse now?

**Mr. COBURN:** A very large quantity of it is burnt, and some of it is used as fuel for the mills. There are heaps of it on the banks of the Burdekin River creating a nuisance. The council has even had to take the matter up with Pioneer Sugar Mills Ltd. because of the pollution of the river by huge quantities of bagasse.

**Mr. Dewar:** Unless the mills used oil-fired burners there would not be enough bagasse to support such an industry.

**Mr. COBURN:** There is a pith on the outside of the fibre, and the pith and the fibre must be separated by a disintegrator. There would possibly be waste to the extent of about one-half—that would be the hard pith that covers the fibre—but a great deal of bagasse would still be available.

A full-scale commercial mill, I understand, would require upwards of 75,000 tons of bagasse a year. That would be the minimum to make it an economic commercial project. A ton of bagasse will produce half a ton of paper, and in Australia paper ranges in value from about \$389 to \$156 a ton for the poorer types of paper—that is, wrapping paper and brown paper about \$389 and newsprint \$156—to \$500 for the more expensive types—the type used by the Minister for Industrial Development, for example. Cardboard is worth about \$197 a ton, I understand. The minimum quantity of paper that could be made from bagasse would be about 462,770 tons annually and the maximum would be about 991,650 tons.

Many experiments have been carried out with the process of making paper and cardboard from bagasse, particularly in Hawaii. I hope the Minister for Industrial Development will interest himself in this proposal; I am sure he will.

What has been done in other countries? Is there any possibility of establishing such a mill economically. Let me give the Committee the information that I have received as a result of the research I have undertaken. A. R. Ruiz Cortes, in a book published recently, discusses the composition of bagasse, and its uses for fuel and in the manufacture of various products are summarised. Factories exist at present in Cuba—let us not say that we cannot do what Cuba is doing—for making paper, rayon pulp, boards, furfural, and charcoal, and the economics are considered.

Other possible uses include activated carbon, plastics, composts and fertilisers, animal foods, poultry litter, bricks, (mixed with lime, pressed and faced with concrete), and insulating and absorbent material. Fuel-economy measures for increasing the amount of residual bagasse are also enumerated in that book. I commend it to the Minister for Industrial Development.

The first bagasse-board factory for the manufacture of chip-board from bagasse is being installed in India at Golagokarnath, in Utter Pradesh, at a cost of about £600,000. The factory will have an initial capacity of 30 tons a day and will gradually be expanded to double this capacity. The boards will be suitable for use in making high-quality furniture, flush doors, partitions, ceilings and floors.

Dealing with bagasse paper production in Costa Rica, the Commission Consultiva de Industrials has decided in favour of the establishment of a second paper mill in Costa Rica. The new mill, which will be situated at Turrialba, represents an investment of £1,200,000. The plant can produce 18,000 tons of paper products a year, using bagasse as raw material.

Turning to Egypt, in addition to the bagasse factory at Edfu, which produces 60 tons per day, a cardboard plant, which also will utilise bagasse as raw material, is to be erected at Ratka.

In J. E. Atchison's book "Sugar y Azurcarr," progress in bagasse collection, storage, de-pithing, pulping, and the use of pulp, especially since 1950, is surveyed. In regard to bagasse paper possibilities in Ecuador, an adviser to the Junta Nacional de Plantificacion y Co-ordinacion recently stated that there would be excellent prospects for a paper and pulp industry, using as raw material bagasse and mixed tropical timbers from the north-west of the country. Ecuador Begasse Paper Plant-Papelera Nacional, a new company, is to build a plant at San Carlo, Ecuador, at an estimated cost of \$U.S.4,000,000 to manufacture paper and cardboard from bagasse. The plant, which will be owned jointly by United States and local interests, will have an initial annual production capacity of some 8,000 tons of product. It is expected to meet local demand for Kraft-type paper and will begin operations late in 1967.

Based on a study of by-products utilisation in a number of cane-growing countries, the importance to Mexico of using bagasse for paper products, etc., and of molasses for yeast production (as a cheap source of protein for animal fodder and for alcohol production) is emphasised.

Turning to Hawaii, C. Brewer & Co. is conducting a study of the defunct Canex wall-board plant in Hilo to determine the possibility of converting the facility to a bulk pulp manufacturing operation.

The Indian Government is planning to set up a bagasse plant in a bid to reduce shortages in the production of paper and newsprint. A corporation is to be started which will arrange for regular supplies of raw materials to the paper factories by purchasing and storing bagasse from the sugar factories and pulp from the pulp-manufacturing units.

A new bagasse pulp factory at Canlubang sugar estate in the Philippines was inaugurated recently. This enterprise is the spearhead of a programme for conversion of 1,000,000 tons of bagasse a year into pulp for the manufacture of paper.

I do not see why we cannot do what countries like Ecuador, Cuba, Costa Rica, Hawaii, the Philippines, India and Egypt have done successfully. We have all the means to do it, and those means are crying out for development. I must say in fairness to the Minister for Industrial Development that he has been very helpful in every representation I have made to him. However, I do not want to start off with the attitude towards this project of "Where are you going to get the markets? Where are you going to get your raw products? Where are you going to get money for investment?" We must have faith in the project we are advocating. Once we have the faith I think we can move mountains. With the present-day demand for soft-boards, wrapping papers, and all sorts of other papers, with raw materials so readily available, with water in such enormous quantities and with the potential to produce power at a cheap rate, I cannot see why we could not successfully establish this industry.

I hope that the Minister for Industrial Development at least will give his close attention to the submissions I have made on this matter, and that he will have regard to the fact that if people in other parts of the world have done this sort of thing successfully, we should be able to emulate them and obtain a similar result.

**Mr. PILBEAM** (Rockhampton South) (3.11 p.m.): I support the Treasurer's move to have this Budget adopted. Before speaking about the Budget, however, I should like to congratulate Jack Houston and Perc. Tucker on assuming the Leadership and Deputy Leadership of their party. I hope they are able to weld it into a very effective Opposition because an effective Opposition is necessary for good government.

I congratulate the Deputy Leader in particular, because he is a representative of one of the leading pioneering families of Central Queensland. The Tucker family has been represented in many worthy civic endeavours for a number of years, having taken a prominent part in the industrial and commercial life of the city of Rockhampton. It is a well-respected family.

**Mr. Houston:** It was a wise move by the party.

**Mr. PILBEAM:** I say there is hope for North Queensland if it calls on the good citizens of Central Queensland to help in its development.

The Treasurer is to be congratulated on the courageous grappling with the financial position evidenced in his Budget. His Financial Statement proves that he is making a determined effort to balance the finances of the State. For that he is to be commended. If in his endeavour he has had to tread on a few corns by increasing certain fees and charges, we must support him and appreciate that what he is doing is being done in the interests of the State.

Two groups of people feel somewhat aggrieved. I refer specifically to the graziers, who always feel the impact of any increased freights and charges, and to the automotive industries of Queensland, who are particularly concerned about the stamp duty on the transfer of motor vehicles and the increase in registration fees. Perhaps these people have some ground for complaint about the stamp duty, but I am not sympathetic towards them because of the increase in registration fees as this is the first increase that has been levied since 1960. I consider the increase is overdue in view of the spiralling rises in every other field.

The Treasurer has indicated that the increased revenue from this source will be specifically earmarked for the construction of vital roads. There is no doubt that the implementation of the Wilbur Smith Report in Brisbane will require a great deal of revenue. As a certain amount of this increased revenue is earmarked for that purpose, none of the Brisbane motorists can have much complaint about it.

I hope to see a considerable proportion of the increased revenue earmarked for the construction of vital highways in the State. In that case the motorists in the rural areas of Queensland could not have much complaint. I am sure motorists must appreciate that great benefits will flow to them if they are driving consistently on bitumen highways and not on some of the sorry excuses for highways that exist, particularly in Central and North Queensland.

I cannot conscientiously object to any rise in registration fees, especially as in an earlier speech I indicated that this could be a source of extra revenue and that the

increase should be earmarked for the construction of vital highways throughout the State.

I was very interested to hear the remarks of my good old friend from Burdekin. Everyone sympathises with his views, but it would be a very Utopian state of affairs if everyone came to this Chamber and voted entirely according to his individual conscience. In reality, we would probably get a situation somewhat similar to that in France or the Latin-American countries, with Parliaments here today and gone tomorrow. It is a pretty good old Utopian situation where everyone votes according to his individual thinking. We must appreciate that until some other realistic form of government can be substituted the party system is the only system that will provide consistent good government.

The Minister for Industrial Development was quite right when he drew the parallel with a football team. I could draw an analogy with the Army. Before a game, the tactics to be employed may be decided upon; two members of the team may be absolutely opposed to the tactics adopted by the majority, but what would be the good of their going onto the field and playing the game as they think it should be played? When we join a team we are bound to show loyalty to the leader and fellow-members of the team. The same principles apply to an army, to a Parliament, and to a Government, especially where members have gone to the people and told them that, if elected, they will become a working team and form an effective coalition with another party. They are elected to Parliament on that basis. I do not deny the right of the individual to vote according to his conscience at times and, under extreme provocation, or with an extreme desire for justice, even to cross the floor of the Chamber, because I have crossed the floor. I had justification for doing so. But such cases should be regarded as exceptional and not as the general rule. If they were adopted as a general practice the party would not stay long in office; it would soon go out.

We have had an example in this Chamber, not far from where I stand, where divided control led to the downfall of a strong Government. I even hope that the Opposition can be a united party some day, because a good Opposition helps to make a good Government. For the life of me I cannot see how a team of individuals, all working as they think fit, can bring down legislation. How could we have good government with 50 people voicing their individual opinions in this Chamber? I do not attach much importance to what the hon. member said. I prefer the local government method where, for every word said in open council, about 10 are said in committee. I should prefer to see five times as much debate in committee as in debate here. There would be a substantial saving in the printing of "Hansard" and a great saving in time if

we spent five times as much time in committee as we spend in the Chamber. We would streamline procedures.

I can give a very good example of over-elaboration in the present debate in that most hon. members speak fairly effectively for half an hour and then read articles from a newspaper for the remainder of their speech. I have not heard anyone in this Chamber speak for an hour who could not have spoken much more effectively if he had limited his speech to half an hour. I should like to see this system introduced into Parliament, and I make no secret of it. The debate would be more effective if members of the Opposition adopted that practice, because the last half-hour of some of their speeches was hard to listen to.

Each committee should meet regularly every week and the Ministers should take members of those committees fully into their confidence relative to every aspect of legislation before it is introduced into the House. The hon. member for Burdekin was quite right in some of his arguments. But we must go with the strength, and, in the case of this Government, it is real strength.

The Chamber of Automotive Industries in Queensland has lodged a protest against the increases which will affect that industry. I have been asked to make certain representations in this Chamber to set out the views of the Capricornia Branch of that body. I have a letter from it which reads—

"Dear Sir,

"Our Chamber views with grave concern the proposal of your Government to implement a Stamp Duty on the sale of New and Used Motor Vehicles in Queensland—a developing state harassed by drought conditions over the past seven or eight years and upon an already depressed industry which cannot afford to stand further impositions.

"It would appear that the Treasurer has overlooked pertinent factors which apply to the Motor Industry. Registrations of New Vehicles in Queensland have fallen by 18.9% comparing August this year against August 1965, and Retail Dealers are experiencing considerable difficulty in maintaining employment at its present level—a factor contributing substantially to this State's economy.

"Over the years the Industry has absorbed many items of increased costs to maintain buoyant marketing, but any further costs such as Stamp Duty, increased Registrations and particularly increased freight must of necessity be passed on to the Consumer thereby creating further buyers resistance.

"My Chamber implores your Government to reconsider its intentions in these matters, and to make a further full investigation, and we will appreciate your making our objections known.

"Yours faithfully, "

It is fair enough to say that after discussing all aspects of increased registration with the deputation and upon informing its members that it was the intention of the Treasurer to earmark this money for the construction of major highways, they said they could not stand against the proposition. They thought that motorists would agree that if more money is to be spent on roads, it must be obtained, and if it is obtained from the motorists who will get the benefit, there could be no argument.

I support the rise in motor registration fees, particularly as some of that money will be spent on the construction of necessary roads in my area. I must refer specifically to the Capricorn Highway. It would make one's heart bleed to see the condition of that highway between Emerald and Barcaldine. Everybody would agree with the Chairman of the Jericho Shire, Mrs. Langston, that that road is causing distress to the people in the area. One problem those people have is to retain a doctor in Alpha. I should say that the poor state of the roads is the main reason a doctor will not remain there. These people are isolated because of dreadful roads, and if it rains they are completely bogged down. It is distressing to see all of the wealth of the West cut off from our ports because of this missing link. The late Mr. Evans, when Minister for Main Roads, promised me that not less than £600,000 would be spent each year on the construction of this road.

I am not casting any reflection on the present Minister for Main Roads, who is an earnest, hardworking, and conscientious Minister. He has had put on his plate the obligation to construct many other highway systems. He has roads to build through the brigalow country and, with Commonwealth assistance, beef-cattle roads. Every day the necessity for more highways becomes apparent. One vital link now is between Moura and Gladstone. It is fair enough to say that the amount spent on that road in the past 12 months is in excess of the amount spent on the Capricorn Highway. It was an election promise of the Government that immediately the coastal highway was completed, No. 1 priority would be given to roads west from Townsville and Rockhampton.

I say that the whole economy is being upset by the lack of good roads. Decentralised development is being hampered by the absence of vital highways. I sympathise with the hon. member for Gregory when he seeks a quick method of construction. His suggestion, which I think is feasible, is that considerable sums of money be obtained on loan from American construction companies, who could construct all the highways that we need in about three or four years, and the major loans could be repaid from the present allocation of Commonwealth road grants.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** Hasn't the Minister promised to spend £300,000 on the Capricorn Highway this year?

**Mr. PILBEAM:** The Minister made certain promises, particularly with regard to the Drummond Range scheme, but they do not apply till next year. We made representations to the Minister to accelerate work on that road and he promised to give them sympathetic consideration. He pointed out the necessity for other highways, and the representations of local authorities through whose territories they run. My contention is that no Government should listen to representations from local authorities concerning the construction of highways. If that happened when railways were being constructed, what sort of railway lines would result? State highways are the responsibility of the State Government, and the necessity for them should be determined by economic factors quite uninfluenced by parochial local-authority arguments. If a highway is determined by the Department of Main Roads to be necessary for the decentralised development of Queensland, as the Capricorn Highway has been, the local authority concerned should not be asked, "Will you build this portion of the road through your area?" I do not agree with making any such approach. That is one way in which the construction of this necessary highway is being bogged down at present.

The Australian Road Federation considers that a system of highways should be determined, and that the Commonwealth Government should take them over and finance their construction. There is a conflict between the State and Commonwealth Governments on this matter, and, unless there is a change in the Commonwealth Constitution, I do not think it can be reconciled on the basis of the Federation's suggestion. It must be possible to find, between the Commonwealth and the State, some way of borrowing the money necessary to construct all of these highways and repaying it from Commonwealth grants. I am quite sure that the road grants are sufficient to enable this to be done.

We are putting the cart before the horse; we should be doing what local authorities are doing. Every local authority in Australia builds roads with loan money; none of them do it from income. All cities and local authorities borrow money to build roads and pay for them afterwards, and in the meantime they receive the benefit of good communications.

I recommend that course. Let us borrow the money to construct vital highways, and pay for them later. It can be done. Although the American Ambassador denies that he said anything specific about the availability of loan money from America, I am sure that money could be obtained from that country, particularly if contracts were let to some of the very large road-construction firms overseas to build the roads.

The need for these vital highways is so strongly with us that I think every effort should be made to have them constructed

without any further delay. We are too far into the road age to depend entirely on railways any longer. Railways play a vital part in the transport system of the State, but they must be complemented by first-class bitumen highways.

The mention of bitumen highways reminds me to again request the Minister for Main Roads to include the Yaraka-Windorah road in the next beef roads scheme.

With regard to water conservation, the hon. member for Barcoo referred to the Nogoa Gap scheme and expressed his disappointment at the possibility that the scheme may not go ahead. I think everyone in Central Queensland will be disappointed if it is not proceeded with, because it is of great importance to the area. Water is needed in Central Queensland, and the water is there to be used. The Fitzroy River system is the second largest river system in the Commonwealth, but there is not one water conservation scheme along its length. I exclude the one at Theodore, which is not a great success. It would be a tragedy if the Nogoa Gap scheme fell by the wayside. The case presented to the Commonwealth Government has been brought up to date, the findings on the two farms are completely favourable, and I have no doubt that before very long the scheme will be brought into effect. It is very necessary for Central Queensland that it should be.

In the meantime, of course, the city of Rockhampton is beginning the first water conservation scheme on the Fitzroy River. Although the primary object of the barrage is to supplement the city's water supply, so much water will be ponded for 50 miles upstream from Rockhampton that it must have a very large irrigation content. The Commissioner for Irrigation and Water Supply has told the Rockhampton City Council that his department will not take any share in the financing of the scheme because it has no irrigation content. However, I am quite sure that once the scheme is working and once it is obvious that there is a very large surplus that can be made available for irrigation, its irrigation content will be very plain. As a matter of fact, many people are already beginning to irrigate from the Fitzroy River, before the barrage is built. After 10 years of fighting, the barrage is no longer a nebulous proposal, and the Minister for Industrial Development will have the opportunity of officiating at the driving of the first pile on either the 31st of this month or the 7th of November, whichever is the more suitable date.

The hon. member for Barcoo made some comments on the air service to Emerald. Although I believe it is necessary that this vital transport link should be preserved, there are some difficulties, to which the hon. member referred. The major one is lack of patronage. The people must take some blame for the curtailing of the service, because I am sure it would not have been curtailed if the patronage had been greater. The pilots have now insisted on a maximum of eight

stops, and the inclusion of the old service to Emerald would constitute 11 stops, so that does not help in overcoming the difficulty. The income will have to be augmented if the airline is to be persuaded to restore the service, and there are only two ways of doing that—either by increasing the patronage, or by the Commonwealth Government increasing its subsidy. The hon. member for Barcoo suggested that it might be regarded as a development service. Possibly development services are clearly defined and it may be difficult to bring this service within the definition.

My comment on the Budget is much the same as the comments I have made in other debates during the current session. It provides ample money for areas in which there is explosive development, but it does not devote enough money to those areas which are capable of only normal growth. I again cite the case of the Capricornia Regional Electricity Board, which, out of a record loan allocation of \$8,000,000, could not find enough money to erect 14 street lights in the city of Rockhampton. One could not get a better example than that of full provision for explosive development and no provision for normal development. It is not good enough for me that the lights in Central Queensland should be allowed to go out whilst bonfires can be lit in other areas.

I am pleased to hear the Treasurer say that he will call upon some of the large developments going on in Central Queensland to provide some of the capital in future. That is why we are suffering in places like Rockhampton, where we see suburbs with sewerage, bitumen roads, kerbing and channelling and every city amenity provided, yet where people have to go back to kerosene lamps or bottled gas because C.R.E.B. is unable to provide the money for normal development of its services in a city which gave it its start in development.

The city of Rockhampton gave the Capricornia Regional Electricity Board, without compensation, a utility which was a paying concern and showing a profit and in which assets exceeded liabilities by \$500,000, yet we cannot get a street light, unless—this is the proposition that has been put to us—we accept a 10 per cent. rise in domestic tariff. People in the suburbs will have to accept that 10 per cent. rise so that large industries can establish themselves without any payment of extra tariff, or in some cases at a reduced tariff. It is not good enough that if one lives in the country and wants electricity, or an expansion of electrical services, or if one lives in a city and wants a street light or even lighting for one's own home, one has to do it with a sort of do-it-yourself kit.

We pay the Capricornia Regional Electricity Board in Rockhampton over \$133,000 annually for light and power, yet when we ask them to put in an effective system of inner-street lighting in Rockhampton and we think they will make a contribution of

\$13,000 towards the cost, the only way we can do it is to give them the money to do the job and take the \$13,000 out of the \$133,000 we will be paying for our lights this year.

Contrast that with the treatment handed out to industrial development in explosive areas of Queensland! It is just not right. Throughout Rockhampton the people are protesting against this, and I must say I am on-side with them.

Whenever a member of the Government mentions a new railway station in Rockhampton he always has the cynics, the critics and the knockers saying, "We will believe it when we see it. For 40 years we have been promised by various Labour Governments at various elections that if they are put back in power they will give us a new railway station." As a matter of fact, they went close on one occasion—they put the stumps in. When I say, "You will get it this time" these people say, "We don't believe it; we think you are just as bad as the Labour Party."

I do not like to be indicted in that way, so I asked the Minister to give me some clear indication in regard to the progress of the new railway station in Rockhampton, and he gave me this information to include in my address on this occasion—

"Finality has been reached in the design of the new station building at Rockhampton and working drawings are being prepared. However, before construction can commence it will be necessary to complete a considerable amount of work in the preparation of the site.

"The building will be located in the George, South and Murray Streets area and at present the site is low-lying. The area will require to be filled and the depth of filling will range up to about 8 ft. in the lowest parts of the area.

"Another preliminary work which will have to be undertaken is the diversion of a long section of a Council sewer, as this at present is located in an area which will be occupied by rail tracks serving the new station. During the present financial year it is proposed to divert this sewer and to fill the area that will be required for the new station trackwork and access roadways.

"All of the necessary resumptions have been completed and the land vested in the Commissioner, but a number of claims have still to be settled. Most of the departmental buildings on the site have been removed, including the Maintenance Workshops and the General Store which have been re-established in new buildings at Glenmore.

"Several smaller buildings have yet to be removed but the General Manager has this in hand. One building which cannot be removed at present is the Trainmen's Quarters but it is expected that tenders will be called next week for the construction of new Quarters at the eastern end of Caroline

Street, and once this building has been completed the old quarters can be demolished.

"The station building will be approximately 500 ft. long and 47 ft. wide and at the Stanley Street end will be located the Parcels Office which will measure approximately 320 ft. long x 100 ft.

"The main platform will be 880 ft. long and in addition there will be an island platform of similar length. The station building and parcels office will be of steel framed and brick construction and the former will have a large entrance vestibule, together with all the necessary station offices and a large Refreshment Room section. In the Parcels Office there will be three dead end roads with platforms on each side and these will provide accommodation for 12 baggage cars.

"It is anticipated that all of the work of filling the site and relocating the Council sewer will be completed this year, and that it will absorb all or most of the \$100,000 which is available for this project in the current financial year.

"It is unlikely that tenders will be called for the construction of a new building and platforms until next financial year.

"All of the track work together with signalling and interlocking that will be required to serve the station will be carried out by departmental staff."

That gives the answer direct to those who say that we are just as bad as the Labour Government and will not build a new railway station in Rockhampton. The plans I have seen convince me that it will be the best railway station in Queensland outside of Brisbane.

We must be patient when dealing with the Railway Department, especially when we have been badly treated by the previous Government. Although I should like to, I cannot put pressure on the Minister for Transport for a new streamlined, air-conditioned mail train from Brisbane to Rockhampton. We are the only people in the State who have not the benefit of a streamlined, air-conditioned mail train. The present mail train cannot be accepted for any protracted period. I am quite sure that as soon as the new railway station is completed my representations to the Minister for a new streamlined, air-conditioned mail train will be favourably received. One must keep things in their correct perspective.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. PILBEAM:** We will get the station, and then we will be able to convey members of the Opposition to Rockhampton in the new mail train for the next 50 years.

**Mr. Sherrington:** It will be like the university.

**Mr. PILBEAM:** Now that the hon. member has mentioned the university, let me say that we are very grateful to the Government for giving us a break-through in the field of

tertiary education. There are those who say that the institute of technology will not be as good as a university because it will be controlled by the Department of Education and not by a senate. That does not carry much weight with me. In other parts of the world such institutes have taken their place alongside universities. I think we can make the Capricornia Institute of Technology something of which the city and district can well be proud. I thank the Government for including its financing in this Budget.

No harder task in port development has ever been undertaken than the development of Port Alma. After a great number of years during which we have had to fight doubt, mis-information and prejudice we are now getting somewhere with the development of this wonderful natural port. For years we have tried to rehabilitate it. We have put public money and private money into the construction of the road to Port Alma. We have completed the first section of the wharf, and we are now engaged in planning for the second stage of a wharf at Port Alma which will enable us to take a share in the container trade.

**Mr. Graham:** What will you ship through Port Alma?

**Mr. PILBEAM:** Many commodities. For a start there will be a much larger beef export. There will be general merchandise and steel, and a fair amount of copper is exported at present.

**Mr. Graham:** Do you think you will ever share in the coal trade?

**Mr. PILBEAM:** Whether we do or not will be determined by the way the coal trade is implemented. If Blackwater exports more than a certain quantity of coal Gladstone will not be able to handle it. There is a need for two export ports in Central Queensland. We do not place any great faith in the export of coal or in the fact that we will share in its export. However, we want facilities at the port and we will certainly try to take advantage of any large increase in coal exports.

A development of note at Port Alma is the salt complex that has sprung up. We had a wonderful small body of local men, Central Queensland Salt Industries, which battled to establish the salt works at Port Alma. I know only too well the many difficulties experienced by the company, and no-one is in a better position to be gratified by the recent development in which a very large world-wide concern, I.C.I.A.N.Z., joined with this small company to develop the industry substantially. Central Queensland Salt Industries has developed the local salt industry for the past eight or nine years. It now satisfies the Queensland market, whereas previously, with the exception of a few thousand tons, all of Queensland's salt requirements were imported. In the course of its operations the company took over the

Bowen salt works and now this world concern, which has steadily developed chemical industries in all States—and recently, in conjunction with the Queensland Fertiliser Company, established a fertiliser complex in Brisbane, with other ventures in Queensland—is to develop the Port Alma salt works.

This company is responsible for the injection of \$15,000,000 into the State of Queensland during the life of the present Government. It has played a valuable part in the development of the State. It deserves all the support we can give it as it uses local raw material, wherever possible, and local labour, and has a large skilled staff of Australian technicians. For many years, before salt was harvested substantially in Queensland it came from South Australia. Now, because of the need to expand the industry and because of the requirements of the alumina project at Gladstone, it is necessary for a great increase to be effected in salt processing in Queensland.

I am very grateful that this company, instead of doing what many other big complexes have done, that is, taken over the local company, came into the field prepared to co-operate with all interests in the locality. It came to the harbour board and asked if there was any objection to the company's acquiring leases to mine salt in certain areas. We stipulated the areas to which we would offer objection. Naturally we did not want the company mining salt right up against the port facilities. We needed a certain area of land for carrying out normal port development and the company co-operated fully with us. It entered into an agreement and negotiations are now under way to underwrite bulk-loading equipment to export salt from the port.

Of particular note is the fact that the company has agreed to underwrite part of the wharf installation cost. It is necessary to build the second stage of the wharf at Port Alma to carry the bulk-loading equipment and to cater for the container trade. We have drawn up plans for an L-shaped wharf with two dolphins to enable us to achieve all of these things. This project has been substantially underwritten by I.C.I.A.N.Z. Some people may think that this project is not being pushed ahead. The work at Port Alma is well on the way. All major earthworks will be completed early next year. The total capital expenditure involved at that stage will amount to \$2,500,000.

It has been emphasised by discussion and correspondence that proving of the brine deposits in the Fitzroy River delta will be a long process, taking a period of three or four years. But initially it has been established that there is sufficient brine in the area to manufacture 150,000 tons of salt a year. The aim of the company is to increase this to 400,000 tons per annum. So it is an important major project.

To give a further idea of the extent of the work being done, I quote from "The Courier-Mail" of 11 October, where it is reported—

"Salt Works is Right on Time

"\$1.7m. Job Ready in December

"Rockhampton.—Imperial Chemical Industries' giant new saltworks near Port Alma is expected to be completed before the end of the year.

"The project is being constructed several miles inland from the port by John Holland (Constructions) Pty. Ltd. and subcontractors at a total cost of \$1,700,000 for the initial stage.

"The plant and evaporators are being constructed on the southern side of the Port Alma road and 124 big tip trucks are now pouring back and forwards along the road with earth for the walls of the salt pans.

"Economic

"The construction engineers are drilling holes up to 140 ft. deep to reach the salty brine.

"The brine is a far more economic proposition than sea water because it contains a higher percentage of salt.

"The fleet of trucks and other equipment are approaching the final stages of construction of salt ponds covering 4,200 acres of low lands near the coast.

"The ponds are divided by over 30 miles of walls made up of more than 800,000 tons of earth carted from pits several miles away.

"A spokesman for the construction company said work had started on the big project last May and was expected to be completed on schedule at the end of December.

"He said a large private industrial bridge now under construction over Inkerman Creek, to cost about \$170,000, should be completed at the beginning of December.

"The saltworks will have a maximum annual output of 150,000 tons with provisions for later expansion to 450,000 tons."

That will give some idea of the immensity of the project. It has thoroughly justified the faith people have in Port Alma and has justified the confidence the people placed in members of the council and myself who guaranteed the future of that port and signed an agreement to meet any losses occasioned by the operations of Port Alma.

The charge was made against me that I was putting a rope around the necks of Rockhampton ratepayers, who would be paying prohibitive rates. I can produce evidence that Rockhampton is the lowest-rated provincial city in Queensland. Ipswich is the only town anywhere near it. I can produce indisputable evidence that the rate of 4.5c in the \$1 on a valuation of less than \$22,000,000 is the lowest in this State. That includes provision for substantial repayment towards port development, 50 per cent.

towards the major highway bridge, \$30,000 a year loss on buses, and contributions towards seaside roads and seaside amenities.

I make no apology for imposing the lowest rate in the State on the people of Rockhampton for this development. If that is putting a rope around the necks of the people of Rockhampton, every other city should put ropes around the necks of their electors, because Rockhampton ratepayers have a comfortable feeling which is much appreciated by them. In the years ahead we will prove the wisdom of this generation paying now for developments to ensure the provision of many necessary services in the city. We are undertaking a project that will supply three times the city's water requirements by the year 2000. What other city in Australia can claim such a project? It is a comfortable rope that has been put round the necks of the ratepayers of Rockhampton, and they are well able to sustain the burden.

There are many things that I could discuss in this debate. As I said at the beginning, however, I do not think that an hour should be wasted in elaborating over-elaborated things. I therefore do not propose to speak at any greater length at this stage. I support most emphatically the leadership of the Treasurer, and I most enthusiastically thank him for his Budget. I am quite sure it is a blueprint that will allow for the full development of Queensland. My only criticism of it is that it places too much emphasis on areas where explosive development is taking place, and not enough on cities such as Rockhampton that are going ahead at a steady rate.

Townsville is another area that is receiving a lot of financial assistance. I am not at all against that, nor am I against the full development of Gladstone. I am in full agreement with it, and I am also in favour of the construction of the major power stations. I agree with the construction of the railway line from Moura to Gladstone, and of the Cunningham Highway. These things should be done, however, in addition to the normal development proceeding throughout the State; they should not be carried out at the expense of other places. Stagnation should not be forced upon some areas because they are developing steadily under their own steam, without being pushed ahead as other areas are. That is the only argument that I have against the Budget.

I think all State avenues have been fully exploited for additional revenue, and I therefore think that some approach must be made to the Commonwealth for further finance. This State has been so successful in its planned development that it has run out of money. As there is only one taxing authority, that is where we must go for more income. Having obtained as much revenue as possible at the State level, it is now necessary to put fairly and squarely before the Commonwealth Government the claim

that more money must be provided for the areas of explosive development where so much heavy capitalisation is necessary.

**Mrs. JORDAN** (Ipswich West) (3.58 p.m.): I rise to support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. Before I proceed, I should like to offer my congratulations to the hon. member for Bulimba on his election as Leader of the Opposition, and to the hon. member for Townsville North on his election as Deputy Leader. I regret very much the circumstances that led to the resignation of the hon. member for Toowoomba West as Leader of our party in the House. I still feel stunned from the blow, and I am sure all members fully sympathise with him in his time of trouble and wish him well for the future.

In presenting the Budget a fortnight ago today, the Treasurer prefaced his remarks by saying—

“Government of the people, by the people, for the people has been the keynote of democracy down through the years.”

He also expressed the opinion that this Parliament, like those of all democracies, has always been careful to preserve the many privileges and powers it enjoys. He said that one of those powers was control of the public purse. In the Budget that he then presented, he showed just how true his remarks were about the control of the public purse, and in the months to come many people will know, and know very decisively, just what it means to them, as they have to produce from their pockets or their purses, as the case may be, the extra dollars and cents demanded by the additional taxes and payments imposed on the people of Queensland by the Treasurer, and by the Government's decision to balance the Budget.

Of course, most of us were expecting much the type of Budget that the Treasurer brought down. We had heard so much about the drought and its adverse effect on the economy at Commonwealth and State levels that we were fairly well brain-washed in preparation for it, as were many members of the public. But I am afraid that I have not been sufficiently brain-washed to accept the drought lament as being the only thing responsible for the adverse financial situation that the State is in. Make no mistake about it, this is a time of recession. Times certainly are not good, and I have never had so many men, particularly unskilled men, coming to me seeking jobs, and that, I think, is always a sure indication of how bad unemployment is. Therefore, I cannot fathom why the Government, when it is quite happy to budget for deficits in good years, must impose additional charges in a bad year in order to enable it to come out somewhere near even at the end of the financial year.

There is no doubt that the Federal Government, with a Federal election in the offing, passed the buck to the States. Other hon. members on this side of the Chamber who

are more knowledgeable than I am on the subject of finance have expressed their criticisms of the rather lethargic approach by the State Government to the Federal Government and at the Loan Council meeting, when Queensland got such a poor slice of the financial cake that was then cut up. Because of its acceptance of the poor deal given to this State and its failure to put a case for extra grants from the Federal Government because of the drought—contrast this with the action of other State Governments which, as a result of a more dynamic approach, got a better deal—the Government of Queensland is now asking the people to pay more at a State level. All hon. members on this side of the Chamber are greatly concerned about the effect that the additional charges, particularly the increases in railway fares and freights and in transport fees, will have on the family unit. As I said before, it is a case of “from the people”, and if the Treasurer had added those words to his opening sentence, he would have been nearer the truth.

I am very concerned about the effects that extra transport charges will have on the cost of living, and they certainly will have an effect, particularly in more distant areas of the State. They will add considerably to the cost of food and other items in those areas. Somehow or other, costs always seem to rise, and in almost all cases the additional costs are very quickly passed on to the consumers. As a result of the Budget brought down a fortnight ago, the living standards of the people of Queensland will once again be slashed. Indeed, over the years that the Country-Liberal Government has been in office in this State, the standard of living of the people has steadily declined.

No-one knows this better than the housewife. She it is who knows just how much the purchasing power of her money has shrunk as she struggles to make ends meet for her family. There are no family wage adjustments for her or her wage-earner husband under this Government: the burden has to be carried by the wage-earner and his family until there is an annual wage review or until public pressure is such that the Government favours a special hearing, as happened just prior to the last State election, when we had the spectacle of a special court hearing and a rise being given to the workers as a vote-catcher.

My regret now is that all suffer and bear the full burden just because so many people were so confused that they voted against a better deal for themselves and again returned a Country-Liberal Government. I am hopeful that they will, as a result of what has happened in Queensland, at least vote for an A.L.P. Government at the Federal election in a few weeks' time and give themselves a chance to gain a better deal for themselves.

I again wish to speak about my concern at the allocation of loan funds to some provincial local authorities, and, in particular, at the allocation to the Ipswich City Council. In my opinion, and in the opinion of the Ipswich City Council and the ratepayers in the area, Ipswich received a poor deal. I must agree with what the hon. member for Rockhampton South has said here today, and also on the last Grievance Day, in relation to local authorities, when he appealed for a just consideration of the rights of provincial cities to grow, particularly those with steady growth as against those that are undergoing explosive development. I, too, believe that development in one area should not be at the expense of another where the State or the Commonwealth Government feels that special development is necessary. I agree that this additional development is good for Queensland's progress, but I believe that extra money should be channelled into these areas over and above the normal requirements of steady growth and not by way of the present policy of robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Nowadays, more and more has to be provided by local authorities. People are expecting more than they did over half a century ago, but the State is slowly contributing less and less to local government bodies and to the whole local government field. Subsidies have been progressively reduced. I well remember the local authorities conference in 1961, I think it was, when Sir Thomas Hiley, the then Treasurer, broke the bad news that there would be decreasing subsidies and warned that these would be progressively reduced. There was quite an outcry at that conference, but the local authorities could not do other than accept the decision of the then Treasurer. Just as he said that subsidies would lessen, so it has come to pass.

Local government cannot avoid giving increased services, such as more and better roads. More water and sewerage services must also be provided. Local authorities want to do all these things but in doing so they cannot avoid increasing costs, which will again be increased by this Budget. Local authorities will find in the ensuing 12 months that they will incur higher costs as a result particularly of the transport increases that have been provided for in this Budget.

Local authorities have done much over the last few years to improve health standards. Local government by a local authority is the government that is closest to the people. It has contributed greatly to the financing and development of this State. I believe that local government must be given greater assistance by way of substantial grants from both Commonwealth and State Governments. If local authorities stagnate, the whole country stagnates. This Budget is certainly doing nothing for them; indeed, it is a great hindrance. From present indications it would seem that local authorities are going to have a much harder task to fulfil their loan quotas

than they have had for many years. Now we see the spectacle of money from semi-governmental and governmental loans being put into private enterprise, with less being allocated to local authorities. I hope that the Government will give some consideration to this aspect of local authority finance, and that between them the local authorities and the Government will be able to think up some new means to add to local authority finance.

I wish to refer to some very doubtful advertising practices which have arisen in our community—practices which are becoming far too much a part of everyday advertising that I feel is tantamount to sleight-of-hand methods. We have become accustomed to the false packaging, the advertising of "6d. off", "giant size" and so on, about which something is now being done in a Bill that is before Parliament. However, I feel that something also should be done about the advertising of bigger items of expenditure needed in the home, such as sewing machines, refrigerators, and washing machines.

The practice of retailers in marking up prices with the offer of big trade-ins is very misleading. Recently a sales campaign was conducted for a certain brand of sewing machine. I am not saying that there is anything wrong with the quality of the sewing machine, but I am referring to the type of advertising that appeared in the Press and in shop windows. In this publicity campaign a very big trade-in was offered for the oldest machine, but this was for one machine only. The advertisements in the Press and in shop windows in Ipswich, as well as Brisbane, said, "For as little as". The price quoted was minus the trade-in price for that one oldest machine.

The price of the machine was £99 15s., the trade-in price for the one oldest machine was £50, leaving a balance of £49 15s. to be paid by the one lucky enough to have the oldest machine. The advertisement did not say all this; it merely said, "For as little as £49 15s." Of course, anyone looking in the shop window or reading the advertisement in the paper would think that that was the price of the machine to everyone.

It was very misleading advertising. I spoke to the manager of a large and respectable retail store in Ipswich about it. He agreed that it was not very ethical but told me that if his store did not advertise that way for machines and electrical goods they lost the business to the firms that did. He said that they could not compete with firms who used this method of trick advertising, as I call it. He said that the impression he had gained from selling results was that people felt they were getting a bargain by being allowed something off the price of the article they purchased. I would fear that I was being taken in, but as people are being conditioned by this type of advertising apparently they feel that they are getting a bargain if they get something off the advertised price.

It is time the Government stepped in and controlled by law such questionable advertising practices for the benefit of the people and the retailers. Indeed, when I spoke to the manager of this store about the matter he said, "Well, it is up to the Government. We would be happier to trade the other way instead of having to compete on the same lines as some of the other firms." I repeat that it is the Government's responsibility to control by law these very doubtful advertising practices.

In relation to the steep rise in car registration, I wonder why it is always the unfortunate car-owner who is singled out when more money is needed in the Government coffers. It is normal today for the average person to own a car. Maybe he has quite a job to purchase it—usually on the "never never" principle—and he has quite a continuing expense from then on, in one way or another. Many people own cars before they retire and desire to keep them for their convenience. These pensioners, and people on a fixed income, such as those on superannuation, are the hardest hit by this extra tax. During the recent State election campaign the Labour Party, realising the plight of many of these people, offered some concession to pensioners who owned cars. But we were not returned as the Government and now, as a result of this Budget decision, they are even worse off than before—and they were badly enough off then.

**Mr. Hanlon:** They have to pay the extra registration and get no concession.

**Mrs. JORDAN:** As the hon. member for Baroona says, they have the extra registration and no concession to help them with the extra expenditure.

I think all hon. members will agree that the mere fact that a person retires is no reason why he should immediately have to sell his car and suffer the resulting inconvenience. People in retirement should be able to continue to enjoy approximately the same level of living as they enjoyed during their working life. It would appear that the Government is trying to chase car-owners off the road. Perhaps that is the Government's roundabout way of solving the traffic snarl that is developing, particularly in Brisbane. However, it is also developing in a number of provincial cities.

This brings me to the Wilbur Smith Report and the Government's announcement that it will give some financial aid to the Brisbane City Council to implement the report. While I do not wish to detract from Brisbane's case in any way—indeed, I think the Government should help even more, and I am pleased to see that Brisbane, at least, is getting a little help—nevertheless I make a plea on behalf of provincial cities for a crumb from the Government's table to help in the implementation of their Wilbur Smith reports. Ipswich undertook such a report at a cost

of \$20,000 and has also had subsequent traffic data correlated. Ipswich also needs some medium of assistance to progressively carry out the plan proposed for traffic as contained in our Wilbur Smith Report. Again it is a case of the explosive things taking all of the cake and the lesser fry getting very little; another case of the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer.

I now wish to make some comments about a case reported in "The Courier-Mail" of Monday, 10 October, and express my concern at the lightness of the sentence imposed on the lads concerned. These youths were only 15 and 16 years old. I point out that in these days boys of that age know what they are doing—or, if they do not, they should. Even the judge concerned in the case said that the youths would be liable to life imprisonment if they were older. Their conduct was premeditated, and they did not even know the woman concerned. These youths were protected by the law which, under section 63 of the State Children's Act, provides that a person under 17 years of age who is convicted of a capital offence may not be charged in the same way as an adult. In this case the sentence of being committed for two years to the care of the Director of Children's Services is a very light one and will in no way act as a deterring example to the kind of young people who are inclined to kick over the traces and break the unwritten laws of our society as well as the written ones. I was very heartened yesterday when the Minister for Justice, Dr. Delamothe, in his answer to my question on this matter, showed that he, too, was somewhat concerned by indicating that the Government was considering an appeal against the sentences, and, what to me is more important, that the law in relation to penalties in this regard was being considered.

We have far too many crimes of violence today. The time is due for some research into the underlying causes. I certainly believe that we need education for leisure as well as education for earning a living. There is something very wrong indeed when, because I expressed an opinion, I should have been subjected to the telephone threats that I was on Tuesday. For myself, I can take it; one has to in public life. But to express the hope that something dreadful would happen to my children, as one woman did, is, I believe, the thinking of a sick mind, and I feel very sorry for people who are so mentally and morally unbalanced as to wish that sort of thing upon anyone. I believe they need help.

I now wish to refer to the national task that women are performing in rearing their children. It was something that was not recognised for many years. While some make mistakes in the upbringing of their children, the great majority do a very commendable job. Nevertheless there are many who are playing this role in our community under very adverse circumstances. I have

spoken before about the hardships of some deserted wives and their families. Today I draw attention to the anomalous position that exists in Queensland because of this State's laws. Until a deserted wife takes out a maintenance order against her husband, she is not entitled even to temporary relief from either the State or the Federal Government.

Hope dies hard, and many women will wait in the hope that their husbands will return. Consequently they delay taking out the necessary maintenance order. Once such an order is taken out a mother can apply for State aid of \$2.50 for each child. But deserted mothers in Queensland cannot get the special Federal grant because the Federal Government will only pay such grants in States which do not have their own relief aid. The Federal benefit rate is \$8.25 a week for the mother and \$1.50 for each child. The State relief is \$2.65 a week for the mother, \$2.65 for the first child, and \$1.50 for each other child, no matter how many. So that Queensland deserted wives are worse off. Add to that the anomaly that the State does not allow relief to be paid to children in conjunction with State aid from the Department of Children's Services. As against that, in cases where the special benefit is paid by the Federal Government, or where deserted wives' pensions are received, State aid is allowed. This differentiation is tragic to both mothers and their children and is a blot on our State.

I feel that there should be some discussion and mutual action at both State and Federal levels to rectify this position and to give equal justice to our Queensland mothers in such circumstances. I appeal to the Government to take steps in an endeavour to iron out the anomalies in this whole business.

I was pleased to see in the Budget that a much larger sum is to be spent on education, and also to learn that the Federal Government is now also coming to the education "party" and apparently is willing to participate more and more in assisting to provide education for our young people. I can remember sitting in the visitors' gallery at Parliament House, Canberra, some years ago and listening to a discussion into which education was introduced. I was very surprised at the time to hear Liberal and Country Party members pooh-pooing the whole idea of education being a Federal matter.

Thank goodness, ideas and policies have changed since then. No doubt it has been a very slow process, and I believe that the Commonwealth Government should come to the education "party" much more than it does. However, I think we can be pleased that at last the Commonwealth has recognised that it should have an interest in education and, although much more is required, it is now realising that fact and doing something about it.

Since the education explosion in Queensland as a result of the change in the education system in 1964, when 8th Grade was transferred from primary to secondary schools, there has been a constant call and increasing agitation for more to be done in the field of education. The expanding development of technical education as a result of the recognition that it is a very great and constantly growing need in this country has meant ever-increasing expenditure in this field alone.

New spheres of development in education always necessitate greater outlays, but I feel that money spent on schools of technology will be money well spent. My criticism is that not enough is being done quickly enough. I realise that it all comes back to money and that we can never have enough of that. Indeed, Queensland spends less on education than does any other Australian State, and Australia as a whole spends a smaller proportion of its national income on education than do many other countries. Last Tuesday evening we heard the hon. member for Toowoomba East speak in detail on education, and I am sure many of us could learn quite a lot from what he said. He referred to the fact that the amount spent on education per head in Queensland, namely, \$2.79, was the lowest in any Australian State, and he contrasted it with the amount of \$4.19 per head spent in Tasmania, the smallest State.

I think all hon. members will agree with the hon. member for Toowoomba East that much more needs to be done in the field of education in Queensland. I think that the money spent should be spent more in relation to needs, and I feel that an inquiry is needed into the whole education system in Queensland to see that first requirements come first and that money is not spent merely for the sake of spending it. I believe that the Minister for Education is a very conscientious Minister and is concerned about the future of our children and their preparation for life by the receipt of a good education. He certainly has to stand much criticism, at least from this side of the Chamber. Of course, that is as it should be, because it is the Opposition's job to be critical when it thinks that more is required. In this instance, we do think that much more is required. Therefore, we have subjected the Minister for Education to many questions and to much criticism in the hope that the department will have a look at the whole system of education in Queensland and do more to provide our children with a sound education for both earning a living and enjoying life.

I think that Ipswich has missed out in the field of technical education. Even though that city has always had a greater number of diploma students than either Toowoomba or Rockhampton, it has not been considered for the establishment of an institute of technology. As it is, every student from the third year onwards has to

travel 25 miles to Brisbane, and there are quite a few who do. Apparently Ipswich suffers because of its proximity to Brisbane; but it is an industrial town and, as a result, people living there have a special interest in technical and trade matters. I believe that the Department of Education should consider setting up, in the first instance, a part-time institute in Ipswich to cater for at least some of the faculties that are particularly required in the area and relieve students of the need to travel to Brisbane, as they do now. It would mean only an extension of classes and of teaching facilities. There is plenty of room in the buildings now used as a technical college, and it would not be very expensive to provide classes and facilities for diploma students in Ipswich. It is very inconvenient and time-consuming for them to travel 25 miles to Brisbane several nights a week to pursue their studies, and I know just how much hardship this causes because my son is one of those who travel to the Institute of Technology in Brisbane.

Attitudes to teaching are changing because of the changing demands in this age of tremendous scientific and technical development, and I think that more provision should be made by the Department of Education for in-service training for teachers. In my humble opinion, it is important enough to merit the closing of schools for a week now and again during the year specifically so that teachers collectively could undergo concentrated in-service training in various centres. Teaching methods have altered; the knowledge that teachers require has altered and increased over the years. That is why I believe that in-service training is very important. Many of the teachers have been in the department for a great number of years. In-service training would be of great assistance to them and, as a consequence, would also be of great assistance to their pupils.

I turn now to railway matters, particularly in Ipswich. I am concerned about rumours that are abroad and about the effect that some departmental decisions will have on railway workers and the electorate of Ipswich as a whole. Workers in Ipswich are deeply concerned about alterations that may take place as dieselisation proceeds and about their consequent effect on the workshops and on the general workings and timetables in the area. They fear that changes may make some positions redundant, and I hope that the department will give due regard to the position of these men when making plans and decisions.

I hope, too, that these decisions will be made known early enough for adjustments to be made, both so far as the workers are concerned and so far as the city is concerned. I realise that dieselisation is progress and I would not, for one moment, want to speak against it, but I am concerned with what

is going to happen to the workers of Ipswich and also to the employment position in that city as a result of the complete reorganisation to dieselisation.

We in Ipswich are very concerned about the closure of the Ellenborough Street bridge over the railway line. We have been compelled to accept the decision because our efforts to have the bridge replaced were unsuccessful, but I hope that plans to replace the bridge will not be pigeon-holed and that in the not-far-distant future a structure that will meet the needs of the area and its future development will be built.

I am quite aware of the bottle-neck that occurs with railway traffic at the Ipswich railway station and in the Ipswich railway yards. I know that the department requires an increased number of lines in this area for the better handling of rolling-stock and that, particularly with the increasing trend to dieselisation, more lines will be needed for handling diesel engines.

This bridge is one of five over the railway line in Ipswich. They were built over a cutting as a result of the decision of engineers a century ago, which decision cut the town in half, as it were. As a result, traffic flow in Ipswich depends to a large extent on the condition of the bridges that cross this cutting, and on those bridges being kept open. The closure of this particular bridge has upset planning for future roads and for development in the area, and has thrown traffic on to one particular underpass which we feel will become a terrific traffic hazard. Indeed, since the bridge was closed on 1 October this underpass has been handling a far greater volume of traffic than it was thought to be capable of and it is now a very dangerous underpass. I hope the city of Ipswich will get some consideration and co-operation from the department in planning for the city's future needs in this regard.

Finally, I want to put forward the very real need to have trained dietitians in the main hospitals throughout the State. At the present time, very little attention is paid to this particular need. There are no training facilities in Queensland and very few trained dietitians. As a consequence of there being no training facilities, of course, no-one is pursuing the course; it is a case of no course, no encouragement. At the same time, patients who are being treated with some of the newer drugs must be very careful with their diets. Some foods, when taken in conjunction with some of the drugs doctors prescribe, upset the whole metabolism of the body. As a matter of fact, doctors are very concerned about this lack of diet appreciation in treatment in hospitals, particularly in conjunction with some of the newer drugs.

Quoting one particular instance to illustrate the current attitude, a patient who was in hospital on cortisone, and had been

on it for a number of years, was given bacon and eggs for breakfast. She refused it, telling the nurse on duty that she could not have bacon and eggs and could not have salt in her diet. The nurse reported it to the sister-in-charge, who hurriedly came into the patient and told her that she must eat the bacon and eggs—that bacon and eggs were salt-free. The patient, who had been on cortisone for many years under the treatment of her own doctor and knew that she had to avoid salt as much as possible, explained this to the sister-in-charge and said that she knew that bacon and eggs were not salt-free. The sister-in-charge replied, "Well, you will have to eat it or you can go without." The patient went without rather than upset the balance of her metabolism by too great a salt intake.

The treatment that is being given by doctors to patients under such drugs can be completely negated by the attitude of the Department of Health because of the procedures in the hospitals, where there are no trained dietitians who are qualified to ensure that patients get the diets that their treatment requires. This is not something that would cost a great deal of money. Beyond the salary of a dietitian there would be little extra cost because the food is there. At the present time much of it is being wasted because patients are not eating it. It is just a matter of training and a better usage of the food that is already there. It would mean a better service to the patients and an improvement in their health, because they would then be getting the full treatment necessary for their improvement.

In conclusion, let me say that I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. HARRIS** (Wynnum) (4.43 p.m.): I, too, support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

I congratulate the new Leader and his Deputy on their elevation to such important and honourable positions. I also congratulate the hon. member for Norman on his success at the party meeting.

Having listened to some speakers criticising the Government and others telling the Committee what a wonderful Budget has been presented and what progress Queensland has made during the last three years, I trust that I will be excused if I agree with certain items in the Budget as being of great benefit to Queensland and, on the other hand, disagree to some extent with how some of the money is to be spent.

I fully realise what a nerve-racking job it must be for any Treasurer to present a workable Budget that will be acceptable to the people in general. Having been in business myself for many years, I can appreciate what the Treasurer went through during the time he was preparing his Budget—the sleepless nights and hard work that go into

presenting any type of balance sheet. When the Treasurer has to channel finance from one source to another to enable the Government to continue to operate, and when we know perfectly well that the cupboards are almost bare, we know that he has a very difficult and well-nigh impossible task to perform.

I should now like to mention a few facts and figures to be found on page 15 of the Estimates. I am confident that most hon. members have studied the Estimates and when I refer to these matters they will know that this is a very harsh Budget. They will also realise that people are faced with higher hospital fees, increased road transport charges and higher rail freights and fares, and motor vehicle registration fees are also to be increased. These increased charges will either wipe out the working man's ability to save or force him to adopt a poorer standard of living. Irrespective of which way one looks at it, that is the ultimate result of the Budget as it affects the working man and his meeting the increased charges, which in some instances are vicious.

While the Minister has told the public that they will have to manage on less, his own department has had a huge increase in staff and expenditure. I am referring now to page 15 of the Estimates, which gives details of the Treasurer's Department. It shows that the appropriation for last year was \$7,000,000, but the Government managed to spend over \$11,000,000. For the present year even \$11,000,000 will not be sufficient, and the Treasurer has budgeted for a further increase; the amount is greater than \$16,000,000. That is an increase of about 50 per cent., yet he expects the average citizen of the State to pull his belt in a little tighter.

The staff position is similar. Last year there were 704 employees in departments under the Treasurer's control, and this year it is estimated that they will need 742 employees—38 more employees in this organisation, business, or whatever we might call it. This is in a year when it is difficult to balance the Budget. I should like to have been able to do that when I was in business.

Turning to education, we see that heavy expenditure has been provided for. For the last 10 years—or even as far back as the days of Vince Gair—every Budget has been similar. There is nothing particularly outstanding in the huge expenditure for education. Why shouldn't there be huge expenditure on education? The important factor is that Government departmental expenditure continues to rise. The department decides how much they will need, and then the private individual is told that he will be socked harder than ever before. This applies even to the Governor. He has a private secretary, an official secretary, an assistant secretary, a clerk, three clerk-typists, an orderly, a lodge-keeper, a head chauffeur, an assistant chauffeur, a butler, a footman, a head

housemaid and an Aide-de-Camp, and he requires two more staff members. It seems that a staff of 13 is not big enough; he has to have 15, which will increase the Budget by another \$10,000 a year.

One of the worst features will be the inflation that these extra charges will cause. With road and rail freight costs going up, as well as other charges, there will be a delayed impact; that is certain. There is no way we shall be able to stop those increases from causing general price rises, and the Budget gives no incentive to industry. Other States of Australia—Victoria, Tasmania, South Australia and New South Wales—and even the Commonwealth, have realised that there is a necessity, in these rough and tough times, to budget for a deficit. But Queensland goes the other way and budgets for a surplus, and expects the poor old wage-plug to foot the bill once again. While these extra burdens are heaped onto the private individual, Government departments cannot curtail their own expenditure and will spend more than ever before.

Fully realising the financial position, I must take this opportunity to thank the Minister for Education for what he has done in my electorate on every occasion that I have mentioned to him the inadequacy of educational facilities in my district. He knows by now that I do not make frivolous representations, and he knows that the condition of the schools in my electorate is such that he is virtually ashamed of them and will do everything possible to improve the position. He knows that the electorate has solid, full-time representation and that I shall at all times bring to his notice, or to the notice of his department, the failure of the Government to do certain things.

I know I can expect that treatment from this Minister because he is one of the few men of logic in the Government who are prepared to listen to reason, and he knows that sometimes his Government is in the wrong. I have pointed out to him over the last two or three months certain things that are necessary at the Wynnum State High School; they should have been done without any representation from me.

There has been talk about poor representation. The only time this district had poor representation, if it can be referred to as such, was when the former hon. member for Wynnum was so ill that he could not get out of bed and attend to his duties. Nobody else—not even the staff of the Department of Education—had the decency or courtesy to help him in his difficulty. If anybody queries the action of my predecessor in any way at all I shall take up the cudgel where he dropped it and carry it for him, as well as for myself.

I wish now to refer to the Minister for Works and Housing. Like the Minister for Education, he fully realises the condition of many of the buildings in my district, not

only those belonging to the Department of Education. I shall refer to other Government buildings later on. He has shown great consideration, not particularly to me, but to many other people, realising that they must be kept reasonably quiet at all times. I know that he will support me when I take complaints to him, because they are all genuine complaints.

This district has not been as sadly neglected in some other respects. I refer now to other Government buildings. During the many years of Mr. Gunn's representations he, assisted by the hon. member for Belmont, advocated the building of a new police court in the Wynnum district. I can remember quite a number of years ago reading articles on this subject by the hon. member for Belmont, when Mr. Gunn was unable to make this contribution, and on each occasion requests were made for the provision of a new court-house. Through those representations, I am happy to say that the Minister for Works has agreed to have a court-house built, and his men are now on the job and doing splendid work.

Let us not think for a moment that provision of the court-house will complete what is needed in this area. A new police station is essential, because part of the police residence has to be removed to enable the court-house to be built. A new police station is also necessary because there is insufficient accommodation in the present building, even for the limited staff that is there now. Police officers are now working in the spare rooms of the old residence. These are quite inadequate, but the men are expected to work and do their best for the community in shocking conditions, which will be much worse when the building is partly demolished. Admittedly a new police residence has been provided, which is a credit to the builders.

Whilst I am dealing with the police, let me again appeal to the Government, as the hon. member for Belmont has done, to provide more police in the Wynnum district. I make this request not because the people in this area are more susceptible to crime than are those in other districts but simply because there is more work to be done than 14 men can cope with. At present there are at the station 13 men and a trainee, who have to look after an area extending from Cleveland to Tingalpa and out to the islands. Carrying out their job properly is well-nigh impossible, as 75 per cent. of their work is done in their offices on typewriters instead of on the beat endeavouring to prevent crime.

Recently I went to the Hemmant Police Station to welcome to our district a police officer who had been transferred there. In the course of conversation I asked if he had made any application to his department for repairs and installations. I was shocked at the condition of the police station and house. I saw that the police station had furniture that must have been there from the time the station was

established. I feel sure that no other police station in any part of the metropolitan area, and possibly in Queensland, has such antiques. I say that with all sincerity.

There was no semblance of any comfort for the public. As a matter of fact, not one chair was available for use by the public. The tables were inadequate, and the furniture supplied by the department was not desks but pigeon-holes in the wall. The toilet facilities are an e.c. down at the bottom of a 32 or 36-perch block of land, and this constable is a married man with five children, the youngest about four weeks old.

Imagine the inconvenience that the wife of that constable is put to in an area only 11 miles from the General Post Office. If sewerage is not available, everyone in the area should have the advantage of another facility that is on the market and with which, I am led to believe, other one-man police stations are equipped. I appeal to the Minister in charge of police to see whether something can be done in this respect for the Hemmant Police Station.

I was told that application had been made to the department to have some of the anomalies remedied. The difficulty of getting into the police property in wet weather has also been pointed out to me. There is not even a footpath, a path to the front gate, or car tracks to the police garage. In wet weather there is no alternative to leaving the vehicle out on the road.

Again dealing with a police matter, I ask the Government to re-open the Manly Police Station. It may be rather a forlorn hope, but its re-opening is very necessary for the good of the district. The building and equipment needed are there already; all that is needed is a couple of men to look after the bottom end of the Wynnum electorate, which contains about 15,000 or 20,000 people. As I said earlier, the courthouse is needed urgently, and it is pleasing to know that it will be completed in the near future.

Generally, the police in my electorate have been doing a very good job under the leadership of Senior Sergeant Purtle. He came to Wynnum to endeavour to clean it up—it was very necessary—and, despite a shortage of men, he has done well. The police have to do all their own typing and work on files, and this allows motorists and pedestrians to flout the law. Admittedly, the position probably is similar in most districts, but law-breaking must be stopped and, particularly for the people of Wynnum, the sooner the better.

Again I emphasise the need for a hospital in the district. Hon. members have heard me speak on this subject before; they have also heard the hon. member for Belmont and my predecessor, Mr. Gunn, speak on it. Only a week ago three more deaths occurred unnecessarily in the area. Two of the

people concerned died on the way to hospital and the third was killed instantly. It should not be necessary for me or anyone else to stress continually the need for a hospital in the Wynnum area when things such as that occur. The hon. member for Belmont has raised this matter on many occasions, and I again appeal to the Minister to expedite the building of a hospital at Wynnum.

Recently I read an article in the local paper stating that the Government was seeking sites for four new hospitals, one being at Wynnum. It is gratifying to know that the Government has been looking at an area that was originally chosen by a Labour Government as the site for a hospital. I refer to the area opposite the Manly West State School. If any hon. members had the privilege of seeing the Spring Parade at Wynnum, they would have seen in it a float depicting the need for a hospital. It showed smashed-up cars, nurses, and an inadequate ambulance centre.

As the Government has not seen fit to accede to our request for a hospital, although land had been purchased by the previous Labour Government in a particularly good area—this Government is not satisfied it is adequate and insists on buying other land—I should like to raise a question relative to the Wynnum dental and medical clinics. As I say, we have no hospital—and it looks as if there is little likelihood of our getting one in the near future—but we have a medical clinic which was established, I understand, in 1936, by an Australian Labour Party Government with a staff of one doctor, who was expected to administer to the needs of the people at that time. At present this clinic is open on two half-days a week. It is open on Wednesday afternoon from 1 p.m. till 2.45 p.m. and on Friday afternoon during the same hours. In all, two periods of 1½ hours each are available to the people of a district the size of Wynnum for medical attention in each week. No provision is made for attention at night. If one has to get sick one has to do it in daylight hours. If one becomes ill on any day other than Wednesday afternoon or Friday afternoon one must remain sick until the following clinic day. The alternative is to travel to the Royal Brisbane Hospital, but how many aged people have the facilities to travel to Brisbane, particularly on their own and when they are ill?

In the period between 1936 and 1965—29 years—the population of Wynnum has grown considerably and the medical staff has been increased to two doctors, but it is still open on only two days a week. The Government has not increased the number of visiting days or the length of the visiting hours. Although two doctors now attend they are available for only 3½ hours a week, from 9 a.m. to 10.45 a.m. and from 1 p.m. to 2.40 p.m., still on Wednesdays and Fridays

only. Our urgent need is a medical service from Mondays to Fridays during the existing hours, and also on at least two nights a week. This is absolutely necessary, particularly in the absence of a hospital in the Wynnum area.

I do not wish to labour the necessity for this hospital. I have already done it previously on so many occasions and I know that the Government is fully aware of the position. I have on several occasions paid a visit to the clinic and have found the waiting room full of patients, mostly workers. I have discussed with them their possible loss of wages and I was amazed to find that in virtually every case their sick leave had been exhausted. If we had a night service from 6 p.m. to 7.45 p.m. on at least two nights a week it would allow these people to attend during those hours and eliminate loss of pay or any other unnecessary hardship. As hon. members know, this is an industrial area inhabited mainly by workers, and in my opinion these are the people most in need of the service to which every Queenslander is justly entitled, namely, free hospitalisation and treatment.

Whilst on the subject of the clinic and the hospital, I should like to bring to the Committee's notice the position of the ambulance brigade in the Wynnum area.

We all know what a wonderful job the Wynnum ambulance is doing. It is one of the very few ambulance centres that is paying its way. That centre pays its way for two reasons: the bearers are prepared to go out on a house-to-house canvass to get their wages; if they do not get enough money for their wages that way they organise a Spring Parade. They have done that for a number of years, and only last week-end they put on a three-day programme which was a great success. When one realises that in an area like Wynnum the ambulance centre has to do this sort of thing to pay its way and make wages for the bearers, and without a hospital in the area, it makes one wonder if it is all worth while.

Although the area covered by the ambulance centre has been drastically reduced over the last few years, it caters for the needs of nearly 50,000 people. Not only does it provide for the Wynnum area but it operates as far as Cleveland and Tingalpa, and it even caters for the islands. With so much territory to look after, how can this centre continue to operate under such conditions and maintain the excellent service it has rendered to the people for so long? The fact is that we urgently need a hospital in Wynnum.

Let me give some facts and figures from the latest ambulance budget. For the year ended 30 June, 1966, in its casualty room the Wynnum Centre treated 1,223 severe cases and 1,338 slight cases, a total of

2,561. The number of transports of people from their homes or the ambulance centre to hospitals in the city numbered 12,316 medical cases and 897 accident cases, a total of 13,213, which, added to the cases treated in the casualty room, makes a total of 15,774. This approximates one case every half-hour of every hour of the year. Hospital request "Repeat transports" represent approximately 50 per cent. of the total. If we had a hospital in Wynnum all these transports would not be necessary and we could provide a better service in the centre.

A total of 4,977 pensioners were transported over 112,240 "patient-miles". To explain what a "patient-mile" is, I point out that two cases transported over 10 miles equals 20 "patient-miles". In all, 96,323 miles were run with pensioners alone, and remember that pensioners are transported free.

This is an enlightening fact: the Government subsidy of \$14,511 for a district population of 45,000 amounts to an average of 33c per head of population per annum.

In respect of workers' compensation cases, up to early 1965 a donation from the State Government Insurance Office of approximately \$2 a week was received. However, since then no donation has been received and the ambulance is required to transport compensation cases to hospital free. This is despite the fact that the State Government Insurance Office receives a premium from the employers to provide this service. In other words, the Q.A.T.B. at Wynnum is subsidising the State Government Insurance Office.

I come now to the Wynnum South Jetty, or the Wynnum Central jetty, as it is called. I know that someone may interject and say, "What are you talking about, Harris? This has nothing to do with the State Government; it is the council's jetty." I am fully aware of that, but if the Government took over this jetty, as it did the Manly Harbour jetty, I should have no complaint. In dealing with this important matter, I propose to refer to the safety of the boating fraternity in general who use Waterloo Bay and Moreton Bay. It is impossible to bring any boat within a distance of 10 yds. of this jetty, yet it was built only a few years ago. I draw the attention of hon. members to the manner in which it was constructed, as this is very important. I can only assume that the advisers who investigated the jetty site could not previously have seen water. There is no way in the world that anyone with common sense could have constructed a jetty like this. It was built not by the Labour administration but by the C.M.O., during the Groom regime, and it has remained the same ever since.

Firstly, it has a batter wall extending approximately 12 ft. to the bottom of the mud. If this jetty was constructed so that

a boat could pull in and tie up, in accident cases approximately an hour could be saved instead of travelling to the Brisbane River from Green Island, Moreton Bay or Waterloo Bay, and a life might be saved.

I shall give a few details concerning the jetty. Owing to its construction the entire end of the jetty is unsuitable for boating purposes. The batter walls are sloping at such an angle that even on a flood tide it is impossible for a boat to come in and tie up to let people off. Possibly it was not built for that purpose, but it is extremely dangerous as there are no railings at the end of the jetty. A number of people still go out there to sit, or to have a quiet stroll. As a large number of children go out there it is quite possible, as has happened in the past, for them to slip over the side. Parents have had to jump in and pull them out. The end of the jetty is perfectly flat, and if a person goes out at night there is nothing to indicate that he is at the end of the jetty; there is not even a light to indicate the end of the jetty.

At one time a navigation light was erected on the jetty but louts broke it. Even if it had not been broken, it would have been inadequate because the background lights of houses tend to mislead boat skippers wanting to approach the jetty. The only way to overcome the problem is to install one of the new fluorescent navigational lights. I sometimes wonder if an accident has to occur before the Government takes notice of these matters.

As hon. members no doubt are aware, in the last 10 years the members of the sailing fraternity in Wynnum-Manly area have increased tenfold in number. However, no additional facilities have been provided for these people. Would it be possible to provide two more ramps for the use of the young people who have taken an interest in sailing and are using the Bay? There have been two ramps there for many years but because of their age and position they are quite unsuitable for these people. They should be concreted so that the power-boat fraternity can use them at high tide.

A large number of people visit Wynnum at the week-end. It is, and has been for some time, one of the few places where the average wage-earner can get near the sea. Visitors are handicapped by a lack of parking facilities. The area containing the boat ramps has been fenced off to allow the sailing fraternity to hoist their sails prior to entering the water. There is plenty of room on the beach that could be fenced off as a parking area. That would be beneficial to the visitors and would make safer the highway between the beach and the shopping centre. We have only one traffic policeman in Wynnum, and on Sundays thousands of cars visit the area and much of the danger could be eliminated by getting these vehicles off the road.

It is probable that this Government will electrify the railways in time to come. In 1957 it was first mooted that we would have an electrified railway system, and \$11,000,000 was spent on that project. Many branch lines have been closed, and I am led to believe that a railway service will be denied Wynnum people. Three months ago I applied to have a drain installed at the Manly Railway Station. I commend the department on the promptness with which it carried out that work. In wet weather water flooded the land of the person who complained to me, and it was causing great inconvenience to her. Within a week of my recommendation the department installed a 10-inch drain, approximately 100 feet long. Everybody was quite happy, including me. A month later I was again contacted and asked when the department intended to complete the drain. Another gang then came down and completed the other end. However, a gap of 4 feet was left between the lines, and I have been quite unable to have the drain finished. I have appealed for it to be done on three or four occasions, but without success. The Minister for Transport is now in the Chamber, and I feel quite sure that he will give some consideration to this matter and have it attended to.

Let me now refer to the Wynnum Central Railway Station. I have no complaints about the Railway Department. On each occasion when I have approached its officers I have received prompt and very courteous service. However, the Wynnum Central station has become a bit of a bugbear. When sewerage went through this area, the department installed a sewerage system at the station. What it did not do was close the old e.c. at the end of the platform. Possibly the department had not been notified. After the e.c. had been used for months, without any pans, I was contacted and I made representations to the department. That was months ago, but nothing has been done. It is still in such a shocking condition that people are complaining to me, sometimes two and three times a week. All I ask is that this building be demolished. It is of galvanised iron and is totally unfitted for use. It is in a shocking, filthy condition, as it has been used as a toilet without toilet facilities. I see that the Minister is busily making notes, and I am sure he will pay due attention to this matter. When this building is removed it will also erase a public eyesore, and that, too, is very important. There is, however, one problem. Portion of the building may be used as a signal-lamp room or a store room. I request that some attention be given to this problem.

Whilst dealing with the platform of the Wynnum Central Railway Station, I might also mention that there is a tap on the platform that has been leaking for 12 months. It has made a shocking mess of the platform. An area approximately 6 feet in diameter is completely sodden, and it is virtually

impossible to walk near the tap or use it. There are no other drinking facilities. That is another problem that needs attention at the station.

I also ask for signs to be placed in a prominent position on the ladies' and gentlemen's toilets. I refer now to the new sewered toilets that have been built and are, in their fine workmanship, a credit to the staff of the Railway Department. Someone went down and put a sign on the men's toilet, but did not think it necessary to put one on the ladies'. I hope that, with a bit of persuasion, we may be able to get signs on both toilets at Wynnum Central. There is already a sign on the door, but when it is open it is impossible to see it.

I mentioned in the absence of the Minister for Education, who is now in the Chamber, that I am particularly grateful for what he has done in my district. I repeat, too, that I have many more complaints to make to him and I know that he will again extend the courtesy that he has shown me in the past, because by now no doubt he realises that when I make requests they are not frivolous but urgent and are what the people and I, as the representative of the district, want.

**Mr. DEAN (Sandgate) (5.30 p.m.):** In supporting the amendment moved by my Leader, the hon. member for Bulimba, protesting against the Budget and expressing the Opposition's opinion of it, I should like first to offer my congratulations and good wishes to the hon. member as the new Leader of the Parliamentary Labour Party, and also to his Deputy, the hon. member for Townsville North. I have no doubt whatever that they will make a success of those positions because they bring to them a sound knowledge of parliamentary procedure and wide general knowledge and experience.

I compliment the preceding speaker, the hon. member for Wynnum, on the speech that he made this afternoon. The most important part of it, to my mind, was the very wide and comprehensive exposition he gave of the difficulties of the Queensland Ambulance Transport Brigade, particularly the brigades in the Brisbane metropolitan area. As you know, Mr. Hodges, I am a member of the board, and I realise only too well the truth of the statements made by the hon. member. When legislation is brought down in this Chamber—I hope it will be in the near future—I hope that many, if not all, of the difficulties will be removed from the administration of this very important public utility.

The debate on the Financial Statement affords hon. members an opportunity of dealing with a wide range of subjects. As I have slightly less than 30 minutes in which to deal with the whole of the Budget, I shall first deal briefly with a very important subject that I have raised in debates and by way

of questions from time to time over the years that I have been a member of this Assembly. I refer to civil defence.

I criticise very strongly the paltry amounts provided to the States by the Commonwealth Government for civil defence. Again in this year's Budget the amount provided is quite inadequate, in my opinion, to bring this very important organisation up to the high standard of efficiency that is desirable. I am sure I voice the thoughts of all hon. members when I say that I hope the services of the organisation are not needed, but I think it is very wrong to have an organisation in being that cannot carry out the duties expected of it if an emergency arises. I am critical of both the Federal Government and the State Government for the amounts that have been provided. It is obvious that both Governments are not only anti-Labour but also anti-civil defence. It is only natural that one should link them when dealing with this subject because one influences the other and they are interdependent. I lay most of the blame on the Federal Government, which has control of the apportionment of moneys. It has shown a shameful disregard for civilian safety in the event of an attack on Australia, and more particularly on Queensland.

If we are subject to any attack we will find ourselves unprepared. I have carried out a sort of gallup poll of my own, asking people what they would feel about their own personal safety if an attack alarm should be given. I asked them what action they would take not only for their own protection but for that of their families. Not one of them could tell me what he would do if we were attacked by nuclear weapons.

My prime purpose in bringing this matter forward is not to be a carping critic of the Government but to try to arouse it, so that the Premier might insist on the Commonwealth Government's making a larger grant for this purpose by allocating a larger proportion of over-all expenditure to it.

As hon. members know, the allocation for civil defence comes from the over-all defence fund, and civil defence is granted less than 1c in \$10 from the Federal defence allocation. This miserable grant doubtless must be very disappointing indeed to civil defence directors.

We seem to be enclosed within a vicious circle, with the two Governments chasing each other and trying to pass the responsibility to each other. I have some justification for saying that, because some time ago the Commonwealth Minister for the Interior said in the Federal House that this was a State responsibility. I know that the implementation of it is a State responsibility, but the States cannot carry out their responsibility in this regard if they do not get necessary and adequate finance.

First of all, let me explain the very definite constitutional position historically. It does not call for much debate, because it is within our Constitution that this particular organisation is set up. In the 19th century the impossibility of each of the six Australian States, with their then very small numbers of inhabitants, defending themselves separately was clearly recognised. Defence was the major reason for the creation of the Commonwealth, because it was recognised that the most efficient form of defence was a collective one. The States got together and formed the Commonwealth, and the States voluntarily surrendered some taxation powers so that the Commonwealth could have one unified defence system for the whole of Australia. But the Commonwealth Minister for the Interior, who is supposed to administer civil defence, in reply to a question, told the Federal House that this was a State responsibility. Later on, of course, he had to make a correction in the House and break down much of what he said because I think he realised that what he said at that time was said mainly through ignorance; I do not think it was deliberate.

The greatest weakness within the civil defence organisation is that most of the responsibility is placed upon the shoulders of our defence chiefs. They are the people who have the final say in the allocation of money from the general defence budget, and I think it is only natural that they will look after their own services first and regard civil defence as of secondary importance.

I think the time is long overdue for the Commonwealth to take cognisance of the system that operates in Great Britain. In that country, civil defence is not dependent on the allocation by the defence chiefs of a certain amount from their own allocations. Civil defence there is a separate Vote altogether. The sooner we get to that stage here, the sooner we will be able to iron out a lot of the present difficulties and shortcomings that are so evident in our civil defence structure. It is only natural that the Chiefs of Staff give consideration to their own requirements before allocating money for civil defence purposes.

A lot of information on this subject can be gleaned from the Parliamentary Library. In Russia, the authorities have so much faith in civil defence that for many years they have made it compulsory for all members of the civilian population to make themselves fully conversant with the action to be taken in an emergency. When countries that live under a system contrary to our way of life take that sort of precaution, how much more important it is for us that we should be fully prepared and competent to take whatever precautions are necessary in the event of an alarm being given.

Much of what I am saying today I have said on a previous occasion in another way. My purpose in bringing this matter forward

again this afternoon is to try to impress upon the Government the fact that the present organisation is quite inadequate. Of course, one would not expect that admission from the Director, but when we make a comparison with the civil defence organisations in other countries it is obvious that this is so. We should learn from the experience of other countries who have had the misfortune of having had to use their civil defence facilities. Little excuse can be found for the authorities in this country—Governments in particular—for not taking notice of what has happened in other countries. There is no doubt that we have the personnel if we had the money to set up the necessary organisation to train them.

Next I have to undermine the support that military officers receive from a wide cross-section of the public. It has been said on many occasions that it is unnecessary at this stage to alarm the people—that we might scare them and cause a panic among the population. That could be so but, knowing the temperament of the Australian people, I am sure they have enough sense to realise that a person must be trained for any job if he is to carry it out properly. If a mild panic were caused in peace-time it would be far better to have it then than under war-time conditions, when a panic could be disastrous. Those who were foolish enough to allow their emotions to get the better of them would benefit from their experience. It would be far better to benefit that way under peace-time conditions than to try to gain this experience under war-time conditions.

From time to time various public statements on civil defence are made by people with great professional knowledge. I refer to one person in particular on the payroll of the Commonwealth Government, namely, Professor Titterton. From time to time he writes in the local Press on the very important subject of civil defence. If my memory serves me rightly and my notes are correct, only recently he said in one of the local newspapers that the fall-out from the French nuclear test in the Pacific would not do any damage so far as Australia was concerned. Yet at the same time the Commonwealth Government made vigorous protests to the French Government about the tests, which does not seem to fit in with the reassurance of the Press. In other words, the professor was lulling the public into a false sense of security. It is wrong for professional people to make such statements when something very serious could occur at any moment.

Professor Titterton is one of ten members of the National Radiation Advisory Committee, which includes some of our foremost internationally respected scientists on nuclear warfare and nuclear effects. In that committee's report to the Prime Minister, which is very difficult to obtain and is not readily available to the public, his name appears as

a signatory to the findings that radio-activity has been measured year by year in ever-increasing strengths in milk. It has also been found in vegetables such as cabbage, and in flour. Many of these samples were collected in places as far apart as Perth, Adelaide, Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane. It is interesting to note that although they are small dosages they were recorded by instruments on a nation-wide basis, and radiation can accumulate and be very dangerous.

It has been shown by American and other overseas authorities that, over a period, radio-active fall-out can greatly influence the future of our race in that it can cause mutation of the genes in people in the community. There is little need for me to go into technical details or give a very minute examination of what I have referred to. Hon. members can well understand that abnormalities could occur in the community, with the result that many sub-normal babies could be born. Many of the matters we read about concern what is taking place in other countries. The radio-active hot spots created by nuclear explosives are very dangerous and, as I pointed out earlier, I, as well as many others, am concerned about the unpreparedness of our people. They are unable to do anything for their own protection or for the protection of their families if it should be necessary.

As to some of the samples of fall-out taken over the last few years in Australia, the tests were carried out in Queensland by British scientists. I am referring to the tests at Maralinga. I think all hon. members will be aware that that was one of the first places where a nuclear bomb was exploded, and the explosion affected a very wide area. Our own C.S.I.R.O. scientists arranged for very exacting tests of many of the animals within the area of fall-out. They arranged for the thyroid glands of grazing sheep and cattle to be sent to them for analysis. The dosage strength at the Brisbane Abattoir was 31. This represents the range of strontium 90 which is found in foodstuffs resulting from fall-out. The figures are—

Brisbane Abattoirs .. .. .	31
Townsville .. .. .	88
Longreach .. .. .	131
Mt. Isa .. .. .	181
Rockhampton .. .. .	440
Monkira station .. .. .	830

According to the scientists who read this information, the last two readings were very dangerous and were what they described as hot spots of radiation from these nuclear tests.

To amplify and stress what I have said, and because the Federal authorities seem to neglect this important subject, I quote what Sir Winston Churchill said in the House of Commons in reply to certain people who

spoke in derogatory terms about the civil defence structure in Great Britain. This is what he said—

“The need for an effective Civil Defence is surely beyond dispute. It presents itself today in its noblest aspect, namely the Christian duty of helping fellow mortals in distress. No city, no family, nor any honourable man or woman can repudiate this duty and accept from others help which they are not prepared to fit themselves to render in return.”

That fortifies what I said earlier about making people aware and preparing them not only to help themselves but the general community. The authorities in charge of the Commonwealth civil defence organisation quoted that speech at the Macedon school, which is one of the most modern schools of its type, and then, after a request was made to have it printed and distributed over a wide area of Canberra, they were ordered to withhold its publication. It is difficult to understand why people would take such action against the publication of an article that would impart knowledge and help people with this problem. It was deliberately withheld from the people, I suppose, on the ground that what they did not know about they would not worry about.

In some States a great deal of encouragement is given in this direction. New South Wales leads Australia in civil defence organisation. Its set-up can be used not only in the event of a nuclear disturbance, but also for many other purposes. That was pointed out this morning in the Minister's answer to my question. He said the very same thing in the early part of his answer.

I have completed dealing with this particular subject. I have not touched upon general budgetary items, which I intend to deal with next week. I feel I have covered most points in the notes I have before me. What I have tried to stress is the necessity and urgency for the allocation of more money to civil defence so that that organisation can work in conjunction with our Armed Forces. The Armed Forces play their part in a different sphere altogether, but I feel the time is long overdue when Queensland and the Queensland Government should do something to bring our civil defence organisation up to the standard in New South Wales. I feel sure that it would be comforting and reassuring for the people of Queensland to know that, in case of emergency or serious peril to themselves and their families, there is here an organisation equal to that existing in New South Wales to provide a measure of protection.

As I should not like to start dealing with another facet of the Budget at this hour, I shall continue my speech at a later date.

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 5.56 p.m.