

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 18 OCTOBER 1966

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 18 OCTOBER, 1966

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

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mr. SPEAKER announced the receipt from the Auditor-General of his report on the public accounts of the State for the year 1965-66.

Ordered to be printed.

COMMONWEALTH AID, FITZROY RIVER BASIN BRIGALOW DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

REPLY OF PRIME MINISTER

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that on 23 September I forwarded to the Right Honourable the Prime Minister the resolution agreed to by the House on 22 September relating to the Fitzroy River Basin Brigalow Development Scheme, and that I have received from him the following reply:—

"Prime Minister,
"Canberra,
"13th October, 1966.

"Dear Mr. Speaker,

"Thank you for your letter of 23rd September informing me of a resolution passed by the Legislative Assembly which commended the Commonwealth Government for its continued support of the Queensland Government's policy of decentralised development and particularly for the support the State has received for the implementation of its major projects in regional areas.

"The sentiments contained in the resolution were warmly appreciated by my Government.

"Yours sincerely,
"HAROLD HOLT.

"The Honourable D. E. Nicholson,
"Speaker of the Legislative Assembly,
"Parliament House,
"Brisbane, Queensland."

QUESTIONS

COST OF DRIVERS' LICENCE TESTING CENTRE, COORPAROO

Mr. Donald for Mr. Bennett, pursuant to asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) (a) What was the total cost of purchase of the new Drivers' Licence Testing Centre, Coorparoo, (b) what commission, if any, was paid on the purchase of the centre and (c) what is its area?

(2) Can particulars be given to itemise the cost in relation to land and improvements?

(3) Was the adjoining block with its improvements sold to a Mr. Uscinski for the sum of \$10,000?

(4) If there is a difference in the prices of the two adjoining allotments, what is the reason?

(5) What is the area of the adjoining block?

Answers:—

(1) "(a) The land is Crown land and had been previously held by the Brisbane City Council under a deed of trust. It was subsequently set aside as a Reserve for Police purposes and truncation to a corner reduced the area from 2 roods 9 perches to 2 roods 7·7 perches. The total cost incurred was \$183.85, covering survey fees and incidental expenses. (b) Nil. (c) 2 roods 7·7 perches."

(2) "Cost of land (survey fee, &c.), \$183.85; cost of building and ground improvements, \$34,000."

(3) "I have no information concerning such transaction."

(4) "See Answer to 3."

(5) "See Answer to 3."

RAISINGS UNDER CHARITABLE COLLECTIONS ACT

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

Excluding sporting organisations and parents and citizens' associations, what has been the amount raised by other organisations registered under the Charitable Collections Act for the year ended June 30, 1966, and how much of this has been levied by the Government by way of permit fees, taxes, &c.?

Answer:—

"The amount raised by the organisations referred to for the period mentioned is not ascertainable. Different such organisations have different financial years, their modes of fund raising are varied and in many instances differ one from another, and the Department is not concerned with the amounts raised by the various schemes of fund raising for each financial year as no Crown revenue is obtained under the Charitable Collections Act. This applies even to those associations which I referred to in this Assembly on the twelfth of October last and which, although registered as charities under that Act, are not charities in the true sense of the word. I might here mention that these associations have never included sporting organisations simply as such. As was indicated by me in this Assembly on the twenty-fifth of August last, revenue is collected only in relation to fund raising by the conducting of art unions. Moreover, no permit fees, as distinct from the application for permit fee, is collected in respect of art unions conducted for the charities and charitable purposes set forth in regulation 62 of "The Art Union Regulations, 1965". As regards the amount of revenue collected in relation

to the conduct of art unions, no figures are kept of moneys collected from organisations registered under the Charitable Collections Act, but as regards those organisations classified for art union purposes as hospitals, youth clubs, community service funds, soldiers' and sailors' associations, and spastics, &c., associations, the whole proceeds raised by art unions amounted to \$2,736,863, while the fees paid amounted to \$43,208."

SURVEY FEES HELD BY MINES DEPARTMENT

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

(1) How much money is at present held by the Mines Department in survey fees relative to leases which are awaiting survey and how many leases are involved?

(2) Is there any shortage of staff in the survey section of the Mines Department and, if so, will he take steps to provide for more staff?

Answers:—

(1) "This information would involve considerable research and cannot be prepared in the time available. It could give a misleading picture as some very large special leases are involved. Costs of the Departmental surveyors would have to be computed and charged. I must point out that even though survey fees are collected by the Department, the Mining Acts place the onus for survey directly on the lease applicant. If the applicant has an acceptable survey performed the survey fee deposited is refunded."

(2) "As is well known, private practice for surveyors is so lucrative it is difficult to retain them. Present Departmental staff comprises one senior staff surveyor. In this year's Estimates I have also provided for one examiner-computer, one staff surveyor and field party and a survey cadet. In addition very costly special equipment is provided. I would mention that advertisements in all States of the Commonwealth have so far failed to attract suitable survey staff. Efforts will be maintained."

(2)—

DISPOSAL OF PRODUCE FROM YARRABAH ABORIGINAL SETTLEMENT

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

(1) Has the Aboriginal community at Yarrabah under instructions from the Director of Aboriginal Affairs been prevented from selling the produce of its communal efforts on the open market in that part of the State?

(2) Is such produce consigned from time to time to other Governmental institutions without payment?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "No. Possibly the Honourable Member is not aware that at Yarrabah, as at other centres, the Department has encouraged community residents to develop their own farming and other enterprises and to dispose of their produce in their own right on the local market, to their individual benefit. Some measure of success has been achieved and efforts are continuing. The Department separately maintains its own farming undertaking, the produce of which, being Government property, is disposed of in accordance with Departmental requirements as issue, either to community residents or departmental or other State institutions."

EMPLOYEES AND LOCOMOTIVES, RAILWAY DEPARTMENT

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

At June 30, 1952, and 1966, respectively:—

(1) What was the number of Railway employees in the following grades (a) drivers, (b) firemen, (c) guards, (d) shunters, (e) signalmen, (f) workshop and (g) permanent way?

(2) What was the number of locomotives (a) steam and (b) diesel?

(3) What was the maximum permissible weight and length of goods trains (a) steam-drawn and (b) diesel-drawn?

Answers:—

(1) "The information sought by the Honourable Member would involve a considerable amount of clerical work, the expense of which is not considered justified.

"Number of Locomotives

	Steam		Diesel Mechanical		Diesel Electric
	3ft. 6in. Gauge	2ft. Gauge	3ft. 6in. Gauge	2ft. Gauge	
As at June 30, 1952	852	7	1	Nil	Nil
As at June 30, 1966	576	Nil	4	7	170 "

(3) "(a) At June 30, 1952, two steam locomotives 650 tons for a length of 70 units. At June 30, 1966, two steam locomotives 1,500 tons for a length of 90 units. (b) At June 30, 1952, there were no diesel electric locomotives in service. At June 30, 1966, two diesel electric locomotives, 2,600 tons for a length of 140 units."

INTERIM SUGAR PRICE

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

Is he in a position to inform the House and the sugar industry when it is anticipated that the interim price of sugar will be increased, can he indicate the amount and will the extra advance be applied to all No. 1 pool sugar from the 1966 season?

Answer:—

"It is proposed to give notice of a Bill dealing with this matter later today. Until this legislation is dealt with by the House I am unable to make any announcement."

POLLUTION OF BRISBANE RIVER

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the report in *The Courier-Mail* of October 13, relative to the pollution of the Brisbane River from industrial and other wastes which is causing great concern?

(2) What action does he intend to take to remove the nuisance?

(3) What action has been taken by his Departmental officers following the warning contained in my speech in 1964 concerning the pollution of the river?

Answers:—

(1) "I presume the Honourable Member is referring to an unsigned letter in *The Courier-Mail* of October 13 in which the writer expresses concern at the pollution of the Brisbane River by the discharge of tar oil into it."

(2) "Action to prohibit the discharge of oil or a mixture containing oil is contained in *The Pollution of Waters by Oil Act of 1960*" which is not administered by the Health Department."

(3) "In February and the following month in 1964 investigations were carried out into the pollution of the Brisbane River at Luggage Point and its effect on the waters of the lower reaches of the river and Moreton Bay. This investigation was expanded in September, 1964, and, in co-operation with the Brisbane City Council, to cover the river from the Indooroopilly Bridge to its mouth and bay-side beaches. Samples were taken at weekly intervals to determine the nature, amount, and frequency of occurrence of any pollution. A joint report on the investigations was submitted by Dr. M. H. Gabriel, Health Officer, State Health

Department, and Mr. C. F. Sharp, City Chemist, Brisbane City Council. They concluded as a result of the surveys that— (1) There was no significant pollution of bayside beaches north of the river mouth; (2) There was no gross pollution of the Brisbane River; (3) The river is able to satisfactorily cope with the isolated pockets of contamination which do occur. The Honourable Member will recall I was able to make a copy of this report available to him on August 31, 1966."

HEALTH OFFICER, MACKAY CITY COUNCIL

Mr. Davies for **Mr. Graham**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health,—

(1) Is he aware that since the resignation of the Mackay City Council's Health Officer, Dr. Chenoweth, some months ago the Council has been unable to fill the vacancy because of the refusal of other medical practitioners in Mackay to accept the position?

(2) Is there any risk to the general health of the citizens of Mackay as a result of there being no Local Authority medical officer?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "When I was in Mackay recently I was informed of the resignation of Dr. Chenoweth as Medical Officer of Health and the circumstances associated with it. The citizens of Mackay are fortunate in that the duties of Medical Officer of Health are still being carried out by Dr. Chenoweth, but at no cost to the Council. Dr. Chenoweth is a doctor of the highest integrity who has the interests of the people, particularly the children, of Mackay at heart and the Honourable Member can rest assured that under the present circumstances every health precaution is being taken and that the situation in Mackay, from a health point of view, is no different from what obtained prior to Dr. Chenoweth's formal resignation."

PAPERS

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

Reports—

State Government Insurance Office (Queensland) for the year 1965-66.

Director of Aboriginal and Island Affairs for the year 1965-66.

The Queensland Meat Industry Authority—First Annual Report.

Queensland Radium Institute for the year 1965-66.

State Fire Services Council for the year 1965-66.

Commissioner of Main Roads for the year 1965-66.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

The Harbours Acts, 1955 to 1964.

The Racing and Betting Acts, 1954 to 1965.

The River Improvement Trust Acts, 1940 to 1965.

Regulations under—

The Apprentices Act of 1964.

The Children's Services Act of 1965.

By-law under the Harbours Acts, 1955 to 1964.

Sixty-sixth Annual Report of the Bureau of Sugar Experiment Stations.

FIRE BRIGADES ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

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

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Fire Brigades Acts, 1964 to 1965, in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

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

Debate resumed from 13 October (see p. 904) 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. PORTER (Toowong) (11.25 a.m.): To me the Budget debate has been rather strange; listening to the contributions so far, I have heard comments about literally everything but the Budget. It seems a little reminiscent of the fellow who, during the last test cricket season, found that he was unable to sleep. He went to his doctor and said, “Doctor, I have a dreadful time getting to sleep. Every time I close my eyes I see myself either bowling to Peter Burge or batting against Ray Lindwall's bowling.” The doctor said, “Well, that is simple. All you have to do when you close your eyes is to think you are holding a very lovely girl in your arms.” “What,” said the man, “and miss my chance to bat?” The same applies here. Members of the Opposition seem to be

thinking, “What! Speak on the Budget and miss out on my opportunity to talk about my electorate and having my speech reported in the local paper?”

This is rather a pity from the Opposition's viewpoint because such an attitude tends to produce a rather anaemic Budget debate. Parliament has a very important role to play as keeper of the public purse. When introducing the Budget the Treasurer made this point—and it is a very good point—of the role of the Opposition in ensuring that Parliament keeps a tight hold on the public purse. I should expect, in all innocence of course, that in a Budget debate the Opposition would have had a good look at the Budget; that members of the Opposition would have attempted to analyse it and have made some real and careful tests such as these: Is it adequate? Does it indeed cover all the things that need doing in this State at this time? Is it too extravagant? Does it try to do too much and do it in a too lavish way? It is strange that I did not hear very much at all about this except from a few hon. members.

After the Opposition had had a good look at the Budget in these terms, especially on a clear, factual basis, I would have expected Opposition members then to consider its financial structure and say, “Well, now, are these methods for raising new revenues the best methods to adopt? If they are not, what shall we tell the Government to eliminate? If we do tell the Government to eliminate certain things, what do we substitute in their place?” Really, we have not had any such criticism. It is true that the Opposition has jumped up and down a little—that is the sort of thing we expect—but it was not done with a great deal of fervour and enthusiasm.

An Opposition Member: You must have been out of the Chamber.

Mr. PORTER: I have not been out of the Chamber. I have listened to the debate with great care. My impression of the Opposition has been that, with one or two exceptions they have gone through this as a sort of tired ritual. It is a little like the Aborigine who was near the Woomera Rocket Range at the time of a small atomic explosion and who, when he saw the large mushroom cloud, said, “Gee! I wish I had said that.” That is the impression I gained from the Opposition. They have looked at the Budget and said “I wish I had been able to say that.”

This is to be regretted for, as I say, an Opposition has a very important role to play in any Parliament. Indeed, I venture to say that the quality of an Opposition goes a long way towards determining the quality of a Government, for it is the duty of the Opposition to hone the Government to a fine, sharp edge; competition works in this Parliament just as it does in all places.

Mr. Murray: Their criticism of the Budget is a reflection on themselves.

Mr. PORTER: Unfortunately, it is.

I believe that the censure motion which the Opposition has introduced, more or less as a matter of form, has no viability at all. It will not be sold in this Chamber and, obviously, it is not being sold to the larger world outside. If it were to be valid in any sense at all I should have expected the Opposition to tell us where the Budget fails, what it should be doing that it is not doing, or what it should drop out that it proposes to do. If there are to be no new imposts—and there have been criticisms of some of the new forms of revenue—what services are we to reduce? The cake cannot be cut into more slices unless there is a larger cake. In other words, is there any suggestion from the Opposition that we should reduce services such as education and hospitalisation, or any of those services associated with development? I, for instance, am one who would be quite happy to see a variation in emphasis. But this has not come from the Opposition. I would be quite prepared to see less spending on a so-called free hospital system and part of those moneys made available, say, for education or development.

That would have been a constructive proposal from members of the Opposition, but they seem to be so attached to this sacred cow of a free hospital system that they are not prepared to look at it in any other way. I would not think that the Opposition at this point of time would want to go on record as recommending any severe or substantial cuts in hospitalisation, education, or the services associated with development.

The only contribution that has come forward from the other side of the Committee has been a recommendation for deficit financing. This is a strange one at this stage. It is a sort of dire Micawber-like hope that if we put off action now something will turn up in the future. For the life of me I cannot understand why an Opposition contemplates deficit financing at this point of time. The economy is stable and sound; indeed, but for the slight cream taken off by the drought it would be fair to say that it is buoyant. The production growth rate and the steady growth in the gross national product of the Commonwealth suggest that we are in good times, sound times; certainly not a time to consider putting off balancing our Budget for another 12 months.

Mr. Mann: Whom are you trying to kid?

Mr. PORTER: My view is that this Budget is a sensible one, and I have no criticism of it. If anything, I would say it is too moderate. I believe the times are such that the Treasurer could well have been a little bolder. He could well have taken a bigger bite out of the body politic without getting any more backlash than he has for the mild nibble he has taken. I think most intelligent, thinking people recognise the urgent necessity for development, and they are prepared to pay something towards it. I believe that in this sense the electorate is streets ahead of the Opposition. I would have hoped that

the Treasurer might have been a little bolder in his outlook. That is my only criticism of the Budget.

In the debate from the Opposition there has been a tendency, when looking at this Budget, to attack the Federal Government. We know the sort of thing: we are little Orphan Annie; we do terribly; the Federal Government does not look after us at all. This, of course, is the syndrome that I pointed out in a previous debate where, in an election year when the Federal Government is a little susceptible to criticism and wants to win friends and influence people, all the critics decide, "Now we will put the spurs in." We are seeing it happen at the present time. I have no doubt at all that just as we are doing it in this Chamber, so in Parliaments of other States they are doing exactly the same thing. They are saying, "Look how badly we are treated by Canberra. If only we did as well as Queensland, how happy we would be." That is endemic to politics at a time of an imminent Federal election.

It is true that we should never be satisfied. I agree with hon. members on both sides of the Chamber that no Government should be satisfied with what it achieves, whether in terms of the deal it makes with the Federal Government or in terms of its own achievements. I hope that we on this side of the Chamber never become complacent. But having said that, I think it is proper that we should acknowledge just what has been done. It is a very sad thing to see an Opposition trying to create an atmosphere of gloom, misery, despair, and almost depression, when the picture is so greatly different. In this year alone \$2,000 million is being spent in private and public spending north of the Tropic of Capricorn.

I think we should properly acknowledge the debt that we owe to the Federal Government, not only in the provision of revenue but also in terms of interest on State debts, road grants, assistance to universities, the provision and maintenance of T.B. hospitals, the repairing of cyclone damage when necessary and, also when necessary, drought relief. My colleague the hon. member for Chatsworth also mentioned other aspects of Commonwealth assistance, such as beef-cattle roads; the Mt. Isa-Townsville railway line; the brigalow land development; the development at Weipa; research into the beef industry; the coal-loading facilities at Gladstone; and the Army camp at Townsville, which will be worth no less than \$20,000,000 to \$22,000,000 to the North. Of course, there is also the military operation Barra Winga, which I have no doubt will bring to Rockhampton and the area associated with it no less than \$4,000,000 to \$6,000,000. They are sums of considerable magnitude and reflect something that is being done for this State and that, in an election year, I am quite sure people outside this Chamber will judge fairly and impartially, without asking for more.

As this subject has been introduced into the Budget debate, it is perhaps appropriate, as the Federal election is only five or six weeks away, that I review the tremendous development Australia has undergone in the past 12 to 15 years, in which Queensland has very successfully shared. Since 1947 our population has increased by 50 per cent. Critics of this country should bear in mind that no other country in the world has shown Australia's increase in production, allied with such an increase in population and so remarkable a degree of economic stability.

An Opposition Member: Including North Queensland?

Mr. PORTER: Yes; North Queensland is part of Australia.

Australia has a record that no other country can equal. Our gross national product has doubled in this period, with an average growth rate during those years of 4½ per cent. That is one of the best rates of growth in the world. We have 20,000 more factories and 375,000 more factory workers. In the rural sector, our growth has been literally fantastic. The number of tractors in Australia has increased from 86,700 to 295,000. Artificial fertilisers applied to pastures increased to 3,500,000 tons compared with a previous figure of 1,300,000 tons, and the area under irrigation has increased from 1,500,000 acres to 2,900,000 acres.

In the basic services one gets perhaps the best reflection of over-all growth. The supply of electricity throughout the Commonwealth in this period has quadrupled. Telephones have trebled in number. Motor vehicles have also trebled in number, and the number of private dwellings has doubled. The ratio of hospital beds to population has shown an improvement of 30 per cent. Those are wonderful achievements.

Mr. Lloyd: What about the means test?

Mr. PORTER: I am not dealing with social services yet, although that is a subject on which I should like to say something later.

I regret that the quality of contributions to the debate from the Opposition side has not been the best. To some degree, it has been a little impaired by recent events within the Labour Party. In this regard, I am happy to tender my congratulations to the present Leader of the Opposition and his Deputy. At the same time, I express my deep personal regret that the hon. member for Toowoomba West found it necessary to relinquish the office of Leader of the Opposition. I have known the hon. member for well over a quarter of a century. I have been involved in very tough political battles with him and, in a political sense, I have never given him any quarter. But that does not disguise the fact that, in a personal sense, I have a very deep regard for him, which I continue to hold.

However, I think that the needs of practical politics demand that we acknowledge what my colleague the hon. member for Chatsworth said earlier in this debate: that the appointments now made to the leadership and deputy leadership of the Australian Labour Party in Queensland do indeed further indicate that Labour is a Left-wing party.

I hope that hon. members opposite will not misunderstand me when I say that. I am trying to be tactful and, after all, it is said that tact is the knack of making a point without making an enemy. So, if I say that Labour is a Left-wing party, I am saying only what many good Labour men say. I am reminded that not very long ago, in a magazine called "Dissent", Dr. J. F. Cairns said this—

"We of Labour are situated in the political spectrum next to the Communists and they will stand for many things for which we also stand. We cannot therefore oppose those things."

That, of course, is not confined to the present day and Dr. Cairns. When the late Dr. Evatt was Federal Leader of the Australian Labour Party, he said quite unequivocally, "Labour is a left-wing party", and Mr. J. V. Stout, then Federal Labour president, said—

"The A.L.P. must always give its second preferences to Communist candidates in front of D.L.P. or Liberal.

Those things are not very surprising, but I do think that, when attempting to use the Budget to project the party's image in a favourable way, the Labour Party is running into severe trouble because of its own appointments. After all, that is the way we operate these days. The trick is to try to project a favourable image of one's own party. Perhaps I should not use the word "trick". As a professional engaged in this, I do not think it sounds a very good word; let me say "the technique of projecting a very good image". We of the Liberal Party, in conjunction with members of the Country Party, try to project an image of ourselves as parties dedicated to the full development of individual personality—a free use of every person's capacity. On the obverse side, we try to present the Labour Party as a backward and hidebound party tied to the very flat chariot wheel of Socialism. The Australian Labour Party, on the other hand, tries to project an electoral image of itself as the party of the little man, the party concerned with social justice, the party committed to protecting the little man against the greedy exploiter; and we, of course, are the hungry and willing henchmen of the greedy exploiter. That is roughly how it goes.

I should say that in a "younging" electorate, and a much more sophisticated electorate, the Labour Party has the job ahead of it. The former Leader of the Opposition referred to that matter in his final speech as Opposition Leader, and it is quite true that we have a much more sophisticated electorate than we have ever had before. There are more and

more young people, and there are more and more young people with a high educational standard. They do not swallow claptrap in the way that we used to in my generation. They are much more discerning, much more thoughtful, and, therefore, much more informed in their judgment.

Mr. Sherrington: That is why they all bank Commonwealth.

Mr. PORTER: If the hon. member believes that they would all bank Commonwealth, let us have competition and find out. In my opinion, any party that wants to win an election in the future has to recognise that fact. That is where the Labour Party runs into real trouble, because the concept of Socialism just does not fit in with the aims, aspirations and horizons of most young people today.

I should say that is one of the principal reasons why the Labour Party is in an electoral trough: because the electorate, and particularly the younger section of it, cannot be convinced other than that while Labour is Socialist it will always be something of an uneasy bedfellow with the Communists. The point about Socialism is that it is very difficult to distinguish where theoretical and academic Socialism leaves off and where practical Communism takes over. Mr. Chamberlain, who was a very eminent leader on the organisational side of the A.L.P., put it rather neatly when he said—

“While the task of winning seats and finally Government is important, it should only be secondary to the primary task of formulating policy based on Socialist objectives.”

That is interesting when we set it against Lenin's famous dictum: “Through Socialism to Communism.” This danger is well foreseen by public citizens of all types.

In 1948 the late Archbishop Sir James Duhig said at Childers—

“Socialism and Communism are the two arch-enemies of peace and prosperity, with Socialism the more plausible and subtle foe”.

That is better said than I could say it.

I think that being Socialists puts the A.L.P. permanently on the horns of a dilemma, not only in social and economic terms but also in the vital sphere of national security—in the realm of defence, foreign policy, pacts and treaties—and this explains the strange and ambivalent attitude of the A.L.P. to these vital matters. I have no doubt whatever that the overwhelming majority of hon. members opposite desperately want to be staunch Australians, but, just as a compass can be pulled to a lodestone, so the Socialist party is inevitably pulled towards Communist-oriented policies.

Mr. O'Donnell interjected.

Mr. PORTER: Let me quote quite an important one for the hon. member on this matter that I am now dealing with. It deals with national security. In 1965 the A.L.P.,

at its twenty-sixth conference, dropped from its then defence platform the words, “Labour will honour and support Australia's treaties and defence alliances” and replaced them with the ambiguous, to say the least, words, “Australia must periodically review its defence treaties and alliances to meet new circumstances as they arise.”

One has to look at this in the light of Mr. Calwell's 1961 policy speech, when he advocated replanning S.E.A.T.O. not on a military basis, but for cultural, educational, medical and technical assistance.

Mr. Hanson: You will agree that Labour was in office during the war years and never let the defence of this country down.

Mr. PORTER: I hope the party will be able to do as much for itself at the present time. I say that more in sorrow than in anger.

This strange and ambivalent attitude of the Labour Party is very clearly revealed in its attitude to the coming visit of President Johnson. For a start they were not sure whether to regard it as an election gimmick, whether to commend it, or whether to be completely against it, as Senator Keeffe was. Then quickly they changed ground and tried to recover from what had been a tarnish on the image by saying, “No, we won't be against his coming. We won't protest against it but we won't be glad about it.”

I should have thought that on the visit of any head of State we would always be glad to see him. That makes common sense to me—to be glad to see him and to have him seen in our country.

I am sorry indeed that, as a Budget debate this seems to get away from finance and go towards matters of general politics.

Mr. Newton: You have been slanderous and scurrilous.

Mr. PORTER: I have been neither slanderous nor scurrilous. Whatever I have said Labour men have said; I have done nothing but quote what Labour men themselves have said about their own party. I should be surprised if any hon. member opposite would want to disown his own very eminent colleagues.

So far the Budget debate quite starkly reveals the Opposition's banked “fires”. It is difficult even to discern the embers; they are more like damp fires. They seem to lack a sense of direction or purpose. I say that the motion of censure is a foolish one, because the Budget is sensible; if anything, it is too moderate. It is geared towards the needs of development, although I should like to see it engaged in an even higher gear. Most certainly it has been well accepted by the community outside this Chamber.

The Opposition censure motion is a trivial and rather hackneyed piece of political mumbo jumbo, and deserves the fate of complete rejection that most surely awaits it.

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) (11.51 a.m.): The hon. member for Toowoong castigated us for supposedly not dealing with the Budget, but then, for the next 25 minutes, he spoke on subjects completely foreign to the Budget. I cannot follow his reasoning at all.

Mr. P. Wood: He offered nothing constructive.

Mr. TUCKER: That is completely true. There has been no constructive criticism from his side during the debate. If anybody needs to be castigated, it is the hon. member who has just resumed his seat.

Before I make certain observations on the Budget and other matters I should like to refer briefly to a happening last week, namely, the resignation of our then Leader, Mr. Jack Duggan. I want to go on record as saying that I always had the greatest faith in him as Leader and a tremendous admiration for his undoubted ability. This faith and admiration have not diminished because of his resignation. Jack Duggan is inherently honest. The action he took proved that—in fact it had to be proved. I regard him as a victim of circumstances and of peculiar law. I can understand the motivating force—the protection of the future of his wife and family. I lost my father when I was 12 years old, being the eldest of six very young children at that time. Responsibility, as I well know, sits very heavily on young shoulders. Want and fear for the future can leave a very lasting impression. I will always stand by Jack Duggan, as I know will all my colleagues in the Australian Labour Party.

My new Leader, Mr. Jack Houston, the hon. member for Bulimba, has my complete loyalty. I want to record that I will work with him diligently for the return of the Australian Labour Party to the Treasury benches of this State.

To the Treasurer, who was then also the Acting Premier, I say, "Thank you for your words of welcome and congratulations last Thursday." I assure the Treasurer and, indeed, the whole Committee, that Mr. Houston and I are well aware of the responsibilities that will devolve upon us—our responsibilities to our party and to our colleagues, and our responsibilities, as an Opposition, to the people of this great State to ensure good government. We acknowledge all this, and it makes us feel very humble indeed. But we do not stand in awe of any of it. It is our intention to meet every challenge, not as individualists, but as a team, and collectively we will overcome whatever might be put in our path.

As usual, the sting was in the tail of the Treasurer's remarks when he wished Mr. Houston and me a very long term in our present positions. That is fair enough and I do not cry about it, but I draw comfort from the fact that, in my opinion, his occupancy of the Treasurership will go a long way towards nullifying the wish he expressed so fervently last Thursday.

The Treasurer's Budget was dull, and apologetic in the telling. It was also stark, harsh in reality, and sectional in its application. As I proceed I will show why it is extremely sectional. It dealt at length with the effects of the drought on our economy, especially on the fact that sheep and cattle losses were very severe. It is acknowledged that they have reached almost catastrophic proportions. Wool and meat are the backbone of our economy, and this is especially so in the North. In such circumstances, we should be taking solid and certain steps to protect these vital primary industries. In Budget after Budget I have turned to the Estimates for the Department of Irrigation and Water Supply to see how much has been allocated. Budget after Budget has disclosed just how vulnerable are we in this State to the vagaries of the weather; but on each occasion, although I have turned hopefully to the Estimates I have found that this department has been allocated a virtual pittance. This year \$6,500,000 has been allocated for irrigation projects. One would need a microscope to find the scratch that sum would make on the surface of the great need for drought mitigation and water conservation projects. Such an amount is pitiful, even laughable, but this is not a laughing matter.

The present Treasurer, and preceding Treasurers, have pointed to this vulnerable part of the State's economy. When we remember that some years ago the Treasurer said that the Burdekin Dam would cost \$200,000,000 to construct, we realise that the \$6,500,000 allocated this year to this department will have the same effect as one rain-drop in the parched areas of the West; it will be completely lost in this great State.

The sad fact is that neither the Treasurer nor the Premier appears to be able to interest the Commonwealth Government in any such schemes for Queensland. It is very obvious to me—and I think it is obvious to everyone in the Chamber—that we do not possess the money to construct the great schemes that are so necessary if we are to look after our primary producers. The sum of \$6,500,000 certainly will not construct any large scheme, although it may construct some small dams. To use the vernacular, we are not in the race as a State in attracting or finding the huge sums necessary for these large schemes. It is obvious that the Treasurer and the Premier have been unable to convince the Commonwealth Government that we need this development in Queensland and the money to carry it out.

We have made a strong plea for members of the Snowy Mountains Authority to be sent to Queensland, but this appeal also has fallen on deaf ears. So far we have been unable to get an assurance from the Commonwealth Government that these officers will be sent north to inquire into water conservation, which is so desperately needed in Queensland.

Our relationship with the Commonwealth grows steadily worse each year. I shall use some of the Treasurer's own words in a

moment to prove that statement. We have seen the unsavoury spectacle of the Premier going to Canberra begging and pleading for more funds, and each year getting the "royal order of the boot" from the Prime Minister. We are given only just enough, particularly for water conservation, to keep us from starving. Sir Henry Bolte and Mr. Askin seem to be made of sterner stuff than our leaders, who bow to the arrogance of the Commonwealth Government.

The only time the Federal Government showed any humility was after the 1961 election. I interjected and pointed that out a moment ago when the hon. member for Toowong was speaking. For a short time after the 1961 election we received co-operation from the Federal Government. It co-ordinated its activities with ours and determined priorities for the allocation of funds to ensure maximum development. As a result there was development in this State between 1961 and 1963, and the economy was stimulated. Beef roads were built, the brigalow scheme was commenced, and there was railway rehabilitation. Since 1963 the position has deteriorated, and it is now at its lowest ebb.

I shall give some examples of the arrogance displayed by the present Federal Government. As reported in Federal "Hansard", Dr. Patterson recently asked when the Nogoa River irrigation project would be brought into being. The answer was—

"It is not customary to make information of this type public without the prior agreement of the State Government concerned."

That was a wipe-off.

Then the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Whitlam, asked a question about the Border Rivers project between New South Wales and Queensland. The reply was—

"Information of the type requested by the honourable member is regarded by the Commonwealth Government as confidential between itself and the State Government concerned unless it is mutually agreed to make the information public."

Again there was this arrogance and a complete wipe-off. These are vital matters to Queensland, but when questions are asked by our representatives in the Federal House there is arrogance and the same pattern of reply.

Dr. Patterson recently asked this question—

"What is the name of each water conservation project located north of Brisbane for which the Queensland Government requested financial assistance?"

The reply was—

"Information of the type requested by the honourable member is regarded by the Commonwealth Government as confidential."

If something were being done in that direction, the Government would be proud to tell us about it. But on every occasion there is this stonewalling, and the representatives of this State in the Federal House receive this wipe-off. Like every other member in this Chamber, I know the answer. Nothing is being done and the Federal Government is afraid to say so because that will show how disinterested it is in water conservation in this great State of ours.

Every member of the Country Party who represents a drought-ravaged area must understand and agree with what I am saying this morning. Year after year primary producers find themselves in the grip of drought. In good years they work themselves to death trying to pay off the debts that have accumulated during bad years. When that has been done it is time for another drought to be experienced, and the same cycle starts all over again. There should be co-operation between the State and Commonwealth Governments in the very vital matter of water conservation so that something can be done on a large scale in the strategic areas of Queensland.

The Premier and the Treasurer seem unable to convince the Commonwealth Government of this great need. Why should this State be held to ransom because the Prime Minister is sure that the Queensland Government, which is of his political colour, will not press demands on him? That is what is happening now. This Government is telling the Commonwealth Government how grateful Queensland is for the pittance that it has been given over the years, when in fact it should be pointing out to the Commonwealth Government what I am saying today. Queensland is being held to ransom because the Commonwealth Government is apparently cocksure that the Government of this State will not make demands on it.

In two places in the Financial Statement the Treasurer highlighted the Commonwealth Government's miserly and cheese-paring attitude. At page 6 he said—

"However, I must repeat my earlier public expression of disappointment that the only aid afforded us towards the factor of loss of revenue by drought is \$2,750,000. As we have already lost in the vicinity of \$8,000,000 from this cause and I estimate that we shall lose a further \$9,000,000 from the same cause in 1966-67, I can only state that the help given in this direction is totally inadequate. In consequence, as Treasurer, I was left with the alternative of cutting back in works and services or of finding means of obtaining extra revenue."

At page 8 the Treasurer said—

"The Committee will appreciate my concern that the Commonwealth Government was not prepared to support an increase of more than 6.6 per cent. in new Loan raisings for State Public Works and Housing, barely sufficient to cover rising costs and population increases, whereas

its own capital works and services financed from Consolidated Revenue are increasing at almost double this rate."

In both statements the Treasurer sought to blame the Commonwealth Government for the savage sectional taxation that he was imposing on the people of Queensland. Although one can perhaps have some sympathy for him in his dilemma, we feel that, if this is the best he and his Government can do, they deserve the censure contained in the amendment so ably moved by the Leader of the Opposition, which I am supporting today. I believe that, because of their inability, hon. members opposite should vacate the Treasury benches.

The Treasurer lists what he claims are record levels of expenditure on education. Every responsible and thinking person recognises the need for such increased spending. I am not here to argue that matter at all; I am here to argue where the money should be obtained. On perusing that list, it is obvious that the Government has failed to grapple with the main problems in education and has adopted very unsatisfactory and stop-gap methods. It is not only I who says that; many people outside this Chamber are saying it. Proper teacher-training is not being done on the scale on which it should be done, and teachers are the nucleus and the basis of a system of education.

Mr. Pizzey: How many years' teacher-training did the Labour Government give? One!

Mr. TUCKER: I will allow the Minister for Education to argue that question when he presents the Estimates for his department. I think he had better save all his power and all his arguments, because I am sure he will be shot down in flames the moment he rises to present his Estimates. I advise him to conserve his energies.

The great need is to produce enough properly trained teachers in all subjects for the schools, and this is where I am sure the Treasurer and the Government have made an error. The Commonwealth Government has helped to meet the Bill for university education. I stress "university education"; I have not said "tertiary education". I have noticed in each Financial Statement that the Commonwealth Government has been prepared to come to the party for university education. However, I believe that teacher-training is part of tertiary education, and the Commonwealth Government has not shown any interest in it.

I make this point very strongly to the Committee: although the Commonwealth Government sees fit to assist fairly heavily with university education, it has been allowed to go scot-free in primary and secondary education. It virtually does not assist at all in those fields. To my way of thinking—other members of the Opposition are in accord with it—primary and secondary education forms a very vital part of the

State's education system, and the Government of Queensland is forced to spend a record amount, at the expense of other Government departments, because the Commonwealth Government will not assist in those fields of education.

An article issued in July under the heading "The Commonwealth Government in Education" said that over 31 per cent. of current State revenues is devoted to education. That is the average for all Australian States, and I have no doubt that Queensland's expenditure would approximate that figure. If it has been thought—and rightly so—that the States have not been able to cope with university expenditure without equal participation by the Commonwealth Government, how is a State such as Queensland supposed to cope with much greater school expenditure? Again I say that every effort should have been made to force the Commonwealth Government to meet its obvious obligations in this field. Because our advocates have failed in this respect, the taxpayers of Queensland, or some of them, must shoulder a further heavy burden.

I referred initially to the taxation proposals contained in the Budget as being sectional in their application. If one is unfortunate enough to become ill, one immediately comes into the telescopic sights of the Treasurer's hunting rifle. Fees for private patients will rise from \$7 to \$10 a day—an increase of 43 per cent.—and those for intermediate patients will rise from \$6.20 to \$8 a day—an increase of 22 per cent. That such savage increases should be made at the expense of sick people, that illness should be exploited, is an indictment of the Country-Liberal Government. So much for free hospitalisation; so much for the Government's lip service to free hospitalisation! If ever I have seen anything in grave danger it is free hospitalisation in this State.

Now let us look closely at the rail fare and freight increases to be operative from 1 November, 1966. Country fares will rise by 20 per cent. At the same time, freight rates will be increased by an average of at least 10.75 per cent. The 20 per cent., 10 per cent. and 7½ per cent. increases mean an average rise of almost 11 per cent. I ask the Committee today: who will be hardest hit by these large rises? The answer, of course, is the people of the North, the people of the West—people in the remote and far-flung areas of the State.

All these people must have their commodities and goods railed or transported by other means hundreds, and in some cases thousands, of miles. This is the section of the community from whom the Treasurer will reap a golden harvest. Is it any wonder, then, that I say that this Budget is sectional in its application? It will fall hardest on those who can ill afford to pay such savage increases in fares and freights. It will add \$4 or \$5 to the cost of a trip to Brisbane from the centre of the North; it will add much more if one has to come from the West to the coast and

then down to Brisbane; and it will also add greatly to the price of goods which have to be hauled at the higher freight rates.

I do not deny that the increase will have some impact on people in the metropolitan area, but its effect on them will be small in comparison. In the country, I believe these freight and fare rises will be disastrous and primary producers who, as I mentioned before, are always battling with drought and living almost from hand to mouth, will receive another kick in the pants when the increased rates become operative. Products, especially from the North and the West, will be priced off the market. At the present time, these people are hanging on grimly by their fingertips because competition is always a big issue with producers in the North and the West, and even with those closer to the metropolitan area. Indeed, northern and western firms, already hard put to it to keep their heads above water, will be forced out of business because of the freights on raw materials which often have to be brought hundreds of miles from the South. With these heavy freights on materials coming to and going from the place of manufacture, just imagine northern and western firms trying to compete with southern firms. They will be unable to do so, because competition for markets is already extremely keen. Contracts can be won or lost by a very small margin. Nobody is more aware of that than I am.

What a mad state of affairs exists at the present time! Not long ago Army contracts were let in Townsville and the Railway Department offered freight cuts to southern firms to bring pre-fabricated steel to Townsville. We heard of this and made representations to the Minister for Transport. We pointed out that northern firms were priced out of these contracts because of heavy freight rates. Eventually he bowed to our representations and granted a cut of something like 25 per cent. on the carriage of steel. A few months later, however, out comes the Treasurer and foists a 20 per cent. freight rise on the same material. I say quite rightly that it is a mad state of affairs when one Minister acknowledges our representations and grants freight cuts and then, two months later, another Minister in fact reverses the decision and increases freight rates by 20 per cent. on already over-burdened primary producers and firms. That does not make any sense to me. It seems to smack of a lack of liaison between Minister and Minister in this Government. The Treasurer has "bludgeoned on" another 10 to 20 per cent.

Does the Government really know where it is going so far as the northern and western people are concerned? Does it really worry about the northern people and northern development? Its actions speak louder than its words. Its actions say that it does not care about northern development, northern

firms, northern primary producers or northern people in general. The same applies to the West and its people.

The owners of motor vehicles are also picked out for special attention. It would appear that the Treasurer has made up his mind that no worker should be allowed to own a car. Registration fees are to be increased by $8\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and 1 per cent. stamp duty is to be imposed on the consideration on the registration of all motor vehicle transfers and on the registration of all new motor vehicles. Has the Treasurer ever stopped to consider what this further impost may do to the motor trade?

Let us consider what a new-car buyer in the North will face. Firstly, he will be required to pay a substantial freight rise on the carriage of the vehicle to the North; secondly, an $8\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. increase in the registration fee; thirdly, 1 per cent. stamp duty on the consideration on the registration of the vehicle.

Mr. R. Jones: And that is on the capital cost.

Mr. TUCKER: That is correct.

Mr. Hughes: You know that he gets this back by way of better roads.

Mr. TUCKER: I wish we did get it back by way of better roads. Obviously the hon. member has not had a look at the roads in that part of the State. He runs down to Sandgate or the Gold Coast and then says, "We get it back in better roads." I reject that argument; it has no substance. At the present time we are flat out maintaining the existing roads in the North. Along some parts of the Bruce Highway in my electorate if you do not keep your vehicle to the centre of the road your nearside wheels are running into potholes.

Mr. Lickiss: In your time we were flat out keeping a car on the road.

Mr. TUCKER: These increases might not matter to the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha, because I know that he is almost a millionaire. I am making a plea on behalf of those people who are barely able to afford a car. These rises will probably mean that many of them will not be able to afford to run a car. It is very wrong that such sectional taxation should be imposed. It is completely unfair, because a motor vehicle has become a "must" to many workers. We talk about decentralisation—I am all for it, to a degree—but decentralisation makes the ownership of a motor vehicle very necessary. Cement workers and others living seven miles out from the heart of Townsville need to own a car or share the ownership of a car to take them to work. This applies to workers on the Army installations and other projects.

Just as illness has not escaped, so also has workers' compensation come under the Treasurer's greedy eye. To say that this stamp duty will be absorbed within the premium structure is to appear to be naive, but we know that the Treasurer is certainly

not naive. He knows to where these additional costs will finally trickle. They will trickle to those who cannot pass them on any further.

When the Treasurer was Minister for Transport he often said that medicine should be given in small doses. I remember his saying that when I led a deputation to him at the Hotel Allen, in Townsville. When referring to the closure of branch lines and railway workshops he said, "You do not take a bottle of medicine all at once; you take it in small doses." But today he ladles it out with abandon. Judging by the presentation of this Budget, he appears to be prepared to give us the full bottle at once. I reiterate that the further heavy indirect taxation is a result of his inability, and the inability of the Government, to prise money from the Federal Government.

The people of Queensland thank the present coalition Government for nothing when they are faced with savage and heavy taxation imposts. They realise that the fault lies in the Government's inability to present a good case for Queensland with the result that we have to raise our own revenue. It is becoming more and more obvious that the Queensland Government is desperate for money to bolster a tottering economy, and that more and more of our primary products are being sold to foreign interests for a song. The pattern is apparent at Weipa and Callide, and in many other places. In a desperate attempt to raise money the Government is prepared to sell our products for a song. At the same time it tries to fool the general public with the false cloak of "development", which is placed on all these transactions. I do not believe that it is development to sell many of our primary products to overseas countries so that they can use them for their own betterment. If we were able to get up and go we should be able to manufacture the finished products in our own country.

Our heritage in this State is being slowly frittered away by a Government that is completely unable to manage the State as it should be managed. Huge slices of Cape York are now dominated by foreign capital.

I see that many hon. members opposite are ready to interject. I know they want to put the Opposition on the spot by saying "Aren't you in favour of northern development? Are you against America? Are you anti-American?" Those are the tactics used by the Government and its supporters to cloak and cloud the issue—to raise a smoke-screen. They realise what is happening when they allow these things to happen.

Mr. Hughes: Yes—development.

Mr. TUCKER: I do not call it development; I call it the selling-out of our economy. Development should take place under our Government. I am not anti-American, nor am I opposed to development. I have in San Francisco a sister who is married to an American. I know many Americans, and

I think they are wonderful people. But I am concerned about our country's welfare. I am concerned, because I think that one day we may wake up and suddenly find that our country does not belong to us.

Mr. Lee: That would be right, too. It would belong to the Commos.

Mr. TUCKER: Of course, this is the old song. The hon. member who has interjected is trying to raise a smoke-screen and hide what is really happening.

I recently spoke to a Canadian who was flying from Townsville to Brisbane. He admitted that at present Canadians do not own their own country and do not have all the say in what goes on there. Some people say they do, but the strings are pulled by people of other countries. None of us wants that to happen here.

Development is the responsibility of our Government, not of foreigners. Like my colleagues, I want to hold our country for Australians. I do not want to be one of the purveyors to overseas interests, whoever they may be or whatever colour they may be. By this unimaginative and harsh Budget the Treasurer will kill incentive when he should be assisting development. The increases in freight rates and passenger fares must react against those who are developing the North and the West. It was difficult enough for them to compete with southern interests before this Budget. When contracts were let to southern firms I asked why, and was told that their tenders were lower. I shall show later why that has happened at the Army base in Townsville. I went to Ayr to lodge a protest about that matter. I did so not to disturb the meeting, but to place before Cabinet the urgent need to do something about freight rates. The Minister for Transport subsequently took action in that regard, but it was nullified by these new rises which will operate to the detriment of every primary producer in the North and the West.

On behalf of the people whom I represent, I lodge a vehement protest against the Budget and wholeheartedly support the motion of censure moved by my Leader.

Mr. HOUGHTON (Redcliffe) (12.33 p.m.): At the outset, I offer heartiest congratulations to the Treasurer on the presentation of his first Budget. It has been said repeatedly in the Chamber, and I support the remarks, that the drought has been responsible for some of the adverse aspects of the Budget. To balance his Budget the Treasurer had to use all the resources available to him. Anybody could balance a budget provided he cut off the legs or stopped progress and development. At times there are deficit Budgets, and there should be. But not if progress and development are to continue. I should not like to think that this State's development would be brought to a standstill because of a lack of funds. Anybody who reads the Financial Statement and studies the Estimates has an opportunity to examine this

Government's administration and its expenditure both in the past and as anticipated for the future. The State is limited in its resources for fund raising. The Commonwealth Government, being the tax collector, also distributes taxpayers' funds.

There are a couple of matters that disturb me. The Treasurer has found it necessary to impose on the people of Queensland additional taxes to balance the Budget. However, one sees in Press reports that millions of dollars are being spent on the development of the city of Canberra. I do not deny the Commonwealth Government its right to spend money on Canberra, but I sincerely believe that if there is to be any levelling-off in expenditure it should start at the place of distribution, which is Canberra. Surely the Federal Government could have given to Queensland an additional \$7,000,000 to balance the State's Budget and remove the necessity for the Treasurer to impose additional taxes.

I was alarmed when I picked up the newspaper this morning and found that the Commonwealth Bank had made available to a company \$1,000,000 unsecured. This disturbs me, because I have had some experience in local authority matters and know that it is impossible for local authorities to go on the market today and raise loan allocations necessary to meet their commitments. In spite of that, the Commonwealth Bank made available \$1,000,000 unsecured. That is something that I absolutely abhor, and I will not allow it to pass without comment whilst I am a member of Parliament. I am disturbed about things that from time to time place the Treasurer in an invidious position.

Hon. members opposite say that the Premier, the Treasurer, and officers of the Treasury Department, should go to Canberra to press their demands on the Federal Government. I have the utmost confidence in the ability of the Premier, the Treasurer, and Treasury officials to present a case on behalf of Queensland, but I should say that their constant presence in Canberra would not carry any weight at all. The present financial trouble will remain as long as the Commonwealth Government is the one that "cuts up the cake". The Premier and the Treasurer have on many occasions gone to Canberra and returned with considerable financial assistance.

Finance is a peculiar thing, and I am at a loss to understand why, if a financial weakness develops, the State cannot immediately seek assistance from the Commonwealth Bank or the Commonwealth Government. Queensland has had such a weakness during the last 12 months; because of the drought, the receipts of all Government revenue-producing departments were reduced.

The fact that the Budget deals with \$325,000,000 clearly indicates the extensive development that has been taking place in Queensland, and we would be remiss if we adopted the attitude, "We are not going to proceed with further development to match

what has already been achieved." The drought has been partly responsible for many of the deficits that have occurred. Another vital factor is cost of production, and this is increased by petty stoppages that take place from time to time. I believe that all hon. members agree that the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission has been of great assistance in the development of this State. In my opinion, many of the industrial stoppages that occur from time to time are of a pinpricking nature and can only be detrimental to the interests of the workers. They must increase production costs, and if we can get the message through to the people who are not prepared to be controlled by an arbitration system that has worked very well for many years—

Mr. Davies: Are you speaking about employers?

Mr. HOUGHTON: I am speaking to employees and employers, and to the unions, of which the hon. member is an ardent supporter. If they face their difficulties and endeavour to overcome their problems, as has been done in other countries, we may see an entirely different approach to such problems in the future. The unions, of course, wish to reserve the right to strike and other principles that have played a large part in protecting the welfare of employers and employees and, indeed, in developing Queensland. This State cannot afford to be costed out of the market.

Rabble-rousers are causing many of the problems that Queensland is facing today, but increases in the basic wage also affect the economy greatly. I do not deny the worker or any other citizen the right to apply for wage increases. They are entitled to an increase in wages if the cost of living rises, and I think all hon. members will agree that in an economy such as Queensland's, in which the standard of living is rising continually, wages must rise accordingly. Anyone who says that the standard of living today is not as good as it was in days gone by has not moved around the State very much, I should say. In my opinion, the standard of living enjoyed by the citizens of this country is equal to that in any part of the world. The most difficult task is to convince the rabble-rousers that this is so. If we could put them on a ship and send them to under-privileged countries and let them see what conditions and standards of living are like there, I am sure they would return to Australia singing a different hymn. It would not be a hymn of hate; it would be a song of jubilation and joy. However, at the moment such people are causing problems to industry and to the Government.

The Opposition has moved a censure motion against the Government by moving that the amount provided for the salary of the Aide-de-camp to the Governor be reduced by \$2. Such a motion is the traditional way of censuring the Government, but I believe that we should get away from what was done 40 years ago and bring the procedure up

to date. In those days, hon. members probably arrived at Parliament House in a horse and buggy, and I believe that such a motion shows a negative approach to the State's problems. I do not think that the Opposition's motion of censure has done anything to stimulate the minds of hon. members to constructive thinking about the Financial Statement submitted by the Government. Even the Treasurer would be gratified if anyone could tell him where the State could obtain more revenue, because that is the greatest problem confronting him. From time to time members of the Opposition have been very vociferous about what should or should not be done, but they have not told the Treasurer how he can obtain extra funds to overcome the deficit. I am sure he would be very pleased indeed to have their assistance on this problem.

Mr. Davies: Change the Commonwealth Government in November and it will help greatly.

Mr. HOUGHTON: Don't talk to me about the Commonwealth Government or the Commonwealth Bank! It was the A.L.P. that sold this State out. I have said before, and I repeat again, that until such time as this State has its own banking facilities we will have difficulties in regard to loan raisings. I have mentioned that before but, as I have also said, we now want to look to the future, not to the past.

The hon. member for Toowong spoke about members operating the parish pump. I looked at some of the statements made the other day by Opposition members and I noticed that the hon. member for Barcoo said that Mrs. Jones is a good Australian.

Mr. O'Donnell: I have never mentioned Mrs. Jones in my life.

Mr. HOUGHTON: All right, if it was not the hon. member for Barcoo it was another hon. member sitting on that side.

One of the most important matters in a State like Queensland is assistance to primary producers, and it is consequently very disturbing—particularly after the State has experienced probably its worst drought on record—that only a very small allocation has been made in the Budget for water conservation, which is important not only to the cities but to the development of the whole State. I represent a city electorate and I am very disturbed about the water facilities that will be available to Redcliffe in the next few years compared with what will be required. Cities such as Redcliffe, Toowoomba and Townsville expand very rapidly. They are vital centres and their future development depends very largely on the availability of water, electricity and roads. Those are the most important features in the development of any locality. No city can exist without an adequate water supply, nor can primary production or any other industry develop.

Mr. Muller: Water is the basis of it all.

Mr. HOUGHTON: Absolutely. Other countries that are backward in comparison with the standards that we enjoy are already converting sea water for use in industrial development, yet we in this country adopt a pinch-penny attitude in overcoming minor difficulties in the use of the large and numerous water resources available to us.

It must be disturbing to primary producers today to see the paucity of funds provided for the provision of water. This Government has a proud record in minor water conservation schemes—those that have been undertaken have been very beneficial—but I feel that by a stroke of the pen somebody in authority, whether it be in the Commonwealth Government or the Commonwealth Bank, could charge the Treasurer of this State with authority to expend \$X million in overcoming our water problems. As was said by the hon. member for Townsville North, if we do not develop this country it will fall into the hands of other people. If we are to hold this country we must be prepared to develop it. We will get development only by extra taxes, extra work and extra production. The value of any country can be judged only on its production.

Mr. Tucker: Extra production is the crux of the matter. If you kill that, you kill everything.

Mr. HOUGHTON: It comes back to that.

We will not achieve greater production until we overcome the industrial lawlessness that is evident from time to time. I believe in unionism, but, along with many Queenslanders and Australians, I am definitely opposed to the type of industrial lawlessness that has been besetting the Government and everybody else. The hon. member has seen this with the A.L.P. Today we cannot get a power-house built simply because of the grumbings, rumblings and murmurs. We get that sort of thing in every avenue of development. We get it in the railways—

Mr. Tucker: Every time the Government denies them their just dues.

Mr. HOUGHTON: If they are just dues they should take their case to the Industrial Commission. If there is anything wrong with industrial conditions the workers can have recourse to the Industrial Commission. The Government has the same opportunity. If we do not have faith in the arbitration system the whole thing must become a shambles.

An Opposition Member: The parties go there after a big fight.

Mr. HOUGHTON: These big fights are started by the little bloke, who pushes the other bloke in. I am all for the worker. I am all for a fair go for both employer and employee but, in many instances, this does not exist today.

Mr. Newton: It does not exist from your Government's point of view. There is always Government intervention in favour of the employer.

Mr. HOUGHTON: Not the Government, the Trades Hall; that is the whole trouble.

The Treasurer is confronted with a deficit of \$7,500,000. I think it was the Leader of the Opposition who said that we should have balanced Budgets in times of prosperity, and that deficits should not be allowed to continue at the present time. That goes back to my previous argument. With the exception of isolated pockets there are no present signs of poverty. Of course, there would be poverty in western parts of the State that have suffered from the ravages of drought. Unfortunately some of the people out there will never recover. I should hate to be out there trying to establish myself in an area that had been drought-stricken, with the heavy commitment of a bank overdraft hanging over my head. Such is the dilemma of some of those people that they will never recover.

It all comes back to the same old point. I firmly believe that the Government was wise in seeking Commonwealth aid for the stabilisation of the sugar industry (my only comment about the sugar industry is that I should like to see it take control of surplus sugar internationally) but consideration should be given to providing assistance for people in the western parts of the State, either through the Agricultural Bank or the Commonwealth Bank, or in some other way.

Money to establish water supplies and rehabilitate herds can come from anywhere, but the Treasurer is not Mandrake. He cannot pull money out of a hat. These things will take place as a result of increased production and increased revenue. I firmly believe that the State is just starting to get up and go. I think members of the A.L.P. will agree with that. It seems that they have begun to realise it as they have already brought the "Go-Go girls" into their organisation. This represents the thinking of the young people. The A.L.P. has been jogging along with an organisation as dead as the dodo; it needs the stimulation of young thinking. It must engender thinking in the minds of its people far different from that of the past, looking forward to the future with the thoughts of the young people so as to realise what the State has to offer. I compliment the A.L.P. I think it has learnt a lesson and now realises that it must implement the thoughts of young men with young ideas if it is to become a party to be considered in this State.

When speaking on the Budget, I do not wish to look back but to look to the future. I am sure that I express the thoughts of all hon. members when I say that anything we do in this Chamber should be for the benefit of the State and its children. That is what we are all here for. There is much constructive criticism to be offered to benefit us all and help to solve the problems of the State. We could hark back to the days of our fathers and previous Governments and trace some of the problems that we have inherited

today, but that is past history. We should be trying to improve the State for the benefit of all.

Mr. Newton: We can look back to the Federal credit squeezes in 1951, 1956 and 1962.

Mr. HOUGHTON: I have had experience of a party of the hon. member's political colour in both the State and Federal spheres—I have had experience of them all—and I am not prepared to surrender my beliefs in what we on this side of the Chamber stand for. I am sure that the majority of people in Queensland and the Commonwealth believe likewise.

In 1965 the Financial Agreement was signed for the ensuing five years. It will give the State progressive benefits. The recurring yearly benefit of \$2,000,000 will be of major benefit in carrying out capital works and development. However, the formula is such that it is still not satisfactory. In a State like Queensland a few dollars will not do much for development. It only means that the Treasurer will have to balance the Budget. It is only a book entry, and we should be able to bring in this money to bridge the gaps and overcome the deficiencies.

We have heard much about the Commonwealth Government not being generous to Queensland. I am sure that all hon. members will agree that it has been particularly generous since this Government assumed control of the Treasury benches. To cite a few examples, I refer to \$12,000,000 for the beef-cattle roads, the \$4,500,000 for the Fitzroy Basin brigalow development scheme, the \$500,000 for Gladstone coal, the \$15,000,000 for the Mount Isa railway rehabilitation scheme, and the \$2,700,000 for the development of Weipa. An extra loan allocation was given to the Brisbane City Council for the development of the Wynnum sewerage scheme, and many other matters have been generously considered by the Commonwealth Government.

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

Mr. HOUGHTON: I was dealing with the generosity of the Commonwealth Government to this and other States. The Opposition has claimed that the Premier, the Treasurer and other members of this Government have been lazy and lax in their approaches to the Commonwealth Government, but the results speak for themselves. They are conclusive and convincing evidence of the success of this Government.

Mr. Davies: In what way?

Mr. HOUGHTON: I shall tell the hon. member in a moment.

Queensland's share of funds from the Commonwealth has risen from 11.58 per cent. to 12.65 per cent., that is, \$6,500,000 extra, for capital works in Queensland. That is a considerable sum, and is clear evidence that this Government has not been lax in getting

funds from the Commonwealth. It is different from the treatment we received when the Australian Labour Party was in office in this State. In Redcliffe we could not get a high school, a hospital, or one worker's home. That shows the alleged generosity of the A.L.P. towards the workers of this State. People who have resided in Redcliffe for any length of time will have no truck with the A.L.P. This Government has been responsible for great development in this State; it has been unprecedented. The Government has not been sectional in its activities. The State has been developed from Weipa to the New South Wales border. Every fair-minded Queenslander knows that this Government's approach to development has awakened and rejuvenated the State, which lay dormant for 30 years under the Australian Labour Party's stewardship.

The Government is to donate \$36,000,000 to the City of Brisbane towards the cost of implementing the Wilbur Smith plan. The Redcliffe City Council had to provide its own funds from its own revenue for its plan, yet this Government is contributing \$36,000,000 to Brisbane. For seven years we have tried to have Sandgate Road widened between Sandgate and Brisbane. Today it is the greatest shemuzzle of all times, and it is getting worse. I appeal to the Government and the Brisbane City Council, whose responsibility it is, to widen that road and so give the people who use it easy access to and from Brisbane. The Government or the Brisbane City Council should provide off-street bus stops for the picking up and setting down of passengers, so that the buses will cease to impede the flow of traffic along a road of only two lanes. It is a shocking state of affairs at present.

Mr. Newton: What has your Government done about it?

Mr. HOUGHTON: It is a matter for the Brisbane City Council. What has the Lord Mayor done about it? This generous Government has handed out \$36,000,000 to the Brisbane City Council. Did it give such assistance to Rockhampton, Townsville, Maryborough, Redcliffe, or Toowoomba? Of course not. Yet hon. members opposite have the audacity to sit in Opposition and say that the Government has not been generous. Undoubtedly it has been generous to the people in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Tucker: Do you say it is a "Queen Street" Government?

Mr. HOUGHTON: No. An extra allocation has been made for development in Townsville. People in Townsville do better than those at Redcliffe. However, I am not complaining. If the population of an area is to be increased through defence necessity, whether it be at Townsville, Maryborough, Toowoomba, Redcliffe, or anywhere else, then I have no complaint about that, but surely there is enough flexibility in our outlook and thinking to plug the gaps in the State's development.

Admittedly the Treasurer has been left with no alternative but to increase charges, which will reflect adversely particularly on people in the West.

Mr. Newton: It is a pity this was not done before the election. If it had been, we would now be sitting on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. HOUGHTON: If the Australian Labour Party were in power, people would not be able to live in the West. Is it regrettable that rail freights have had to be increased. After the Government has been so generous and given to the Brisbane City Council \$36,000,000 to assist in the implementation of the Wilbur Smith traffic plan, it should also have a close look at the difficulty of road access to the city of Redcliffe and provide complementary and adequate public transport for those who live outside the metropolitan area. Whether the Government likes it or not, there will be a reversion to the electrification of the railways in the metropolitan area. Although I am not a resident of Brisbane, I should say that if the citizens want trams replaced by buses, that is their responsibility. However, let them bear in mind that history has shown that in every other city throughout the world where large sums of money have been spent on the construction of freeways, particularly Los Angeles, thinking is now returning to railways and other forms of public transport in the central business area.

When the Estimates of the Main Roads Department are before the Committee, I shall have something to say on constructing railways in preference to pouring money into the building of roads in Brisbane. I am of the opinion that the railways should be electrified, particularly in the inner-city ring. Why should those who live at places such as Redcliffe, Sandgate, and Strathpine, be faced with a hazardous trip each morning and evening to reach and leave the metropolitan area? The construction of freeways will not overcome all the traffic ills. I should like to see the electrification of the railways, using either monorails above the ground or tubes beneath it. However, when one remembers the years in which nobody was prepared to construct a tunnel even for sewerage, one wonders what chance there is for railway construction underground.

We speak of tunnels under the river and bridges over it. Why is it all made available in the metropolitan area? Many other places are equally in need of assistance. The citizens of Redcliffe had to bear the cost of providing four-lane highways and distributor roads on the Redcliffe Peninsula. They have not had the benefit of a railway service from Brisbane to Redcliffe, perhaps because of a lack of foresight on the part of councils in the past, perhaps because A.L.P. Governments were in office for so many years.

It is true that increased motor-vehicle registration fees will add to the costs of a person who owns a motor-car. I do not deny the worker the right to own a motor-car, a television set or any other amenity that will improve his standard of living. But if he has such things, it is no good his crying to the world about how much they cost him. One can own a Rolls Royce if one is prepared to pay for it. It depends what one wants.

Mr. Newton interjected.

Mr. HOUGHTON: With good representation, the hon. member for Belmont would have had water in his electorate years ago.

The Opposition has not offered any constructive criticism of the Financial Statement, and I do not think the Treasurer had any alternative to increasing certain fees and charges. I compliment him upon having the wisdom, foresight and vision to continue with the development of the State.

Turning to affairs in my own electorate, I refer first to the prawning industry. Earlier I had a few words to say about production, and if one realises that there is five times more sea than land in this world, one sees immediately the potential of the sea. In Queensland, and in Australia generally, very little effort is being made to make use of foods available in the sea. A survey is being made of the prawning industry in the Gulf of Carpentaria, and, on looking through the Estimates, I notice that there was an appropriation of \$20,000 in 1965-66 for east coast prawn research, of which only \$2,605 was spent. The estimated expenditure this year is \$5,000, which would barely run one trawler for 12 months. The prawners operating from the Redcliffe Peninsula are the major suppliers from Moreton Bay, so, naturally, I am concerned about their difficulties. In my opinion the prawning industry will fall by the wayside if the importation of prawns is allowed to continue. A survey is being carried out into the tuna industry, but it is not being done quickly enough. There are many men in the prawning industry who could give the Treasurer and his departmental officers much more information than they could receive from anyone else.

Mr. Bromley: They have told them, too.

Mr. HOUGHTON: The only one who has told them anything is Mr. Bulcock, a former Labour Parliamentarian, and no-one would take any notice of him. He is a rabble-rouser.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HOUGHTON: It is very important that assistance be given to the prawning industry. As I said, many people who have been in the industry for years and have a

wide knowledge of its problems would be prepared to give the Government all the information it requires.

I understand that consideration is being given to the establishment of a research station at Scarborough, where many of the trawlers are based. This could be a step in the right direction. There are many avenues open to the Government by which it can increase production in this industry and benefit the industry generally. The industry is not only self-supporting but is a dollar-earner, and these earnings could be substantially increased. The crayfish industry also earns dollars, as do the scallop and abalone-harvesting industries. These sea-foods are in great demand and their production can be of great advantage to this country. Incidentally, those produced in Moreton Bay are equal to any in the world, but not enough of them are produced. I think the Government should have a close look at this matter.

I have a few suggestions to make, if time will permit. I suggest that there should be an immediate investigation into fishery reserves, both within and outside territorial waters. At the present time some large prawn trawlers are operating in very deep water outside the three-mile limit. They operate in depths of 70 fathoms in order to get a yield. But they cannot operate in deep water all the time because of weather conditions, and consequently they come into the Moreton Bay area and trawl there. I suggest that the Government should restrict the operations of these big trawlers in that area because, by their very size and the size of the fishing nets they use, they are restricting the breeding of prawns in the breeding areas. They rake the ground over and the prawns have no opportunity to breed, with the result that the general yield from the area is restricted.

Areas in Bramble Bay and Deception Bay have been set aside for the preservation of maturing prawns, but unless these areas are controlled and regulated the large trawlers will ruin the industry. Many of them are owned by large property-owners in the country who invest in a trawler and put Bill Smith on it as skipper. Bill Smith does not worry about the industry; he probably knows that he will be there only for 12 months or so and he will take anything that crawls, swims or floats as long as he can get two bob for it.

The Government should keep a close watch on these hatchery areas. Overseas countries have prawning-ground reservations and nurseries. This is a most important aspect of the industry. If we are to preserve the industry in Moreton Bay, I think the answer is to set areas aside strictly for breeding purposes. It is done in fresh waters, so why not in the sea waters? Professional men, who make their living out of the industry, would readily make all the

necessary information available to the department or to the C.S.I.R.O. and, if acted upon, it must in the long run be of immense benefit to the industry.

Mr. Davies: You are not very satisfied with what the Government has done?

Mr. HOUGHTON: I am very satisfied with what has been done, but we have not done enough. It was this Government that acquired a landing for the prawners at Scarborough and built them a jetty; it was this Government that put in boat ramps and established a Fish Board. The Government has done that sort of thing all along the seaboard.

I do not know how much hon. members know about the prawning industry, but moonlight and the tides have an effect on the catching of prawns. At certain times the prawns move into quiet areas to breed. Occasionally an unscrupulous person will disorganise the whole industry by trawling in these breeding areas. I have seen prawns taken that were no bigger than a fingernail. This is where the Government must regulate if the industry is to survive. The person who is employed full-time in the industry should be given every encouragement. All too often a skipper who is employed on a trawler does not know the first thing about the vessel. Either he runs it onto a reef or goes over to the hotel to get "full" without tying the boat up, and it drifts away. The real professional men in the industry will tell you that their worst enemies are the gypsies in the industry. They are the ones against whom we have to regulate. There are other excellent men employed in the industry.

Mr. Tucker: Are you in favour of restricted entry?

Mr. HOUGHTON: Yes. If the Bay waters are to be open we should say, "Only 100 boats can operate in this area." Nobody should be allowed to take any yield from the nursery. If I had any say in it, I would impose the harshest of penalties.

Having lived in the Redcliffe area all my life, I think I can say that in future the Bay waters will not yield even a jelly-fish unless the Government takes some action. Everything will have been taken. Control of the fishing industry would be of great benefit because, with a properly controlled industry, the sea's potential is enormous. Most of the people in the industry subscribe to my views. If the industry cannot control itself, it behoves the Government to protect those who depend upon it for a livelihood.

Mr. Hughes: Would these prawners be likely to transfer their operations to the Gulf of Carpentaria if the survey proved the potential of that area?

Mr. HOUGHTON: Yes. I have known the trawlers from Redcliffe to go right around to Western Australia to catch prawns. They go to Southport, Bundaberg and Tin Can Bay. The true professionals in the industry go out

prawning when the weather is good, and do maintenance work on their boats when it is not good.

Mr. Newton: It is a perilous job in those areas.

Mr. HOUGHTON: My word it is! Those who make their living from the prawning industry deserve every dollar they get. I do not deny them their right to the 4s. 2d. a lb. they receive for fresh prawns. Admittedly some of them get very big hauls with their deep-sea boats. Some of them may catch up to 1,600 or 1,800 lb. a week, but in the following fortnight they may not be able to get to the grounds. The average prawner who is established in the industry looks after his equipment and affairs properly, but there are others who come into the industry and kill it.

Mr. Tucker: They can pay a fee and become master fishermen overnight.

Mr. HOUGHTON: Yes; that is the weakness in it.

As the boats are becoming larger and fishing is taking place in deeper water, it is only right to establish standards for boat skippers. Not so long ago, a little runabout in the bay was run down by a trawler with no-one at the wheel; the ship was under its own steam. There are men in the industry who are not doing the right thing; they are a heavy liability. They get \$100 or \$200 a week and take anything at all. They are not worried about the future as they will not be staying in the industry. These practices could be controlled if close attention was paid to them.

I do not know if all hon. members have had the opportunity of a trip on a trawler. If anyone cares to do so—and he does not become seasick—I should be only too happy to arrange it. It would benefit every hon. member to see the destruction that takes place. A lot of offal is dragged up in the trawls; it is useless for human consumption, but it could be used to establish a fertilizer works. Protein meal is excellent for primary production purposes and could be used to great advantage, yet the offal is shovelled overboard by the ton. Now that the prawns are starting to run, a mass of lights on 300 or 400 boats is to be seen looking across to Shorncliffe and Bribie Island at night.

The Government should closely investigate the matter of subsidies. At present a subsidy is available for the fishing industry, but as these people have to buy very costly equipment I believe that either the Commonwealth Government or the State Government should give serious consideration to this matter.

Finally, I suggest the establishment of a school so that masters of vessels may be taught the intricacies of the industry and how it may be preserved, together with the necessary duties pertaining to the operation and conduct of a motor vessel. This is an important matter, as many of these men have never previously been to sea. They learn the hard way. In one case, a father put his

son in charge of a trawler that cost £30,000. He went out into deep water, and after trawling for a few hours became so seasick he could not raise his net. It was down all night, until one of the other trawlers came alongside the next morning.

Standards must be established if the industry is to survive. These people could be taught something about currents and temperatures, and given a scientific approach to the industry. Many other things should be controlled for the benefit of the industry, especially when we remember that the Tangalooma whaling base had to close down because other nations went in willy-nilly and killed whales in unprecedentedly large numbers.

I compliment the Treasurer on the presentation of his Budget, even though it is a little distasteful in parts. If Queensland is to be developed in the proper manner, the Budget is the correct approach.

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) (2.45 p.m.): I support the very justifiable amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. Prior to the delivery of the Budget, it became apparent from the Treasurer's remarks that it would contain measures that were not in the interests of this State. The Opposition, therefore, has no hesitation in supporting the amendment.

I congratulate both our new Leader and our new Deputy Leader. The Australian Labour Party always finds the man to meet the moment, and will continue to do so. The occasion has never arisen when it has failed to provide men capable of stepping into the shoes of those who preceded them.

Mr. Tucker: And in a democratic way.

Mr. MELLOY: That is so. I regret the circumstances that made the change necessary. Our sympathy goes out to our former Leader for the situation that led to his resignation, which meant a great loss to the party. But, as ever before, the Labour Party will recover and resume its rightful place in the political life of this State.

There are many unpleasant, unpalatable, and, as the hon. member for Redcliffe said, distasteful features of the Budget. I shall point out why that is so, and why the Budget should be amended. Throughout its history this Government has blamed the State's financial plight onto drought or some other natural catastrophe, instead of looking at itself to see where it has failed to meet the situation and overcome the difficulties facing Queensland. How many more times will the Government use the vagaries of our climate to cover up its inefficiency in administering the government of Queensland, and its inability to plan the administration of the State? It is of little point for the Government to blame the drought. Droughts are not unusual, new, or unexpected, yet every time a drought occurs the Government is caught with its pants down, not knowing

where to turn to rehabilitate the State. It does not appear to have benefited from the lesson it learnt from previous droughts. One would have thought that it would have taken precautionary measures, because it knows that droughts recur periodically. Every time we have a drought, nothing is done about it; no preparations are made to meet any future drought or unfavourable climatic condition that we may encounter. The Treasurer blames the drought almost completely for the sad condition of the State's finances. He painted the drought as the cause of all his budgetary troubles. But he ignores the other side of the picture.

What is the other side of the picture? The pastoral industry has been seriously affected by the drought, and the Treasurer said that the gross value of production in that industry fell in the last year by \$29,000,000. On the other hand, the Minister for Industrial Development has lauded his party and the Government for the manner in which they have developed the industries of the State. As soon as a drought is experienced and pastoral revenue falls by \$29,000,000 the Treasurer's scream is, "We cannot balance the Budget."

What has happened in other fields in the State? Mount Isa Mines Ltd. made a record profit of £16,000,000 this year. I shall quote a few other industries that do not appear to have been affected by the drought, which the Government blames for all of its troubles. Appleton Industries Ltd. made a record profit of \$600,000; Thiess Holdings Ltd. made a record profit of \$1,700,000; Pioneer Concrete (Qld.) Pty. Ltd. made a record profit of \$1,700,000; Castlemaine Perkins Ltd. made a record profit of \$2,260,000. If the State has been so badly affected by drought, how is it that these firms have been able to show record profits whilst the Government, which is running the biggest business in the State, cannot handle the situation? After nine years of administration of the State, the Government is still crying poverty and misfortune, although it has had the opportunity over that period of time to do something about all the things that it says the Australian Labour Party did incorrectly when in Government. In spite of everything the Government says, Queensland today is in a far worse position than it ever was during the days of A.L.P. Governments.

The present Government is a businessman's administration. It is a Government that looks for its candidates to the ranks of the industrial and business world, and the bright boys of the Young Liberals. The Government says to the people, "Don't trust the A.L.P. We have young, capable, energetic, bright boys who will lead Queensland out of the wilderness." But what has happened? The Government is further in the wilderness than it has ever been.

Mr. Chalk: You are in the wilderness.

Mr. MELLOY: The Treasurer should talk! A couple of weeks ago he cried tears of blood when telling us how poor we were

and in what a shocking situation the State was because of a lack of finance. He cried his head off. Who is the one in the wilderness? He is. He admitted it, and I shall have more to say about his contribution in a few minutes.

The Government has paid no attention to the cost of living. To support that statement, one has only to look at what was said the other day by Mr. J. R. James, a representative of the employers, in relation to unemployment in Queensland and also, incidentally, price control. He said that Queensland faced an unemployment rise unless restraint was exercised in the next six or 12 months over further wage and price increases. There an employer's representative advocated control of prices and said that if prices—and, admittedly, wages also—were not controlled, we would face further increases in unemployment in the next six or 12 months.

The Government has given no indication, in the Budget or anywhere else, that it has any intention of establishing price control, or control of any kind that would stabilise the economy of the State and put it on a better footing for the next 12 months to meet the prophesied increase in unemployment.

Again referring to prices, the Treasurer said that at 30 June, 1966, meat prices were 15 per cent. higher than in 1965 and that this was a result of the drought. The Government has not given any indication that it will take action to restore meat prices to their previous level when the effects of the drought are no longer being felt. I should like to see it take action along those lines; I know it will not.

The Financial Statement indicates that the ground is being laid for the Budget that is to be brought down in August, 1967. It mentions that the effects of the drought will be felt for another 12 months, which means that in August, 1967, the Treasurer will again say that drought has had a serious effect on the State's finances. Anyone reading that statement would think that Queensland's prosperity depended entirely upon primary industries. As against that, of course, the Minister for Industrial Development claims that the State is going to rise to unbelievable heights industrially. If what he says is correct, will not the development of secondary industry sustain the economy of the State? According to the Treasurer, apparently it will not.

The financial position of the State will depend largely on the way in which Queensland's resources are developed. The Government, of course, claims credit for the development of bauxite at Weipa, coal at Moura, and various other mineral deposits. If that were true, it would be able to use the revenue from those developments. However, because a very large part of the revenue is going out of the country, it cannot. With such tremendous assets, the Government should be able to use the State's expanding mineral production to offset losses in the

pastoral industry. Queensland is supposed to be Australia's richest State in minerals, but the Government cannot take advantage of that because of the way in which the Federal Government and former Country-Liberal Governments in Queensland have sold out to overseas interests.

In the Budget, the Treasurer set out to meet the situation in his own way. On whom did he call? Despite the very high profits made by Mount Isa Mines Ltd. and various other industrial enterprises, who is to be called upon to foot the bill? One has only to look at the Financial Statement to see that. The workers are to be called upon to offset the deficit by paying railway fares that are 25 per cent. higher, not the people who would ordinarily have the cash to come to the aid of the Government. Through increases in rail fares the workers will make a very large contribution to Government revenue. In addition, the farmers, the very people whom members of the Country Party claim to represent, are to be called upon to make a contribution by paying increased rail freights. The Minister estimates that this will bring in an extra \$8,500,000 in a full year. This money, in the main, will be taken out of the pockets of the farmers.

Mr. Chalk: What about Mount Isa?

Mr. MELLOY: The Minister says, "What about Mount Isa?" He knows as well as I do that Mount Isa Mines get concession rates that the ordinary farmer will not get.

Increased road transport fees will be another imposition on the farmer. The Treasurer expects that an additional \$750,000 will come from road transport fees.

Mr. Chalk interjected.

Mr. MELLOY: I should not have to speak in this Chamber for the farmers.

Government Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is far too much cross-firing in the Chamber. I ask both sides of the Committee to refrain from it.

Mr. MELLOY: If the A.L.P. does not speak in this Chamber for the farmers they will not get any representation at all. We have seen debate after debate here in which all the speakers have been on this side, whilst Country Party members have remained silent. They would not speak, either because they did not know what to say or because they did not know how their electors would respond to what they did say. So, it fell to Labour Party members to speak on behalf of the farmers.

The other section of the community to be slugged are the motorists, and this section also contains a large number of workers. I do not think any section of the community has been bashed in the past as heavily as the motorists. Now the Government finds itself having to put another slug on them. Extra registration fees are expected by the Treasurer

to bring in another \$3,000,000 a year. This is to come out of the pockets of the already-overtaxed motorists, and I do not think they will thank the Government for it in the coming Federal election. I think it will have a big bearing on that election, because Government members here and in Canberra are all birds of a feather. I think the actions of this Government will rub off on the Federal Government at the forthcoming Federal election.

That is not all that is to be taken from the motorist. The Treasurer has indicated that a form of stamp duty is to be imposed on motor vehicle registrations. Where is all this to end? Every time the Treasurer opens his mouth he "dobs" something on somebody.

Mr. Chalk: I will "dob" something on you, too, when I reply.

Mr. MELLOY: The Treasurer makes an onslaught on the workers of this State every time he finds himself in a bit of strife. As I pointed out, the industrial concerns in this State will not be contributing; it is the workers who will have to get the Treasurer out of his difficulties.

The increase in income attributable to the new stamp duties is estimated to bring in another \$750,000 a year. Over \$3,000,000 extra will come out of the pockets of the motorists. One has only to read "The Road Ahead", the R.A.C.Q. journal, to find out what the motorists, through their club, think of the Government in its treatment of motorists in this State.

There are also to be fairly substantial increases in hospital fees for private and intermediate patients. In reply to a question by me, the Minister for Health indicated that there were only about 22 private beds occupied in the two public hospitals in Brisbane, so that the new charges for private patients will not be of very great moment. However, there is a considerably greater number of intermediate beds. It was expected that a charge would be made in public wards, but this has not eventuated. It will come, however, because the increase in the cost of intermediate hospitalisation will force people into public wards. It will increase the number of patients in public wards, which will increase the cost of running public wards and thus increase the cost of hospital administration. I will bet my bottom dollar that within six months the Government will introduce a charge in public wards.

In the Treasurer's heartrending speech the other day—there were tears running down my cheeks—

Mr. Chalk: You have been howling all the time you have been here.

Mr. MELLOY: Did I ever have greater cause to howl than after reading this Budget? I will guarantee that 90 per cent. of the people of Queensland are still howling after reading it.

The Treasurer concluded his Budget speech by saying—

"We have come through rough times before and I am prepared to believe that Queenslanders are willing to accept a little 'tightening of the belt' to ensure development of their State and to maintain its place as the finest in which to live."

I am sure there are many people in the State who know what the Treasurer meant by those remarks. Over the last few years they have become experts in tightening their belts. I refer to pensioners, who constantly have had to tighten their belts. That sort of statement comes as no surprise to them.

The reaction of the people to this Budget will be tremendous. I do not think it is fair for the Treasurer to suggest that in a State like Queensland—a State with tremendous possibilities; the State that the Minister for Industrial Development said had developed beyond all imagination since this Government has been in power—the people should be asked to tighten their belts to enable the Government to carry on. What a ridiculous situation it is for the Treasurer to make such a suggestion to the people in this time of high prosperity. How does the Treasurer expect people to carry these burdens? It will lead to more heartbreak and sorrow in the community than there has been at any previous time in the State's history.

The hon. member for Redcliffe commented on the generosity of the Commonwealth Government to Queensland and the other States. Let us look at how generous it really has been. Over the last 20 years it has completely wiped out its own public debt, but, in the same time, Queensland's public debt has grown to the amazing figure of \$936,000,000. In 1949, when the Liberal-Country Party Government took over the Treasury benches in Canberra, Queensland's public debt was \$277,000,000, or \$246 a head. During the period in which the Federal Liberal-Country Party Government has been in control the public debt has risen from \$246 a head to \$579 a head, and, as I have pointed out, the Federal public debt has been wiped out. That is an indication of the so-called generosity of the Federal Government. It has imposed its debts on the States, at the same time wiping out its own debt.

It is also interesting to note that in the 17 years prior to the advent of the Menzies Government in 1949 Queensland's public debt increased only from \$238 to \$246 a head compared with the increase since 1949. It has more than doubled, rising from \$246 a head to \$579. In the nine years before Labour left office in Queensland the public debt increased from \$246 a head to \$384, and in the nine years since 1957 it has increased from \$384 a head to \$579. It will therefore be seen that there has been a much greater percentage increase during the period in which this Government has been in charge of the Treasury benches.

I recently had the privilege of visiting the Queensland Agricultural College and I have a word of praise for its principal Mr. Britten. Tremendous developments have taken place there. I should like to give a little sidelight on my visit. In discussing training at Gatton we were told that in many cases lads who finished their courses went back to their parents' properties, but because dad had used the same methods for the last 30 years the lads' new ideas could not be put into practice. It is regrettable that the education the young fellows receive cannot be put into operation on their parents' farms.

Mr. Campbell: Why not?

Mr. MELLOY: Because their fathers will not adapt themselves to the new methods that the young fellows have learnt.

Mr. Campbell: That is a bit unusual.

Mr. MELLOY: From what I was told it is not unusual. I accept advice and information that can be relied upon. It is regrettable that such a thing should occur because this is a wonderful institution and it gives these lads remarkable training. They have every facility and the college is a credit to Mr. Britten.

We also had an opportunity of visiting Bamaga, on Cape York Peninsula—we were there previously in 1964—and we found that there has been a tremendous improvement in housing on the Aboriginal settlement, and in what is done there. Mr. Griffin, the overseer at Bamaga, told me that he could not get sufficient labour to carry out all the necessary work. He deserves a great deal of praise for the work he is undertaking. He is only a young man, about 30 years of age. It would be good if there were more like him in charge of our Aboriginal settlements. I do not agree that our Aborigines should be kept in places like Bamaga, but under the present circumstances we have to make them as comfortable as we can. I hope there is a new policy on Aborigines, who are the poorer for the existing circumstances. The sooner we get them into the community and develop them as they should be developed the better, because we are backward in our treatment of Aborigines.

A housing problem exists on the north side of Brisbane. There is a dearth of rental houses available to workers. Apart from those at Lawnton, the Government has not made any new houses available for rental in the last seven years. Admittedly there has been some development at Acacia Ridge and Inala, but with the extraordinary industrial development occurring on the north side of Brisbane people working there are faced with the problem of obtaining suitable accommodation in places such as Zillmere, Geebung, the mouth of the river, and Bulwer. Every week people come to me for assistance in obtaining accommodation. Some of them are living in caravans and tents. The alternative is to travel long distances from Acacia Ridge and Inala, but they are seeking accommodation on the northern side of Brisbane.

Plans are afoot for the development of the Serpentine area, where a good deal of industrial development will take place. It is high time that the Housing Commission acquired land in northern suburbs suitable for the erection of houses when the Serpentine industrial area is fully developed. There will be tremendous industrial development there in the next five years, and unless something is done there will not be sufficient housing for the workers in that area. If the Government does not act soon, land will not be available and these people will be forced to live in areas too distant from their places of employment. The Government should acquire lands in the Serpentine area, and at Pinkenba and Banyo.

This is an extremely disappointing Budget to the workers of Queensland. The burden of the State's financial difficulties will fall on them rather than on those who are best able to bear it. I appeal to the Government—I suppose it is a hopeless appeal—to have another look at the burden being placed on the people of this State generally, who are already hard put to meet the cost of living. Unless the Government introduces some form of price control, an ever-increasing difficulty will confront our people. As I have already said, Mr. J. R. James, secretary of the Queensland Employers' Federation, has pointed out that unless there is some form of supervision over prices and wages, there will be increased unemployment in Queensland within 12 months.

Mr. HINZE (South Coast) (3.20 p.m.): I join with previous speakers on this side of the Chamber in conveying congratulations to the Treasurer on the manner in which he presented the Budget. All members agree that it was a difficult Budget because of the drought and possibly the after-effects of the strike at Mt. Isa.

I am very pleased to see the Premier back in the Chamber after his visit to London on behalf of the State. I am pleased to see him looking fit and well, and so virile, keen, and young, with the map of Queensland all over his face. Obviously no-one had to ask from which State he came. I am pleased to see him back and in a position to receive next Saturday the most powerful man who has ever come to our State.

I regret that the hon. member for Toowoomba West was obliged to resign from the most important position of Leader of the Opposition. I understand his feelings very well, and I felt strongly for him when he indicated his attitude last Tuesday morning, as I am sure did almost every other member in the Chamber. However, that is now history and something that we can do nothing about.

I should like to convey my congratulations to the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Bulimba, and to the Deputy Leader, the hon. member for Townsville North. Unlike some of my parliamentary colleagues, I do not care to which party or

group a member belongs; that is entirely his business. The hon. members to whom I have referred have been elected to the most important positions of Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and I congratulate them on their elevation. I am sure that on behalf of their party they will do their best for the State.

I congratulate the Minister for Primary Industries and officers of his department on the manner in which they have honoured a promise made to the dairying industry during the last State election campaign. It will be seen in the Financial Statement that \$750,000 has been appropriated this year to commence a scheme for the rehabilitation of the dairying industry. In my area I can see evidence of the way in which the proposed scheme will function. Already thousands of acres have been ploughed, cultivated, and fenced, and prepared for seeding with improved tropical legumes and grass. The scheme will be of tremendous value to Queensland in a few years. I congratulate the Minister and should like him to convey to officers of his department my congratulations on the way in which the Government's promise to the dairying industry has been implemented so quickly. Although dairying has long been regarded as a Cinderella industry and one that has been dubbed inefficient, in a short period of time it will be one with which people will be pleased to be associated.

I now wish to refer to a statement by Mr. H. A. Stone, the President of the Australian Dairy Farmers' Federation, Chairman of the Australian Dairy Industry Council, and President of the Primary Producers' Union of New South Wales, following a decision of the Government of New South Wales to renew the licence of Marrickville Holdings Ltd. to manufacture table margarine provided they adhere strictly to their legal quota.

The Australian Dairy Produce Board was happy to associate itself fully and wholeheartedly with the statement made on behalf of the industry by Mr. Stone, which reads as follows—

"The New South Wales Cabinet decision to renew the table margarine production quota license of Marrickville Holdings Limited provided the Company gives an undertaking to comply with its quota of 2,166 tons a year will be accepted by dairy-farmers in good faith.

"The strict policing of this quota and the quotas of all other manufacturers will clarify a position which has been most unsatisfactory and confused for some years. The dairy industry, margarine manufacturers and oil seed growers will now know just where they stand.

"The dairy industry has appreciated the way in which other margarine manufacturers have accepted the law and observed their quotas during a time when Marrickville was taking advantage of legal

procedures to try and establish a position which would have been most detrimental to its competitors.

"The Cabinet's decision to maintain quotas was the right decision. The dairy industry is an established industry with tremendous investments and providing vast employment. It plays a vital role in rural development, decentralisation and builds up overseas funds by exports worth \$120,000,000 a year.

"It would be unsound, therefore, and not in the public interest to undermine its economy."

I subscribe wholeheartedly to the views expressed by Mr. Stone.

There is one matter in Queensland to which I suggest that the Minister for Primary Industries should give consideration. I refer to the milk section of the industry in Brisbane. Anyone associated with the industry knows how the city has been served for some considerable time. I believe that the day is approaching when the Minister and the Government should give consideration to setting up in the city of Brisbane a co-operative company to control fully the marketing and distribution of milk. I mention this specifically because of a report on the operations of a company named Queensland United Foods Ltd. that appeared in "The Courier-Mail" of 13 September this year. It said—

"Queensland United Foods Ltd. lifted net earnings from trading by \$35,725 to \$686,705 in the year to June 30 last, but group net profit was lower at \$694,371.

"Dividend will be maintained at 11 per cent. with a final of 5½ per cent.

"The latest group result, which represents an earning rate of 14 per cent. on paid capital, compares with \$786,072 in 1965, when the figure included a non-recurring \$63,858 dividend from a subsidiary company, and \$57,772 capital profit.

"Sales rise

"The preliminary report from the big milk and ice cream, timber, earthenware pipe, fishing, and rum group said earnings from trading at \$1,294,405 were up \$98,025 for the year.

"Tax provision increased from \$545,500 to \$607,700, and depreciation was lower at \$790,614 (\$821,462).

"Other income at \$8,236 compared with \$13,462 in the previous year.

"Directors said that although net earnings increased by 5.5 per cent., they did not reach the level originally anticipated."

This is the important part—

"In the clay products group the introduction of rigid new industry standards caused technical difficulties in the manufacture of earthenware pipes and fittings, which greatly affected turnover.

"The problems had now been overcome. The re-organisation of the brick-making subsidiary at Townsville had been delayed, but this year planned output had been achieved.

"Despite successful milling and increased sales in timber subsidiary, anticipated profits from housing construction were not realised. It was necessary to write-off substantial bad debts.

"Markwell Fisheries operated at a loss and Normanby Distillery had not reached a profitable level.

"Directors said that despite the intensive price competition encountered in the marketing of ice cream, turnover was slightly greater than last year and since the close of the year the sales volume had been maintained at a higher level."

I think that is very good but the important feature is that the report shows the extent of diversification of a milk company in the city of Brisbane. It has gone into many other types of business, and, as can be seen from the report I have just read, all the other interests are running at a loss. For this reason I believe that the State would be better served by a co-operatively controlled milk-bottling plant in the city of Brisbane from which all the profits would flow either to the producer or to the consumer. I am opposed to the monopolistic type of control in the city today.

Mr. Lickiss: You know that is a completely unfair statement.

Mr. HINZE: I am quite sure it is not.

Mr. Lickiss: Do you know the break-up of milk handling alone?

Mr. HINZE: No.

Mr. Lickiss: I will give it to you later.

Mr. HINZE: I am not at all optimistic about the future development of the State, having regard to the loan approvals for local authorities. I have here the approvals that the local authorities of Queensland have applied for over the last five years and the amounts that were approved. In 1962-63 they applied for \$44.8 million and received \$28.5 million; in 1963-64 they applied for \$41,000,000 and received \$28,000,000; in 1964-65 they applied for \$51.6 million and received \$30,900,000; in 1965-66 they applied for \$57.4 million and received \$32.8 million. In 1966-67, the current year, they applied for \$60.4 million and received \$36,000,000. An analysis of those figures reveals a shortfall of \$100,000,000 in local government borrowings in the last five years.

Although we appreciate that capital investment in the State is increasing by leaps and bounds, local authority finance and finance for State development is lagging far behind. That brings me to the particular question raised in the discussion that has taken place in this Chamber since the

Treasurer introduced his Budget, namely, what are we going to do about the difficulty we find ourselves in at the present time?

I have listened attentively from the commencement of the debate and I can honestly say that I have not heard anyone put forward any constructive ideas as to what we can do about it. It is all right to get up and blame Askin, or Bolte, or our own Treasurer; but that is not the answer. We must find ways of raising finance for the State. The figures I have quoted indicate quite clearly that local authorities are right behind the eight-ball and have no possible chance of developing this State under the present conditions. My own shire, the Albert Shire, asked for \$1,200,000 for development. We were not over-ambitious; we did not ask for anything we were not entitled to, but we received only \$200,000.

I have been quoted as saying that the Gold Coast City Council is satisfied with its allocation. It receives \$2,000,000. However, for the next 20 years \$1,000,000 a year will be earmarked for sewerage alone.

I want to be quite honest; I cannot see the answer at this stage but I believe it is most important that our Government should strive to find an answer to the very important question of how and where we can raise the funds necessary to capitalise the State's potential. Three or four years ago I heard some bedtime stories about the advantages that would flow to the State because oil had been found here; however, we still cannot balance our Budget. The fellow in Western Queensland who has been hardest hit by the drought still has to subscribe a fair proportion of the funds required to balance the Budget. The last thing I want to do is to say these things, but there is no getting away from them. Unfortunately I have not got the answers.

Mr. Aikens: Where do you think the money should come from?

Mr. HINZE: I have been thinking about this matter very seriously, as has everybody else. I thought that if we are as good as we say we are as a State, we should be prepared to back ourselves. I thought that perhaps we should ask the Commonwealth Government to forgo some of its taxing powers, and give us the right to introduce some sort of State development tax. I was very quickly reminded that if we did this it would have the opposite effect to what we desire. We would never get manufacturers to come into the State if we did something like that.

I am saying these things to indicate at least that I am thinking about the problem; that I am prepared to give some consideration to it.

Ed. Clark came into the Gold Coast area and made a statement that we should apply to the World Bank. If it were as easy as that I am sure the Treasurer would have done it long ago. If there is anything in that avenue I should like to suggest it to him.

I should like to spend a little time dealing with the tourist industry and the Gold Coast. Although we talk about our famous tourist areas, the fact is that we do precious little about them. I am very pleased, therefore, that the Government has at last recognised the importance of the industry by creating a portfolio of Tourism and by planning to set up a Tourist Advisory Board.

One of the first functions of the board should be to carry out an intensive survey and to collate the necessary facts to prove to the Government that this is a really important industry and that much wider recognition must be given to it to allow it to develop.

On the Gold Coast we have everything required of a tourist area. Private enterprise has done a magnificent job. All that we require is a leg up now and again from the Government and we will really earn dollars for the State.

In the Address-in-Reply debate I indicated that we believe we earn \$75,000,000 a year for the State. I do not know whether that is true or false, but they are the figures given to me. No figures have been officially collated but it will be appreciated that the tourist industry on the Gold Coast is recognised throughout the world. We are fortunate in Queensland that we have the Gold Coast to which thousands and thousands of southern visitors flock year after year. Overseas visitors are coming in now.

I think it is most important that we give consideration to our liquor laws. It is obvious that the New South Wales and Victorian Governments have considered this problem. We cannot expect to attract visitors from the southern States and overseas if we will not permit them to drink liquor while they are dining in a restaurant after 10 p.m. Overseas visitors I have met think it is a joke. We do not want that sort of thing to continue. I am not asking that hotels be allowed to remain open until all hours, but if we are to attract the type of people we need to attract to the Gold Coast it is most important that the Government give consideration to relaxing the present liquor laws.

We know that the Government plans to introduce legislation governing night-trotting. It is a wonderful sport and, if it is to be approved in Queensland, the Gold Coast would be an admirable area for its introduction and should be given serious consideration by the Government.

To give an indication of the facilities available on the Gold Coast, I mention that only last Saturday night some 700 Apexians and their wives sat down to dinner at the Chevron Hotel and had finished their meal within 1½ hours. Is there any other area in the State where such service could be obtained? That demonstrates that we have the facilities. We also have good recreational facilities, an ideal climate, and natural attractions. We have every possible thing to attract people to our area. We have only to be sensible about it to earn more and more dollars for the State.

Mr. Aikens: And dynamic political representation.

Mr. HINZE: There is not much doubt about that.

Mr. Davies: Do you want poker machines on the South Coast?

Mr. HINZE: No. I am strongly opposed to poker machines.

Most of our visitors come from Sydney, Melbourne and New Zealand. There are over 2,000,000 people in Sydney and Melbourne and hon. members know the population of New Zealand. In the last few weeks we lost a certain amount of trade because of the overlapping of school holidays in Victoria and New South Wales. Previously, we got the benefit of six weeks' school holidays on the Gold Coast, but this year the loss of a certain amount of trade was very noticeable. Queensland can do nothing about it, but I mention it to indicate how our economy can be affected.

I suggest to the Minister for Transport that he give serious consideration to asking the Minister for Transport in New South Wales to conduct a survey and see if it is possible to re-introduce the scheme to build a standard-gauge rail link from Murwillumbah through the Gold Coast to Brisbane. I am not saying that we should try to bring back what we lost, the "Southport Stinker" or "Carey's Commuter", or whatever we might call it, for we were not getting any service out of those dilapidated broken-down trains. The best thing to do was to close the line. I am trying to build for the future. The increase in population on the Gold Coast is the greatest in Queensland. It is second only to Canberra, and surely it is sensible to give consideration to establishing a real rail service in this area. No other area in Australia has the population and the same potential for development. I ask the Minister for Transport in all seriousness to confer with his counterpart in New South Wales. I understand that if we can get agreement between the States it will then be possible to ask the Commonwealth for a rail subsidy. Only 82 miles of line would have to be built at a cost of \$25,000,000. It would be possible to purchase the land—or resume it whilst it is reasonably cheap—on the eastern side of the highway, and possibly on the downstream side of the city of Brisbane where we know there is to be a tremendous build-up in industrial development.

I commend the Department of Main Roads for the magnificent job carried out on part of the South Coast road. Hon. members who drive to the Gold Coast will agree with me that we have a wonderful road. However, at times I must remind the Government that we have traffic congestion problems. Anyone who goes to the Gold Coast knows that on the return journey traffic hold-ups occur near Pimpana and it may take some hours to get back to Brisbane. We have recently increased the registration fees of motor vehicles, and it is not right that people who want to go for a

drive on a Sunday on the South Coast road should have these traffic hold-ups. I therefore ask the Minister, if possible, to allocate increased funds to overcome this problem. I am trying to be realistic; I say "if possible" because I know that in the west and north of the State there are roads without bitumen surfaces. It is a tourist area and increased funds should be made available for this road.

The hon. member for Albert suggested naming the new bridge "The Gold Coast Bridge". I concurred. We discussed the matter with the co-ordinating committee of the Gold Coast City Council, and agreed it should be named "The Gold Coast Bridge". I should like the Minister for Main Roads, the Treasurer, or Cabinet to finalise this matter as it is causing some concern in my area. The bridge will be opened before Christmas and it would be appreciated if it could be given a name before then.

I ask the Minister for Lands to consider setting aside as park land an area of three or four acres on the eastern side of the southern approach to this bridge. It is an ideal site for park lands. It would be most undesirable if it were subdivided and sold for residential development.

I ask the Minister for Main Roads to give me permission to place a sign on the road. I know the department's thought about signs on highways, that it is most important not to clutter up roads with signs; but in the Gold Coast area there is such a terrific build-up of population that it is desirable for a sign to be erected in a sensible reasonable fashion. The Gold Coast City Council is prepared to pay for the sign, the Chamber of Commerce in Coolangatta has been asking for it for some considerable time, and the tourist industry is prepared to support our proposal. Therefore the department should consider erecting a sign reading "Gold Coast City" so that people coming to our State will know they are in Queensland before they get within five or six miles of the city boundary.

The population of the City of Gold Coast increases from 40,000-50,000 to 140,000 during the holiday period. Those figures give some indication of the density of traffic on our main arterial road. I am justified, therefore, in asking the Government to give serious consideration to allocating more funds for road construction in that area.

Conversion of land tenure on the South Coast raises a real problem. Leaseholders who wish to take advantage of the Government's scheme to allow freeholding of property appreciate the Government's attitude and intention. They know the position under previous governments. They realise that it is their right to freehold over 20 years, free of interest, and that these conditions could not be bettered. They also appreciate the Government's attitude to remission of rentals to those in receipt of a pension. But they say that the valuations in the area are increasing so quickly that it is not a good proposition for those who have gone there to retire to undertake the responsibilities of

freeholding unless the Government is prepared to recognise that the leaseholder is entitled to some owner's equity.

A letter I received from one person reads—

"The powers of the Minister under Part II, Division I, clauses 19, 20, 21, 22 and 23 and particularly subclause 30 are quite clear. The recent alteration and addition to section 190 says, *inter alia*, 'That where the land concerned is used exclusively for the lessees own residential use, the lessee may apply to the Land Administration Commission for rental relief' and sets out the scale of relief which can be given."

"We consider this scale of relief as being most liberal. Now, Sir, we cannot see why some relief cannot be given to this same leaseholder if he wishes to freehold now. So we respectfully suggest that section 190 be amended to include 'that any leaseholder entitled to rental relief under this section may apply to the Land Administration Commission to have the said land made freehold, at not more than fifty per cent. of the market value of the land as at the 1st September, 1966. Payment for such freeholded land shall be spread over twenty years. The Minister may at his discretion grant this concession—whole or in part to any leaseholder, irrespective of income, where the said land is used exclusively for his or her own personal residence.

"In determining the freehold value of such land consideration will be given to whether the land is in a single unit area or multi unit area or has potential commercial value.' You can see now Sir, that this simple freeholding section will meet our request because it will give an equity to the limited income residential occupier owner. That is the Person for whom we are fighting.

"We are not asking for this land devaluation for the present flat owner, or the owner of future flat or commercial sites. The flat owner can always meet increased costs by increasing the rentals.

"We shall be very grateful if you can arrange for us to see the Minister again and you can tell him of our thoughts on this matter, and also that we are very grateful to him for what he has done for the 'little man' leaseholder. You can tell him that we have expressed our opinion publicly."

I have another letter from a person who believes that one of the problems in the area is the fact that people are not always told the true position by those in the real estate business. Although I do not subscribe entirely to the views contained in the letter, this is the type of thing that people in the area are saying, and I crave the attention of the Committee whilst I read it. It states—

"Further to domestic leasehold land, I find in my search for information that the Real Estate people are possibly at the foot

of our troubles as they do not always present leasehold land in its true light when making a sale.

"I find that they rarely have all the facts of the land offered, and emphasise the low present rental 'only shillings', they say, and gloss over or do not mention re-valuation.

"One agent I quizzed had a lot of leasehold land on his books for sale, but had only two cards showing the date of the end of the present tenure when re-valuation and reassessment of rental would take place.

"You will agree that this must be rectified and you may care to place the following suggestions before the Minister of Land, Attorney General or whatever department is concerned.

"I suggest that when leasehold land be listed for sale, a document supplied by the right authority, be filled out and when the sale takes place, is signed by the Vendor, Buyer and the Agent.

"In this way there could be no misrepresentation of the facts and no subsequent complaints.

"The document could read—

Description of property and area....
 Type of lease.....
 Present lands dept. valuation \$.....
 3% of \$.... is present annual rent of \$.....
 Date of next valuation month
year.

Valuation will be based on sales of comparable land in the area and rent calculated at 3% of that value.

Next period of tenure at this rent will be 10 years."

Mr. Davies: Who wrote that?

Mr. HINZE: Mr. Ted Dolby. I believe the Real Estate Institute of Queensland to be a body of most honourable men. I believe that they have made representations to have their members registered. They say that any person who sells real estate, whether he be the principal of a company or a salesman, should be registered. They also say that before he is registered he should have some education in real-estate law. A course now available for this purpose at the Technical College has been sponsored by the Real Estate Institute of Queensland. At present all that is necessary to obtain a licence are five character references and the lodging of a bond with the State Government. I understand that in Victoria it is necessary to spend eight years as a sub-agent to gain experience before registration is granted.

Mr. Aikens: You know that there are a lot of little groups with a mania for registration these days. They want the protection of this Parliament without any of the responsibilities involved.

Mr. HINZE: I think the hon. member will agree with me that some action is needed. Today, anyone can go along, pay his few dollars, or whatever it is, and set himself up in business. There is no control over him, and I believe that there should be.

I express my appreciation to the Minister in charge of police for making increased police staff available for the Surfers Paradise area. The people of the area were becoming worried about hooliganism and thefts, which were getting Surfers Paradise publicity of an undesirable type, and they are grateful to the Minister for taking action. All I ask now is that provision be made in next year's Budget for the establishment of a permanent police station at Surfers Paradise.

Police officers are somewhat concerned because, after spending a good deal of time in improving their physique, they spend about two-thirds of their time punching typewriters. It seems that the day of the policeman on the beat has almost gone (I believe that such men did a good job) and a good deal of time is now taken up in making out reports. I understand that policemen do not like work of this type, and I think Parliament could give consideration to the use of tape recorders, or possibly female typistes, for such work. This would allow the men to do more work outside the office.

As hon. members know, the increase in population in my electorate has been greater than that in any other area in Queensland. As a result, problems have arisen in the field of education. Broadbeach school, which opened three or four years ago with an enrolment of 60, now has 460 pupils; Miami High School has between 800 and 900 pupils; and Southport High School has over 1,000 pupils. Therefore, provision should be made in the very near future for the purchase of land in the Gold Coast-South Coast area for a third high school, for a second hospital, and for a future housing estate. I am pleased to say that the Minister for Housing has indicated to me that funds have been made available in this year's Budget for the purchase and subdivision of land for a housing estate on the South Coast. That is important because, as I think all hon. members know, there are as many workers there as there are in any other town in Australia.

Mr. Davies: Where would you put the second hospital?

Mr. HINZE: I believe it could be somewhere in the Currumbin area, to serve the southern part of the South Coast.

I suggest that consideration should be given to reforestation on the Springbrook Plateau. Although the area was used for dairying for many years, large quantities of timber were originally taken from it. If the Government could get the co-operation of farmers in reforestation, I believe that the revenue could be of great benefit to the State.

I should like to refer very briefly to the valuation of land on the Gold Coast and impress upon the Committee the importance of the area. According to the Valuer-General, the value of the Gold Coast has increased 35 times in 15 years. Prior to 1950 the valuation of the area was \$2,300,000; it is now \$80,000,000. The valuation of Townsville was 7·2 million dollars; it is now \$40,000,000. Toowoomba was 2·3 million dollars; it is now \$30,000,000. Therefore, it can be seen that the valuation of the Gold Coast has increased more than that of any other area of the State. It is now equal to the total values of Toowoomba and Townsville put together; it is also equal to the total values of Ipswich, Rockhampton and Cairns put together, and it is also equal to the values of Redcliffe, Mackay, Bundaberg, Maryborough, Dalby, Warwick, Gympie, Gladstone, Roma, Goondiwindi and Charters Towers put together.

Therefore, I believe that hon. members will agree with me when I say that the Gold Coast is an area that is earning much revenue for this State by way of Land Tax, Succession and Probate Duties, the wonderful Tourist industry and the dairying industry which as I have indicated, will develop into an industry with which people will be pleased to be associated.

I believe I represent a very important part of this State and that when I make representations to the various ministers for roads, housing, or whatever it may be, I am justified in doing so.

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) (4.1 p.m.): Last week we had the amazing experience in this Chamber of seeing the former Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Duggan, stand up in the Chamber and parade himself as an honest man by disclosing taxation defalcations of mammoth proportions. By an amazing coincidence, he did this only a day before his name was listed on the table of the Federal Parliament as a tax defaulter. His claim to be an honest man by disclosing the matter in this Chamber on the previous day reminds me of a man who gets a girl into trouble and decides to marry her just one day before the baby is born, and then wants the whole world to acclaim him as a man of dignity and honour.

At the outset, I want to say that it is a matter of complete indifference to me whether the former Leader of the Opposition tried to diddle the Commissioner of Taxation or whether he did not. That is a matter between him and the Commissioner of Taxation; but I think I speak on behalf of all the people of Queensland when I say that we have become heartily sick and tired of his continual whimpering and whingeing—and not only his own whimpering and whingeing but that of his lugubrious and lachrymose stooges, both inside and outside Parliament.

Now, let us have a look at the case clearly and dispassionately—and again I remind the Committee that I am not concerned at his attempt to diddle the Commissioner of Taxation. Quite a number of people do that and I suppose quite a number get away with it, but in relation to this attempt particularly, when we read of it in newspapers, which should have a sense of responsibility, and in statements by people in this Chamber and outside of it, we are led to believe that the Commissioner of Taxation was a brutal, callous, heartless, unfeeling man and that if he had displayed more charity towards Mr. Duggan he may not have been listed as a tax defaulter.

Let me say—and I hope that the more reputable newspapers will correct the impression that has been created in the minds of people—that the Commissioner of Taxation is merely an instrument of the law. He merely administers the taxation laws as passed by the Federal Parliament down the years, by both Labour and anti-Labour Governments. He is bound by those laws just as anybody else is bound by the law and if, in the circumstances, he had not listed the former Leader of the Opposition as a tax defaulter, if he had not decided that he was a trader in shares and not an investor, he would have left himself open to a charge of dereliction of duty—and rightly so—because it is a proud boast of Taxation Commissioners—and I have had a fair amount of dealings with them, not as a defaulter but on behalf of many of my constituents—that they treat all people alike. Both the little man and the big man feel the law just as the Commissioners think the law should be interpreted, and they show no favour to any person. Therefore, instead of everybody condemning the Commissioner of Taxation, instead of the newspapers rushing in and hitting him, I think the people of Australia should be very pleased indeed that we have a Commissioner of Taxation and taxation laws that show neither fear nor favour to anyone.

Let us face up to the facts of the case as they have been disclosed by the former Leader of the Opposition. He was declared by the Commissioner of Taxation to be a trader in shares. That was purely and simply a primary decision which is required to be made by the Commissioner of Taxation; nobody else can make that decision. It is obvious, of course, that the taxpayer cannot determine whether he is a trader or an investor. Having all the evidence before him, the Commissioner of Taxation makes the preliminary decision that the taxpayer—in this case the former Leader of the Opposition—is a trader in shares. The Commissioner of Taxation was in exactly the same position as a traffic policeman who pulls a motorist up in the street and says, "I believe that you have committed a traffic offence and I am going to give you a traffic ticket". The motorist can accept the traffic ticket and pay the fine or, if he thinks he is the victim of heartless, brutal, callous and uncharitable

action on the part of the policeman, he can go to every court in the land, right to the Privy Council, and have the case fought out on its merits. He can have the case determined in accordance with the evidence and the law. In this way the Commissioner of Taxation is in exactly the same position as the traffic policeman.

If the former Leader of the Opposition felt aggrieved at the action of the Commissioner of Taxation in classifying him as a share trader and naming him as a tax defaulter, he had the right to go to many places where he could have lodged an appeal and fought his case. He could have gone to the Taxation Assessment Tribunal. If dissatisfied with its decision he could have gone to the court. He could have fought the case through the High Court and, if necessary, before the Privy Council.

I believe every Queenslander should be told that the Commissioner of Taxation was not the final arbiter in the case, as has been claimed by the former Leader of the Opposition and his stooges, inside this Chamber and outside of it. The final arbiters were the courts of Australia in accordance with the taxation laws of Australia, as passed by Federal Governments down the years. If the Leader of the Opposition was such a sea-green incorruptible, such a shrinking violet and perfumed pansy in this matter, I want to know, and the people of Queensland want to know, why he has not used his right of appeal. Why has he not gone to the courts and said, "I challenge the decision of the Commissioner of Taxation naming me as a share trader and a tax defaulter"? I think I express the opinion held by most people in Queensland when I say that he has not exercised his right of appeal and has not gone to the courts because he knows that if the case came before the courts it would be heard in open court, and all the circumstances surrounding it would be published for the world to read. That is why he has not gone to the courts. I honestly and sincerely believe that there are things associated with his mammoth share transactions that he has every reason to hide.

I want to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that not so very long ago—a few years ago—the hon. member for Fassifern was in exactly the same position. He was named as a tax defaulter at a time when he was much closer to the "throne" than was the former Leader of the Opposition, because at that time he was the Deputy Leader of the Country Party. If anything had happened to the Premier to cause him to relinquish his office the hon. member for Fassifern would almost automatically have become the Premier of this State. Compared with those of the former Leader of the Opposition, the tax defalcations of the hon. member for Fassifern were in the peanut class. I invite hon. members to go to the centre table of the Chamber and read in printed "Hansard" what the

former Leader of the Opposition had to say about the hon. member for Fassifern. If hon. members want me to do it, one of these days, I will go to the table, pick up "Hansard" and read it for them.

They are the whole circumstances of the case. I want to know why the former Leader of the Opposition is continuing on with his whingeing, whining, and snivelling, and why his supporters and stooges are doing it for him, when all he has to do is go to court; all he has to do is to appeal in accordance with the provisions of our taxation laws. He will not go to court because he knows full well that we would get a full disclosure not only of the money he made out of his mammoth share transactions but of where he got the money from in the first place and how, on the relatively meagre salary of a Minister at the time, he was able to engage in such mammoth share speculation. We probably might hear of such things as placement shares—shares that are set aside in any company to be allotted by the directors of that company. Those shares can be handed out for nothing or at a very small premium and they are handed out by very wealthy and influential companies for services rendered to them by various people. It is not an unusual thing in the company world for the directors of a company to make an allocation of placement shares—say, 1,000 placement shares at 10s. or £1 each—to a certain person who has rendered that company some service, even though those shares are listed on the Stock Exchange at up to £10 each at the time. There is nothing to stop that man from immediately selling for £10 the shares that he obtained for 10s or £1.

I want to know where the former Leader of the Opposition got the money to engage in these mammoth share speculations. Up to the time of defalcation covered by his tax transactions, I am positive from my own knowledge—and I live just as frugally as the former Leader of the Opposition—that he could not have done it on his parliamentary or ministerial salary. If he wants to prove that I am perhaps judging him rather harshly, then let him lodge an appeal to one of the courts and have the whole case ventilated. If the Government wants this done, let it appoint a Royal Commission to go into the whole of the matter. It is my opinion that the former Leader of the Opposition will make men like Tom Foley appear to be in the rag-picker class.

One thing that has sickened me and the people of Townsville—and I assume that what sickens the people of Townsville will sicken the people of Queensland, because they are just ordinary citizens of the State, the same as are those who live elsewhere—is all the whingeing and howling—and I understand some of it took place today—about Mr. Duggan's mother being left with some children following the death of her husband. That is a tragic thing, but he is not the only man to whom that has happened. There

must be thousands of men in Queensland whose mothers were left with young children because of the death or departure of the father, the bread-winner. My father left us when I was four years of age and my sister was two years of age, but, I never squealed about that whenever I got into trouble or did anything wrong. I accepted what was coming to me. I did not break into a howl and argue the fact that my mother was left with three children. I did not parade my wife's various illnesses—I do not know that she had any, but if she had kidney disease or diptiptis or warts on the torso, I would not bring that forward as an argument why preferential treatment should be extended to me. What has that to do with the rest of Queensland?

I feel very sorry for Mrs. Duggan, the wife of the former Leader of the Opposition, in whatever it is that she suffers from. Indeed, she has my deepest sympathy and condolences. My only objection is that the former Leader of the Opposition should have squealed it from the hustings in this Chamber and had it paraded all over Queensland in the columns of the Press. What sort of a state have we reached when a man stands up here and parades his wife's illness and the fact that his mother was left with young children to rear as an excuse for his being a tax defaulter, scores and scores of years subsequently? To my knowledge—and no doubt the Minister for Labour and Tourism could tell us the position more precisely—there are many such people in this State. How many mothers in this State are struggling to rear children because the fathers have died or walked out on the family? I sincerely hope that, like myself and other men left in the same position, they never run squealing, clamouring, and sobbing to anyone with whom they may happen to get into some financial difficulty later on. Indeed, a statement was made in a Sunday newspaper—

Mr. Walsh: Which one?

Mr. AIKENS: "Sunday Truth". Of course, it came out on Mr. Duggan's side and asked what would have happened if he had lost in his share transactions.

Mr. Bennett: You are the white-haired boy of "Sunday Truth".

Mr. AIKENS: I will say that I have the guts and ability to disagree with anyone whom I think I should disagree with. That is more than the hon. member for South Brisbane can say. He may have the guts and he may have the ability, but I doubt whether he would disagree with some of the people I disagree with. He would be afraid of the repercussions.

Mr. Walsh: He would disagree with Jack Egerton.

Mr. AIKENS: I know he would. I know that he is not a "Moscow man", and I shall deal with that aspect of his party later on.

He would disagree with Jack Egerton, but I doubt if he would disagree with Edgar Williams. I doubt if he would openly criticise any article in "The Worker", any more than some of the "Moscow mob" would come out and openly disagree with any article that appeared in "The Tribune". But I have the guts and the ability to disagree with anybody at all at any time, and I think all hon. members would agree that no-one can tie a knot in my tongue.

Mrs. Jordan interjected.

Mr. AIKENS: The hon. member for Ipswich West interjected. I say to her in all charity that if she would only keep her feet on the ground and stop lime-lighting and bring the circumference of her cranium back to normal proportions she would be a much better member than she has been up to date.

"Sunday Truth" came out and said, "What would have happened if Mr. Duggan had lost his money in these share transactions?" That is not the point at all. Let me be perfectly clear about this. The Commissioner of Taxation and the taxation laws of this State do not care two hoots in hell what business a person engages in. They do not care whether he is a share trader or a businessman, or whether he hawks rags, bags, bones, or bottles. They do not care what he does. That is his business and they will not interfere with it and will not dictate to him. But the taxation laws of this land—not the Commissioner of Taxation—provide definitely that if a person makes a profit or earns any money at all he must disclose his profits and his earnings, irrespective of how he derives them. So that all this talk of what would have happened if Mr. Duggan had made a loss is of no account. I do not know how anybody could make a loss if he gets a bundle of placement shares for nothing or 50 cents when they are worth \$10 or \$20 on the Stock Exchange.

Mr. Walsh: Are you suggesting he got some placement shares like that?

Mr. AIKENS: I am suggesting that, yes, and he can prove me wrong by lodging an appeal against his tax assessment and going to the court and producing all the papers and documents to show that what I am saying is wrong. We all want to know where he got the dough to start with.

Mr. Mann: You know he has already paid the tax and has no right of appeal now.

Mr. AIKENS: If he has paid his taxation, it is a clear admission that everything the Commissioner of Taxation charged him with is correct. It is an admission that he is a tax defaulter, that he is a trader in shares, and that he has not the guts to go to the court, because he could have gone to the court long before he paid his tax. So that the hon. member for Brisbane, who by the way is not exactly a blood-brother of the former Leader of the Opposition, may be sorry that he made that interjection. That is the point.

It does not matter whether the former Leader of the Opposition made a loss or a profit; the law of the land, which the hon. member for South Brisbane and the rest of us are pledged to uphold, prescribes that no matter in what business a person engages, if he makes a profit he must declare it and pay tax on it. If a person buys and sells, whether it is land, or property, or shares, or anything else, there comes a point of time when someone has to decide whether he is merely an investor or whether he is a trader. The only person who can make—I repeat these words—that primary decision is the Commissioner of Taxation. His primary decision that a person is a trader and not an investor is, as I said, open to appeal, and any person who feels he has been dealt with unjustly has the right to go to the court and have the matter cleared up once and for all.

I point out to members of the Australian Labour Party, who should represent the working class, although everybody knows they don't, that no worker can diddle the Commissioner of Taxation. Every penny the worker earns is shown on his group certificate, a duplicate of which is sent to the Taxation Department. He must pin the original of the group certificate to his income-tax return, and he must pay tax on every penny shown on that group certificate. It is only the person who does a little buying and selling, and a little bit of business on the side in addition to earning his salary, who can sometimes diddle the Commissioner of Taxation.

Let us have an end to these goings-on. I feel sure the hon. member for Brisbane will tell this to the former Leader of the Opposition in conference over a drink or two at a hotel, probably while they are having dinner together for which I feel sure the hon. member for Brisbane will pick up the chit, because they are so friendly. Let us have an end to all this weeping and whining and snivelling. Let him say, "I had a go. I missed, and I am prepared to accept my penalty", and say no more about it.

Mr. Mann: He has already said that.

Mr. AIKENS: Only after he told us about his wife's kidney complaint and how his mother was left to rear young children, and all about the Commissioner of Taxation being an uncharitable, brutal, callous oaf of a man who did not give him a fair go and who could have been more charitable and taken into account the fact that he was leader of the Parliamentary Labour Party and the coming Premier of the State.

Here is something for the hon. members for Brisbane and South Brisbane to think about. Only a few months ago the hon. member for Toowoomba West led the Labour Party at the State election. If, by some strange chance, the electors had returned the Labour Party to power, he would have accepted the office of Premier of the State, knowing that the sword of Damocles was suspended over his head

by the Commissioner of Taxation, and knowing that within a few months he would be forced to resign the Premiership and bring his party into electoral disgrace. If he knew that—and no doubt he did—he had the greatest temerity to lead the Australian Labour Party at the last State election. He had the temerity to go forth on the highways and byways and say, "The Labour Party is an honourable and decent party, and I am their honourable and decent leader. Elect me and the Labour Party to power". He did that knowing that within the next couple of months he would be publicly branded as a tax defaulter of the first magnitude.

With the exit of the hon. member for Toowoomba West from the leadership of the Parliamentary Labour Party, there followed the most depraved and undignified scramble for his position that has ever taken place in any political party.

Mr. Walsh: What do you think of Mr. Milliner's advice?

Mr. AIKENS: In reply to the hon. member for Bundaberg, I may say that it is hard to determine where the small fry at the Trades Hall fit into the picture. No-one knows better than the hon. member for Bundaberg that there is only one boss of the Labour Party in Queensland today, and that is a gentleman named Jack Egerton. I suppose he graciously gave Milliner permission to make that statement, just as he gave Whitby or some other person permission to make a statement the other day.

With the scramble going on for leadership, down came word from the Trades Hall that it was to be Tucker for Leader and Houston to remain as Deputy Leader. Those who were opposed to the "Moscow mob" closed their ranks; I wonder why they did not do it before. When all is said and done, the anti-Moscow mob in the Parliamentary Labour Party were spread all over the place like piccaninnies' footprints on the plain. But they closed their ranks and said, "Don't let us have a scramble for leadership. Let us get behind Pat Hanlon". The moment that happened, the "Egerton boys", to use the vernacular used out Warrego and Gregory way, got the wind up and said, "Tucker can't beat Hanlon. Let's go for Houston". Even then they were in doubt because they really thought there were some men in the Labour Party who had the interests of their party at heart. They really thought that there were men previously in the "Moscow mob" who wanted to get the Labour Party back on the Treasury benches. They did not realise the bitter enmity between the two factions.

Whilst there is a disagreement between the "Young Turks" back-bench members of the Liberal Party and those in more elevated positions in it, and disagreement between the Country Party and the Liberal Party, there is plain undisguised hatred between the factions of the Labour Party. It is not an uncommon

thing to hear the word "bastard" used between members of one section of the Labour Party and those of another section.

The hon. member for Tablelands is laughing uproariously, as he usually does. I will tell the story one of these days of the two union tickets he had when he was in the Railway Department. He used to buy a union ticket in the A.R.U. as well as a union ticket in the A.F.U.L.E. so that if the A.R.U. was in industrial strife he could say, "Now, look, I am not going to be in that. I am in the A.F.U.L.E.", and if the A.F.U.L.E. was in industrial strife he could say, "I am not going to be in that. I am in the A.R.U."

I might say that such an exchange of pleasantries, if I may refer to them as such, occurred in the Dining Room recently between the former Leader of the Opposition and the former deputy Leader—one said "Bastard", and the other said, "Same to you"—yet this is the Party that claims there is only mild disagreement among its members. Well!

It was really expected—frankly, although I was not here (I was in my electorate; and the people knew where I was)—

Mr. Bennett: Were you selling tickets in the sweep? Tell us what you got out of it?

Mr. AIKENS: To be quite candid, I do not know anything about the sweep to which the hon. member is referring. I do not think the hon. member for Townsville North will deny that if the shemozzle had not occurred in the Labour Party, he would have been in Townsville with me all last week, because on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday nights respectively I attended speech nights at the Technical College, Townsville High, and Pimlico High—three in a row—on Monday night I was at a meeting of the Townsville Choral Society, and on Friday night I assisted in the opening of a new church at Aitkenvale. That is something that the hon. member for South Brisbane is not prepared to do. He can attend, but no-one will let him take up the collection. That is where I was last week.

As I said, the shemozzle occurred in the Labour Party. I really thought that at least three men would place the party before their own personal vindictiveness and realise that if the Labour Party is ever going to regain the Treasury benches in this Chamber—I am going to give them some very good advice if they have the wit to realise it and the courage to adopt it—it has no possible chance of doing so while the Red-Trades Hall-Moscow mob are in control of the party, both outside and inside this Parliament. I really thought that at least three men would realise that the only chance the Labour Party might have—it is a pretty tenuous chance, I will admit, but nevertheless it is a chance—of getting back onto the Treasury benches lay in the election of Pat Hanlon, the hon. member for

Baroona, as its Leader. The three men to whom I refer are Mr. Duggan (the hon. member for Toowoomba West), Mr. O'Donnell (the hon. member for Barcoo) and Mr. Davies (the hon. member for Maryborough). I really thought they would line up with the 12 who were pledged to support Pat Hanlon. But we found, when the figures went up, that the hon. member for Maryborough, the hon. member for Barcoo and the hon. member for Toowoomba West voted with the "Moscow mob". In case there is any doubt about it, I propose to read the names of the 12 men who voted for Mr. Hanlon so that their names can be inscribed in the pages of "Hansard" and so that those who run may read.

Mr. Walsh: How did you become possessed of this information?

Mr. AIKENS: Fancy the hon. member for Bundaberg asking me that! He came into this Parliament before I did; he had a period out of it while I was still here. Even when he was a Minister of the Crown, even when he was the tyrannical despot of the Labour Party for some years, as he was, I got information about him that astonished him, and I think he will admit that.

These are the 12 men who really want to see the Labour Party back on the Treasury benches and who know that the only chance they have is to put an "anti-Moscow-mob" man in as Leader of the party: Hanlon, Hanson, Thackeray, Lloyd, Dufficy, Mann, Byrne, Donald, Graham, Wood, Harris, and Bennett. They are the 12 who placed the party before their own personal vindictiveness. The other 14, including the "old Bolshie from Barcoo", including the hon. member for Maryborough, and including the former Leader of the Opposition, swung over to the "Moscow mob" to ensure the election of the hon. member for Bulimba as Leader of the Labour Party in this House.

Mr. Mann: What has it got to do with you?

Mr. AIKENS: That is a typical interjection from the Labour Party today, and they wonder why it is that the people will not trust them and will not vote for them. The Labour Party has always exercised the right—I give it this inalienable right—to criticise any party or the workings of any party. That is all right. I would be the last to take that right from it, but the moment anybody else says anything about the Labour Party, its members immediately throw their hands up in the air and say, "What has it got to do with you?" It is my duty to tell the people of this State the truth, and the whole truth, about Parliament and everything connected with it, and while I am here I will continue to do that.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: Like the truth you told about me.

Mr. AIKENS: Anybody can bring down a document when he has written it himself. I could do that too. I will ask the hon. member to produce his A.R.U. or A.F.U.L.E. ticket. All he did in the railways was to dodge industrial trouble, no matter who started it. The only time he took part in any industrial action was when the A.R.U. and the A.F.U.L.E. decided to combine in action, and I suppose he then decided to buy a ticket in the A.W.U.

These are the men who claim, as the hon. member for Brisbane claims, that I have no right to say anything about the Labour Party. The Labour Party has an unlimited right to say anything about me. I do not deny them that right, because I realise something that the hon. member for Brisbane does not realise, that is, that a man's best friend is a candid critic. The hon. member has not the courage to face up to it. So I say to this hopeless, helpless, disorganised, bitter, venomous, vicious rabble masquerading as a Labour Party that if they want to become the Government of this State again they will have to get the Red mob off their shoulders, both inside and outside of this House. Nobody knows that better than the men in the Labour Party, but they have not the courage to face up to it. Twelve of them have, but the other 14 have not.

Mr. Melloy: If there is any no-hoper speech to be made in this Chamber you will make it.

Mr. AIKENS: When a fellow is speaking to "no-hopers" such as the hon. member for whatever electorate has the misfortune to be represented by him, that is the thing to do.

Mrs. Jordan interjected.

Mr. AIKENS: Here is the megacephalic member for Ipswich West bellowing out once more. I hope she is not again talking through her bonnet.

Now let me give the Chamber some idea of what standing I have among the working class in Townsville so that hon. members may get some idea of whether or not I am competent to make these remarks. In the 1959 redistribution, the big problem with the redistribution of seats in Townsville was where the dyed-in-the-wool Labour southside would go. Prior to 1959 George Keyatta had some of it and Colin McCathie had the rest. In the 1959 redistribution, when it was decided to cut Townsville into two seats, there was the problem of what to do with six polling booths on the southside that had voted solidly Labour since Robert Towns used to come up the creek with his cargo of blackbirds.

When the boundaries were finally gazetted, lo and behold, I had these six dyed-in-the-wool Labour booths in my electorate. Believe it or not, in the 1960 election my opponent, Bill Edmonds, who had been politically discredited—I have nothing to say against him personally—beat me in one of those six booths. I beat him in the other

five and received an over-all majority. In 1963, when my party decided more or less to rest on its oars and see how good the Labour Party was, believe it or not the Labour candidate defeated me in three of those six dyed-in-the-wool booths, but again I had an over-all majority of 180 in those six booths that had voted Labour since the blacks were bad.

On the last occasion, because of the remarks made by the hon. member for Townsville North after the 1963 election, namely, "The A.L.P. in Townsville has Aikens by the throat and at next election we will drive him out of Parliament," my party decided to put a little bit of effort, time and money into the campaign. We did not spend very much and we did not do very much. As a horseman of quite some note, Mr. Rae, you could say that we barely got out of an amble, we certainly did not get into a full gallop. When the figures went up it was revealed that I had won the seat by well over 4,000, and for some time I was more than two to one in the lead of my A.L.P. opponent. I think the Labour candidate beat me by nine votes in Stuart and 11 votes at the Waterside Workers' Hall. In those six dyed-in-the-wool Labour booths on the south side I had a majority of nearly 700. If those six dyed-in-the-wool Labour booths on the south side constituted the whole of the electorate of Townsville South I would still be the member for that electorate in this Chamber.

It is a bitter pill the Labour Party cannot swallow that on each occasion the railwaymen, wharfies and meatworkers who live on the south side vote for Tom Aikens in preference to a good Labour candidate like Arthur Trower. In 1963 I beat him in those six booths by a reasonably moderate over-all number. This time, after our party spent a little bit of effort on the campaign, I left him for dead. What happened in the other booths such as Mundingburra? At that centre we won by 1,500 votes to 500; at Hermit Park we won by 1,400 to 400; at Aitkenvale we won by 1,200 to 400. The margins at the other booths is anybody's business.

When I speak of being a Labour representative, I think I can claim to be a better Labour representative than many members of the Australian Labour Party. If the hon. member for Clayfield were here, as a former Federal member for that area in Townsville, he would admit the lacing he used to get there. I think the hon. member for Townsville North will agree that the Herbert electorate will be won or lost in those six booths in South Townsville. I believe that, as they always have done, they will again vote Labour. They will vote for any Labour candidate, except when I am the candidate opposed to Labour.

Mr. Bennett: By jove, Tom, you are a modest man!

Mr. AIKENS: One of these days I shall overcome my reticence and be able to make the speech that perhaps I would desire to make.

I should now like to deal with something that is of interest to all the people. I made a very long telecast on this issue during the last election campaign. People say to me, "You are prepared to say things in Parliament under the privilege of Parliament that you are not game to say from the public platform". Anybody who knows me knows how false that is. On this occasion I did not bother to say anything from the public platform; I did not use the public platform during the last election campaign. The Labour Party did, and it also arranged for a Communist candidate named Bishop to run against me. He was out every afternoon for 11 weeks conducting a campaign on the street corners with a big loud-speaker system, hurling all the filth and abuse in the world at me and saying, "Don't vote for Aikens. Put Aikens last on the ballot paper. Vote for Bishop first, Trower second, and Aikens last".

The Q.C.E. decided that the second preferences of the A.L.P. were to go to the Communist candidate in preference to me. When the whole matter was exposed in the northern Press and the good Labour supporters were still reeling from the shock, about a fortnight later the Q.C.E., realising the desperate position it was in, said it was all a misunderstanding and that it was giving its No. 2 preferences to me.

Perhaps the hon. member for Townsville North can enlighten me on this point. When the Communist candidate's loud-speaker broke down and Bishop and his henchmen were hurling abuse at me, the A.L.P. made its loud-speaker available to him. Whether it did or not, he polled very strongly! As a matter of fact, he got an astonishing number of votes; of the 15,000 electors who went to the poll he got 192 votes! While many people in the A.L.P. walk in fear and trembling of the Communists, that demonstrates how strong they are when they come face to face with opposition in a strong industrial centre like Townsville, where there is a Communist Party secretariat and paid officials who control and master the big unions in the Labour electorates of Townsville. Out of 15,000 votes the Communist candidate polled a magnificent 192 votes! Yet hon. members opposite are scared to death of the Communists. The moment they look at them they start to get wavy at the knees and say, "What do you want us to do? Tell us, and we will be happy to do it".

I have previously raised the matter of sex offences against children. I am not talking about the ordinary rapist of adults, although hon. members know my viewpoint on that subject. I am dealing now with perhaps the most loathsome and detestable animal who ever lived—the man who seizes a little child and molests, rapes and violates, and sometimes kills her. It has been the practice over

the years to sentence these human animals to a term of imprisonment, and with our benevolent, and I should say mush-gutted, Parole Board, the moment they have served half the sentence imposed on them they are turned loose on the community to repeat their foul deeds.

The figures I have had taken out show that in Australia the percentage of recidivists in people who commit sexual offences against children is as high as 82. I point out that a recidivist is a person who commits the same crime two or three, or more, times. We have read in the newspapers, and in other sources, some shocking cases concerning men who have gone to gaol for raping little children, and sometimes murdering them, and of their being released only to rape and murder little children soon afterwards.

I am sick and tired of this sort of thing. I appealed to the people, not only in Townsville South, but all over Townsville, and all people covered by T.N.Q.7 (which I think on some days can be received in Cairns, and extends out past Charters Towers) to support me in my plea for the castration of any sexual offender against a child. I know that the hon. member for South Brisbane disagrees with that plea; he does not believe in the mutilation of the criminal's body. He is not a bit concerned about the mutilation that the criminal inflicts on the little child's body. That does not concern him in the least. He is concerned only with protecting the criminal from mutilation by the surgeon's knife.

I came out openly on a television programme and asked the people if they agreed with me. If hon. members had seen the women and children go into the booths a couple of days later—I made this speech on the Wednesday night, and polling day was the following Saturday—I think they would agree with me that the women of this State, almost to a woman—and I would say 70 per cent. of the men—want to have these human monsters castrated.

Mr. Bennett: The only fallacy in that argument is that they did not watch you on television.

Mr. AIKENS: The only tragedy is that someone whom I knew very well in the West, and whom I held in high regard, was not castrated about 45, 46, or 47 years ago.

I have papers taken out on this subject, and a lot of information has been gleaned for me by many people. Many European countries, West Germany in particular, have faced up to the fact that there is only one cure for the sexual attacker of little children. There are three phases, namely, psychiatric treatment, brain surgery, and castration.

When I raised this question here some years ago the late Dr. Noble said it was possible now for a castrated person to insert a synthetic testicle subcutaneously in his arm or thigh and still perform the sexual act. That claim has been disproved by overseas

people, who claim that the desire has gone even though the ability to do it is there. We hear talk about castrated people who will attack children. I have had figures taken out on this subject and they show that castration has been practised in Mediterranean and other countries not for years, but for centuries. Males are castrated at birth, or at any age at all. While it is true that many eunuchs in those countries have obtained positions of eminence—some have reached a position almost next to the sultan, or have become great military leaders or great scholars; some have become homosexuals—there is not one recorded instance in all the centuries since castration has been practised in those countries of a eunuch attacking a young woman or child. That is the argument against the handful of medical practitioners who always rush in to protect the sex criminal.

I hope that before this session ends I shall have an opportunity to deal with the punishment that should be imposed on certain types of criminals, particularly recidivist rapists and others who threaten the sanctity of our women and children. Let us face the fact that these human dogs attack those who are least able to defend themselves—women and children.

Mr. Walsh: Do not defame the dog.

Mr. AIKENS: I am glad the hon. member for Bundaberg called my attention to that fact. I apologise to the dogs, because dogs would not do what some of these so-called human beings do. The moment a person does it, however, he has most of the psychiatrists, the psychologists, the dogooders, and the mamby-pampy people rushing to his aid and saying, "This poor man is not a criminal. He is suffering from a disease and should go into hospital. He should not go to gaol. He should receive treatment from soft-handed nurses and doctors and sit in a garden and look at the flowers and listen to the radio", and all that sort of thing. That has been fed to our people so long that some believe it.

Let us face the fact that this problem must be grappled with quickly. I have addressed many meetings here; I am addressing three more meetings here this month, and there are only 13 days left in this month. I deal with this matter on every conceivable occasion and I am arousing public feeling towards my view that the only effective treatment for these people is the surgeon's knife.

Mr. Bennett: What would you do with a shop-lifter?

Mr. AIKENS: I am a little sympathetic to the shop-lifter. The way goods are displayed is an enticement to the shop-lifter. The big chain stores are almost agents provocateur. Of course, that still does not excuse a person who becomes a shop-lifter because, when all is said and done, they are as much agents provocateur to all of us and we are not shop-lifters.

Mr. Bennett: Are you seeking the mutilation penalty for them?

Mr. AIKENS: For shop-lifters?

Mr. Bennett: Yes, and other types of offenders.

Mr. AIKENS: Why should I advocate castration for shop-lifters? What the hell is the hon. member talking about? Is he having another one of his spasms? I will say this: because of the way our law has been administered, and because of the Innes case, which is a startling case in point, the reputation of the legal profession and the judiciary in Queensland has never been at a lower ebb.

Mr. BENNETT: I rise to a point of order. I do not think it is right for a case in progress to be referred to in such a dishonest fashion.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Rae): Order! I ask the hon. member for Townsville South to refrain from mentioning that case.

Mr. AIKENS: I was not going to deal with any aspect of the case, but merely with the way it is being dragged on and on.

Mr. Bennett interjected.

Mr. AIKENS: I have the guts to get up on a public platform and say these things, and if a Royal Commission was ever held into anything that I say either in this Chamber or out of it, I would have the guts to go into the witness box and give evidence. That is more than the hon. member for South Brisbane is prepared to do. I am not going to enlarge on this aspect of my speech; I hope to have an opportunity to deal with it later.

I now refer to the statement made by Mr. Justice Hart. Here again I say that the people are getting sick and tired of double talk by judges when they discriminate between those whom they consider to be criminals and those whom they consider not to be criminals. There is nothing accidental about drunkenness, because a man lifts the glass to his mouth and drinks deliberately. He does not accidentally put his foot on the accelerator. Drunken-driving combines deliberate drinking and deliberate driving.

Mr. BENNETT: I rise to a point of order. Again I think it is only right and proper that one of our greatest instrumentalities should not be unfairly attacked under parliamentary privilege. Neither Mr. Justice Hart nor any other Supreme Court judge is allowed to deal with charges of drunken-driving; they are matters for the inferior courts.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Rae): Order! The hon. member is quite in order at the moment.

Mr. BENNETT: I am saying that I do not think Parliament should be used as a weapon to attack the judiciary when what is stated is completely untrue. Judges have not the right to deal with charges of what is commonly known as drunken-driving.

Mr. AIKENS: I am dealing with charges of manslaughter, dangerous driving causing death, dangerous driving causing grievous bodily harm, and dangerous driving as a result of drunken-driving. We have become accustomed to the hon. member for South Brisbane standing up in this Chamber and crawling to the judiciary in the hope of winning a case now and again. If he wants to say these things, let him say them outside and not befool and besmirch this Chamber by his sycophantic and obsequious attitude. He could not win one more case than he does because he does not get very many to conduct.

We are sick and tired of the double talk of judges who say that one man is a criminal, yet another (who deliberately gets drunk, drives dangerously, and kills another person and is found guilty of the serious crime of driving dangerously causing death) is not a criminal but is merely guilty of negligence and consequently should not be punished as if he were a criminal.

Mr. Bennett: That is a deliberate lie. No judge has said that. I say that quite conscientiously.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Rae): Order! I think the hon. member for South Brisbane should withdraw that statement.

Mr. BENNETT: I did not call anybody a liar; I said, "That is a deliberate lie," referring to the claim that a judge said that a man who deliberately gets himself intoxicated cannot be considered to be a criminal. That is obviously untrue.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Rae): Order! The hon. member must withdraw his statement.

Mr. BENNETT: If the word "lie" is offensive to your sensitivity, Mr. Rae, I shall use the words, "It is a deliberate and violent untruth."

Mr. AIKENS: Now we know why the people are disgusted with the legal system of this State when this is the sort of thing that goes on in the courts, for which barristers charge 100 guineas a day. The statement to which I refer was made in "The Courier-Mail" by His Honour Mr. Justice Hart before he sentenced a drunken killer to a paltry eight months' imprisonment.

Mr. Bennett: I challenge you to produce that statement.

Mr. AIKENS: Let the hon. member come down to my office and I shall show it to him.

Mr. Bennett: You produce it to Parliament.

Mr. AIKENS: The hon. member for South Brisbane would not be here; he would be at the court defending a criminal from the South or endeavouring to get some other dubious character "off the hook".

I may have forgotten to mention—it is very difficult to make a speech in this Chamber with the hon. member for South Brisbane sounding off and limelighting and big-noting himself all the time—that in West Germany and other European countries that have adopted the three-pronged attack on sexual offenders against children, that is, psychiatric treatment, brain surgery, and castration, the rate of recidivism for that offence has dropped to 2·3 per cent. In Australia it is 82 per cent.; in more-advanced, modern countries that are dealing with the problem fearlessly and openly, it is 2 per cent. Is it not better that we should do something to protect women and children rather than adopt the attitude of the hon. member for South Brisbane that the criminal is the only person who is entitled to our pity, our mercy, our compassion, and our consideration, and that the protection of the criminal should be our only aim?

Mr. CAMPBELL (Aspley) (4.56 p.m.): My contribution to the debate may be considered as a change from the sublime to the commonplace.

Since I have been a member of this Assembly, I cannot remember a Budget debate in which the Opposition has launched such a colourless and ineffective attack as it has during this debate. When a Treasurer increases charges, naturally they become a target for criticism, but obvious criticisms such as that seem to be all that the Opposition is capable of on this occasion. The comments of hon. members opposite have been devoid of constructive criticism, and one is left with the feeling that their heart is not in the debate, that perhaps they have lost the will to fight.

I realise that the Labour Party has its problems at present, but I do not think that the ineptness it has shown in this debate and which is in evidence generally stems from those problems. Rather do I think it has been brought about by the sterility of thought that now pervades the Labour Party, a sterility that is the product of the inbreeding that has been going on in the party for the past 10 years. As a result of that inbreeding, the Labour Party is an inward-looking party, devoid of any suggestion of a bold or positive approach to modern-day problems, and still relying on outworn and class-conscious policies.

The events of the past few days, with the change in leadership of the party, have caused considerable disquiet amongst people outside Parliament, and no doubt all of us who move in fairly wide circles have heard concern expressed by people at the gradual erosion of the leadership in the Labour Party. To be specific, the public of this State are bewildered because the hon. member

for Kedron was sidetracked when the position of Leader of the Opposition was recently redetermined. All hon. members are aware that the position of Her Majesty's Leader of the Opposition in Parliament is a very high one, and that it should not be dealt with capriciously. I think it is fair to say that the hon. member for Kedron has served a fairly good apprenticeship as Deputy Leader of the Opposition and there seemed to be general acceptance of the fact that he would succeed to the position of Leader if circumstances changed.

I repeat that there is complete bewilderment amongst people outside because of the way in which he has been relegated to a minor position in his party. I think it is fair to say that the hon. member for Kedron possesses the entitlement, the qualifications, the ability and the experience to fulfil the position of leadership. It is also fair to say that his prestige and standing in the community generally is high and the people of Queensland are wondering why a person of his calibre has been passed over for leadership of the party. I have been asked on innumerable occasions if he was passed over because of any misdemeanour on his part or as a result of outside pressure being placed upon the party.

Mr. Davies: Did you tell them that you would be an authority?

Mr. CAMPBELL: No, I am not in a position to tell them I am an authority but I think the public of Queensland are entitled to an explanation of this most amazing about-face by the Labour Party. I think it calls for a forthright statement from the newly elected Leader of the Australian Labour Party, to meet public disquiet on the matter.

Recent events in Mt. Isa, as reported in the daily Press, also call for an explanation of the situation that is developing in that town. I think it also is something that the Leader of the Opposition might be expected to explain. I refer to the problem that is developing in trade union circles there and the endeavour that is being made to introduce a type of union control similar to that which prevails at Broken Hill.

During the past four years, hon. members opposite at every opportunity endeavoured to place the blame for the tragic events that occurred at Mt. Isa on the shoulders of members of the Government.

Mr. Davies: There is a trade union congress going on; what about going up and explaining the situation to them?

Mr. CAMPBELL: I appreciate such an invitation and I thank the hon. member for Maryborough for obtaining it for me. In condemning these charges that were improperly levelled against us, we pointed out that the trouble in Mt. Isa, resulted not from the legislation passed in this Chamber but from the industrial anarchy that had developed in that town and action taken against a company with a very proud

record in this country of labour-management relations. As a company it has provided amenities second to none. It has gone to great pains to see that the work force at Mt. Isa is kept contented by providing it with all the amenities one would expect in a suburban community. I do not say that Mount Isa Mines Limited has done this out of the goodness of its heart; for sure there is a self-interest in it. But let no-one say that Mount Isa Mines Limited is a harsh or oppressive employer. The State is still suffering from the financial results of that previous industrial trouble. During the strike and after it hon. members opposite were at great pains to champion the cause of those who fomented and initiated that dispute. I referred to this matter in a speech which is reported in "Hansard" No. 241. It is timely to remind hon. members of the information which I gave in the debate on 7 September, 1965, when I said—

"I now wish to raise a matter which is a sequel to the recent industrial trouble at Mt. Isa. It revolves around the recent visit of Messrs. Egerton (President) and Macdonald (Secretary) of the Queensland Trades and Labour Council, together with Mr. Arnell and Mr. Devereux, who visited Mt. Isa from Friday, 13 August to Tuesday, 17 August last, ostensibly in connection with re-employment of certain men by Mount Isa Mines Ltd.

"As this matter is the subject of an appeal to the Industrial Court, everyone knows that nothing can be done until the appeal is determined. What then was the real reason for this visit? Reliable information suggests that the reason was to endeavour to obtain from Mr. Bevan Foot, Secretary of the local Trades and Labour Council which acted as the Disputes Committee at Mt. Isa, receipt books in an endeavour to find or trace the whereabouts of an amount of approximately £6,000 about which the Brisbane Trades and Labour Council is very concerned, money contributed to the Mt. Isa Industrial Dispute Relief Fund which cannot be accounted for."

I went on to describe the inquiries which union officials were making during their visit to Mt. Isa in an endeavour to trace this deficiency. Of course, I made certain references to the part that Mr. Pat Mackie played in this dispute which union officials had gone to Mt. Isa to investigate. All of this is past history now, but the damage to the economy still remains. To this day no evidence has been brought forward to refute the claims I made in that speech about the inquiry which the officials of the Trades and Labour Council of Queensland made when they visited Mt. Isa. Again, I think the public is entitled to an explanation by the Leader of the Opposition of the present developments. Who would be better acquainted with those developments than the Leader of the Opposition? I think the public is also entitled to know what personalities

are associated with these recent moves to form an Industrial Council at Mt. Isa, and whether they are the same people who were responsible for promoting the previous calamitous industrial trouble. I think it fair to say that if the same evil forces are at work resolute steps should be taken to nip in the bud any proposal for industrial anarchy similar to that which occurred in 1963. In short, I think the public is entitled to know just who runs the show at Mt. Isa now, and also if the current developments portend any industrial upheaval similar to the former tragic strike. Perhaps we may be able to have a statement by the Leader of the Opposition or, if not by him, at least by the President of the Trades and Labour Council or some other responsible industrial representative.

Passing from that serious problem I now wish to make some comments pertaining to the publication in "The Telegraph" of 11 October 1966 of a photograph of the Town Clerk of Brisbane offering his congratulations to Mr. Clem Jones, the Lord Mayor of Brisbane, on his decision to submit his nomination once again as a candidate for the Lord Mayor's office in Brisbane. Let me say first that I appreciate that a close bond could have developed between the Lord Mayor and the Town Clerk because of their close professional association over the last six years, and that this would be only natural. It is quite possible also that the Town Clerk may rather work under the present Lord Mayor than under any other incumbent who may succeed him. I would agree also that after the rather premature disclosure by the Lord Mayor that he was again to be a candidate for the Lord Mayoralty the Town Clerk spontaneously might have wanted to wish him well in his campaign, and I do not think anyone could disagree with that. But I am bound to say that in his avid desire for publicity at any cost (or perhaps it was his desire to avoid the public gaze on another pressing problem in the Labour Party at that time) the Lord Mayor of Brisbane, Mr. Clem Jones, whether wittingly or unwittingly, has placed the Town Clerk in a most compromising situation by the publication of this photograph. The Town Clerk is the permanent head of the Brisbane city administration and is expected to preserve a neutral view in political matters. As an aside, I might repeat that I do not think there is any room in municipal affairs for party politics, but that is another story. The Town Clerk is expected to preserve a neutral attitude on political matters.

Mr. Pizzey: The best method of local government is obtained without politics.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I quite agree with the Minister for Education that the best local government is obtained when politics are kept out of it. The handshake which is the subject of this photograph is not a spontaneous gesture on the part of the Town Clerk in extending his congratulations to the Lord Mayor on his decision to again stand for the

Lord Mayoralty. A person would have to stretch his imagination to the limit to believe that newspaper representatives happened to be on the spot coincidentally with this expression of goodwill. It is quite obvious that the Lord Mayor organised this as a political stunt to gain further cheap publicity.

Mr. Pizzey: Television, too.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Yes, and television; the whole lot were there. So it was not a spontaneous gesture on the part of the Town Clerk; it was a preconceived idea of the Lord Mayor who organised T.V., Press, and radio coverage of this announcement.

Mr. Lee: The only thing that went wrong was that he made the announcement when Lyndon Johnson was coming.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I suppose he tried to outdo the prominence which the Press gave President Johnson's visit to this country. It is bad enough when a Town Clerk publicly congratulates a candidate for political honours on his decision to accept re-endorsement by his party, but this photograph takes on a more sinister aspect when it is remembered that at past council elections the Town Clerk has acted as returning officer.

Mr. Melloy: You are not suggesting anything, are you?

Mr. CAMPBELL: If the Town Clerk occupies that position in the next few months' time he will act in a similar capacity.

Mr. Melloy: Are you suggesting he may be biased?

Mr. CAMPBELL: I am not suggesting; I am stating most emphatically that the Lord Mayor of Brisbane, Alderman Clem Jones, has placed the Town Clerk, who, we can assume, will be the returning officer at the next municipal elections in this city, in a most compromising position. I am aware of the lack of political morality possessed by Mr. Jones in seeking this cheap publicity. He acted with a singular lack of propriety in this regard. The hon. member for Nudgee asked me if I was making any suggestions of anything improper. An unfair-minded person could draw all sorts of inferences from the fact that the leader of the Labour political team at the next council elections had his photograph taken with the person who is to be returning officer at that election. A parallel case, if he occupies that position just prior to the next State elections, would be the Premier's organising a photograph being taken of his being publicly congratulated by the Principal Electoral Officer for this State. This photograph illustrates the lack of political morality possessed by the Lord Mayor who would stop at nothing to obtain cheap political notoriety.

I congratulate the Treasurer on his Budget and on the way in which he has courageously faced up to an unusual set of adverse circumstances over which he has no control. He has approached them with a high degree

of resolution. I repeat that he has shown courage in that he has been prepared to stick his neck out in order to meet a situation of emergency. He has been prepared to run the risk of criticism by those affected by his actions and by the public generally. He has been prepared to take these risks because he believes that to do so is in the interests of the State.

The hon. member for Baroona endeavoured, by the use of smart phrases, to discomfort the Treasurer, particularly in his reference to the recent approaches by the Premiers of New South Wales and Victoria to the Commonwealth Treasurer because of the financial predicament of those States. No State or Federal Treasurer faces his budgetary requirements at present without great and weighty problems. Although I do not presume to speak for the Treasurer in this matter—I know that he will speak most forcibly for himself—I venture to say that when these matters are examined early in the New Year, and it has been agreed that they will be, it will be found that Queensland will not have been left out in the race, as has been suggested by the hon. member for Baroona. Queensland will have a very good advocate in the Treasurer.

It is interesting to consider why Sir Henry Bolte and Mr. Askin felt impelled to make fresh approaches to the Federal Treasurer. Their main complaint was that the formula agreed to when the financial agreement was recently renewed was working against the interest of New South Wales and Victoria. If that be so, it stands to reason that it is not working against all States. Those who study these matters know that the formula confers a lot of benefits upon Queensland, and those who negotiated the agreement on behalf of the State had our interests well in mind and obtained a very good deal.

Of course, today it is common in financial matters to endeavour to pass the buck, and it is quite apparent that the buck always finishes in the lap of the Federal Treasurer.

Mr. Davies: He deserves it, doesn't he?

Mr. CAMPBELL: Of course, the hon. member for Maryborough says that he deserves it. That is an example of the paucity of thinking that emanates from hon. members opposite when they discuss financial matters. They refer to the Federal Government as the "Big Brother" who has bulging pockets and dispenses his favours according to his whim. In local government, State Government, or Federal Government fields, we are all Australians who contribute to a common pool. It is evidence of negative thinking to believe that the State can run to the Federal Government whenever it is confronted with financial stress and expect the Federal Treasurer to come to its aid.

Mr. Davies interjected.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Despite the peurile interruptions of the hon. member for Maryborough, I say that Queensland has no

reason to complain about the considerate treatment it has received from the Federal Government. Although we have not been satisfied with all that we have been given, I suppose that, human nature being what it is, that is understandable; but I think it is very unfair and incorrect to say that the Federal Government has disregarded the interests of Queensland and withheld funds that it should have made available to the State. That is the second leg of the complaint of Sir Henry Bolte and Mr. Askin, because they complain very bitterly that the Federal Government, realising the problems of development in far distant areas of Australia and wishing to render assistance to them, has made available special grants that have become very irksome to our friends in Victoria and New South Wales. I heard someone say—it was not in this Chamber; I cannot recall where it was—that some people in Victoria think that Northern Australia begins at Geelong. That is drawing the long bow, but the Governments of New South Wales and Victoria are very jealous of their position and sometimes become rather bitter when they discuss the grants that have been made, particularly to Queensland and Western Australia, for areas that show the greatest promise for the future development of Australia.

I have not the slightest doubt that when the chips are down, far from being left out in the cold, the Treasurer will put an equally strong case, or an even better case, and argue it with as much tenacity of purpose as the Premiers from our two sister States will argue their cases. I say that the Treasurer has shown courage in facing up to his responsibility to provide increased services for the State during a period of difficult economic circumstances.

It is very easy to be in Opposition. If you agree with a measure, you can voice your agreement and say, "We agree with this, but it does not go far enough," or, if you are opposed to it, you can oppose it right to the hilt, and you have no responsibility.

Mr. Davies: You want us to believe that we are a poverty-stricken nation?

Mr. CAMPBELL: The hon. member is doing the country a disservice when he says that Australia is a poverty-stricken nation.

Mr. DAVIES: I rise to a point of order. I did not say we were a poverty-stricken nation. I said that the hon. member wants us to believe that we are a poverty-stricken nation. We are not a poverty-stricken nation, and the Labour Party believes that there is plenty of money here to do the work. I suggest that the Treasurer believes that, too.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I accept that very clear way in which the hon. member for Maryborough corrected the impression that he

gave me. I honestly believed that he said that Australia was a poverty-stricken nation, but I accept his correction.

There is a very big paradox in the arguments put forward by the Opposition in this debate. As I have just mentioned, on the one hand hon. members opposite are decrying the Government's efforts to provide services for the community; on the other hand they say we are hitting the pockets of the people too hard when we find it necessary to obtain increased funds to provide more services. What does amaze and concern me is the glib manner in which hon. members opposite refer to the drought—as though it was just passing phase.

Mr. Melloy: You have not listened intently.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I have sat here and listened to the arguments presented by members of the Opposition and I say that it annoys me to hear members such as the hon. member for Nudgee refer to the drought as though it was just a passing phase, whereas I venture to say that this State and New South Wales, have passed through one of the worst droughts in their history. Most areas of the State have experienced one of the worst droughts on record.

I venture to say that but for the diversification of industry that has occurred in the last 10 years the economic effects of this drought would have been felt with much greater severity in the community than they are being felt today. I make bold to say that if there had not been so much diversification of industry a great economic calamity could have befallen the State because of the drought. The Treasurer had the courage to face up to the criticism that he knew he would incur by imposing certain increased taxation in certain areas because he realised that we still have to progress.

I think the Treasurer's action is in line with the thinking in the community, because politics aside, I think there is a general acceptance in the community today of the fact that because of our increased standard of living, calling for an increasing measure of services, a greater contribution will have to be made by the community. I do not think there is any great germ of wisdom in that.

Mr. Bromley: I do not think people would mind that so much but they are getting it from the Commonwealth as well as from the State.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The point I am making is that there is a general acceptance in the community of the point of view that we will have to make a greater contribution to public revenues to meet demands that are being made on the public services. To support this, I want to quote from the remarks of the Acting Principal of the Aspley High School at the recent Speech Night at that school. This gentleman, whom I hold in high regard, is a responsible member

of the Teachers' Union. He holds a position of responsibility in that union, and as such he speaks with a certain degree of authority.

The Acting Principal of the Aspley High School, after having criticised the lack of some things which were considered desirable at the school—things which were not of a very serious nature, but which all of us would like to see provided—had this to say and in quoting this section of his report I am not reflecting on him—

"I ask parents to view with great seriousness the accommodation position. The desire to build, I am sure is in the hearts of the authorities—the basic problem is lack of money. It should shock you to realise that whilst Australia enjoys the third highest living standard in the world, the expenditure on education per head of population ranks this country about fourteenth.

"You must urge your Federal and State Governments to increase education expenditure either by—

- (a) a reallocation of existing funds, or
- (b) by increasing taxation.

"This solution, I feel, is up to you, the citizens and future citizens of this State and country."

I have quoted that because it is the expression of opinion of a responsible person in the community who sees the need for increased expenditure and suggests a solution to the problem. What should be emphasised is the comment that we have two alternatives, either the reallocation of existing funds or increased taxation to meet the present need to provide greater educational facilities.

I pass now to another matter that has been repeated almost ad nauseum by hon. members opposite, namely, their parrot-like claim that this Government is going to do away with the free hospitalisation system.

Mr. Davies: There is no doubt about that.

Mr. CAMPBELL: "There is no doubt about that", says my friend in a parrot-like fashion. They would like to see us do that. Hon. members opposite constantly repeat this assertion in the hope that they will mesmerise us into doing it. They have been saying this consistently since 1957. How bitterly disappointed they must be that their phoney forecast in 1957, "You cannot trust the Nicklin-Morris Government because one of the first things it will do will be to do away with the free hospital policy", has not proved to be correct. After nearly 10 years of office we are still providing free hospitalisation in Queensland, and I venture to say that the health services provided by our predecessors are greatly outshaded by the excellent services provided today.

As an illustration of the forward, humanitarian attitude of this Government in providing health services I point to the development that has taken place at the Chermiside Hospital. Most hon. members would know

that that hospital was built by the Commonwealth Government as a weapon in the campaign to eradicate tuberculosis in the community. So successful was that campaign that our Government found that not all the accommodation at the Chermside Hospital was required for that purpose and, consequently, in accordance with its humanitarian outlook it looked for ways in which the hospital could be used to promote the policy of the Country-Liberal Government towards health services. You could not have a better example of the progressive, forward thinking of this Government than is to be found at the Chermside Hospital. At Chermside Hospital a vast and progressive hospital service is now being provided. It provides accommodation and treatment for tuberculosis, cardiac, thoracic, neuro-psychiatric, geriatric and orthopaedic patients and mentally-handicapped children. I do not think that there could be a better illustration of the approach of this Government to the problem of mentally-handicapped children, in contrast with the approach of our predecessors, than what is being done for this unfortunate section of the community at Chermside Hospital.

People who have been to the Chermside Hospital and have seen the loving care and attention given to these young children who, because of their disability, have absolutely no hope for the future, can testify to the humane treatment they receive. And we are well aware of the treatment they received at Goodna under the previous Government!

I have referred to the various types of ailments and diseases dealt with at the Chermside Hospital and I now give figures for the average daily patients in the various categories for last year. They were—

Tuberculosis	135·68
Cardiac	30·14
Thoracic	30·77
Neuro-psychiatric	54·44
Geriatric	212·73
Orthopaedic	65·88
Mentally-handicapped children	147·71
Total	677·35

The Chermside Hospital Board recently appointed an additional cardiac surgeon with wide experience in cardiac surgery. He will take up his duties early next year. The cardiac surgical team at the Chermside Hospital will then perform major cardiac surgical techniques including heart-valve replacements. It is interesting to recall that the first hole-in-the-heart operation in Queensland took place at the Chermside Hospital on 7 April, 1964. To facilitate the diagnosis and pre-operative assessment of cardiac cases arrangements have been made for periodic visits by the full-time cardiologist to the major cities of North Queensland. Additional equipment has been ordered including an ultra-sonic cleaner for the heart-lung machine at an approximate cost of \$2,500, and a 16-millimetre film viewer,

again at a cost of \$2,500. The hospital board is also purchasing a new heart-lung machine at a cost of \$10,500. A total of \$114,500 has been expended to date in the purchase of cardiac equipment and apparatus. I believe that the instances I have referred to provide a classic illustration of the modern outlook of the Government on the need to provide up-to-date and expensive health services in Queensland. It gives the lie to the many expressions of opinion that we have been bombarded with by hon. members opposite.

During the last financial year the neuro-psychiatric services at the Chermside Hospital were further developed. A total of 552 patients were admitted during 1965-66, an increase of 143 over the previous year. Occupational therapy services have been progressively extended and three full-time occupational therapists are employed. The construction of a brick and timber free-standing occupational therapy building has been completed and will shortly be functioning at the occupational therapy centre at the Chermside Hospital. If time permitted I could give further illustrations of the expenditure that has taken place at the Chermside Hospital, which now ranks as one of the best equipped and most modern hospitals in the Commonwealth for the treatment of the various categories of illness and disease to which I have referred.

Hon. members opposite constantly repeat parrot fashion the claim that this Government is bent on destroying the free hospital system. They thought they detected a slight wedge when they heard the Treasurer announce that he would increase the charges for hospitalisation of intermediate and private patients. Who would disagree with the Treasurer's action? After all, if that is the cost of providing this service is it a crime for the Treasurer to recoup the State? Those increases do not indicate an intention to do away with the excellent service the Government has continued to provide since it assumed office in 1957.

There are many other matters to which I should like to refer, but time does not permit. The building industry has always been regarded as a fairly good barometer of the prosperity in a community. I shall not weary the Committee by quoting the figures I gave in my Address-in-Reply speech. But in 1956-57 approval was given for the construction of 9,946 homes. The figure steadily increased until 10 years later, in 1965-66, 15,834 approvals were given. If that is not an illustration of economic growth and prosperity I should like hon. members opposite to tell me what is.

A problem I have encountered in my electorate is the erosion taking place in the area of Kedron Brook bounded by McCord Street on the west of the stream and Norman Street on the east. The problem is caused by the gradual accumulation of silt which has caused an obstruction in the brook. With each succeeding fresh the accumulation

of silt has built up until it formed an island in the brook. This pushed the course of the stream towards the left bank and threatened the homes situated on this high bank to such an extent that in the last two years whenever a further fresh occurred more erosion took place. I have in mind one back yard in which the clothes-line was on the verge of disappearing into the stream. If another serious flood had occurred, it would have done so. In the last three years erosion has increased to an alarming extent and the homes on the west bank of the creek are threatened. Appeals to the local authority, the Brisbane City Council, were to no avail. The council stated that the responsibility for streams rested with the Government. Approaches were made to the Department of Irrigation which found its powers limited because of lack of specific funds to deal with such a problem. Property owners were desperately afraid that a really big flood would engulf their properties.

A solution gradually evolved by means of the granting of a licence by the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission to a top-dressing contractor as a result of which the silt was removed. After this was done, the assistance of the Department of Main Roads was sought and obtained to tidy up the banks and surrounding area generally. I am pleased to say that this problem no longer exists. The Minister for Local Government is well aware of the situation, and I wish to thank him for his co-operation, and also officers of the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission and the Department of Main Roads for their assistance and understanding of the problem. It was a most worrying situation for the property owners concerned, and I venture to say that if no action had been taken the recent heavy rain would have caused serious damage to their properties.

Finally, I wish to congratulate the Treasurer on his successful efforts to have the itinerary of the President of the United States, President Johnson, altered to include a visit to this State.

Mr. Hanson: He had nothing to do with it.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The hon. member for Gladstone says that he had nothing to do with it. In characteristic fashion, the Acting Premier, as the Treasurer was at the time, swept aside all obstacles in the way of a visit by the President. I conclude my remarks by saying that it is because of his tenacity and doggedness that we will have the pleasure of an overnight stop in this city by the President of the United States. That is a feather in the Treasurer's cap.

Mr. DEAN (Sandgate) (5.53 p.m.): In continuing the speech that I began last Thursday, I wish to make it clear that I do not intend to take up the time of the Committee by referring to many of those things that we have already heard so much about, especially those that have been dealt

with this afternoon. There has been a change in the domestic set-up on this side of the Chamber, and I learned many years ago that the success or failure of one's efforts could be judged from watching the reactions of certain people.

This afternoon I want to pay the Treasurer the respect that he deserves, and to refer to his Budget. I think we are duty bound out of sheer respect, if for no other reason, to take some cognisance of the Financial Statement. I intend to refer to some portions of it only, because it contains such a mass of information that one could not deal with all of it in detail without taking up more time than is allotted to speakers in this debate. The hon. member for Townsville North said that one would need a week to do justice to it. I think one would need longer than that. My intention is to deal at this stage with the work of departments mentioned specifically in certain sections of the Budget. I think one is duty bound in this debate, which affords hon. members one of their few opportunities to do so, to express appreciation to the staff of Parliament and to members of the Public Service for their work during the year.

In my opinion, the Public Service of Queensland is one of the best services of its type in the world, and I pay a tribute to its personnel. I compliment the Clerk of Parliament and his staff on the very efficient way in which they run Parliament and express my appreciation for the help and assistance they give whenever one seeks guidance from them. My remarks apply to Mr. Dunlop and all those who work under his control. The Parliamentary Librarian and his staff also deserve a word of appreciation, and I think their worth is well recognised by hon. members. The "Hansard" staff deserves high commendation, too, and I am sure that, from time to time, when hon. members look at the proof of a speech that they made the day before to check whether it has been reported accurately, they are grateful for the improved phraseology. I am not ashamed to admit that now and again I make very grave grammatical errors, and I am always gratified to find that the gentlemen upstairs and their lady assistants have made a very fine job of editing it and have made it something worth reading. I express my appreciation to them.

It may be said that I am coming down to mundane matters now, but if one is to do a job properly, one must mention all those who are entitled to one's appreciation. Another gentleman to whom I should like to pay a compliment is the head gardener Mr. Reg. Coates. He does a very fine job, and I and other hon. members enjoy many pleasurable moments not only in looking round the grounds but also in spending some time in the hothouse, in which from time to time there are wonderful displays. If hon. members have not availed themselves of the opportunity of visiting the hothouse in the grounds of Parliament House, I

assure them that their time would be well spent in doing so. Mr. Coates would appreciate very much their showing an interest in it.

Mr. Sherrington: More money should be spent on it.

Mr. DEAN: I agree with my friend the hon. member for Salisbury. I know that more money is required for many other purposes, but I think his suggestion is a good one.

The day must come when the river bank forms part of the grounds of Parliament House. It should be beautified and made into a tourist attraction, because at the moment it is merely a conglomeration of old buildings. Although some of them are used by the armed services, it is not a spot of which the capital city of the State can be proud. Coupled with that—and this is a belief that I held during the years that I was a member of the Brisbane City Council—I believe that the Botanical Gardens should be part of the concept of beautification of the area of Parliament House. The larger area would add to the beauty of the existing grounds.

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

Mr. DEAN: Under the heading of the Premier's Department there is an item in the Estimates dealing with the office of the Agent-General for the State in London, and I have a comment to make relative to the staff in that office. From time to time I have come into contact to newcomers to Queensland and I should say that the majority of those to whom I have had the opportunity of speaking had a fair amount of criticism to offer of the advertising and the information imparted to them prior to their leaving England for Australia. They have not been the type of migrant one could refer to as the whingeing type, but generally they have been of the opinion that insufficient information on this State was given to them prior to their leaving England. Many of them have told me that they had gained the impression that members of the staff in the office in London do a fair job within the scope of their ability, but they give the impression that they are not Queenslanders by birth and therefore have not the requisite knowledge of the State to pass on to intending newcomers to Queensland, or to Australia generally. I think that is a fair enough criticism to make relative to that office.

The Premier has just returned from a visit to London, and I hope he may now realise the existence of some of these shortcomings and that the position will be remedied. As I say, the general impression is that the staff behind the counter just do not have the information that is required and that when most newcomers arrive here they find conditions entirely different from those they were told about prior to leaving England. In saying what I have said I do not intend to convey that any of the people to whom I

have spoken were sorry about having left England to come to Queensland, but they do feel that much of the discontent that has been expressed in the past could have been avoided had fuller information been given in the first place.

Another important item in the Budget to which I wish to refer is that covered by the Department of Harbours and Marine. Coming closer to my own electorate, for years we have been waiting for the development of a boat harbour at Cabbage Tree Creek, Sandgate. This facility has been desired for many years because Cabbage Tree Creek is in such a handy position and is so well situated that it would make an ideal small-boat harbour not only for yachtsmen who indulge in yachting for recreational purposes, but also for commercial trawlermen and fishermen.

I hope this work will be speeded up and that, in the near future, we will see the completion of this boat harbour in our area. We who live in the area know that it could result in Sandgate becoming one of the leading tourist areas within the boundaries of Greater Brisbane. I therefore appeal to the Treasurer to assist in the completion of this small-craft harbour for Sandgate as soon as possible.

From time to time I think most of us here have had the opportunity of visiting the university at St. Lucia, and I do not think anyone would contradict me when I say that it is one of the most beautiful universities in Australia, if not in the Southern Hemisphere. Over the years progress has been made and the buildings have been added to, and many of the new buildings are unquestionably beautiful in their architectural design.

The feeling is being expressed in the community that the university is reaching the stage of being a little too big, that it is losing its personal appeal. Instead of having the atmosphere of learning that is associated with older universities in other countries, the Queensland university is tending towards having an institutional aspect in its whole set-up. That is the only criticism I have to offer. What we see at St. Lucia today probably goes beyond what could have been envisaged by pioneers in the field of university development. The late Hon. W. Forgan Smith was a man of great foresight, and one has only to read the pages of "Hansard" to realise the great part he played in the development of the very fine university we have today. However, I fear that it is getting a little too large, and I am all for decentralisation when a university loses its personal atmosphere.

Provision is made in the Budget for the Queensland Conservatorium of Music. Here is a classic example of something that has outgrown itself in its present location. Publicity has been given to the fact that the Conservatorium of Music will be shifted to another location in the future. I appeal to the Minister for Education to move as quickly

as possible on this matter, because the present building at South Brisbane is quite inadequate and does not allow the conservatorium to fulfil the purpose it was intended for many years ago, that is, to provide for the encouragement and development of culture in our community. There is no room for expansion in the present building, and the move to the George Street site cannot be made too soon.

I pay a compliment to the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs. Some time ago, with my colleague from Nudgee, I had the opportunity of making a trip to Thursday Island, where I saw some of the work of that department. We had time to pay a visit to only one settlement, Bamaga, on the Gulf of Carpentaria. The department is doing very good work in that area. I compliment Mr. Killoran and his staff on the way they look after the affairs of our native Australians. Actually the settlement I looked at was inhabited mostly by Torres Strait Islanders. It was very good to see that they are receiving a fair amount of education, including a certain amount of trade training. However, we are likely to face some very grave problems in the future if we do not get industrial development in the area so that these people can be absorbed. It is no use training men or women for any positions unless work is available for them. A dangerous situation can be created; indeed, we have read about what is happening at the present time in the United States of America.

I should like to place on record a matter about which I am deeply concerned. It comes within the scope of the Minister for Education and relates to the manuals used in our schools to teach home economics. I have received a letter from the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Queensland voicing a very strong protest about a certain manual, namely, "Home Economics", by Florence M. Cullen. My attention was drawn to a very dangerous section in this book, which I believe should not be issued in its present form to any students in the State as it could start them on the wrong track.

To make my point clearly understandable, I will quote from the letter I received from the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Queensland. At page 71, under the heading "Alcoholic Drinks" the manual describes the types of alcoholic drinks that may be used, and defines them in this way—

"Kinds: Beer made from fermented malt flavoured with hops. Wines made from fermented grape juices. Spirits made from distilled liquors.

"Value and Use: Small quantities of alcoholic liquids taken before or during meals stimulate the secretion of digestive fluids, aid digestion, and ease tension."

That is laying the basis for future generations of alcoholics.

It continues—

"Alcohol is helpful in some diseases.

"Alcohol has a rapid stimulating effect as it passes without digestion into the blood."

That is a lot of tommy rot and it has been proved to be so.

It then proceeds—

"In large quantities it acts as a poison affecting the brain, nerves and tissues and slowing down one's reaction."

Do you, Mr. Hooper, really think that sort of thing is fitting and proper in a manual used for teaching children of a very impressionable age? I am sure you do not. It is shocking. It has been proved beyond all doubt by medical science that alcohol does not act as a stimulant; in fact, the feeling of stimulation is a numbing of the central nervous system. Alcohol is nothing other than a narcotic drug, and this has been proved to be so for many years. Alcohol is not a specific cure for any disease. Outside the body, alcohol plays a very important role in industry and I do not think it is necessary for me to amplify that statement. It certainly plays an important role in the commercial field, but it is very dangerous to bring it to the attention of children during their formative years, when they are so easily influenced. However, this is the type of information circulated by the Department of Education for use in Queensland. I take strong objection to this article in the manual, and fully support the stand adopted by the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Queensland.

I now come to the Queensland Agricultural College at Gatton, which is another fine institution that comes under the control of the Minister for Education. Recently I had an opportunity of inspecting the college. Queensland has been fortunate to have had it for so many years, and we should be proud of it. It is doing a wonderful job for the State in training our future farmers and those interested in the grazing industry.

I am disappointed with one item in the Budget in that the grant to the Creche and Kindergarten Association is not as large as it should be. The responsibility of these institutions grows every week. The need for this type of work increases, especially in the Greater Brisbane area, where the large proportion of our population resides. In the very near future consideration must be given to granting a larger allocation so that these institutions can carry out the work they are designed to do. Those in my area have great difficulty in coping with the demands made upon them.

Under this heading grants and subsidies are paid to many organisations and bodies. The Queensland Symphony Orchestra should be given greater encouragement. For many years it has sought help from the Government and the City Council, both of which

have given great assistance. As our city and State develop, so should our social and cultural pursuits.

I have had a good deal to do with the Queensland Bands Association. Little enough encouragement has been given to this association, and most of its finance has been raised by direct public donation. This is all part of our educational set-up and the Government, which has control of these grants, should increase the allocation. This year's Budget allocates the same amount as has been allocated in previous years. The time is overdue when these organisations should be given greater recognition.

Much has been said about our hospital system. The new hospital at Redcliffe has played its part in relieving congestion at the Royal Brisbane Hospital, but still more consideration should be given to decentralisation. In this regard the clinic at Sandgate is doing its utmost to give good service to the people. Many of our people, particularly the aged, deserve better medical care. Travelling to the city worsens their condition. More consideration must be given to the development firstly of our hospital system and secondly of our clinic system, which is contained within the structure of hospital administration. If a hospital cannot be provided at Sandgate, the clinic should be enlarged. The doctor in charge, Dr. Richards, is doing a wonderful job, but the clinic cannot give the service it wants to with the facilities at its disposal.

The aged people, and others at "Eventide" deserve more modern buildings. The old buildings are in a fair state of repair—in fact, it could be claimed they are in a good state of repair—but the congestion is taxing the resources of those whose responsibility it is to look after the old people.

The manager, Mr. Kelleher, does outstanding work, and I believe that the time is overdue for the construction of a new Eventide home. It was suggested some time ago that a new one was to be provided. I saw the plans for it at least two years ago, but to my knowledge, and from inquiries that I have made, I do not think it has advanced beyond the planning stage. From time to time over 1,000 people have to be cared for in the home, and I think they should have more modern buildings, conditions, and amenities in the evening of their lives. I hope it will not be long before we see the beginning of a new structure on the site near the Hornibrook Highway. The land is available, and I see no reason why the new building should not be provided within the next couple of years. If it is not, there will be congestion and a lot of inconvenience as a result of the present cramped quarters.

Much has been said, particularly in the last year, about the organisation of the Queensland Ambulance Transport Brigade. We are still waiting for the much-needed legislation that will provide some relief to this service. I do not think any other organisation or group of people has provided over the years

a greater service to the community than has the ambulance brigade. When the opportunity presents itself in this place, I think credit should be given where it is due and steps taken to see that our appreciation is duly recorded. I therefore pay a very high compliment to Mr. Turner. He is not only president of the Parent Centre of the Queensland Ambulance Transport Brigade in the Greater Brisbane area, but also president of the State Executive. He is one of the dedicated people on whom the brigade has been able to depend for many years. As I have said on other occasions, when he and other similar great humanitarian people pass on I cannot see others taking over the work that they have done so willingly through the years. With Mr. Turner, Mr. Bradley and Mr. Bartels have done mighty work. They, with every other officer and man in the ambulance brigade, far exceed the call of duty in their jobs, and for this they deserve the highest commendation.

In the few remaining minutes of my time I should like to refer to something that was dealt with briefly this afternoon by the hon. member for South Coast. He made a plea, as many of his colleagues do from time to time, in the name of tourism in this State, and gave the impression that tourists will never be attracted to Queensland unless we turn it into a "grog" State, with casinos and gambling dens everywhere.

Mr. Hinze: That is not true.

Mr. DEAN: I sincerely hope that intending tourists to Queensland do not get the impression that if they are not alcoholics they are not welcome here. The hon. member conveyed the impression, as many of his colleagues do, that every potential tourist is a "grog artist" From what I have been able to see with my own fair eyesight, I think liquor is available in sufficient quantities for those who require it, without drowning themselves in it.

Mr. Sherrington: Wouldn't the Government drive you to drink?

Mr. DEAN: I am afraid that could be one of the reasons for it.

I hear it said from time to time that the State's drinking laws must be relaxed if we are to attract tourists to Queensland. When the Premier was abroad, I sincerely hope that he did not find anyone asking him what the drinking laws were like in Queensland before making up his mind to come here.

Mr. Bromley: He said that we drink pineapple juice.

Mr. DEAN: If he said that, he could not have given better advice. If people drank pineapple juice we would not see newspaper articles, such as those that I have before me, about men going to gaol for unlawfully killing when they were intoxicated and did not know that they had run over someone in the street. It is easy to put all the blame on alcohol.

In conclusion, I should like to refer briefly to the Government's attitude towards university students who conduct demonstrations. I cannot see anything wrong with a group of university students conducting demonstrations if they keep within the law, and I think they should be given permits to do so. Recently we saw a newspaper headline stating that 21 youths were on remand for causing a disturbance when they did not have a permit to conduct a demonstration.

Mr. Hughes: You condemned all these demonstrations when you were in the Brisbane City Council, and rightly so.

Mr. DEAN: It is all right as long as they get a permit.

This article appeared in "Sunday Truth" of 9 October—

"Some official sanity must be employed to stop these all-too-frequent clashes between Brisbane police and St. Lucia University students.

"The police attitude seems to be that students are educated louts. The students in turn are mounting a bitterness against what they claim is police brutality. Between these two fronts lie all the elements of an explosive situation."

That is very true.

(Time expired.)

Mr. MULLER (Fassifern) (7.43 p.m.): I do not think it would be an exaggeration to say that the Budget now under consideration is the most difficult Budget since the advent of uniform taxation. The Treasurer very rightly pointed out that the drought has had a very serious effect on the Budget, and, in addition, I suggest that if the inflationary trend were examined fully, it would perhaps be shown to have an even greater retarding effect than the drought.

This evening my mind goes back to the days before uniform taxation. I remember quite clearly sitting on the Opposition benches when the late Hon. W. Forgan Smith, who was then Premier, was discussing uniform taxation. The Government of the day agreed to it reluctantly, but the Premier saw the dangers of it and used these words—

"If you forfeit your right to tax, you eventually forfeit your right to govern."

I often think how true his words were.

In speaking on the Financial Statement and the difficulties surrounding budgeting for the current financial year, I speak with some knowledge of the Treasurer's problems. I know what it means to sit in Cabinet with a limited amount of money and a multitude of works staring you in the face. The alternatives are to find some means of raising additional revenue or to reduce expenditure. You cannot have it both ways; there is no question about that. You must either get more money or reduce the services you provide. That problem is not peculiar to Queensland; it is common to all Australian States.

At the outset, I should like to quote from the remarks of Mr. R. J. McAuley, who is the new president of the National Farmers' Union and a man for whom I have the greatest admiration. He has a very sound knowledge of economics and, in addition, thoroughly understands primary production. Only a few days ago, while commenting on the fact that State Governments are finding it increasingly difficult to draw up Budgets that will satisfactorily finance Government services, he was reported as follows—

"Australia's progress, particularly in the cost-sensitive rural sector, will be conditioned either favourably or adversely by the degree of prompt co-operation in Commonwealth-State fiscal policies.

"State Governments are responsible for major and costly services, yet the borrowing powers and resources available to them which enable them to carry out these operations are very limited, he said.

"The Victorian Premier, Sir Henry Bolte, stated during his Budget speech that the collective debt of all States had grown over the last 20 years from \$2,019,000,000 to \$8,767,000,000 while the Commonwealth Government debt had been reduced over the same period from \$3,650,000,000 to \$1,892,000,000.

"Mr. McAuley continued his statement by calling for a re-examination of the system of Federal taxation reimbursements by which the States determine their annual expenditure.

"He said recent heavily increased taxation proved the existing system of Commonwealth allocations was so deficient as to retard vital community services provided by the State.

"If these State services are to be continued, under the present degree of Commonwealth intervention, a more effective financial formula must be found, and the States given greater financial responsibility.

"The system of giving greater financial responsibilities to the States has been carried out in Canada where the Prime Minister, Mr. Pearson, calls it 'Co-operative Federalism', and in the United States, where President Johnson refers to the system as 'creative Federalism', he said.

"As a result of this, Central and State Governments in these countries carry out their business separately although where a joint effort is needed they combine with mutual respect.

"The drought has emphasised the vulnerability of State finances, and just how dependent Australia's export income is on effective community services, particularly in agriculture, concluded Mr. McAuley."

I think that is a very sensible statement. It conveys to us that there are a number of people thinking on the same lines as we are in Queensland.

The Treasurer calls his Budget a "go-ahead" Budget, and perhaps there is a good deal of truth in that statement. I have not a lot of criticism to offer in connection with this Budget, but there is one part of it that I dislike very, very much. This "go-ahead" Budget is made possible only at the expense of our primary producers who, in effect, are the chief sufferers as a result of the drought. I could quite understand applying taxation to every section of the community in order that each section might carry its fair proportion of the load, but under this proposal the primary-producing section will carry the general additional taxation as well as the extra transport costs.

I feel that it would not be out of place this evening to use that Biblical quotation which I know every hon. member has heard so often and which, in the minds of some people, is so difficult to understand. Paraphrased, it is—

"To those who have shall be given, and from those who have not shall be taken that which they already have."

I think that applies very aptly in this case. I have heard some very wonderful sermons on that question and, from the Christian point of view, it can be explained to me very satisfactorily. But when it comes to a matter of placing a greater load on our primary producers through increased transport costs, I think it is quite wrong and that it will have its repercussions.

One of our great difficulties over the last few years has been the high cost of transport. The economy of our primary and secondary industries is dependent very largely on transport costs. If they are too high, secondary industries must be concentrated around the city. It is impossible to establish a secondary industry any distance from the city because it cannot compete with industry close to the city. Primary industries, however, are obliged to go out into the country.

It was no surprise to me last week to hear the hon. member for Gregory complain very bitterly about the way the increased costs would affect the people he represents. I know something of their problems. Perhaps they are not as close to my heart as they are to his, nevertheless I realise the difficulties of primary producers in areas remote from the capital city. When they market their product, whether it be stock or farm produce, they have to accept the Brisbane price less the cost of transporting their product to that centre. For whatever they use in their work on their properties—the machinery and everything else—and for their food and clothing, they have to pay the Brisbane price plus the cost of transport to their locality. It is a heavy burden that they have to carry, and I hope the Government will take a second look at these increased transport costs. It is more than primary producers in outside areas will be able to bear. I cannot help but feel that this matter was treated rather lightly.

Increased registration fees on motor vehicles are in a different category. This increased tax applies to everybody, as do all the other charges for social services. The man outside pays what he requires for social service purposes, plus what he requires for business purposes.

Without these additional charges, the cost of marketing cattle from my own property in the Burnett is so great that it often makes me wonder whether the job is worth while. I think that a lot of the restrictions in the regulations are really bad, and could well be relaxed without adversely affecting anyone. There are dozens of them, but I shall mention the effect of one or two. If you send a truckload of cattle or sheep to Brisbane you cannot bring back a stock horse or bull on the return journey of the vehicle unless you pay full fees. If you send down produce you cannot get the truck to bring back, say, a few coils of barbed wire without paying full fees. Such small items cannot be carted back without paying the full charge, and this would make it economically impossible.

Only a year or two ago a move was made to even up fuel costs throughout the State. We did not achieve absolute uniformity, but at least an effort was made and much has been achieved. Even in the remote parts of the State people pay only about 4d. or, at the most, 5d. a gallon more for petrol than in Brisbane. However, all the good that was done by that legislation is now being undone with this additional taxation. I am sure that this must worsen the position.

Do we require services or do we not require them? I do not want to be misunderstood. When I look at this Budget I cannot see anything in it that will help our primary industries. The Treasurer is looking at me very hard.

Mr. Chalk: We are allocating \$750,000 to the dairying industry for developmental work!

Mr. MULLER: I realise that we need money for educational purposes. I do not want to be misunderstood, but I point out that in the Budget this year approximately \$66,000,000 has been allocated for education and only \$6,000,000 for water conservation. I realise that if we are to grapple with the problems confronting us we require education, but I am trying to point out the unreasonable attitude adopted by some of our educationists. I have been absolutely staggered to read comments made by some education leaders. Education is already getting 52 per cent. of the tax reimbursements, yet these people are still complaining that they are being harshly dealt with. I give the Minister for Education full marks for the way in which he has stood up to some of those who are trying to extract the last drop of blood from the State Treasury. Expenditure on education must continue, but at the same time there must be sweet reasonableness. To give extra money to one department, money must be taken from another. In other words, we must rob Peter to pay Paul.

Something similar occurs with our health services which are essential. Our free hospital system has done a mighty job for Queensland but it is being abused. I remember when the system was first introduced. At that time it cost about £2,000,000 a year, but now we are paying about £22,000,000 and costs are continually rising. Again I do not wish to be misunderstood, as I have every sympathy for people who cannot pay their hospital dues, but the time has come for a means test to be applied to determine those who can pay and those who cannot. I am not quibbling about the increase of a few dollars a week in the charges for private and intermediate wards, but I firmly believe that the free services should be available only to people who genuinely need them. Unless such a test is applied I do not know what the results will be. I read the report of the recent Liberal Party meeting and I give them full marks for examining this matter. I do not think it was suggested that we should abolish the free hospitals system.

Mr. Campbell: We did not suggest that at all.

Mr. MULLER: The Liberal Party was thinking along similar lines to me.

Mr. Sherrington: It was the six at the back of the Chamber who said that—the rebels.

Mr. MULLER: I am not concerned about that. I am concerned only about how we can carry on this service without the necessary money. Queensland is the only State that provides free hospitalisation, and it is becoming so costly that something must be done about it. If we are to spend so much money on social services, the really important industries that provide 80 per cent. of the wealth—the primary industries—will be in trouble. We will double back on them and say, "We want this extra money; we will charge this up to the pumpkin bill also." Eventually the charge will go right down the line until it rests on the shoulders of the primary producers, and that is where it will stay. It is no wonder that there are complaints about it.

The other night I listened to the hon. member for Toowoomba East. I do not wish to be critical of him; after a few years here he will probably be a little more careful in his remarks. He said that we are really not doing enough for education, and in many ways he was very critical of the way that he said this department had been neglected. It is not many years ago that the Department of Education cost us \$4,000,000. When Labour left office it cost about \$18,000,000. Today it costs \$66,000,000. There was not a high school in any country district. If this Government has done one thing well, it has been in the field of education. We should not be critical and say that enough is not being done, because more has been done than the Opposition is prepared to give the Government credit for.

We cannot give all of these services without getting more money, either from the Commonwealth Government or from the introduction of new forms of taxation. It is dangerous to introduce new taxes, because they generally stick and are never lifted. In the end, the only people who carry them are the primary producers.

We cannot overlook the drought, because while it was very bad last year and the year before its effects will be felt for another couple of years. Many properties will not be stocked for some time, because there are not enough sheep and cattle and the prices being asked for them are prohibitive. It is claimed that the loss of sheep in Queensland was 23 per cent. and that in the Far West, in Warrego, it was 42 per cent. In addition, the cattle loss was 6·8 per cent. The greatest loss is yet to come, when people have to face the cost of holding and running these properties unstocked. Therefore, at a time such as this more efforts should have been made to assist these people in some way. The general view is that people engaged in stock raising and fattening make a great deal of money. Meat prices are high, but when costs are deducted there is not much left. If prices fall and these people are caught with heavy overdrafts, I do not know how they will carry on.

A good deal has been said about the public debt. The public debt does not mean much because we must look at our assets as well as our liabilities. Both sides of the ledger must be looked at. When I entered Parliament in 1935 the public debt was \$232,000,000. I thought that was an awful amount of money. I looked at earlier figures and found that between 1914 and 1935 it rose from \$112,000,000 to \$226,000,000. It has now reached \$936,000,000. According to the Treasurer 12·82 per cent. of our revenue will be needed to service the public debt.

Before we become too critical of the public debt we must look at the State's assets. We have quite a lot of assets in roads, public buildings, and perhaps some water conservation work. But, for primary producers, there is something in addition: in recent years, local authority commitments have increased tremendously, but they are not mentioned in these figures. I emphasise that loans that have been negotiated by local authorities, many over long terms, will have to be met, and probably at a time of falling prices. Again the only people on whom the burden can fall will be the primary producers.

I wish to deal particularly with the need to develop our water resources, and also to do something to protect the beef roads that have been built in inland areas of the State. My information is that much of those roads has not been sealed. I hope that roads built in the future, and those already constructed, will be completely sealed. With present-day traffic, unless they are surfaced within a few years they are ruined. Unless we are prepared

to do the whole job of building and sealing roads, in my opinion we might as well not start at all. That is something we need to be very careful about. These roads are assets that need to be protected. If they are not, in a very few years, as a result of traffic damage and erosion, there will be no roads at all. There are one or two sections of road in my electorate that have not been sealed, and the local authority concerned is obliged to work on them every few weeks to prevent their destruction. It would be a great pity if these roads were not properly protected after a large amount of money had been spent on them.

My real disappointment in the Budget is that so little money has been made available for water conservation. I have been in this Parliament for 30 years, and I have not allowed a session to pass without making a speech in which I have advocated water conservation. I had been a Minister for only six weeks when I launched a scheme to build our first dam. The next year I launched another scheme, and yet another in the following year. They were the Moogerah, Borumba, and Leslie Dams. Nobody can say that I have not been sincere and consistent in this attitude. When looking at the money that has been made available for water conservation and the little that has been done over the years, I can only say, to put it very mildly, that I am very, very disappointed.

I am not now blaming the present Government; this matter goes back for 30 years. In season and out of season, in Opposition and in Government, I have advocated water conservation. Since we have taken office we have not done nearly enough, and unless we do more we had better cease talking about it. A great deal has been said about what would be done to mitigate the effects of drought in the future, either by fodder conservation or by water conservation. A Department of Conservation has been created, but nothing has been conserved and we do not look like conserving anything. To my mind, the allocation of \$6,500,000 is merely a token effort. If it is examined carefully having regard to money values and what can be done with it, it is no better than, if as good as, what has been done in the last nine or 10 years.

I feel that the time has arrived when forward planning has to be undertaken. What is required in Queensland is a master plan for the development and conservation of the water resources of the whole State, not only part of it. Anything that lends itself to conservation should be investigated. Queensland has done so little in this connection that, by way of comparison, I should like to tell hon. members what the other States are doing.

During my term as Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation and soon after launching the first scheme in Queensland, with the Commissioner of Irrigation and Water Supply I made a tour of New South Wales

and Victoria to see for myself what had been done in those States. The Minister in charge of water conservation in New South Wales at that time, Mr. Enticknap, made the services of his chief water officer available to me. He said, "He will stay with you as long as you wish." I was with him for about 10 days or a fortnight.

When we completed our survey of the work in New South Wales, we went to Victoria and made a similar survey in that State. Even at that time Victoria had almost completed the development of its water resources and, when so much could be done for so little, had spent about £110,000,000 on water conservation.

New South Wales had done a considerable amount, but not enough. I have here a clipping from a newspaper published in New South Wales—I think it is dated 11 March 1966—containing a statement by Mr. Beale, the Minister in charge of water conservation. The article says—

"Mr. Beale said that water supplies were only one section of the Government's efforts on drought.

"The Government has implemented some 30 or more measures and can justly claim that the relief it has provided, both in scope and variety of measures, is on a larger scale than ever before in the State's history," he said.

"The Government also has been paying attention to the need for improvement of the State's resistance to drought, particularly through water supplies, in the long term, Mr. Beale said."

This is what I want hon. members to note—

"The Government has:

Started the largest and most comprehensive valley survey of water resources ever undertaken in Australia—embracing 30 river valleys in New South Wales.

Undertaken a review of the engineering aspects of 35 dam sites.

Decided to construct a dam on the Severn River at a cost of approximately \$7 million.

Completed a weir on the Darling River at Bourke, started construction of a weir at Collarenebri and approved another at Brewarrina.

Provided approximately \$11 million in 1965-66 to speed-up construction of Blowering Dam.

Provided \$6½ million in 1965-66 to continue construction of the new Wyan-gala Dam.

Practically completed Burrendong Dam.

Initiated an underground water investigation using new techniques which already have located huge resources in the Lachlan Valley.

"Mr. Beale said the Government has provided a record sum for water conservation this year, amounting to \$23½ million. Yet even this is nowhere near large enough to deal with the problem in either the short or the long term.

"The Government's aim is to create the highest possible degree of drought resistance throughout the State, both on farms and regionally," he said.

"If we can do this in this State, then the nation also will benefit. But, it is clear that the State alone will not be able to do sufficient work in this field unless the Commonwealth Government participates financially in the development of water resources," Mr. Beale said.

"In a drought the primary producer is the first to suffer—then the people in rural employment and country towns—then the effects spread to commerce and industry," he said.

"We all suffer from the drop in national productivity which arises from depressed local markets and from the loss in export earnings," Mr. Beale said."

The article continued in that vein, and I think that his statement is an indication of his statesmanship. He points out that it is beyond the financial capacity of the States to undertake this work without the aid of the Commonwealth.

I have referred to long-term planning, but a survey of the State is required urgently to see what the possibilities are, what the projects will cost, and how far the Commonwealth Government is prepared to participate. The United States of America could never have developed its water resources without a co-operative effort by the Federal and State Governments. When I visited the Snowy River Scheme—I think I have mentioned this before, but it is so important that I think it should be mentioned again—the engineer who was acting as consultant to the Snowy Mountains Authority at that time told me that the Federal Government in the United States provides the whole of the money and that the States pay it back over 40 years at the rate of 2½ per cent. That means, in effect, that there is really no interest. At the rate of 2½ per cent. the State would get more annually out of the conservation than it would put in by way of interest.

As long as the Commonwealth has the money-bags and no effort is made by the States, nothing will ever be done. I mention this because, when I complain to responsible Federal members about the lack of interest on the part of the Commonwealth Government in water conservation, I am told by them—and I want the Committee to note this—that we do not ask for it. If that is true and we do not ask for it, somebody must accept the responsibility.

I mention these things because I know how embarrassing it is to the States to find money to finance all their services unless

they have an adequate supply of money. We have a number of water conservation schemes in this State. I do not like to work the parish pump in a matter such as this, but I have seen Queensland in my time and I know that you cannot get sites like Moogerah, Borumba, or Leslie every day. We have one at Coolmunda, in the Carnarvon electorate, and a number of others that could be used, but we have very suitable and excellent sites right at Brisbane's back door—on the Logan River. We have 25,000 acres of beautiful fertile land in the Logan and Albert Valleys, but as soon as we have a couple of months of dry weather that soil is more or less unusable; we just have not the water to keep the crops going.

On these rivers we have three sites. Two of them are very good ones—one in the headwaters of the Logan River, known as Burnett Creek, and another on the Albert River—and both dams could be built for approximately £3,000,000. Converting that to dollar currency, that figure would be doubled and with the inflationary trend today it might be slightly more, but there, right at our own door, are two splendid sites. Plans and estimates have been prepared, but year after year the proposal is passed over and the people in the locality wonder what it is all about. They are prepared to use the water.

I should like all members to visit Moogerah and see what has been done there, not only by the dam itself but by the diversion channels. I should like them to see the area of country that has been built up as a result of this water supply. Only recently the Government saw fit to build a power-station at Swanbank, just outside Ipswich, and if it were not for the Moogerah Dam that power-station could not operate; there would not be any water, because water for it has to be drawn from that dam. When we see just what water conservation means, for the life of me I cannot understand why these delays should continue.

I should like to draw attention to further weaknesses in this matter. If we allow the coastal streams in particular to go unchecked it is only a matter of time when there will not be any soil left along them. In times of drought the soil is loosened, and when a flood follows these streams flow very fast from the mountains and not only tear up sand and gravel from the bed of the river but they also catch up the soil and take it out to sea. The greatest asset we have, particularly in a State like Queensland, is the soil, and if our soil goes everything goes with it, even our civilisation.

I know these things cost money; nevertheless, people are prepared to co-operate. It is hard to believe, but an engineer of the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission told me that although the Leslie Dam at Warwick was only just completed and only about half full, already all of the water that will be available when it is full has

been allocated. The Government must enter the picture and find the money for water conservation, because the people are prepared to co-operate and use the water when it is available.

I know that we have a lot of coastal land with a good rainfall where conservation schemes are not so greatly needed. That applies also in the United States. I asked the engineer I spoke of just what they did in America. He said that they watered 16 States. When I asked him about the other States, he said that they did not think they required any water conservation schemes. However, \$10,000,000 a year is provided for each of those 16 States, or a total of \$160,000,000 a year.

In my opinion, the subject of water conservation in Queensland has been treated too lightly. We are too concerned about what people in the city might say if we cannot provide all the services they consider necessary. We are always afraid that school-teachers, unions or somebody else will kick up a noise about it. For my part, I have never found an industrial union or anybody of professional or business standing who was not advocating water conservation. I am not asking that the Government should exhaust the whole of its funds on water conservation and leave itself stony broke so that it cannot carry on the services of the State, but this matter has been passed over from year to year without anything being done about it. We cannot blame one particular Government; we have to blame all of them.

I think everyone knows of Sir William Hudson. He has revealed some amazing figures. After pointing out that Australia was the driest continent in the world, he gave some revealing figures which were reported in the following newspaper article—

“As an illustration of the part that water played in food production, Sir William quoted the following figures:—

The production of a 2 lb. loaf of bread requires $2\frac{1}{2}$ tons of water—i.e., about 5,000 times its weight in water.

3,300 gallons of water are required to produce a gallon of milk—i.e., milk requires 3,300 times its weight in water.

An egg requires 2,200 gallons of water for its production.

The growing of a ton of grain wheat requires 1,100 tons of water.

A pound of meat requires 50 tons of water—i.e., over 110,000 times its weight in water.

The food to feed an adult one day requires 35 tons of rain—i.e., 700 times the adult's weight in water.”

Those are staggering figures. They indicate what an important part water plays, yet in an ordinary wet season millions of tons of water daily flow down fresh-water streams,

particularly on this side of the range, carrying the soil with them, but we do little or nothing about it.

What I am suggesting is nothing new. I put up with a lot of cheek in this Chamber during the years I was in Opposition. I remember one occasion, after I had been advocating for something to be done at Mt. Edwards—as we called it then,—a Minister telling me, “The hon. member does not know what he is talking about. There is no water there. It is only a trickle. The catchment area is too small.” The Government of the time said that it could do nothing about what was proposed because it was freehold land. Later, after making an inspection, the responsible Minister at that time said, “In order to do anything it would be necessary to resume all the land and cut it up into little 5 or 10-acre blocks, and the tenants might lease it from the Government.”

Everything imaginable was done to frighten us off the idea. I should like everyone to go there and see what has been done. There are times when one should blow one's own trumpet, and this is such an occasion. Hon. members should go there and see what can be done. The water is used for commercial irrigation purposes and for sporting purposes. It is within a stone's throw of Brisbane. The Minister for Tourism will agree that there is no better tourist run than from Brisbane to Moogerah Dam. It is really a pretty sight and people can see what has been done and what can be done in other parts of the State.

The time has arrived for us to take firm action in getting other schemes under way. In times of drought we say to people, “It is your responsibility to store fodder.” Many people can make provision for this, but there are also many who cannot. There are certain difficulties in the way of storing feed, but on my place when things get really bad we can draw on the water and within a matter of two weeks we have a supply of food. It is totally different from store fodder. It must also be remembered that store fodder depreciates and suffers the ravages of mice and rats. If it is stored too long, interest and depreciation costs have to be met. In such schemes as these we have a God-given asset that we are too blind to develop.

I know that I am speaking in very strong terms tonight. I have heard people move many types of motions about what we should do and should not do. When Cabinet was increased, hon. members will recall that I strongly advocated the formation of a Department of Conservation. I should like to know if the Minister for Conservation has been given any direction to conserve anything. His counterpart in New South Wales, Mr. Beale, took office only a few months ago and we know the results that have been achieved in that State.

There are one or two other matters that I should like to mention, but I know that other hon. members wish to speak. I will have an opportunity at a later date in the session to refer to them.

Mr. SHERRINGTON (Salisbury) (8.28 p.m.): I will preface my remarks on the Budget debate with a brief reference to the tragic occurrence which led to the resignation of our leader, the hon. member for Toowoomba West. I know that Mr. Duggan would not want any special favours extended to him, but I feel compelled in this debate to say that the circumstances that led to his resignation from the leadership of the Opposition are such that not only has the Labour Party lost a good leader, but the State has lost the benefit of his tremendous knowledge and ability. While he may have had political opponents, I am sure that members of all political organisations recognised his undoubted talents. The same circumstances, of course, led to the promotion of other members of the party to responsible positions, and Labour has a tradition that, no matter what the crisis, occasions have made men. I offer my congratulations to those other hon. members on their election, namely, to Mr. Houston as Leader and Mr. Tucker as his deputy. I have no doubt that the occasion finds the man, and, knowing both of these gentlemen, I know they will rise to the occasion and lead the Australian Labour Party in a most capable and efficient manner.

Speaking now to the motion of censure moved by the Leader of the Opposition, I think we had a perfect illustration of the contempt the Treasurer apparently has for members of this Committee and the general public. In keeping with his cold and calculating approach to budgeting problems, he has illustrated the contempt in which he holds hon. members by being absent from the Chamber for the greater part of the debate. One would think that on the occasion of a motion of censure against his Budget he would see fit to pay members the courtesy of listening to their speeches. He is guilty not only of gross discourtesy to members of the Opposition but also of contempt for the people of the State, as they will be called upon to pay the increased taxes he has introduced. In his desire to push ahead, whatever the cost, he has been contemptuous of public opinion and of consequences. I do not think he gives two hoots for the financial burden he has placed on the wage-earners in our community. The magnitude of his contempt can be gauged by comparing his Budget performance with his efforts to win the recent State election. He and his colleagues, during the election campaign, ran around Queensland literally spending like the Watsons.

Mr. Sullivan: What was your leader doing?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I shall prove before I finish that the Premier and Treasurer completely misled the public of Queensland into voting for them.

Mr. Sullivan: Pure nonsense.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Give me time. Do not make impatient interjections. I shall develop my argument in my own way.

Mr. Sullivan: You have a hell of a job ahead of you.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: It would not be difficult to develop an argument that would do the hon. member a lot of good. I think it could be stated that we have been treated to a champagne policy speech followed by a hangover Budget. The Government's performance can be likened to that of a salesman who entertains his client and regales him with pate de foie gras, caviar, and champagne, and then having completed his sale, goes home to his family and has a meal of baked beans on toast.

Mr. Sullivan: You're over my head; I am a corned beef and cabbage man.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: It would not be hard to go over the hon. member's head. The presentation immediately after a State election of a Budget such as the one introduced by the Treasurer must leave electors with the feeling experienced by the victim of the thimble-and-pea trick. One has only to hark back to the policy speech of the Premier delivered five months ago which he concluded by saying—

"I urge you if you value the welfare of yourselves, and your children, to cast your vote for the Government candidate in your respective electorates on May 28, and to return us as the Government to continue to pilot Queensland and its people to the goal of their great destiny. Let us go forward together into the sunlight towards the beckoning heights with their promise of such rich fulfilment."

Those are the words of the Premier. They were brave and bold words, but, unfortunately for the Queensland public, they were nothing but a lot of political malarkey. As a matter of fact, it is not hard to visualise the delivery of that policy speech at Maroochydhore, to the accompaniment of appropriate handclaps and "hear hears" at the right moment. What the Premier omitted to say was that while we are going forward into this "sunlight" towards these "beckoning heights" the taxpayers will be footing the bill every inch of the way.

Of course, the Treasurer had to get into the act, too; he could not be outdone for very long. He said that his objectives were—

"To govern the State faithfully and well; to continue to concern ourselves with the well-being of the individual and the family unit; to achieve all that is good and wholesome and the well-being of the State; and to do the greatest good for the greatest number."

Of course, those are the words of the Premier and his deputy.

Let us compare them with the concluding words of the deputy Premier when he delivered the Financial Statement. Having "conned" the people of this State into voting for the Government by making promises, he said, after dealing with his worries in preparing the Budget—

"I was strengthened in this resolve by my unbounded faith in Queensland and its people."

He was there referring to his slugging everybody with additional taxes. He continued—

"We have come through rough times before and I am prepared to believe that Queenslanders are willing to accept a little 'tightening of the belt' to ensure development of their State and to maintain its place as the finest in which to live."

Five months after the Premier's talk about "going forward to beckoning heights" we are told that we have to tighten our belts.

Mr. Sullivan: Why don't you tell us some of the promises made by your Leader during the same campaign?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: That is fair enough. However, the people rejected our promises; they rejected us as a Government. They had every right to make their decision, but the Government had no right to tell them things that were to be reversed five months later.

The Treasurer sought to excuse his Budget by referring to the reverses caused by the drought. I remind hon. members that, whilst he and the Premier were running round making extravagant promises and "spending like the Watsons" during the election campaign, the State was in the grip of the same drought. That made no difference to the Premier and the Treasurer at that time. In the middle of the drought they were prepared to offer everything.

Mr. Sullivan: For one thing, the Premier made a promise to the dairying industry, and that is being carried out at this moment.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The Premier made promises to everybody, not only the dairying industry. Of course, like the typical "Alibi Ike" that he is, the Treasurer blames everybody but himself. He very meticulously put some of the blame on his compadres in Canberra and made pointed reference to the unfavourable budgetary position of Queensland compared with that of the Commonwealth. These were his words—

"I think it is true to say that every State is short of the funds necessary to finance a satisfactory level of services and provide for development. All State Treasurers would have had the same formidable task that I have had . . ."

He then went on to make a comparison with the Federal Budget and said—

"Looking first at the Consolidated Reserve Fund the overall percentage increase in appropriation from this Fund

in Queensland is, excluding drought relief expenditure, 8.6 per cent. By contrast the Commonwealth Government's Budget provides for an increase of 26.1 per cent. in departmental running expenses over last year's appropriation.

"In respect of capital works the position is similar."

Finally, he said—

"I am stressing the importance of funds for capital works, as I firmly believe that shortage of such funds could be the biggest barrier to development of this State."

As I said, the Treasurer wanted to excuse the fact that he was forced into going to the people for additional taxes by saying that the increase in spending in Queensland was 8.6 per cent. while departmental running expenses in the Commonwealth Budget had increased by 26.1 per cent. It will not be very long—only a few weeks, in fact—before the Treasurer, together with his Liberal Party colleagues and his Country Party supporters, will be fawning at the feet of the Prime Minister and extolling his virtues for the benefit of the voting public of Queensland and virtually begging the electors to re-elect "Our Harold".

Mr. Armstrong: I do not think we will have to beg them.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The hon. member will be out on the stump in a few weeks, yet he comes into this Chamber and complains about the treatment handed out to Queensland by Harold Holt and his Government, just as he did when Sir Robert Menzies and his Government were in office. In a very short time he and his colleagues will be urging the electors of Queensland to re-elect the Commonwealth Government.

Just let us look at what has happened between the Commonwealth and the States since 1949. The best indication of how the Commonwealth is looking after itself at the expense of the States is to be found in a white paper issued by the Treasurer, Mr. McMahon, before he introduced the 1966-67 Budget. It refers to Government securities on issue at 30 June, 1966. One finds in the white paper that in 1950 securities issued by the Commonwealth Government and maturing in Australia stood at \$3,498,820,000, while securities issued by the States stood at \$1,500,216,000. In 1966 the position is reversed completely. Securities issued by the Commonwealth and maturing in Australia stood at \$2,520,779,000, compared with \$6,613,686,000 issued by the States. In other words, the Commonwealth has liquidated its debt by using revenue and, like the usurious moneylender, is lending out money to the States which now find themselves in the position of having to pawn their assets in order to have capital available for developmental work.

When one examines this question on a per capita basis one finds that today Commonwealth securities on issue per head of

population amount to \$271.72 and State securities amount to \$655.19. Yet members of the Government and the Treasury will be out on the stumps in a few weeks' time urging us to re-elect Harold Holt and his Government!

Mr. Bromley: Is that "Handsome Harold"?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: No, "Horrible Harold".

Now let us have a look at some of the so-called assistance the Commonwealth Government has given to Queensland. The Commonwealth Government got the fright of its life in 1961 because it was almost rejected. Had it not been for a few lousy votes in the electorate of Moreton the Menzies Government would have been out of office and it suddenly realised that there was some land north of the New South Wales border. It suddenly woke up to the fact that there were electors who were entirely dissatisfied with the performance of the Menzies Government.

Mr. Sullivan: I think there will be a big swing to the Holt Government in Queensland this year, don't you?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I think there will be a big swing to the Labour Party. The people of Dawson showed quite frankly that they are "jack" of the Federal Government. I do not think Dr. Patterson had any difficulty in convincing the cane-farmers and everybody else in the Dawson electorate that there has been shocking neglect of Queensland by Tory Governments over the last 17 years, and if hon. members opposite were decent loyal Queenslanders, they would not be sitting there giggling like schoolgirls, but would be applying themselves to the Budget rather than trying to make intelligent interjections of which they are not capable.

Now let us have a look at some of this assistance. Dealing first with the brigalow development scheme, Fitzroy Basin, there was a \$14,500,000 grant by the Government, all of it repayable. In the brigalow scheme again, Mackenzie and Isaac Rivers, there was a \$11,500,000 grant, again all of it repayable. We were able to effect a saving of something like \$3,000,000 in the initial development of the Fitzroy Basin scheme, and in accordance with their typical miserable and lousy attitude the Commonwealth Government included as part of the further advance of \$11,000,000 the \$3,000,000 we had been fortunate to save on the first scheme.

Then, coming to bauxite development, \$3,300,000 was received from the Commonwealth Government, again every penny of it repayable. For beef-cattle roads there was an advance in all of \$20,000,000 of which the first \$3,400,000 was non-repayable, the balance in excess of \$3,400,000 being 50 per cent. repayable. If one adds to this sum the Commonwealth advance of \$30,000,000 for

the rehabilitation of the Mt. Isa railway line, which is a repayable loan, one finds that out of a total of \$76,800,000 advanced to the State approximately \$11,700,000 only was on a non-repayable basis. Hon. members might recall that Sir Thomas Hiley originally went all round the world trying to obtain finance for the rehabilitation of this line, before the Menzies Government suddenly realised that an election year was coming up and that they ought to do something about it. The balance of the \$76,800,000 has to be paid out of the pockets of the taxpayers of Queensland. Is it any wonder that we regard the Commonwealth Government as handing out the Chinaman's gift whenever it does give a hand-out.

It can hardly be said to be generous to Queensland in the light of the special development grants given to other States. I can vividly recall the £42,000,000 made available to Western Australia for railway purposes, of which only £16,000,000 was repayable because the standardisation of gauge was involved, the other £26,000,000 being a non-repayable grant. The Commonwealth Government is hardly generous in view of the need to develop our natural resources. I will not directly quote the Premier but hon. members can take my word that it is in black and white. During the election campaign he got up on the stump and claimed credit for the fact that Queensland for the fifth year in succession was the greatest export earner in the Commonwealth, with a figure of \$303.11 per capita in Queensland as against the Australian average of \$227.29. It is hardly generous in view of all things, and it is quite utterly lousy if one reflects on the Treasurer's comparison of the Commonwealth Government's increased Consolidated Revenue expenditure and our increased Consolidated Revenue expenditure, the Commonwealth expenditure representing an increase of 26.1 per cent. as against Queensland's 8.6 per cent. increase in appropriation.

From the caviar of going forward together in the sunlight to the beckoning heights with their promise of rich fulfilment and from the pate de foie gras of achieving all that is good and wholesome we suddenly awaken to a breakfast of baked beans on toast because of rail fare increases, freight increases, motor vehicle registration increases, stamp duty on workers' compensation, stamp duty on motor vehicle registration, increased hospital charges, and so on. Of course, this all happened in the short five months when we had the Premier and his deputy going around the State promising everything. As a matter of fact, it was quite an orgy of rhetoric for the Premier and his "side kick". It seemed to me that they garnished their pre-election promises like some continental chef decorating his feast with some piquant sauce. As a matter of fact, I do not think that their imagination knew any bounds whatever. To me it seemed that at times they were overcome by the exuberance of their own verbosity.

Mr. Sullivan: Is this your own English?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Coming from the mulga, the hon. member would not understand. If I sent it up to him in a smoke signal, he might be able to interpret it, if he had an interpreter. Let me refresh his mind about some of the things that Honest Frank had to say. On page 47 of the Premier's policy speech he set out in large, bold type, so that his failing eyes could read it—

"The A.L.P. has proved that it is unfit to govern either on State or Federal levels. The proof is positive and overwhelming. It comes from the mouths of its own dissident sections."

But what about the performance of his own dissidents in recent times—as a matter of fact in recent weeks!

I turn now to what the hon. member for Clayfield had to say on the Banking Bill. He said—

"In fact, the Treasurer and his colleagues in Cabinet apparently saw nothing wrong with this whole deal. This must be assumed, because no word of what I might call this disgraceful deal ever came before the Parliamentary party or the unsuspecting Associated Banks until a series of questions in this Chamber by me to the Treasurer of the day began to force out the sordid details."

Then, of course, he went a bit better and if hon. members will wait a minute I will give them a couple of bottlers concerning these dissident factions in the Government parties. The hon. member went on to say—

"... Queensland will be bound for 20 years merely because a former Treasurer of the Crown signed an agreement, the full details of which were not made available, I suggest, to his Cabinet colleagues in the first instance, and then to his Parliamentary colleagues in Government, before he signed it. If that is so, we have reached a low level in our moral standards of public administration."

Finally, he gave them a send-off by saying—

"There are differences here. This damnable cult of secrecy which pervades the public administration seems to be accepted without much comment."

Let us see what the hon. member for Albert had to say in a similar debate.

Mr. HERBERT: I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member in order in quoting from a current "Hansard"?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I have been here long enough to be prepared for this. I will read this from notes. I knew that the hon. gentleman, with his petty little mind, would raise that point, so I will continue to read from my copious notes.

Mr. Carey: Did I say something worth while?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I will tell the hon. member. He referred to the rebel Liberal group. He was ordered by the Chairman to withdraw. I do not need any notes for this. The hon. member said that he would willingly withdraw the remark but it would not be erased from his mind.

Mr. Carey: And it is still there.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: In other words the hon. member was not too much of a buddy-buddy with the rebel Liberal group at the back of the Chamber.

Mr. Sullivan: You are telling us about everyone else. What about telling us something about yourself?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Hon. members opposite are very fond of trying to heap the tin on members of the A.L.P. but when it rebounds on them, because they are not buddy-buddies although they try to give that impression to the public, they do not like it. So far as I am concerned they can sit there and cop it.

Mr. Carey: Mr. Sherrington—

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The hon. member is out of order in referring to me by name. The hon. member for Albert said—

"Of course, there was a similar endeavour on the part of some of our Liberal colleagues to drive a wedge between the Country Party and Liberal Party teams at the last election."

So we still see enmity between the Liberal and Country Parties.

The hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha then came into the debate. He said—

"I was interested when the hon. member for Albert joined in the debate on the amendment."

He mentions the "honourable". Then he continued—

"I suppose one's first reaction would be to retaliate in similar terms. However, I feel that this contribution was so puerile and amateurish that I should treat it with the contempt that it so richly deserves."

If the hon. member for Albert wants to take the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha on for that, he is quite welcome. These are comments made by all these buddy-buddy fellows. The hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha was in an expansive mood. He was not taking on only the hon. member for Albert. He came in here just spoiling for a fight. He did not want to hide it in the Caucus room. He did not mind bringing the dissident groups into public gaze in this Chamber. He said, "If the hon. member for Condamine"—I think he nailed this fellow, and I congratulate him on the sentiments he expressed—"wishes to enter this debate in his role of assassin as he did in a previous debate on land matters in this

place, then let him do it and take the consequences." Yet the Premier had to get up at election-time and talk of the dissident groups in the A.L.P.

I do not want to play favourites, so I shall go back in time and quote another Country Party member to illustrate to the Chamber how palsy-walsy they have been over the years. In volume 236, pages 1152 and 1152, the hon. member for Gregory, dealing with land matters in the Supply debate, said—

"All of these dealings savour of a set-up indicating that there is indeed a great avenue for trafficking in land, which is accepted by the Government of which I am a member, and with which I am concerned and confused. It is not good enough!

.....
Overnight we see this shocking indictment on my own Government, of permitting a form of trafficking in lands by people who have no more right to do it than the man in the moon."

Mr. Rae: I still believe it.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I do not blame the hon. member for agreeing with his own contentions. It would be queer if he did not. I believe he was right at that time. Yet the Government goes around rubbishing the Australian Labour Party because of its dissident factions!

Government Members interjected.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I have related some of the things "Honest Frank" had to say.

Mr. Herbert: You wanted to be called the hon. member for Salisbury so give the Premier his proper title.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: All right, the hon. the Premier. I do not mind at all. But do not forget that the Government owes its life in this Chamber to its use of the term "Honest Frank". That is the propaganda they have disseminated, that they are led by a man named "Honest Frank" and that the members of the Opposition are more or less dishonest.

Mr. Sullivan: Are you implying that he is not honest?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I shall let the hon. member form his own judgment. He should take the wax out of his ears and follow my remarks. I do not think the Premier has lived up to what he said.

Mr. Sullivan: The people of Queensland will not thank you much for saying that.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Let us see what "Dishonest Gordon" said on page 21 of his policy speech. Under the heading "Cheaper Travel for Suburban Dwellers" the Treasurer said five months ago—

"But the most progressive feature of our Railway policy for the next three years is an undertaking that we will grapple with suburban transport.

"The Railway Department does not agree with the viewpoint that metropolitan transport fares should rise steeply, as has been the policy inflicted on the people of Brisbane by a Labour Party-dominated Brisbane City Council."

He then went out to pledge himself by saying, "We therefore announce that this Government will, on its return to office, make every effort to maintain cheap travel for suburban dwellers." Not five months later, having "rubbished" the Brisbane City Council by saying that the increase in the cost of living at that time was caused mainly by City Council fare increases and having used that statement politically, in his policy speech, to wheedle a few more votes out of suburban train travellers, the Treasurer announces in his Budget an increase of 25 per cent. in suburban rail fares.

In addition, he has slugged country travellers with an increase of 20 per cent. Whom does the Treasurer think he is deluding? Whom is he hitting? Those who will suffer most are those on low wages who have no alternative means of transport. It is all very well for the Treasurer who drives round in his ministerial car. This 25 per cent. increase is hitting those people who have no other means of transport.

Mr. Carey: You cannot pick on me for this because I haven't a railway.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: He probably pulled up the railway line so as not to embarrass the hon. member for Albert.

I would be remiss in my duty if I did not make a very strong protest at the Minister's turnabout action in increasing rail fares for suburban travellers by 25 per cent. Most of the electorate that I represent is serviced by the railway.

Mr. Sullivan: Very handy to have.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: It might be, but soon one will not be able to afford to use it. It will be cheaper to "Walk with Gordon Chalk". What does this mean? At present people living in the Inala area pay a weekly concession fare of approximately 22s. 3d. The increase will amount to approximately 8s. a week for the breadwinner of the family.

The Treasurer said, "We don't believe in the fare increases inflicted by the Brisbane City Council." Then, having regained his seat in Parliament, he proceeds to slug train travellers.

Worse still is what he has done for country people. What I like about the Treasurer is the way in which, having announced the increase in rail fares and road permit fees, he promptly dumped into the lap of the Minister for Transport the task of working out the details. That is the way in which he has treated country people, for whom he has wept crocodile tears when telling us how they have been affected by the drought. I think that the people of Queensland were misled into voting for this Government, and the Premier

should be very careful when he says, "Out of their own mouths they condemn themselves."

I wish to refer to that part of the Treasurer's policy speech in which he spoke in terms of development. I shall not waste time by turning up the page. He spoke about the development of Weipa, Moura, and so on. Of course, he regards all this as development. Selling our natural resources, oil well by oil well, quarry by quarry, mine by mine, and paddock by paddock—that is what the Government of Queensland likes to refer to as development.

What are we developing by exporting raw materials from this State? We are developing foreign-based companies who come to the State, take the wealth from its ground, ship it overseas and manufacture it into articles to be returned to these shores to compete against Australian-made products. We are developing secondary industries in other countries; we are providing employment for people overseas. The Commonwealth Government is forcing the States to pawn their heritage merely to obtain money for the development of industry.

Mr. Hughes: You would prefer the true story.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The hon. member may be able to convince his kitchen study group on this subject, but I point out to him that Australia could well be warned by the example of Canada in this regard, where 60 per cent. of industry was owned by American companies. Those companies exploited the raw materials in Canada and after processing in the U.S.A. the finished product was sent back to Canada. In 1962 Canada had one of the highest percentages of unemployment in the world. In fact, the election in that year was won and lost on the question of foreign investment.

Even the Leader of the Country Party in the Federal Parliament has repeatedly issued warnings about the lack of control of foreign investment within our shores. If the hon. member believes that shipping raw materials overseas is developing this country, he will believe Hans Andersen's fairy tales.

Mr. Chinchin: Do you believe that overseas balances are important?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The hon. member would sell his soul for a few thousand pounds. He would rather see raw materials going overseas than see them developed here.

Mr. Chinchin: How do you develop coal in your own country?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: What use would it be my explaining the use of coal for the production of thermal power? I have heard members of the Government speak in this Chamber of developing hydro-electric power in Queensland. There is no river in the State that flows fast enough or has the volume to produce hydro-electric

power cheaply. Hon. members on the Government benches do not realise that the only way of generating electricity cheaply and efficiently in Queensland is by thermal power. I do not intend to even try to explain to the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt how the State could develop its own coal resources.

The Government is content to obtain only peanuts in royalties, yet the whole basis of wealth and development in this State—in fact, in any country—depends upon the establishment of manufacturing processes using the State's own raw materials. It is scandalous that Moonie oil is being pumped past two oil refineries. It is probably the greatest farce that has ever been seen in Queensland. The only people who have made money out of the oil found in Queensland have been those who invested in shares. We have the spectacle of this oil from Moonie being pumped past two of our refineries. Can hon. members opposite tell me that that is economic?

Mr. Hughes: Taking your attitude to its logical conclusion Labour would never have developed Weipa.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Here we get back to the Mrs. Grundy attitude about developing Weipa. What development is at Weipa? Ore is being dug out of the ground and shipped to Gladstone, to be made into alumina oxide, which in turn is to be shipped overseas for the making of the finished product. Queensland is doing the hard work and getting little of the return. I do not think the people of this State deserve to be treated in the manner in which they have been treated by this Government.

I want to briefly speak on another important subject. Over the six or seven years that I have been in this Parliament, I do not think that one year has passed without a Treasurer coming into this Chamber and blaming the drought for the bad budget he had to introduce. This evening we heard the hon. member for Fassifern speaking about water conservation. He is about the only member of the Government to whom I care to listen, and the only member of the Government with whose views I would agree on water conservation not only in Queensland but throughout Australia.

As I have said, in every one of the last seven years Treasurers have been coming into this Chamber and blaming drought for the drop in revenue. That is fair enough; the drought may have caused a drop in revenue, but what have we done about it? When the State goes through these periods of droughts, surely lessons should be learned. Surely one thing that should be driven into even the thickest skull would be the need for water conservation, yet what do we find?

Mr. Knox interjected.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Of course the hon. member does not like figures being thrown back at him. One of the troubles with our Treasurer is that he suffers from "vocalular" amnesia.

Mr. Miller: That is a clever one.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Of course; it is beyond the hon. member's capacity to think of, let alone be able to understand it. It means that the Treasurer is a very bad suffer from acute "vocalular" amnesia; in other words, he does not want to remember what he said five months ago in his election policy speech.

Mr. Sullivan: Why don't you talk intelligently like that all the time?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: If the hon. member is intelligent, let him come outside and I will endeavour to arrange an intelligent conversation between him and a monkey.

As I say, Treasurers have been coming into this Chamber and bemoaning the fact that drought has had an adverse effect on the trading balance of the various departments of our State, and what do we find? I will not use 1958 or 1959 figures; I will be kind and allow the Government two years in office. In 1960-61 the Government spent \$4,500,000 on irrigation and water supply. In 1959-60, the year before, they spent \$5,300,000. In other words, there was a drop of \$1,000,000 in that year, and in 1966, after the Treasurers have moaned and groaned about the effects of drought, they are still spending only \$5,900,000 on irrigation and water supply in this State.

What does the Premier say in regard to the use of the Snowy Mountains Authority? He got on the stump at Maroochydore and said—

"The possibility of using Snowy Mountains Authority personnel to expedite investigation and implementation of water resources development in Queensland was realised long before the present popular demand was made."

He went on to say—

"In the past five years the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission has obtained the assistance of the Authority on specific tasks. These included detailed design of spillways for two dams, preliminary investigations of three dams and selection of sites and other works."

Does the Premier consider that in that way he is putting an adequate case to the Commonwealth Government for the use of the Snowy Mountain Authority personnel? I am sure that the people of Queensland, particularly the farmers, pastoralists and graziers who, over the years, have suffered from the drought, would not. Do not forget that we have not had true seasonal rain since 1956, so their difficulties go back at least 10 years. Surely the farmers and any right-thinking people who see the tragedy of our coastal rivers flowing into the sea and western rivers

drying up in drought-time are not going to be satisfied with the words of the Premier when he says that the Government received advice on how to build a couple of spillways and on the selection of sites for another couple of dams.

I am not being political about this. I do not care who started the Snowy Mountains scheme. The greatest piece of developmental work that this country has seen in the whole of its history was the implementation of the Snowy Mountains scheme because of the tremendous benefit it has been to Victoria and New South Wales. Nobody will deny that. I do not want to claim any political credit for its implementation. The Snowy Mountains scheme was envisaged by people who realised what could be done by the applied use of capital for water conservation and hydro-electric development. The greatest tragedy we are witnessing today is that already the design section of the Snowy Mountains Authority is being lost to Australia because of staff retrenchments. I do not think the Premier and Treasurer of this State are doing Queensland sufficient service unless they make a strong demand on the Commonwealth Government to preserve intact the Snowy Mountains Authority and to ensure that its personnel are put to good use in this State.

Queensland has a narrow rainfall belt down the coastal extremity, with a vast amount of land in a relatively dry area. Realising what can be achieved by the harnessing of our various large rivers for hydro-electric development and water conservation schemes, we must accept the fact that we cannot afford to go on approaching the problems of droughts merely by the handing out of miserable grants by way of drought relief. For far too long have we adopted the attitude that when a drought comes we will give the man on the land a few lousy quid to buy fodder.

I wish to refer briefly to the last drought and the performance of this Government in granting drought relief. The initial grant to dairy farmers and others who suffered from the drought was £500. This assistance was not made available until fodder had reached the astronomical price of £82 a ton after a buying ring had come here from New South Wales and bought up every bit of available fodder at a high price. By the time the farmers got this grant of £500 they received the equivalent of six tons of fodder which would not keep any decent herd going.

Mr. Sullivan: That is not the picture throughout the State. The price was not £82 a ton throughout the State.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: It may not have been £82 a ton generally but a lot of farmers were paying that much.

Mr. Sullivan: That is what you are saying.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I am saying that it averaged £82 a ton throughout the State. The hon. member must have been lucky and had a few mates and got in early.

Mr. Sullivan: I conserved mine. You said it was £82 a ton. Tell the true story.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The hon. member should be the last person to talk of telling the truth after having tried to "rubbish" decent labour men by coming into this chamber and peddling his filthy propaganda.

The Opposition can only use the expedient of moving a motion to reduce by \$2.00 the vote to defray the salary of the aid-de-camp.

A Government Member: Why do you want to cut him down?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: If I thought we could win on the vote, I would give him the \$2.00 myself. Unfortunately, although we may win the argument it does not matter if we have not the numbers. This is the only way in which we can express our resentment and the resentment of the people to the 25 per cent. increase in railway fares that will take effect in November. I repeat that the argument of my colleagues and mine should have awakened the people of this State to the fact that they can no longer trust this Government. If the Government's performance in the short five months of its present term is any indication of its performance as a government in the remainder of its three-year period of office, the people will realise only too well that they can no longer trust it. Unfortunately the people of Queensland must suffer hon. members opposite for another two years and seven months. I believe that the people of Queensland will not forget that the Minister for Transport went back on a promise he made to preserve low suburban railways fares.

Mr. LICKISS (Mt. Coot-tha) (9.28 p.m.): I listened with a great deal of amusement to the speech of the hon. member who has just resumed his seat. I also listened with a great deal of interest to the slanging match across the Chamber resulting from his remarks. May I say that I propose to treat his rather loud and empty ravings with the contempt they so richly deserve.

No-one will deny that the Treasurer has had a very difficult task in presenting a balanced Budget and at the same time providing for the continued development of the State. It would have been much easier to cut back on our pace of development. Indeed, this would have been politically more comfortable, but I suggest it would have been contrary to the interests of the State. Consequently, I admire the Treasurer for taking this stand.

Hon. members opposite have seen fit to attack certain aspects of the additional taxation. However, I have noted with a great deal of interest that they have not offered any alternative constructive suggestions. Indeed, each hon. member opposite still required the same amount, or even greater expenditure, this year within his own area.

No-one likes to see additional taxes imposed, and I suggest that the Treasurer would be the last to do so.

It is indeed unfortunate that the spheres from which the State may draw its taxes are few. I, for one, would like to see all the States in partnership with the Commonwealth Government, playing a far greater role in raising finance, through taxation, to meet the States' financial requirements.

This afternoon the hon. member for South Coast advocated the setting up of a co-operative milk distribution point in Brisbane for the marketing of milk, presumably within the Brisbane milk district. I believe it is only right and proper that members should advocate matters which directly affect them and their areas. However, I further believe that, in making such presentation of cases, the true position should be recorded.

The hon. member dealt at some length with a report of the activities of a firm known as Queensland United Foods Ltd., and I think he will admit that the over-all activities of this company (a Queensland company) are fairly wide. It should be congratulated on its wide diversification. However, the main issue to which I took exception was what appeared to me to be an implication that, whilst the general diverse activities of the company showed some losses, it could be construed from his statements that the dairy farmer was losing out by that operation. By interjection, I mentioned that his statements were completely unfair and I now feel it is my obligation to this Committee to substantiate those remarks.

It has been known for quite some time that a move has been afoot to try to have established in Brisbane a co-operative association to bottle and distribute milk in this area. There are, I believe, certain more relevant facts than those that I shall mention here, but I consider that these will hinge more on the actual source of milk supply in this area. In this regard, I believe that there will be an increasing necessity to deliver milk into the Brisbane area from farther afield, firstly because of the expanding growth of Brisbane, into some dairying areas, but more so because of an increasing population, necessitating a larger quantitative supply. However, these matters could be discussed as a separate issue.

Dealing with this particular issue, that is, Brisbane milk processing and distribution, I consider that the points I will raise should be examined in great detail when any variation to the present milk marketing system is under consideration. These points are—

No other capital city has a lower retail milk price than Brisbane;

There is no place in Australia where the margin between the housewife's price for milk and the farmer's price is less: in

other words, the farmer gets a higher percentage of the retail price of milk in Brisbane than in any other place in Australia.

It may be said that the processing and distribution of milk in Brisbane is a monopoly. If so, it is a completely controlled monopoly, because the Brisbane Milk Board fixes the margin at which processors operate and also fixes the margin at which retail vendors operate. Operating costs are checked in great detail by a qualified cost accountant, formerly employed in the Queensland Prices Branch, and margins allowed by the Milk Board are based on these costs.

The present system minimises both processing and distribution costs. It means that high quality and highly efficient plant can be installed for processing, and it means also that the placing of suburban cold-storage depots can be carefully planned. The present system of retail depots ensures that no vendor has to travel more than $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 miles from the depot to his most remote customer.

This system of controlled monopoly appears to be recognised by the Government, as is evidenced by the granting of milk franchises in other cities and towns in Queensland. A franchise gives the company concerned the sole right to process milk in a given area, so keeping costs down.

The system of consolidation in milk processing and distribution is forced on the industry by economics. The small companies just cannot survive on the margins permitted. I propose to discuss the actual cost structure in a moment. Brisbane had many milk processing companies years ago, including two co-operative companies each of which "went under" due to inability to operate on the margins allowed. Sydney, which is four times as large as Brisbane, has two large milk processors and one very small one. Brisbane now has two plants.

I suppose it will be argued that in effect Brisbane has only one. The two companies, namely, Peters-Arctic Delicacy Co. Ltd. and Pauls Ice Cream & Milk Ltd., formed a holding company known as Queensland United Foods Ltd., to prevent takeovers by southern firms and overseas interests. In other words, they are to be congratulated that they have retained their Queensland identity. That is all in their favour. In Melbourne, where there have been a number of plants, the process of consolidation is accelerating. One of the larger companies acquired seven of the smaller companies in the last 14 months.

I think it is worthy of note that the plants in Brisbane are capable of producing at least 35 per cent. more than their current throughput. It is necessary to provide this surplus capacity to make sure that

the milk supply of Brisbane is guaranteed. If a further plant is opened, however, this will mean that capital is spent on still further surplus capacity for no extra turnover, while in addition the very high cost of suburban depots, which is between \$25,000 and \$50,000 each, will be increased. At the moment there are 18 such depots in the Brisbane area, and no doubt this number will have to be increased with the expansion of subdivisional development and the consequent population increase. It is obvious that in these circumstances the increased costs will result in either a lower price to the farmer or a higher price to the housewife, or both.

The estimated capital cost of equipment necessary to provide the present facility would, I suggest, exceed \$4,000,000.

The establishment of a minimum economic unit, with vehicles and some depots, could exceed \$1,000,000.

The primary producer (the milk supplier) has a further benefit at the moment in that milk rejected for the pasteurised milk trade delivered by bulk tanker can, at his option, be diverted to the Kingston Butter Factory for processing.

Whilst, as mentioned, the processing of milk in the metropolitan area might be considered a monopoly, I suggest that the ramifications of the industry generally, from the producer level to the consumer's obtaining the product, in many respects make it not unlike the sugar industry in that the cost structure is rigidly controlled at all levels.

It is evident that the intrusion of another processor, at least at this stage, would tend to over-capitalise the processing and marketing of the product with a consequent adverse price fluctuation, and, with the event of such a separate processing and marketing organisation, it is unlikely that the over-all consumption of milk would increase. In fact, it is more likely that, because of increased price, consumption could decrease as a result of buyer resistance.

The rigid control by the Milk Board at the level of processing and distribution for the Brisbane milk market ensures that the primary producer receives equitable treatment. Indeed, in comparison with other States, the primary producer in Queensland appears to be receiving a far better percentage of the total cost structure than he does elsewhere.

The inference from the remarks of the hon. member for South Coast this afternoon was that the producer was losing because the profit from the bottling and distribution was being used to bolster losing sections of the company's operations. I went to the trouble of taking out figures that I think will prove my case conclusively.

The figures are those shown in the determination of the Brisbane Milk Board in December, 1965, and they are as follows—

		Gallon
		c
Cost of milk	42.594
Cost of processing	11.464
		<hr/>
	Total	54.058
Selling Price	55.2
		(gazetted)
Margin	1.142 or
		.143 a pint.

The sale price through retail outlets is 9c a pint.

I mentioned this afternoon that the statement by the hon. member for South Coast was completely unfair and that, by using certain figures, he could calculate the true position. In the year 1965-66, 20,700,000 gallons of milk were processed. By a simple calculation based on 1.142c a gallon, one finds that the gross profit on this quantity was \$236,900. If one subtracts from that \$100,682 in tax at the rate of 42½ per cent., which is the tax applicable, it leaves a net profit of \$136,217 on a capital investment of about \$4,000,000. Again by a very simple calculation, one can ascertain that on a gross profit basis this gives a return of between 5 per cent. and 6 per cent., and, on a net profit basis, a return of between 3 per cent. and 4 per cent.

Already the industry has absorbed a basic wage increase of \$1.30 within the cost structure since that date, so it will be obvious to all hon. members that this type of operation can be maintained and give equity to both housewife and producer only if it is based on the volume throughput of the plant. Today it is still running 35 per cent. under capacity.

If the hon. member for South Coast now thinks that he owes some apology for being critical of a very great Queensland company, which has the whole of its milk-bottling operations rigidly controlled and finally audited to the nth degree, I think it should be forthcoming.

Mr. Hinze: The case is not a bit convincing; in fact, it is pathetically weak.

Mr. LICKISS: One cannot penetrate rock; I am sorry.

I might mention that with the producer supplying to the processor, particularly to the fresh milk market in Brisbane, one of the vital considerations in extending the area catering for direct suppliers will be continuity of supply. One would think that in his advocacy for this important industry the hon. member would advocate such action as would directly benefit the whole industry and not be sectional in his approach. One would also feel that his advocacy would be in line with the interests of the producer.

In these matters I think a reasoned approach should be made, and I suggest to

the Minister for Primary Industries that if this matter is, in fact—and I trust that it is not—in the melting pot, a very thorough cost investigation should be a prerequisite. Here we have the benefit of a company that is prepared to subject itself to statutory regulation and control and, in fact, to operate at a profit on which no co-operative would be prepared to operate—that is, a net profit of between 3 per cent. and 4 per cent. on a capital investment of some \$4,000,000—and is prepared to provide the smallest margin as between the housewife and the producer. In other words, the processor receives the smallest amount for his activity and huge capital investment, and the beneficiaries, of course, are the producer on the one hand and the housewife on the other.

I believe that, far from being criticised, this company, which is active in Queensland as a purely Queensland company, should be congratulated.

Mr. BROMLEY (Norman) (9.47 p.m.): I want to preface my remarks on the Budget by referring briefly to the Honourable John Duggan, and say that in this instance the word "honourable", which is used so loosely in this Chamber, is a true description of this man's courage, ability, and his many outstanding qualifications. To my way of thinking, the incident that was unfortunately raised last week, and received such wide publicity in the Press, will not react unfavourably against this man, whom I consider to be a friend of mine and a friend of people in all walks of life, including those who move in Christian circles. To say that he has lost the confidence and friendship of those who really matter in this world would be untrue. I publicly state my full appreciation of his assistance to many people and to this State, and I wish John Duggan, as well as his wife and family, the best of everything in the future, including good health.

I also want to sincerely thank the Treasurer, the Honourable Gordon Chalk, for his very Christian-like remarks and attitude last week after the momentous announcement by Mr. Duggan. His words were commendable, and a facet of his character perhaps not generally known was revealed.

Now, with all due respect to the Treasurer, I will move on to the Budget debate and support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I say first of all that it is a shocking indictment of the Government that its Whip cannot command enough speakers from the Government benches.

At this stage I welcome the Premier back from overseas and say that I think he did a good job for Queensland in the short time he was away. However, because he was away last week an unfortunate incident occurred, when the Committee did not sit last Thursday night because we could not get any speakers from the Government

benches. Surely if the Ministers have any capacity at all some of them should have been able to address the Committee on the Budget. It was a shocking state of affairs and an indictment of the Government, which says it represents the people. The Treasurer himself said that the Budget debate was a particularly important event in the session.

I have already expressed appreciation of the Treasurer's remarks on the former Leader of the Opposition, but after studying the implications of the Budget there is much to be said in condemnation of him. Whether he has been correctly advised or not I do not know, but the people of Queensland are saying that the contents of the Budget are not in their best interests or the best interests of Queensland.

Although the Treasurer said that the Budget debate was a very important event in the parliamentary session, hon. members opposite have shown that they are not sufficiently interested to rise to their feet. Let me pose to Government members the question, "What is a Budget?" Apparently some of them do not seem to know what it is, and certainly they do not seem to care. At page 646 of "Chambers's Encyclopaedia" we learn that the term "Budget" was derived from the French word "bougette", which means "a small bag." According to this encyclopaedia it has been used to describe a compact collection of things like a budget of news. Although, according to the encyclopaedia "bougette" means "a small bag", I do not think this Budget is a small bag at all; in fact, I think it is a large bag. In his hunting capacity, in shooting down some of the people in the presentation of his Budget, the Treasurer is going to get a very big "bag" out of them.

Mr. Melloy: It is a wonder he didn't get the "sack".

Mr. BROMLEY: Not only the Treasurer, but the Government as a whole should resign. I am not being facetious about this. I have no doubt that later on, as more people realise the full implications of the Budget, they will heartily agree with me.

Mr. Lee: Wishful thinking.

Mr. BROMLEY: Whether it is wishful thinking or not, we have to look at the Budget from the point of view of the welfare of the people in general. Why should the people be hit right, left and centre, both by the Federal Government and by this State Government?

Mr. Lee: What budget have you got?

Mr. BROMLEY: We have not a budget here, but a large bag. In describing the "Budget", or the "bougette", this encyclopaedia says—

"Traditionally an exact balance must be shown in the account in order to maintain the strictest control over departmental outlay."

Certainly I consider that all Treasurers should endeavour to balance their Budgets, but I do not agree that we must have a balanced Budget on every occasion. I believe that there are certain times of stress, such as we have been through recently, when any Government or any Treasurer should be prepared to take a risk and spend more money than has been appropriated. However, I do not believe that we should milk the people to pay for it. When all is said and done, there is a section of the community that is better able to provide the money that the State needs.

A Government Member: What section?

Mr. BROMLEY: If the hon. member wants to know, I can deal with that. I am referring to the big firms that the hon. member for Nudgee spoke about, the firms that are making tremendous profits.

Mr. Lee: Many of them are not Queensland firms.

Mr. BROMLEY: That is true. Some are overseas controlled, and more and more firms throughout Queensland and Australia are becoming overseas controlled. The State Government and the Federal Government are selling the country's birthright. It is shocking that we have to sell Queensland's assets, or give them away. I will not take up my time in instancing to the Committee what we have given away, such as what has happened at North West Cape and in North Queensland, and in areas similar to the King Ranch land, which was given away for a mere song. Nor do I intend to deal at length with what the encyclopedia says about the Budget, and how it should be balanced.

On page 1 of his Financial Statement the Treasurer said that this Parliament has always been careful to preserve the many privileges and powers that it enjoys. I notice that the word "powers" is not underlined; nevertheless, whether we like it or not, the powers are there and the people are suffering as a result. The Treasurer said that in his opinion the most important day in the calendar of the Legislative Assembly is the day on which the Budget is presented. Most people agree today that the 28th day of May, when they went to the polls to elect the Government and gave it the so-called privileges and powers to impose this harsh Budget on them, was a disastrous one for Queensland. As time unfolds, the people will feel the pinch in their pockets just as when time unfolds they will rue the election day of 28 May when they returned to the Treasury benches this money-hungry, power-hungry Government.

Many statements have been made about the effects of drought. I agree that it is perhaps one of the most disastrous things that has happened in Queensland, and in Australia as a whole. I do not think anyone could argue that the economy has not been seriously affected. Year after year the graziers have suffered the effects of drought.

They know that there is always a possibility of drought, but nothing has been done by the Government to help them. Year after year the Government did nothing. We warned it. When we were in Government we attempted to do something about water conservation so that droughts would not have such a serious effect. I frequently spoke on the need for water conservation. The water is available. I have told hon. members previously about the tremendous volume of water that runs off in the northern part of Queensland, and about the water from our streams and from rainfall that goes to waste year after year.

Why should Queensland continually be the Cinderella State when it comes to spending money on construction? Hon. members opposite may say that we have had a large amount of money allocated for beef roads. But if we do nothing about offsetting the effects of drought or to help the people on the land, and if they will do nothing to help themselves, there will be no cattle or sheep to transport along the beef roads, so what is the good of having them?

The Commonwealth Government should wake up to its responsibilities. First things should come first, and the first need is money for water conservation. If our technicians can implement the Snowy River scheme, which was commenced by a Labour Government, why can't they do something like that in Queensland? The first requirement is water conservation to help the man on the land. In that way we would help the State's economy. It would become stabilised. That would help in what I term "decentralised centralisation". For those who are not familiar with that phrase, I shall explain what I mean. Many of our small townships are going out of existence and the people are migrating to the coastal cities. Under a system of decentralised centralisation we would build larger towns and establish industries in them. These towns would be farther apart than the small towns that are going out of existence. In that way we would provide employment and stop the drift from those towns, and so develop Queensland.

On page 1 of the Financial Statement the Treasurer said—

"The overall situation was an increase in unemployment during the year to an average of 1.8 per cent. of the work force."

I do not like unemployment. If we do something in the line of decentralised centralisation and build larger towns, even at the expense of the smaller towns, and provide greater incentive to the people to stay there, and to the farmers, there could be less unemployment. No-one can deny that many of our townships are dying slowly. We do not like to see that, because this is a vast country that should be developed and populated.

I want to see the State industrialised, and the only way to bring this about is to spend money on water conservation. That is the most necessary thing, because all industries need great quantities of water. If small towns are developed, I believe they will be a great asset to the State and that Queensland will further prosper. I say in all sincerity that if the Government, and Queenslanders in general, are not prepared to take the bit in their teeth and build up these towns and have industries established in them, the unemployment situation will worsen and the drift from small towns will continue.

Only recently I was speaking to a very good friend of mine who told me that a large oil company is closing down its Brisbane headquarters and sending all its accounts to Sydney, where it has automated methods, and is going to employ only about eight people here. That is a rather shocking state of affairs. After hearing this, I made it my business to find out if it was correct. It is in fact true. I shall not identify the oil company beyond saying that it is a well-known, world-wide organisation.

Recently I attended a conference in Perth, and I made it my business to discuss the industrialisation of Queensland with business people on the way to Perth. I was shocked when they told me that if the economy of Queensland did not stabilise and improve, more of the sort of thing to which I have just referred would happen; firms in the southern States would close down their subsidiaries in Queensland and transfer their accounts sections and other types of business administration to the South. There would then be more unemployment and more people leaving Queensland for the South, with a consequent downward trend in the population of Queensland.

On page 1 of the Financial Statement the Treasurer says that his predecessor, Sir Thomas Hiley, introduced nine successive Budgets. He did not say that most of them were designed to balance, nor did he mention the number that finished up with deficits. The Treasurer said that Sir Thomas Hiley brought a very fine brain to the Treasury. All that I can say is that he did not leave it there. The present Treasurer said that he was making a further progressive step. He said it was his personal belief that opportunity should be provided for every Queensland to become better acquainted with the methods being adopted to "touch" him. Although he did not use those exact words, that is what he meant.

Mr. Carey: That is a Labour phrase. We would not say that.

Mr. BROMLEY: Hon. members opposite may not use certain words, but they adopt certain practices. Perhaps the ordinary layman will agree that he can obtain a clear understanding from the Treasurer's words. All I can say is that when he starts to find at the end of each week an ever-decreasing amount of money in his pocket, he will

understand how he is being "touched". I have spoken to many people, including those on low and fixed incomes, and they have told me that already their stomachs and pockets are feeling the effects of the Budget. They do not want an introduction to the Treasurer, either personally or through his Budget, because they are being affected adversely.

I do not say that there should not be a deficit at times. If the Budget can be balanced, so much the better; but at times such as this, when the people of all Australian States are feeling the effects of the "lousy" Commonwealth Budget introduced recently, the Government should do its best to hold on for another 12 months or two years and provide the people of Queensland with a better standard of living, even if it means budgeting for a deficit. The people should not be the milking cow year after year. If the Government of Queensland is as intelligent as it claims to be, it should realise that it can continue for 12 months or two years with a growing deficit so that the people will not be affected adversely. I believe that a deficit can be reduced over the years.

Mr. Low: How? You are not a realist.

Mr. BROMLEY: I am a realist, and I do not believe that too much time should be taken up by any one speaker in the Budget debate. I think an hour is too long, and I think we should have more time to discuss the Estimates. This would enable us to make constructive suggestions. However, if we did make them, would anyone take any notice of them? Probably not. With all due respect to the hon. member for Cooroora, I think we should endeavour to find some way of assisting the people.

In the first paragraph on page 2 of the Financial Statement, the Treasurer deals with the accumulated deficit in the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and in the second paragraph he says that no provision was made in last year's Estimates for the receipt of \$7,500,000 for drought relief. If Sir Thomas Hiley had planned to receive this extra money from the Commonwealth Government the deficit would have been even higher, so I suppose the Treasurer was fortunate in that respect. Anyone who has studied the Financial Statement will agree that this is a "crying" Budget, and I am being charitable in saying that.

The Treasurer then dealt with cash balances and investments, and later with the public debt. Although I am not happy about the increase in the gross public debt, I will admit that I am not very concerned about it.

Mr. Carey: Are you having two bob each way?

Mr. BROMLEY: No, I am being serious about it. I believe that in a young country such as this, a country that is growing, a country with a great future—I never use the word "potential", which is a rotten word;

I think it stinks—something should be done to develop the State. If it is to develop as it should, we should not worry very much whether the gross public debt increases or not, because I sincerely believe that posterity should be called upon to pay for some of the things that are being provided now and that people will enjoy in later years. I think that is fairly reasonable. I do not think the people of the present day and age should have to meet all this debt. Let us get ahead with the expansion of the country and not worry too much about the accumulated debt.

I wanted to deal in detail with the Budget, so it looks as if I will have to go through it and deal with it as I go. If we do expand—and I sincerely hope we do—I believe that posterity will reap the benefit of what we do today, so let us be constructive; let us build things, not destroy them. There is too much destruction going on in the world today. Money can be found for destructive purposes, but when one asks for something for constructive purposes money is not available. Just think of the money that would have been available for the building of homes and for the development of the State from the cost of recent crashes in the Air Force alone. I do not want to get onto Federal matters, but I believe that we should do something with the money we have available, and no-one can deny that it is available. If there was a full-scale war tomorrow money would be available for it. Let us spend money on constructive things in Queensland. Let us build homes for people; let us think of the aged and of people in the low-income group; let us do something for them, and let us be genuine about it.

On page 4 the Treasurer deals with loans and loan money, which all ties up with the development of the State. Because of the inflationary period through which we are going, I believe that local authorities should be allowed to borrow more money. At the same time, of course, I think that the Government should keep a close rein on the spending of that money. It should know why it is to be spent and where it is to be spent, and I think it should advise on how it is to be spent.

On page 5 of the Financial Statement the Treasurer refers to the Wilbur Smith traffic plan. This is a tremendously important subject and one with which I should have liked to deal at considerable length, because I have many submissions, suggestions and ideas that in my opinion would be of great assistance. They are criticisms, but at the same time they are criticisms which, in many respects, might help. It is a matter of tremendous importance to the people, both directly and indirectly.

On the same page, page 5, mention is made of decimal currency, and at this stage I should like to congratulate the staffs in Government departments generally, and in the Treasury, for the wonderful manner in

which they handled the change-over to decimal currency. I think they did a tremendous job. I do not want to dwell again on the shocking job that business people have done in the decimal currency change-over. I spoke about this matter on Grievance Day and the Minister for Labour and Tourism, who is in the Chamber, very courteously wrote me a letter about my grievance. However, I could not quite get the gist of the letter because he said that the matter did not come within the purview or the control of his department. Nevertheless, I appreciated his writing the letter and I repeat that, as far as the change-over to decimal currency is concerned, the Government, or its departments anyway, should be congratulated.

Again on page 5 the Treasurer deals with the purchase of stock—sheep and cattle—for the re-stocking of properties. I say again that I have the greatest sympathy, and to some extent admiration, for people on the land. I certainly have great sympathy for graziers who have to re-stock after the drought. I agree with the Treasurer that this will be expensive. Although I have nothing here to prove it, I say without fear of contradiction that balance sheets and interim tax returns from certain pastoral companies and graziers, whom I will not name, will show that last year they made their greatest profit in history, in some cases, running into well over \$1,000,000. That can be proved by perusing some of the balance sheets. I say "Good luck to them."

Mr. Low interjected.

Mr. BROMLEY: I realise that they had to sell their stock because of fear of losses through the drought. I am not blaming them. Graziers and pastoral companies who made such tremendous profits should be given some consideration by the Commonwealth Government. Perhaps this may not be the place to air the suggestion, but I think the Commonwealth Government should assist these pastoral companies and graziers by assessing their income tax over a number of years instead of saying, "Last year you made so much money. You sold so many stock for so much and you have to pay a huge amount in income tax."

Mr. Rae: We can get a five-year average now.

Mr. BROMLEY: You can get that all the time?

Mr. Rae: Only if we elect to do it. You can be taxed every year as the ordinary person is, or have a five-year plan.

Mr. BROMLEY: I understand that. The point I am trying to make is that these last 12 or 18 months have been a tremendous strain on the man on the land. Although I realise that there is a plan for five-yearly payments I sincerely believe that in this

particular case, because they have to borrow money to re-stock—where they are going to get it from, I do not know—

Mr. Lee: Out of these big profits you just spoke about.

Mr. BROMLEY: I am trying to make some sensible suggestions. Admittedly they made profits. I am not denying that. I said that they had to sell their stock. The Commonwealth Government should adopt a sympathetic attitude and say, "You made so much profit this year. We will give you a 10-year plan so that you will have 10 years to pay your income tax." As an analogy, I refer to the champion boxer whose life in the ring is approximately, say, five years. During those five years he can make a tremendous amount of money. I know that because I have been associated with the boxing game for many years. During his fighting life the champion boxer can be called upon to pay tremendous amounts in income tax. Once he retires from the ring he goes down to a lower tax bracket.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. BROMLEY: Even if the Country Party are not interested, I am making a sincere plea on behalf of the graziers. If hon. members opposite do not like it, they can jump in the lake.

Mr. Lee: What lake? There is no water.

Mr. BROMLEY: Let the hon. member jump in a glass of water. That is about as deep as he is.

This all boils down to the fact that there is an extreme need for additional water conservation schemes in Queensland, and more money should be made available for this purpose.

On page 6 of his Financial Statement the Treasurer refers to water conservation, education, drought, and relief from the Federal Government. I do not wish to take up time by reading what the Treasurer said. It is already recorded in "Hansard".

Mr. Herbert: Hear, hear!

Mr. BROMLEY: Now that the Minister for Tourism, in a sarcastic way, has said, "Hear, hear", I will quote what the Treasurer said—

"However, I must repeat my early public expression of disappointment that the only aid afforded us towards the factor of loss of revenue by drought is \$2,750,000. As we have already lost in the vicinity of \$8,000,000 from this cause and I estimate that we shall lose a further \$9,000,000 from the same cause in 1966-67, I can only state that the help given in this direction is totally inadequate."

That is in strong contrast to the terms of the private member's motion that was on the Business Paper and in the debate on which Government members rose with tongue in cheek, one after another like little lambs,

to praise the Federal Government for its tremendous assistance to this State. This was done, yet in his Financial Statement the Treasurer in his own words castigated the Federal Government for the very minute assistance rendered to Queensland.

Mr. Campbell: Read what he said at page 10.

Mr. BROMLEY: I am reading from page 7 at the moment.

When we analyse the Treasurer's statement we see that he is blaming the Prime Minister and the Federal Government for the lack of assistance, yet Government members supported the private member's motion praising the Federal Government. On the previous page, in virtually the same breath, the Treasurer said—

"I am certain that there is nothing wrong with our economy that a few favourable seasons cannot and will not remedy."

I can only say that he is living in a dream world of his own when all he is hoping and praying for is a few favourable seasons. It is similar to all the talk we have heard about potential. We cannot have seasons made to order. We cannot say that next year or the year after will be a good season to lift our economy. The whole economy is up and down. I believe that the Treasurer is just hoping for the best.

On page 7 the Treasurer spoke about the university and about certain money that has been allocated for endowment, which represents an increase. That is very good to see, and we should see more of it. It is a shocking indictment on the Government, which has been attacked so often about lack of educational facilities, that it has decided to delay the building of the new university at Mt. Gravatt.

On the same page the Treasurer deals with increased motor vehicle registration fees. Other members have referred to this matter. The hon. member for Rockhampton South said he was in favour of the proposed increase. How could any right-minded person representing people in Parliament and in a city council say he is in favour of increased car registration fees?

Mr. Lee: You know that the average motorist is in favour of it if it goes back into roads.

Mr. BROMLEY: Is the hon. member for Yeronga in favour of increased car registration fees?

Mr. Lee: You know that the average motorist is in favour of it if it goes back into roads.

Mr. BROMLEY: Is the hon. member for Yeronga in favour of increased car registration fees? I am asking him to declare himself and say whether he is in favour or not. The people of his electorate can then judge him.

Mr. Nicklin: He is in favour, because it is going back into the construction of more roads.

Mr. BROMLEY: If it does. But it is not going to build more roads.

Mr. Sullivan: Of course we are in favour of it.

Mr. BROMLEY: They are all in favour of it. They are like sheep. But the main enjoyment of the person on a low fixed income is to use his car once a week to take his family out, or, in the case of a person with a sick wife, to take her out. That would be the only enjoyment she would get. The husband can go out only once a week because he cannot afford to buy more petrol. But he has to pay these increased registration fees. I appeal to the Government to allow a 25 per cent. reduction in registration fees to people on low, fixed incomes and more particularly to pensioners.

Mr. Campbell: Will you pay an extra 25 per cent. to match it?

Mr. BROMLEY: Yes. I am prepared to pay an extra 25 per cent. provided the Government does the right thing by these people. It will not cost very much. It will not take much away from road building, which the Premier mentioned. Before long the Premier will be a pensioner, although he will not retire on the pittance the pensioner gets from the Commonwealth Government today. I would allow the Premier a 25 per cent. reduction in registration fees if I could get from him an assurance that he will give serious consideration to my request, and then I would sing high praises for a week. I do not know whether he will commit himself, but I challenge him to do something in this regard. I believe that figures could be taken out tomorrow on what it would cost the Government to allow such a reduction. This is a serious plea, irrespective of the laughter of Government members. They could not care less about the ordinary people; they are not interested in them.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: He could not take those figures out, because no age is stated on the registration certificate.

Mr. BROMLEY: It would be simple. The pensioner himself would apply. There is no such thing as a problem that cannot be overcome. If the Government decides to do it, it will be doing something good.

Mr. Lee: How will you restrict the driving of the car to the pensioner?

Mr. BROMLEY: I am talking about registration fees. Obviously very few, if any, Government members, including the Premier—and I hate to say that—are in favour of doing anything for the pensioners, so I have another suggestion that I hope he will take notice of. The sooner the registration of vehicles is abandoned

altogether and a tax paid on the fuel used, the better. Those who use the roads more than others would pay heavier taxes through the amount of petrol used.

I think that is a fairly sensible approach to the matter. Those who use motor-cars only once or twice a week would have the privilege of owning them and would be taxed only in accordance with the use they made of the roads. Of course, the tax would mean that the price of petrol would be increased. The sooner the registration scheme is abandoned and a tax on petrol imposed in its place, the sooner the motorist, who is the milking cow for all Governments, will get a better deal. Those who can afford only two, three, or four gallons of petrol a week would still be able to enjoy ownership of a car. They would be able to take their families out, and have a car available in the event of sickness. There are many advantages in such a scheme, and I recommend it and hope that the Government will at least investigate it.

On page 8 of the Financial Statement the Treasurer drew a comparison between the State and Commonwealth Budgets. I feel that the sooner taxing powers are returned to the States, the better it will be. If complete State taxing rights were restored, I believe that Queensland would have a better chance of moving ahead. I was very interested to read the Treasurer's comparison with the Commonwealth Budget, because I believe that what he said contains a certain amount of merit. Although he has not said so, I believe that the Treasurer agrees with my view on State taxing rights. I see that the Treasurer is not going to commit himself. If he whistled, I know what tune it would be; it would be, "Yes, yes." The Treasurer makes this statement, which gives him away—

"I am stressing the importance of funds for capital works, as I firmly believe that shortage of such funds could be the biggest barrier to development of this State."

That is the answer that the Treasurer refused to give me a moment ago.

Mr. Chalk: How much longer have you to go?

Mr. BROMLEY: If the Treasurer is not interested in some of the things contained in the Budget, which he probably has already forgotten, I am here to remind him of them.

Mr. R. Jones: People are going to call it the "Walk-with-Chalk" Budget.

Mr. BROMLEY: The Treasurer will be walking a "chalk" line before long.

Mr. Chalk: You will, at the Q.C.E.—don't you worry.

Mr. BROMLEY: I have been on the Q.C.E. for 12 years.

Mr. Knox interjected.

Mr. BROMLEY: If the Minister for Transport wants to be personal, I can tell him that when unfortunately he was ill with

hepatitis, a person came to me and wanted to know who was the Chinese Minister for Transport. If he wants to get personal, I will do the same.

Mr. Chalk: You didn't know it was Ah Wong, did you?

Mr. BROMLEY: I know what he is.

In summarising the Financial Statement, the Treasurer went on to say—

"However, as far as our losses of revenue because of drought are concerned, the Commonwealth Government has agreed to contribute only \$2,750,000. This figure falls far short of our needs and, as I have already explained, we have been left with no alternative but to make increases in certain of our revenue charges."

That statement is in sharp contrast with the attitude of members of his Government who moved a private member's motion praising the Commonwealth Government for the assistance it has given this State. Obviously he is having two bob each way.

The Treasurer summarised his financial Statement; I intend now to summarise my thoughts on it. In all fairness, I say to the Treasurer that there are some good things in it—but very, very few.

Mr. Chalk: I know some good things come out of cheese; I did not know they came out of "chalk".

Mr. BROMLEY: The hon. gentleman should know the difference between chalk and cheese.

The increase of \$2 a week in the allowance to foster parents and charitable organisations who care for children boarded out to them is very good, but it is not before time. Shortly before the Budget was presented I asked the Minister for Labour and Tourism when he intended to alter the allowance, but he did not know. That is one of the good things in the Budget.

Not nearly enough money is being allocated for irrigation and water supply, but it is good to see that some sort of a start is being made with this important work. I give the Treasurer credit, too, for increasing university endowments.

At the bottom of page 9 of the Financial Statement there is reference to the commencement of a scheme for the rehabilitation of the dairy industry, with an initial appropriation of \$750,000. Unfortunately the dairy industry is in the doldrums, and I do not think \$750,000 is sufficient, even in the initial stages.

Mr. Chalk: Do you think I should tax the people more so that I can give more away?

Mr. BROMLEY: No. The Treasurer has the wrong idea.

Mr. Chalk: You have the wrong idea.

Mr. BROMLEY: I believe that \$1,000,000 should be added to that \$750,000 for the rehabilitation of the dairy industry.

Mr. Chalk: From whom should I take it?

Mr. BROMLEY: If the Treasurer travels through the State with his eyes and ears open, he will see that the dairy industry needs rehabilitating.

Mr. Chalk: I want you to tell me where to get the money.

Mr. BROMLEY: I will tell the Treasurer where to get the money. If he gets the State's taxing rights back he will be able to tax those people who have the money.

Mr. Chalk: You are getting more like a babe in the woods every day.

Mr. BROMLEY: The Treasurer wants to know where to get the money. I have told him.

Now I shall deal with some of the very bad things in the Budget. First there is the delay in the construction of the new university. Then there is the introduction of new stamp duties. Again the Treasurer will say, "Tell me where to get the money."

Mr. Chalk: That is all I want to know.

Mr. BROMLEY: The Treasurer has said he is going to fleece the people, right, left and centre. Rail fares are to be increased. Many Government members attacked the Brisbane City Council for increasing tram fares, yet railway fares are to be increased by 25 per cent.—absolutely shocking! Once again, transport fees are to be increased. The people in the country, the people whom the Premier and his colleagues are supposed to represent, are to be hit again. The Treasurer will be popular when the transport operators get together!

I have mentioned the imposition of the new motor vehicle stamp duties, the increase in registration fees, and the increase in certain hospital charges, of which the hon. member for Nudgee spoke. They are certainly insignificant at this stage, but the thin end of the wedge has been inserted and I am very sorry that the Health Estimates are not to be discussed. I would have had quite a lot to say about hospitals in that debate. Some of the things that have been going on in the past are still going on. I could name plenty of them, but unfortunately I have not enough time in this debate. I was very disappointed on learning this evening that the Health Estimates are not coming up for discussion.

On page 10, in his concluding remarks, the Treasurer said that this is not a "stay put" Budget but rather a "push ahead" Budget.

Mr. Davies: What is he pushing ahead?

Mr. R. Jones: And what is he pushing it with?

Mr. BROMLEY: It reminds me of a former Deputy Premier who is no longer in this Chamber; He is now in the Federal sphere.

I refer to Senator Morris, who spoke about heads, not about pushing ahead. What he said was, "When you see a head, kick it."

(Time expired.)

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 10.48 p.m.