

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 10 OCTOBER 1967

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 10 OCTOBER, 1967

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

Assent to the following Bills reported by Mr. Speaker:—

Local Government Acts Amendment Bill.

Austral-Pacific Fertilizers Limited Agreement Bill.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

HER MAJESTY'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ASSURANCES OF LOYALTY

Mr. **SPEAKER**: I inform the House that I have received the following letter from His Excellency the Governor:—

"Government House,
"Brisbane, October 3, 1967.

"Sir,

"I have the honour to inform you that the Message of Loyalty from the Legislative Assembly of Queensland dated September 7, 1967, has been laid before the Queen.

"I am commanded by Her Majesty to convey to the members of the Legislature of Queensland an expression of her sincere thanks and appreciation for their kind message of loyalty and affection.

"Yours faithfully,

"ALAN J. MANSFIELD,

"Governor.

"The Honourable

"The Speaker of the Legislative Assembly,
"Parliament House,
"Brisbane."

DOCUMENTARY FILM OF PROCEEDINGS IN CHAMBER

Mr. **SPEAKER**: I should like to reassure hon. members that the Legislative Assembly Chamber is not being converted into a television studio. The use of television cameras here during the past week or two has been occasioned by the fact that a documentary film is being prepared for the Department of Education and the Public Relations Bureau, mainly to coincide with the 100th anniversary next year of the first sitting of Parliament in this building, on 4 August, 1868. I do not want hon. members to think that this is to be a regular occurrence—or that they will have to join the Actor's Equity.

QUESTIONS

EXPANSION OF RURAL ROAD CONSTRUCTION WORKS

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

(1) As Teitzel Construction Pty. Ltd. and Teitzel Equipment Pty. Ltd. have petitions before the Supreme Court to wind up the companies, how many such companies have been wound up in the last five years?

(2) What is the comparison between the number of road construction companies operating on July 1, 1962, and now?

(3) As the contract system is apparently failing, will he consider expansion of the Main Roads Department's and Local Authorities' activities in road construction in order to maintain rural work at a rate commensurate with State development and to counter the drift to the cities?

Answers:—

(1) "I do not have this information available in the records of my Department."

(2) "The number of contractors carrying out Main Roads Department work in the year 1961-62 was 39, and in the year 1966-67 it was 40."

(3) "There is no evidence that the contract system is failing. As the volume of road works increases, the value of work carried out both by day labour and by contract is also increasing."

ESTABLISHMENT OF APPLE-PROCESSING PLANT AT STANTHORPE

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

As marketing trends are rapidly changing and as apple production on the Granite Belt has considerably increased and will further increase,—

(1) How many bushels of apples per annum are being processed at Northgate?

(2) How many bushels sent to the markets would find a better outlet as processed fruit, firstly for the improvement of the fresh fruit market and secondly as a direct economic benefit to the grower?

(3) How many bushels of processing grade apples are sold by hawkers?

(4) How many bushels of apples suitable for processing are dumped or not harvested partly due to the lack of an outlet?

(5) Would not the information so gained support the establishment of a processing plant at Stanthorpe?

Answers:—

- (1) "Cannery requirements and quantities supplied over the last three years were:—

Year	Juice Grade		Solid Pack	
	Cannery Requirements	Quantity Supplied	Cannery Requirements	Quantity Supplied
	(Bushels)	(Bushels)	(Bushels)	(Bushels)
1965	160,000	165,000	53,000	11,150
1966	160,000	95,600	53,000	19,500
1967	240,000	196,600	53,000	35,840 "

(2) "Precise information is not available. It is estimated that, in a normal season, supplies of 'good' grade Granny Smiths suitable for solid pack would be in excess of cannery requirements. However, supplies to the Committee of Direction of Fruit Marketing for processing have fallen far short of canners' estimated requirements, which suggests that growers anticipate a return from the fresh fruit market which is better than cannery parity."

(3) "No information is available as to the extent of itinerant sales made by growers or other vendors."

(4) "Very little fruit would be dumped because of the lack of an outlet except in a season where hail damage rendered fruit unfit for the fresh fruit trade and it was impossible, or uneconomic, to store the fruit until the cannery commenced its processing of deciduous fruits."

(5) "The industry is not yet at a stage where it can supply the requirements of two canneries as regards production of solid packs. The feasibility of a processing plant at Stanthorpe to engage in the canning of solid packs would depend upon the willingness of growers to support a local cannery, perhaps in the face of more remunerative outlets, and the willingness of existing processors to curtail operations in this field. Any other form of processing enterprise such as, for example, juice extraction, would need to be specifically investigated by any intending processor."

MEANS TEST FOR PATIENTS AT DENTAL HOSPITALS AND CLINICS

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

(1) Further to his Answers to my Question on September 27, what is the total maximum family income under which dental treatment is available in cases in which the factors in categories (b), (c) and (d) of his Answer do not apply?

(2) Is the income of adult members, who are really in effect boarders, included in the family income for purposes of the means test?

Answers:—

(1) "The maximum income allowed for the purpose of determining eligibility for treatment at a dental clinic or hospital, in respect of a person without dependants, &c., i.e., a single adult, is the male basic wage."

(2) "No."

SURCHARGE ON BUS FARES DURING RAILWAY STOPPAGES

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

(1) Is he aware that during the recent two-day rail strike Hornibrook Bus Company conveyed passengers direct to Brisbane and imposed on each passenger a surcharge of seven cents ostensibly to cover road tax on the trips?

(2) Why was the surcharge imposed on passengers in preference to the waiving of the road tax on the buses by the Transport Department?

(3) Will he give an assurance that in future similar cases of emergency the road tax will be waived, thus obviating the necessity for saddling the people with the financial burden created by industrial disputes of which they are the innocent victims?

Answers:—

(1) "I am aware that during the recent two-day rail strike Hornibrook Bus Company, at the request of and with the approval of the Commissioner for Transport, conveyed workers and other members of the public from the Redcliffe Peninsula through to Brisbane. The surcharge of 7 cents for adult passengers was approved by the Commissioner. It had no relationship whatever to the license fee payable."

(2) "The surcharge was to cover the operational costs incurred by the company for the extra distance of twelve miles its vehicles were obliged to travel by road between Sandgate and Brisbane. Normally the Railways receives 18 cents from a co-ordinated ticket. Adding the 7 cents surcharge to this sum allowed the company

25 cents for the additional mileage travelled. The principle of surcharging during a railway dislocation is well established and has been applied on previous occasions."

(3) "In this instance the public was not saddled with an additional financial burden by way of road tax."

REDCLIFFE STATISTICAL INFORMATION IN
GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS ON
INDUSTRIALISATION

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

Further to his Answer to my Question on September 27, will he arrange to have included in all brochures issued in the future by his Department specific statistical information relative to Redcliffe listed for the benefit of interstate and overseas industrialists instead of including it in the overall figure for the Brisbane region?

Answer:—

"It would be impracticable to give any firm commitment along the lines suggested as the material included in the Department's promotional booklets varies according to the specific nature of individual publications. Nevertheless, the Honourable Member's request will be kept in mind when future booklets are being prepared."

VOLUNTARY TRANSFER OF TOBACCO
QUOTAS

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

In view of the large number of tobacco growers with small quotas who are in serious trouble and are unable to carry on and with no possibility of there being increases, as mentioned by him in his Answer to my Question on August 30, and as there is no certainty of a sufficient increase in 1968, will he urgently consider the voluntary transfer of a grower's quota to the Committee with compensation, which in turn could allot such transferred leaf to growers in trouble with small quotas, provided that such growers have sufficient land to accommodate their increased quotas?

Answer:—

"Growers' basic quotas allocated to tobacco growers are designed purely to ensure that the grower is able to sell the tobacco leaf he produces at or above specified minimum prices provided the leaf falls within the accepted grade schedule. It was never intended that tobacco quotas should be a saleable commodity and consequently there can be no question of paying compensation to a grower for the

surrender of his quota where the grower concerned no longer intends to produce tobacco leaf. Under "*The Tobacco Industry Stabilisation Act of 1965*" there is provision for the forfeiture of a grower's basic quota in cases where the grower fails to plant a tobacco crop for two successive years without being able to show reasonable cause. Any quotas so forfeited become available for reallocation by the Tobacco Quota Committee to growers who are prepared to produce and any such reallocation will be made at no cost to such growers as was the initial allocation of quotas. Any voluntary forfeitures would be treated in exactly the same manner."

EXTENSION OF REPAYMENT PERIOD,
AGRICULTURAL BANK LOANS TO
TOBACCO GROWERS

Mr. Wallis-Smith, pursuant to notice, asked
The Treasurer,—

Will he arrange for the Agricultural Bank to extend its period of repayment of loans in such special circumstances as could arise in the tobacco-growing industry in the near future?

Answer:—

"It is the standing policy of the Agricultural Bank to investigate the needs of particular clients and, if feasible, to endeavour to meet such needs. Each case is judged on its individual merits."

STOCK-FEED FACTORY, KAIRI

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

What is the area of the land granted to the company for the establishment of a stock-feed factory at Kairi, what is its tenure and what are the conditions attached to the land?

Answer:—

"Monover Stockfeed Co. Pty. Ltd. was granted a lease of an area of 2 roods 39·8 perches of Railway land at Kairi for a period of 40 years at a rental of \$300 per annum for the first period of five years. The rental will be reappraised by the Commissioner for Railways at the commencement of each succeeding period of five years. The lessee is also liable for rates and taxes."

FINANCIAL AID TO TOURIST INDUSTRY,
NORTH QUEENSLAND

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

(1) What is the extent of State Government expenditure by way of loans, grants or other forms of financial assistance for tourist purposes in the areas centred on

Mackay, Proserpine, Bowen, Townsville, Ingham, Innisfail, Cairns, Port Douglas and Cooktown, during the fiscal years from July, 1960, to June, 1967?

(2) What marine or other works for tourist purposes were provided from the Commonwealth Aid Marine Works fund in these areas during the same period?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "Detailed statistical records are not maintained to enable the information to be furnished in the form requested by the Honourable Member. However, the following expenditure was incurred from the Commonwealth Aid Marine Works Trust Fund from July 1, 1960, to June 30, 1967, on marine works associated with tourism, being mainly jetties, boat harbours and boat ramps:—

	\$
Mackay City and Pioneer Shire	129,500
Proserpine Shire	207,539
Bowen Shire	115,348
Townsville City and Thurin- gowa Shire	167,653
Hinchinbrook Shire	27,989
Johnstone Shire	101,907
Cairns City, Mulgrave Shire and Green Island	184,870
Douglas Shire	22,609
Cook Shire	36,347
Total	\$993,762

LOCATION OF WEIR ON MACKENZIE RIVER

Mr. Wharton for Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Local Government,—

(1) What is the location of the weir which is to be built on the Mackenzie River?

(2) Will any river crossings be affected and, if so, what arrangements will be made to give access to people concerned?

Answers:—

(1) "The weir is to be constructed on the Mackenzie River at the site of the existing Bedford Crossing approximately 15 miles north of the town of Blackwater."

(2) "The existing crossing at the site will be severed by the weir and will be replaced by a new crossing downstream of the weir. No other crossings are affected."

WURUMA DAM

Mr. Wharton for Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Local Government,—

(1) What is the anticipated date for completion of the Wuruma Dam?

(2) How many men are at present employed on the project?

Answers:—

(1) "It is planned that Wuruma Dam will be completed in December, 1968."

(2) "At the present time 291 men are employed on the construction of Wuruma Dam."

LOCAL BUS SERVICES, TOWNSVILLE

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

Regarding the conference held at Townsville concerning the deletion of certain night and week-end local bus services, has the matter been resolved and, if so, how and why?

Answer:—

"Bus services at Townsville and at all other places where they operate throughout the State are constantly under surveillance by the Commissioner for Transport having regard to the requirements of the public and the patronage they receive from the public. Following the conference referred to, certain night and week-end local services were restored on trial. The results are under observation by the Commissioner for Transport."

ENTRY OF TEMPERANCE WORKERS INTO STATE SCHOOLS

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

Why are recognised and qualified temperance workers refused entry into State schools for the purpose of lecturing on the evils of alcohol?

Answer:—

"After a trial period of two years during which Temperance League officers participated with departmental officers, physical education teachers and other teachers, the Queensland Health and Education Co-ordinating Committee on Alcoholism reviewed the position late in 1966. The Co-ordinating Committee adopted a comprehensive programme to fulfil its aims and considered that this programme could be conducted most effectively by its own officers with assistance from the teaching body. Cabinet approved its recommendation to this effect. Additional officers have been employed. I believe, and competent observers outside Queensland have acknowledged, that the Department of Education is developing an effective and unique programme of alcohol education in schools throughout the State."

BURDEKIN RIVER WATER CHARGES

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

Will the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission impose on the North and the South Burdekin Water Boards charges for pumping water from the Burdekin River identical with those charges imposed on canegrowers who are outside the jurisdiction of the boards?

Answer:—

"The schemes of artificial recharge of underground water supplies established by the North and South Burdekin Water Boards are based on the use of unregulated flow of the Burdekin River, i.e., on natural flows not released from storages. The Orders in Council establishing these boards authorised them to divert such flows from the river up to maximum annual quantities of 61,000 acre feet for the North Burdekin Board and 40,200 acre feet for the South Burdekin Board. The Orders in Council do not specify any charge nor is it proposed that any charge be made for the rights of the boards to this unregulated supply. The Orders in Council do not, however, give the boards any rights to regulated supplies released from storages such as Eungella Dam."

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed:—

Report of the Council of the Queensland Institute of Medical Research for the year 1966-67.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Proclamations under the Public Works Land Resumption Acts, 1906 to 1955, and the State Development and Public Works Organisation Acts, 1938 to 1964.

Orders in Council under—

The Rural Training Schools Act of 1965.
The Forestry Acts, 1959 to 1964.
The Water Acts, 1926 to 1967.

The River Improvement Trust Acts, 1940 to 1965.

The Irrigation Acts, 1922 to 1965.

The City of Brisbane Acts, 1924 to 1966.

The Industrial Development Acts, 1963 to 1964.

The State Electricity Commission Acts, 1937 to 1965.

The Southern Electric Authority of Queensland Acts, 1952 to 1964.

Regulations under the Fish Supply Management Act of 1965.

Balance Sheet, etc., of Queensland Trustees Limited for the year 1966-67.

FORM OF QUESTION

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) having given notice of a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I think the hon. member's question is out of order in that it seeks a forecast of Government policy. I shall have a closer look at it later.

SUPPLY

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT—
RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

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

Debate resumed from 28 September (see p. 732) on Mr. Chalk's motion—

"That there be granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1967-68, a sum not exceeding \$3,965 to defray the salary of Aide-de-Camp to His Excellency the Governor."

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (11.35 a.m.): Mr. Hooper—

Opposition Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. HOUSTON: In opening my remarks on the Budget, let me first strongly criticise the failure of the Premier and his Ministers to have available to hon. members the Auditor-General's report and the reports of all Government departments and sub-departments before now. Those reports should have been available when the Treasurer presented his Financial Statement. They are absolutely essential if hon. members are to analyse the Budget satisfactorily. The Treasurer's Financial Statement is his report, but naturally it contains, in its limited contents, only those matters that he wants emphasised.

The Estimates and Tables are but sets of figures which, in many cases, vary greatly from those of the previous year. Those documents do not give the reasons for variations; only the Auditor-General's report and departmental reports can give hon. members the necessary information. As we are considering the spending or allocating of over \$811,000,000, surely hon. members should be well informed on all these matters. It is the responsibility and duty of Ministers to see that nothing is put in the way of hon. members being fully informed. This is not the first year that this has happened, but I hope the Premier will give an undertaking that it will be the last.

Mr. Nicklin: This is the way it has been done for the last 35 years.

Mr. HOUSTON: I do not care whether it has been done in this way for the last 35 years, or the last 55 years. Those reports are essential and they should be made available to hon. members. That is the point I make now. If the Government wishes to continue in the present way, I shall let the people of Queensland be the judges.

Mr. Nicklin: The Auditor-General is an officer of Parliament.

Mr. HOUSTON: Unfortunately there is an increasing tendency on the part of the Government to treat the Opposition and the public with contempt. Although these tactics may be considered to be politically smart, in my view they not only bring Parliament into disrepute but—what is worse still—infringe the concept of democracy as understood by the people.

Let me again emphasise that these documents should be in the hands of hon. members by the time the Treasurer makes his report. He surely must have had the advantage of them; the respective departmental heads most surely would have had the reports prepared before asking their respective Ministers for departmental allocations; and Ministers must have considered these reports before endorsing the Treasurer's "ways and means" and expenditure. If these reports were not available to the Treasurer and the Ministers, how was the Budget compiled? Assuming, then, that they were available, I ask that they also be made available to hon. members.

For the second year in succession the Treasurer decided to give his Budget a name. He chose the same name as last year; he called both Budgets "push ahead" Budgets. How true is his terminology! We in Queensland are again faced with the task of pushing the Government into doing something for this State. All other States, particularly South Australia and Tasmania, do not need pushing—they are leaping ahead on their own initiative. The Treasurer himself, in his Financial Statement, clearly indicated the Government's dilemma. On the financial side, he devoted a lot of time to complaining about the Commonwealth-States Financial Agreement. Certainly it is poor, but the problem cannot be laid at the door of the Australian Labour Party.

Although uniform taxation of a type was introduced in 1942 as a war-time measure to allow the Commonwealth Government to implement its financial policy for conducting Australia's war effort, it has been reviewed and altered on several occasions since then, the main alterations being as a result of Premiers' Conferences in 1946 and 1952 under Labour State Premiers, a court judgment of 1957, and Premiers' Conferences of 1959 and 1965.

Let us not forget that, in both the Federal and the Queensland State Parliaments, since 1957 Tory Governments have been in power. Those hon. members who sit on the Government benches are people who have urged support for the Menzies-Fadden, the Menzies-Holt, and now the Holt-McMahon, Governments; they and their supporters urged the return of those Governments at each election. Hon. members opposite are the guilty men who sold out this State.

This refusal of the Commonwealth to grant more money to the States is not just bad or indifferent management. It is a carefully laid plan of the Liberals to reduce the State Government to the status of a

county assembly, and the more the States are starved for money, the more the Commonwealth Government comes into the field of what were once purely State responsibilities. The Federal Government has come into the fields of education, roads, land development, water resources, and many others, not only on a financial basis but also to the extent that it is now dictating the details of the work to be performed and its priority. This, to my mind, is wrong.

I believe that the relationship between the Commonwealth and the States should be a co-operative federation, one in which the Commonwealth and the States are equal partners in developing the nation and serving its people. There are certain fields of a national character, such as defence, customs, posts and telegraphs, immigration, social services, and many others, in which central administration is possible and in which local knowledge and closeness to the point of administration is of no consequence. In these cases, Commonwealth control is essential. On the other hand, health services, education, roads, assistance to local government, water conservation, land development, housing, mines, development of primary and secondary industries, and transport, are typical examples of fields in which State control and administration are desirable, for in them the centralisation of control and local knowledge are essential. In my view, special Commonwealth money should be available in these fields, with the State Government concerned having the right to administer and allocate at its discretion.

Without speaking on education as a whole at this time, let me use the Commonwealth's granting of science blocks as a typical example of a bad Commonwealth-States relationship. The Commonwealth pays for, and designs, the building and its equipment, without having regard to whether or not a new science block at a particular school is the most pressing need at that school. The quality of the buildings and their equipment might also be referred to. It is far ahead of that of the other buildings and equipment in the State schools in Queensland. In fact, science blocks are becoming prestige buildings on school sites. That might be the Commonwealth's desire; but, in my opinion, when education needs in other fields, such as teachers and general teaching aids, are so critical, this grandeur is a waste of public money and a denial of money for the essentials I have mentioned.

Let me make it quite clear at this point that I completely support the Treasurer in his call to the Federal Government to review completely the payments to the States. The Australian Labour Party in all States is greatly concerned about the lack of Commonwealth recognition of the States' needs and the Commonwealth's apparent desire to take over the main fields of the States' responsibilities. Steps are being taken within the party to frame proposals that would alter

the position. As a party, the A.L.P. is determined to find an answer to overcome the mess in which Commonwealth-States finances are at the moment.

While I am dealing with Commonwealth-States relationships, there are two other matters to which I wish to refer briefly. One is the custom of the Commonwealth of carrying out capital works from revenue while forcing the States to use loan moneys, with resultant interest charges; the other is the policy of the Commonwealth of lending the States surplus revenue, then charging them interest on its repayment. This "robbing" by the Commonwealth in the form of interest charges surely has no moral basis, for the money so lent is collected from the people of the States by way of Commonwealth taxation in various forms.

Let us now look at the part played over the last decade by our own Queensland representatives at the negotiations with the Commonwealth Government. Until two years ago the Premier and Mr. Hiley were our representatives and, although there have been two complete reviews of the financial arrangements between the Commonwealth and the States, the present Treasurer still claims (and I support the claim) that there has to be a complete re-thinking on the part of the Commonwealth and other States on the relative financial relationships.

Unfortunately, Queensland's representatives have been far too soft. I am afraid Mr. Hiley's approach, as he indicated it would be, and should be, in 1957, is not the answer. Hon. members will recall that in 1957 he criticised Labour's representatives when he made reference to State negotiations with the Commonwealth. He then said—

"A good deal depends on how you ask. If you ask favours with vitriol on your tongue, you stand a very good chance of not getting them. At least you can be courteous and decent, which has not always been the case."

To refer to this statement a little further, it is obvious that Messrs. Holt and McMahon do not recognise courtesy and decency. I think this was clearly indicated in the recent election campaign in Capricornia. Those who do not practise courtesy and decency can hardly appreciate those qualities in others.

The other part of the statement to which I wish to refer is the assumption that in asking for tax reimbursement and loan allocation we are asking a favour. As far as I am concerned, it is not asking a favour—it is our right to obtain these allocations. The people of this Commonwealth should not lose sight of the fact that the States created the Commonwealth for the good of the States and the people.

I re-state my earlier feeling that Commonwealth-States relationships must be of a co-operative federation, and not that of master and servant.

I should now like to pass on to a review of last year's income. The Treasurer has explained many items which varied from the Estimates. I do not doubt that the explanations are correct, nor do I doubt that his assumptions are based on sound premises. However, there are some items to which the Treasurer either referred only briefly or did not refer at all, and on which I must comment.

In 1966 the Treasurer presented a Budget which included increasing taxation in many fields, one of which was rail fares and freights. Rail fares for country people went up 20 per cent.; freight on coal and other minerals, grains, hay, chaff, flour, refined sugar and parcels went up 15 per cent.; freight on cement, livestock and general merchandise went up 10 per cent.; freight on logs, sawn timber, fruit, cotton, wool, general contracts went up 7½ per cent.; and freight on sugar cane and raw sugar also went up by 7½ per cent. This was expected to give an extra \$5,000,000 and an estimated income to the Railway Department of \$88,100,000. In fact, the income was \$85,383,993—some \$2,716,000 short, and only \$3,667,000 above the previous year's income. This was to be expected. After all, how can the Government expect to increase business when it raises its charges to such an unrealistic degree.

To make matters worse, when the people in the country areas sought relief from the Minister for Railways, he virtually laughed off the deputations and requests.

This disappointing increase in revenue must be looked at in its true perspective—that is, not only against the background of these extra freight charges and fares, but also against the increased volume of minerals, coal and grain being carried. Surely the Treasurer would have been expected to devote much more than four lines of his Financial Statement to this subject. Yet, I suppose we could hardly expect him to publicise the true position. The reason, of course, for the falling off of business is nothing more than bad Government policy creating bad management. For the railways to pay, the quantity of freight and the number of passengers must be the main object of the business.

The introduction of dieselisation should have resulted in quicker and more comfortable transport, but the comfort of passengers still leaves much to be desired.

There are far too many factors which slow up our rail service—far too many single-track sections where delays can, and do, occur. These delays not only lose business but also result in higher costs in operating the service.

Perhaps at this stage it would be appropriate for me to bring to notice the farcical position of our State transport systems. We have three systems: road, air and rail. Road transport companies can run interstate at little charge to them for the use of our roads. Intrastate transport companies are charged

registration and licence fees, but the amount charged in no way covers the cost of maintaining the roads, let alone providing the roads on which they operate.

The airline companies and the provision of landing fields are subsidised by the Federal Government to such an extent that they compete with advantage against the railways and road transport.

On the other side of the picture, our railways have the exclusive use of their permanent way, and its construction and maintenance has to be paid for out of general revenue. Any operating losses by the railways have also to be paid for by State revenue.

Shall we try to alter this situation where the public as a whole are subsidising each of the forms of transport so that they can compete one against the other, bearing in mind that the railways are completely State-run and operated, whereas air transport and road transport, in the main, are controlled by the private sector? Shall we try to alter it, or should we accept it and try to organise these three transport systems in such a way that each plays its proper part in the service of this State, catering for the needs of the people and helping in State development?

I believe it is urgent for the State Minister for Transport and his officers to confer with the Federal Transport Minister and his officers so that freight and fare charges are such that one form of transport does not have an economic advantage over the other.

As the State is crying out for development, we cannot let our railways continue to lose so much freight and fare revenue, but we warn the Minister that the answer to the railway problem is not just in closing down lines and increasing charges, nor will the problems be overcome by increased haulage of coal and other minerals.

People must be encouraged to use rail travel because of its comfort and service. Freight must be consigned through the railways because the rates are attractive, not only in the favour of the big users, such as overseas-owned coal-mining companies, but also to the small man, whose patronage is essential.

Let me make it perfectly clear that I believe there is a place for road transport in our system of transport, but not at the expense of the railways. Road transport should be complementary to the railways. As feeder service and as co-ordinated service, road transport is essential. In fact, it is my view that there is a further place for road transport, and that is as a combination unit with the railways. By this I mean that the road haulier could pick up the freight at the loading point, carry it to the railway, then the road unit, or, if containerisation is developed, then the road

unit or container, becomes part of the rail freight. At point of rail destination, the rail unit or container would again become self-mobile to deliver the freight to the customer. Whether this is the answer or not, I leave it to the experts to decide, but, if it is not, it is clear to me that we must obtain more railway general business.

Whilst on railways, I agree with the Treasurer regarding the losses on the standard-gauge railway. This seems incredible, particularly as I know how hard it is at times to obtain sleeping accommodation on trains. We certainly seek a review of this position.

Other increases in State taxation last year resulted in an increase in State transport fees to give half a million dollars; in motor vehicle registration fees to give an extra one and a half million dollars; an increase in stamp duty on workers' compensation policies to give an extra quarter of a million dollars; stamp duty on motor vehicle transfers to give an extra million dollars; and hospital charges to give an extra half a million dollars. The fact that each of these extra taxes provided more than was expected clearly shows that the increases last year were of a hit-and-miss nature and, in fact, were far more severe than was necessary at that time.

On a further examination of last year's Budget, we find that income from mining was below the estimate amounting to only \$2,883,269. What a paltry income when one considers all the propaganda that has been put out about the great advantage to the State of our coal going to Japan! The State is certainly getting very little from these holes in the ground that are now covering the landscape of our country.

Let us compare this amount of \$2,883,269 with the \$4,000,000-odd from gambling tax, an excess of \$1,000,000 from liquor sales, and nearly \$2,250,000 from fines and forfeitures. Surely there is something wrong with the thinking of a Government which is prepared to give away so cheaply our natural resources.

I have mentioned the nearly \$2,250,000 as income from fines and forfeitures. To my mind, the fact that the actual amount represents a 30 per cent. increase on that obtained from the same sources last year justifies the assertions by so many people that the Police Force today is being used as a tax-collection agency.

Let me now turn to expenditure. The first fact that becomes obvious on a perusal of the Budget is the significant growth in the Public Service itself in the five-year period between June 1963 and June 1968. This can be seen most clearly by an analysis of the Chief Office Votes which, as hon. members are aware, are the administrative side of the various departments.

In the Premier's Department the rise from June, 1963 to June, 1968, was from 30 to 38 persons—an increase of 27 per cent. Other increases were—

Treasury Department, from 75 to 127—70 per cent.

Education Department, from 268 to 322—20 per cent.

Health Department, from 572 to 710—24 per cent.

Industrial Development Department, from 7 to 47—570 per cent.

Justice Department, from 128 to 165—29 per cent.

Lands Department, from 186 to 263—41 per cent.

Main Roads Department, from 82 to 99—21 per cent.

Local Government Department, from 100 to 120—20 per cent.

These examples show the pattern of growth and, I believe, demand a clear explanation from the Treasurer.

Mr. Chalk: Do you object to it?

Mr. HOUSTON: I have not said that at all, I am asking the hon. gentleman for an explanation. He presented his Financial Statement, and we are asking him why this should be so. The Public Service Commissioner's Report is not available for our perusal. I am asking the Treasurer to make a statement on this matter.

Let us now turn to this year's figures, which indicate that this pattern is continuing and extending—

Premier's Department, from 32 last year to 38 this year—19 per cent. increase.

Treasury Department, from 124 to 127—2.4 per cent.

Education Department, from 300 to 332—7 per cent.

Health Department, from 691 to 710—2.9 per cent.

Industrial Development Department, from 42 to 47—12 per cent.

Justice Department, from 158 to 165—4.4 per cent.

Lands Department, from 246 to 263—6.9 per cent.

Main Roads Department, from 90 to 99—10 per cent.

Local Government Department, from 116 to 120—3.4 per cent.

The estimated increase in income this year is 8 per cent., and the Treasurer has indicated that most of the extra income will be required for award increases of some \$10,400,000 and another \$4,400,000 for an increased payment towards the Public Debt interest. This leaves less than 3.4 per cent. of the increased income for the State development promised—an impossible task if the rate of increase in the administrative side of the Public Service, as indicated, continues.

Whilst dealing with the Public Service, another factor which is causing me concern is the large amount of money being expended each year in the cash equivalent of long service leave. Last year the payment was over \$600,000, and this year the allocation is in excess of \$800,000. These amounts indicate that the Public Service Commissioner is not encouraging men and women to take this leave when it is due. Long service leave was never intended to become a retiring allowance or a special grant; it was designed to allow a period of relaxation on salary after a certain period of work. I trust it will continue to be so.

Let us now look at some of the promises made in the Treasurer's Financial Statement of 1966 and see what has happened to them.

Last year the same Treasurer promised a record spending on education. There was, too; it was up 13 per cent. on 1965. But this was still not good enough. Queensland's per-capita expenditure on education in 1966, according to Volume I, No. 1, of the Quarterly Review of Australian Education, issued in September, 1967, was still only \$30.6, compared with—

	\$
Tasmania	48.6
Western Australia	47.6
South Australia	44.9
New South Wales	42.9
Victoria	42.9
Australian average	41.8

In 1960 we spent \$19.7 per capita compared with the Australian average of \$24.6 (or only \$4.7 below the average), whereas today we spend \$11.2 below the average. Therefore, even with a 13 per cent. increase last year, our expenditure is still critically low.

A review of almost any table dealing with education shows that Queensland is at the bottom of the list of States in education spending. In boasting alone do we come to the top.

In fact, there is no need for me to submit arguments to prove my case that too little is being spent on, and done for, education. The Treasurer himself gave the Minister for Education a decent "blast" in his Financial Statement. He started with praise for the Minister's Address-in-Reply speech, but then went on to list the weaknesses in our education position compared to New South Wales. He said that 1,700 more teachers were required to reduce our pupil-teacher ratio to near the New South Wales figure and that 800 more trainees were required to maintain this ratio. He also admitted that the salaries for teachers in Queensland are well below those in New South Wales, and that we need more clerical staff in our schools.

Many more weaknesses could have been added to the list, such as lack of qualifications of far too many of our secondary-school teachers, lack of opportunity for our teachers

to further their own standard of education, the fact that in-service training is now a meaningless phrase, and the lack of modern teaching aids in our schools.

Calls on parents to finance so much through parents and citizens' associations is reaching the stage of making our system anything but a free education system. Other weaknesses in our position are the lack of teacher training for manual-training teachers and for trade teachers, and a lack of the art of teaching associated matters. Surely it is time for manual-training teachers to be considered as part of our secondary-school teaching staff and not be isolated from all other teachers as at present.

I urge the Government to classify immediately these men, who have teaching experience (the same as any other teachers in the service), and pay them the same scale and give them the same opportunity of advancement as other teachers. To my way of thinking the subjects they teach are just as essential and just as much part of the secondary-school syllabus as are the subjects taught by any other teacher.

New recruits to this field of teaching should be trained in the teaching arts the same as other teachers. Certainly they are not required to take the present teacher training course because they are already expert in the knowledge of the subjects they would be required to teach, but the other training is, I feel, essential.

Much more can be said about our position as far as education is concerned but unfortunately little of a complimentary nature other than to congratulate the present teachers, who are carrying on under extremely adverse conditions and are doing a magnificent job under the circumstances. Large classes, lack of teaching aids and a salary range well below those of other States certainly demand dedication to do the job that teachers are doing.

The Treasurer said there would be an increase of 11.39 per cent. this year, but that is less than the increase of last year. We can therefore expect little improvement, especially when one considers that some of this extra expenditure is a carry-over from last year—in other words, money allocated last year but not spent. There was a carry-over of \$44,682 from the 1966 allocation for teachers' colleges. In fact, the two colleges promised in 1966 (one at Mt. Gravatt and the other at Townsville) are still only promises in this year's Estimates. Of the Institute of Technology allocation, the carry-over was \$380,458, so, as further work is promised, let us hope this time that some practical results will be obtained.

In a similar position is the 1966 promise of a commencement of the general studies block and residential accommodation at both the Darling Downs and Capricornia Institutes of Technology, and the trade blocks at the

Maryborough and Townsville Technical Colleges. All these items are again promised for this year, so we hope that they become a reality as the year progresses.

Last year the Government also promised expanding hospital services, but apart from allowing some to close and reducing services in others, little was done. In fact, the increase of expenditure last year over the amount for the previous year was only 8 per cent. in the case of public health and 7 per cent. in the case of hospitals—hardly the "push ahead" result promised!

Let us now look at the over-all position in the State. The first fact to strike one is the millions of dollars of public money being spent annually in assisting large overseas companies which, by various means, have been able to receive more than favourable treatment from the Government at the expense of other industries and the people as a whole. It is granted that the ore from Mt. Isa and Weipa has to be brought to the coast. It is also necessary that coal from inland mines be brought to the coast. But these facts alone do not warrant the spending of the millions of dollars each year, all from State finances, which are required to build the railways, develop the towns and ports, and provide the necessary facilities, the State then having to meet large annual interest and redemption payments on the moneys expended.

Surely the companies concerned do not require such favourable treatment to set up business in this State. It is more likely that the Government panicked and made promises beyond reason in a desire to be able to boast that these industries are in operation. If the State had plenty of money, perhaps I would not mind so much. There is, however, so little available to the State in all fields of available money that I believe the Government has over-committed the State, and this is a major factor in the State's financial problems today. Some blaming of the Commonwealth is certainly justified, but it is also true that the money available to the State is being spent in fields where the amount is out of relationship to its importance to the State at this point of time. Education, for example, could well do with having some of this money channelled its way.

Years ago large industries developed in Queensland without the State's financial help. Mount Isa Mines Ltd. provided homes for its employees; the management at Mary Kathleen and Mt. Morgan did likewise. Established coal mines also looked after their own employees. Large secondary industries, such as shipbuilding, meatworks, sugar mills, and engineering and food-processing companies received help in many ways, but not at the expense of other industries or the general body of citizens.

When I refer to projects which have received such favourable treatment, including those at Weipa, Blackwater, Moura and

Gladstone, I refer not only to the obvious railway expenditure but also to housing expenditure.

In the field of housing, the Queensland public as a whole is being affected. While employees who work for firms other than the chosen few have to wait (in some cases for years) for rental accommodation or home-ownership because of the large deposits now demanded, employees who work for the favoured companies do not need any priority or deposit; a Housing Commission home is part of the job.

Some people might argue, of course, that Blackwater, Moura and Weipa are isolated places. But so are the grazing selections that are being opened up; so are many long-standing country towns. The people in those places do not get any preferential treatment; no rental homes are provided for them. What about the ringers and station-hands? There is no modern rental home for them and their families. Certainly people who work in newly established industries in outlying places are entitled to a home, as is any other employee; but surely the provision of such homes should be the responsibility of the company and not mean the tying up of Government finances. Provision of schools, the Police Force, health amenities—these are the responsibility of the State, and we support their provision.

I do not wish it to be thought that the homes that are provided are small, simple dwellings costing \$1,000 or \$2,000. Those at Weipa are made on the spot from bauxite, which, as hon. members know, is as plentiful as dirt there, but they still cost in the vicinity of \$26,000 each—State Government money, not company money. I remind the Committee that the company is so "poor" that it can afford to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on holding parties! At Blackwater, many of the homes have four bedrooms so that the wives can have an extra room in which to sew or paint.

One would imagine that these homes would be allocated to the employees on the lower incomes or those with big families. Unfortunately, that is not done. The allocation is purely at the discretion of the company, and the "tall poppies" are allocated homes first, while the worker on the lower income has to live in the single men's quarters or fend for himself.

Let me now refer to the Treasurer's statement about railway requirements, both for the Blackwater rail project and for other purposes, and his faith that the work can be done by Queensland industry. I assure him that hon. members on this side of the Chamber are certain that it can be done in Queensland; in fact, the work must be done here. And not only in Brisbane; it should be diversified throughout the State, and should be done at railway centres as often as possible.

One argument that we do not wish to hear against farming out the work throughout the State is the cost of transporting components from one point to another. A book entry in a railway journal must not be the cost factor against decentralisation of the work, for, to my knowledge, few trains other than specials, either freight or passenger, are fully loaded. A fact we would like to hear, of course, would be that various towns had made gains by having their citizens gainfully employed and that their populations were expanding because of the work available.

That brings me to the question of the sacking, the forced retirement through unacceptable transfers, and the de-rating of so many railway employees. A common propaganda reason for these reductions is the modernisation or dieselisation of the railways. We are told, "You cannot stop progress." Certainly no-one on this side of the Chamber wants to stop progress, but we do condemn a callous disregard of the welfare of the people. Most of the men affected have been employed by the Railway Department for long periods and do not know any other type of work. Unfortunately, the situation has been allowed to develop either by bad policy or by incompetent management, neither of which is excusable.

The coming of dieselisation was apparent from the day the first diesel electric locomotive ran in this State many years ago. Under a Labour Government, electrification of the suburban railways was a counter to any possibility of redundancy in the southern part of the State, with modern workshops at Redbank and Brisbane. For the remainder of the State, the policy of doing the work for the railways within the Railway Department would have ensured a continuation of work in the workshops for workshop employees both during the period of change and afterwards.

When the Country-Liberal Government came to office, the situation changed quickly. Electrification was scrapped. What a tragic decision that was, with all the transport problems of today!

The Government's policy is to give work to private contractors, resulting in increased costs to the department. Government members seem to think that private enterprise is more efficient than a Government establishment—a fact that can only be true if Government management is incompetent.

This Government failed further; it failed to modernise the railway workshops and, in fact, closed some down. We urge the Government to institute, even at this stage, a programme of modernisation of our workshops so that work for the railways can be carried out within the department and thus stop this sacking and de-rating of men. A self-contained railway system is one of the greatest decentralisation projects conceivable.

As far as the running staff is concerned, their plight could also have been avoided by long-term planning and the setting up of an associated job-training programme. Men who are now considered too old for re-training would have taken a change in their stride 10, or even five, years ago.

Although we can be critical of the Government's past actions, it does not overcome the situation as it is today. Today's problems must be tackled today. We cannot re-live the past, nor must we push into the future the decisions and actions required today. The Minister must come to terms with the unions and give justice to those affected by redundancy, loss of classification, forced transfer, or whatever the cause or terminology. We are dealing with human beings, men who have families relying on their income. It is not progress if it causes suffering and misery to our citizens, no matter how few may be affected.

It is pleasing to see that the State Government is going to spend more than half a million dollars over the next two years on the Lockhart River, Mitchell River and Edward River communities. These people certainly need housing, but water, medical services and schools are an absolute "must". To have their drinking water stored in open 44-gallon drums under the northern sun is plain stupidity.

Let me impress on the Parliament that these people do not want charity. All they want is the opportunity to live their lives as free people—free as any other citizen, determined to try to fit into life in an enlightened and modern society.

Let us not forget that it was our predecessors who decided that the way of life of these people should change. Our predecessors took over their tribal lands and slaughtered their food—not as food for themselves, but for the wanton desire to kill—and lately the Government has completed the process by taking over their grazing lands and allocating them to so-called development companies, which, in the main, are American investors who see the opportunity to make a quick dollar.

While speaking on lands, let me protest very strongly against the latest Government action in reducing the area of the Weipa community reserve from 400 to 310 acres—a 90-acre "grab" from an already-too-small area.

I am sure this is the appropriate time for the Minister for Education to tell Parliament and the people of this State the Government's plans to make these communities self-reliant, so that their towns are no different from any other town in the State, where the people who live in them or the surrounding areas are self-reliant and independent of Government charity.

What are the Government's plans for these people so that they may be gainfully employed and earn normal wages, as distinct from the

pittance they are paid today? When Weipa was being established and the lands were taken from these people, we were told that there would be great opportunities for the men to work on the project. The facts are, of course, that few are employed by the company.

From my knowledge of the people in these communities, they are no different from people in any other community in the State. Amongst them are those who have attributes for all the different callings required in modern society, and it is up to us to give them the opportunity to develop as a people and as part of our nation.

Having a referendum must not be the end of the programme; on the contrary, it must be the beginning. I urge the State and Federal Governments to get together immediately and start our original people on their way to independence as individuals and as an integral part of our society and nation.

The Treasurer referred to a 20 per cent. expansion in the forestry programme. This is welcomed, but is any praise due for heavy expenditure one year after neglect in the previous years? Last year's expenditure was up only 6 per cent. on the year before, which was well below the average increase in the Budget for that year over the previous year.

The Treasurer also referred to the increases in costs in future allocations to the Department of Children's Services. I am sure this is of concern to all hon. members, as is also the plight of the deserted wife and the pensioner.

It is true that these are social problems, but surely the community which accepts, fosters and amends our social standards of behaviour has some responsibility. This responsibility is reflected through two fields: one is community acceptance of divorce, de facto wives and husbands, and illegitimacy; the other is the need for Parliament, comprising the people's representatives, to assist those unable to fend for themselves, that is, the children, whether they be illegitimate, deserted, orphaned, in the care of a deserted wife, or the child of a prisoner.

I feel that, first and foremost, the State must assist these children but, at the same time, the community must use all its endeavours to stamp out the cause of most of the problems. Unfortunately, in the past, there has been complete indifference to many of our social problems.

Unfortunately, too, many of our young people confuse freedom and moral laxity. In my view, it is possible to have a really free society with a high moral code. It is up to society as a whole to bring this about. Parents certainly must accept their responsibilities for the training and upbringing of their children. Suppliers, manufacturers and retailers of goods must play their part in the design of articles and the advertising of them. Church leaders must play their part in ensuring that religion and its teaching is purposeful and desirable and, as a State, we must ensure

that our education system is geared to meet the challenge of those commercial influences that wish to make a quick dollar out of our young people.

We must direct the young mind on a wholesome path that will lead to a full and happy life without recourse to unconsidered marriage or other social problems.

The use of drugs by an ever-increasing number of young people surely is a warning to us that drastic action is needed at all levels now. Not only must we stamp out the drug traffic, but we must make every endeavour to remove the desire for drugs, for, without the desire, there is no sale. I cannot conceive why young people in this State, with its sunshine, its beaches and its modern amenities, should require drugs to enjoy life. I think that to the great majority of us the trouble is not having enough time to do all the enjoyable things we want to do. I can assure the Minister that the Opposition will co-operate to the fullest extent in any worth-while plans to help overcome these social problems.

I wish now to deal with the Wilbur Smith traffic plan. It is pleasing to see that the practical part of the work is under way. Let me inform the Minister that the Opposition expects that when compensation is paid, not only the value of the home or business affected will be taken into account, but also the cost of a substitute. As I have said before, we want no part of so-called progress if it is at the expense of our people.

I am also pleased that the plan adopted is a modification of the original, trusting, of course, that the modifications referred to by the Minister are an improvement, for the original plan, to me, had many undesirable features. Amongst these was the closure of the south-side passenger rail service and the too-complete reliance on road transport.

I am sure the Minister is well aware that experience has shown that freeways and highways alone cannot, and will not, adequately solve the transportation problem in large cities, towns or even urban areas.

As freeways and modern highways are established, they attract more cars and road users, resulting in peak-hour high density not only on the main highways, but also in connecting streets, so that once peaceful suburban streets become a nightmare of noise and fumes. Parking space takes over from business, with associated dead-heart problems.

In my view, freeways are necessary, but they must be complementary to a rapid public transport system (either a tram or train style), running completely on its own permanent way. Out-of-town parking stations at the station points would not only allow our freeways to do the job, but would also stop the death of our city and return tranquillity to our suburban streets.

I am convinced that the public would prefer the comfort of rapid, clean public transport to the nightmare of driving to and fro on a freeway which each day would become less "free". It is the slowness of public transport today which causes much of its loss of patronage. I am convinced that a fast service would obtain a paying patronage.

Mr. Campbell: Would you use this rapid transport?

Mr. HOUSTON: Where possible, yes. I have used it in other towns and I am quite happy with it; it gives a few moments' relaxation to keep up with the printed news.

Throughout the Budget considerable moneys are earmarked for rises in wages—a wise provision. It is true that as we progress as a people, one form of progress is for wages and salaries to be increased so that purchasing power can be increased. The unfortunate fact in this instance is that most of the money earmarked for rises in wages and salaries is to cover court judgments based mainly on rises in the cost of living, and not on the result of progress.

The Government's failure to stabilise costs in this State is one of the major factors that is preventing small businesses from starting here. Big business, to which the Government bows so much, is not affected by this constantly varying wage structure to the same extent as the small businessman, who cannot constantly alter his price structure because in most of the small, independent businesses competition is keen.

Besides the effect on our business development, this rise in the cost of living affects all people, particularly those on small and fixed incomes. Combines, cartels and other big business associations completely dominate the Government as far as prices and charges are concerned. Even when price rises have to be referred to a Government authority, they are invariably granted without a proper public examination.

Increases in the prices of petrol, insurance, food, clothing, medical supplies and, last week, haircuts, and many other commodities and services, are made at the whim of those in control of industry—with Government approval. Let me again state what I have said on many previous occasions: our price structure must be stabilised for many reasons and, where competition between businesses gives way to combine control, the Government must then step in.

As our wage structure must be related to basic living costs, so prices also must be related. As wages and salaries require a tribunal for their determination, so, too, must the prices of commodities which are included in the normal basic living standard. To show how this Government has failed to contain prices, let us look at the Consumer

Price Index figures in the September Monthly Review of Business Statistics. The index price figures were—

	1957	1967
Adelaide	111.9	138.9
Perth	113.6	140.1
Canberra	114.0	136.2
Melbourne	114.4	142.9
Brisbane	114.4	145.5
Sydney	114.5	137.8
Hobart	117.0	143.3

Those figures show clearly that the rise in Brisbane was the highest of any capital city and, when one adds to these prices the freight charges to country towns, the price structure in this State becomes even worse.

Usually at this time of the year some reference is made to employment or unemployment, so, for the record, I shall express some views. I have already referred to the dismissals in the railways. Now let me refer to the sacking of cleaners in the Main Roads building. Never in all my association with public administration or private business have I seen such callous treatment of human beings. These people, mainly women, were sacked because the Government considered that a private firm could do the work more cheaply.

When one of the dismissed cleaners applied for a job with the firm, she quickly ascertained why she was sacked. She was too old. The fact that she is a widow with cleaning as her only skill did not worry the Government. It does not seem to worry the Minister either, for he has taken little heed of the union's pleas. The arrogant disregard of the welfare of the "little person" has become a feature of Government policy. I ask the Minister to re-engage these women, even at this late stage, and let them work so that they can live in dignity and peace of mind.

Let there be an end to this laying-off of men and women because their work is taken from them and given to private enterprise. For a person to lose his job at any time is bad enough, but, with age against him, it is frightening. Perhaps if this was a State of full employment and there was work for these people with private enterprise, the practice would not be so bad.

Although the loss of accumulated sick leave, long service leave entitlement and other accrued benefits is important, the worst feature is that this State had more unemployed at June this year than for any June since the "credit squeeze". Our figure at June 1967 was 13,025. South Australia's figure at the same time was 8,484. On the other hand, job vacancies at 2,345, were at an all-time low for the same period. We surely cannot sincerely boast of great progress while we have unemployment.

As I said earlier, what we want in this State are many more small businesses with high labour content to start up throughout

the State. The relying on massive, expensive projects with small labour content due to press-button operation will not bring the desired progress for the people—nor will holes in the ground operated by a handful of men.

Let me now make some reference to matters which, although not specifically mentioned in the Treasurer's speech, nevertheless are of concern to the Opposition. The first is the deterioration in the apprenticeship training course, resulting from the introduction of amendments to the Apprenticeship Act. At the time I pointed out that the new set-up, whilst giving some trades more time for college study, would adversely affect many more. That my opinion was right has now been substantiated by the Government's introduction of post-apprenticeship classes.

I raise this matter now, not to gloat over the fact that my opinion was right but to point out to Parliament and to the public that the department itself knew that this would happen. In fact, the Act was amended for the purpose of creating two levels of tradesmen in various trades, with the ultimate object of keeping the ordinary tradesman's wages down while the present relativity rate will be for those who do the post course only.

I ask the Government to abolish this post course and, in preference, to allow the trades that need the extra college time to have it as part of their normal apprenticeship training, to be carried out in the day-time, so that tradesmen can continue to be held in the high regard they have previously enjoyed.

Let the Government be warned that if it goes ahead with its scheme it will bring about industrial problems of such a magnitude that problems of the past will appear as nothing. Whatever else is contemplated, it would be extremely unwise to engineer a two-level standard to the one trade.

Turning now to the Estimates for this year, we find that the Commonwealth payments are of a similar pattern to those of last year, the main increase being the \$13,000,000 financial assistance, which both the Treasurer and I agree is not nearly enough.

In the State taxation field, items covering licences and permits are generally in line with what could be expected from an increased population, but an increase of over \$400,000 in liquor income is indicated. How this will come about needs more explanation from the Treasurer.

Stamp duty has now clearly become a main revenue producer from State taxation, and, from just over \$10,000,000 in 1961-62, it is expected to reach \$20,000,000 this year.

Totalisator and betting tax is now estimated at nearly \$5,000,000, or \$880,000 up on the figure for last year. The Treasurer's figures show a 31 per cent. increase in T.A.B. and betting tax, so it would appear to be a safe bet that night trotting is not far away. How else can the Treasurer explain the

fantastic anticipated increase in T.A.B., particularly when the T.A.B. itself does not propose any large number of new agencies?

The Treasurer himself explained the expected reduction in land revenue, so I will not reiterate it. I have previously referred to the disappointing return to the State from the mining of our natural resources, and all other incomes appear to be on the same pattern as that for last year.

On the expenditure side, although I have spoken already on many items I would still like, within the limitations of my time, to make reference to others. One is the Civil Defence Organisation. Although it was created as such in 1962 with a great fanfare, it has not made the progress expected or desired. After the northern cyclone and floods, the South Coast erosion and floods, and the Brisbane floods, surely there is ample evidence of the need for such an organisation really to come to life and act as a worthwhile unit in our community.

I am sure that much more could be done on a voluntary basis than is done at present. All that appears to be lacking for a large-scale recruiting and training campaign is a lead from the Government. I now call on it to give this lead.

Before concluding, I want to make some reference to the road toll. This vicious killer claims the lives of the innocent as well as the guilty. As radar traps, on-the-spot tickets, and other punitive measures have not reduced the road toll, will the Minister now step up the programme of education in road courtesy and road safety? As a start, I suggest that the Department of Education include in its high-school syllabus a compulsory subject, namely, motor-car driving and safety precautions associated with motoring, the subject matter to include not only instruction in courteous and safe driving but also calculations to demonstrate practically the effects of speed and weight on braking.

The rules of the road should be learned and understood as would be the simplest chemical equation or mathematical rule. As most high-school students of today will be car-drivers and owners in a few years, starting with them would pay long-term dividends. I feel that the lessons that need to be taught for safe driving could be more effectively instilled into the minds of young people whilst students at high school than at a later stage, when their only thought is to drive their cars on the open road. I believe that, with this as a start, we would soon have as drivers, passengers and pedestrians men and women who understand the dangers of speed, driving after drinking alcohol and other unsafe driving habits.

This, of course, is a long-range plan, so for the present, as the method of fining and trapping is apparently not successful, I urge the Government to extend road patrols so that the dangerous driver, whether he be drunk or just stupid, can be seen in action and then dealt with. Fixed radar traps are, by their very nature, placed only on open

roads with good visibility where people accelerate to go up hills, or at points of change-over in speeds. In my view, they only set up a barrier to co-operation between motorists and the police, particularly when the police and their radar boxes are hidden behind trees or buildings, or they have their cars parked on the footpath.

In my opinion, the best way to guarantee that a driver is constantly on his mettle is for him to know that any other car on the road may be a police car. It certainly will require more police to do this work, but surely the saving of life and the miseries associated with the road toll are urgent responsibilities of Government. The whole concept of road safety should be the prevention of accidents rather than the punishing of offenders.

In summing up, I do not wish to re-hash all that I have said, but two factors are clear. One is that we must get more money from the Commonwealth (and in this I naturally support the Treasurer), and the other is that I feel that the State Government's allocation of the finances available leaves much to be desired. I feel that far too much money is being allocated for the assistance of large mining and associated companies. I feel that the rate of growth of the administrative section of the Public Service has to be contained. The money saved from these two factors could have been channelled into providing more money for education, in both the importation of teachers and the training of our own trainees and also in the provision of the required classrooms and equipment.

I also urge the Government to watch the employment position and the cost structure, as two very unhealthy factors are becoming evident. So far they are evident only in many small trends, but the evidence is still there for those who wish to look. Firstly, job opportunities are becoming more restricted; secondly, the prices of every-day commodities are rising. If these factors get any worse, they could quickly snowball and a very serious position could develop for the people of Queensland.

My colleagues who follow me in this debate will deal with many other aspects of the Budget.

Mr. PORTER (Toowong) (12.41 p.m.): I suppose that, at times, all of us like to indulge in a little bit of day-dreaming, and I intend to do a small amount of that as my contribution to the Budget debate. Although I say that, I should not like hon. members to regard what I have to say as mere flights of fancy, because no part of it is too far removed from hard, cold, practical, political common sense.

I must say at the outset that I was impressed by the way in which the Leader of the Opposition, leading for his party, opened the debate and injected so little acrimony into it. He made some half-hearted attempts at what could not even be described as angry noises; but I think

these were more for the record than to demonstrate any enthusiasm or conviction in terms of his opposition. Most certainly, in nothing that he said this morning has there been revealed any wide gulfs in differences of attitude on this matter of the Budget.

It is really inevitable, I suppose, that no Budget will please everybody. That is too much to hope for. Some will say that not enough is spent here, others that not enough is spent there. Very seldom does one find anybody suggesting that too much is being spent in any direction. Of course, as always, the complaint is that not enough money is being spent in certain directions. However, never do those who make that complaint suggest how the Government could raise the additional moneys that would be required to meet and satisfy it.

As I said, by and large, from what the Leader of the Opposition has said there does not appear to be any major divergence of opinion, and certainly not the wide economic, or even political, ideological gulfs that I would have expected. I am beginning to think that the Opposition will go through the motions of opposing in this debate but without any real conviction of purpose in this respect.

Mind you, Mr. Hooper, I am not suggesting that this should be happily accepted by the Treasurer as an indication that everybody on both sides of the Chamber is thoroughly delighted with the statement of accounts or the statement of intentions. That may well be the case. But I think what hon. members heard from the Leader of the Opposition more or less underlines the feeling that all of us have in this Chamber—the recognition that a State Budget is no longer the main barometer for a State's financial weather. I think we are all aware now—unhappily aware—that the time has gone when a State Budget, in its own right, could indicate whether the financial going for the next 12 months was to be stormy, unsettled, or set fair. I think we all recognise—some of us, perhaps, with more foreboding than others—that now it is Commonwealth fiscal policy that determines the State's economic climate and that, no matter how effectively a State operates its finances, it can be effective only within whatever financial limits the Commonwealth Government permits.

I was, of course, delighted to hear the Leader of the Opposition speak in such strong terms of the need to strengthen State Governments in terms of Commonwealth-States relationships. I was always under the impression that the Australian Labour Party favoured the elimination of State Governments and the creation of one huge central Government. I am glad to be re-educated on that point. Most certainly hon. members on this side of the Chamber, at least, recognise that when the Commonwealth has such huge power, it is a bad situation, a dangerous situation, and most

certainly not a situation that reflects a truly Federal system. Therefore, it was good to hear the Treasurer bluntly affirming that it was time for a review of Commonwealth-States financial relationships. I, with some others, have been saying this for a long time, but I am only a humble back-bencher without any influence. Now that the Deputy Premier and the Leader of a party have said it, perhaps it will receive some very real attention. In my view the Federal system is sick, and unless some very real aid is applied soon the patient will be too far gone to have any fair prospect of recovery.

One of the most dangerous self-deceptions of our time is the way so many people in high places pretend to be assisting and supporting the Federal system when, in fact, they are happily assisting its slow garroting. This Committee does not need me to remind it that Australia is a huge and diverse continent. If ever any nation needed decentralisation of power and financial resources, we need it to cope with this diversity. We of all nations, because of the size of our country, its great spread of resources, and the present stage of our development, need strong State Governmental and local governmental structures, but neither of these is possible when the central Government so controls the purse-strings and pulls them so tightly, as it were, that it acts like a noose around the throat of every Government but the central one.

So, as I say, I am delighted that the Treasurer, in presenting his Budget, spoke out on this matter. Of course, we have reached the stage where words, no matter how blunt and direct, are really not enough. We have reached the stage where we want action. I repeat the advice I have formerly given in this Chamber, that I believe Queensland should take the lead in approaching other States to set up a permanent council of State Governments such as operates in America and Canada—a council of State Governments with a professional top-level, continuing secretariat, so that the State Governments can provide continuing machinery to enable them to talk in terms of equality and partnership with the Commonwealth, and to talk at times outside the “divide and conquer” pressures that the Commonwealth is always able to apply successfully in the hurly-burly and struggle of Premiers' Conferences and Loan Council meetings.

However, important as it undoubtedly is, this subject of Commonwealth-State relationships is not a launching pad for the particular flights of fancy I mentioned. As one who, over a long period of time, has had some experience in planning both tactics and strategy for political battles, I say that no Government can ever hope, with any real assurance, to win elections by merely relying on its record. Although it is very necessary to have a record of responsibility and sensible financing, much more than that is needed. A Government not only needs to have a good

record; it must also be able to demonstrate quite clearly to the electorate at large that it has the capacity to be dynamic, adventurous, and even that it is willing to undertake what might seem to be some risky policies.

What I say here should not be taken as criticism of this Government. I am speaking in broad terms and what I say would apply to any Government of any colour in any State at any time. All I say is that a Government must always look forward because Governments are susceptible to criticism. It is much easier to criticise—it is much easier to destroy than to build—and one of the great problems of political existence is that, no matter how well a Government performs, its critics can always properly say it should have done better. This I do not doubt. In 99 cases out of 100 it is very valid criticism. So, in suggesting, as I am about to, some widespread realigning of Cabinet powers and functions, I am merely offering suggestions which I hope that those at the helm of this Government, either now or in the near future, will accept, and perhaps see some merit in some of them.

This is a matter to which I have given a great deal of attention and study over the last 10 years. Out of that study and consideration emerges, in my view at least, the belief that although we have a Cabinet arrangement that might have been quite satisfactory for the period we have passed through, I have doubts whether it is the best arrangement of executive functions for the modern age we are now entering. As I said earlier, not only must the Government have a good record but it must also look as though it has that record. It must make it appear that it is with the times; it must make it apparent to the great majority of people that it is fully geared to the tempo of modern change; that it is "with it", to use the modern idiom that has had a little bandying about in the Press recently.

I say that this is one of the essentials to political survival. Not only must a Government be in tune with the times but it must also make it convincingly apparent to most people that it is. No matter how excellent the record is, unless the majority of people believe that a Government or a party, or a combination of parties, expresses their major aspirations, then its prospects of success in the future are limited.

I emphasise this because it is a point we too often miss. It is not enough for a Government to be satisfied that in the main it is doing the right things; it must also persuade the majority of people that it is doing the right things. This, as hon. members know, is a horse of a very different colour.

In these challenging times, no Government anywhere can afford to look in the least complacent, self-satisfied, smug, slow, timid, or even overly orthodox. I keep on saying here that these are times of tremendous change, even of fantastic change, and in this

era of change people have different horizons; they want from Governments policies that are dynamic and courageous. In this day and age nobody wants to sit pat. Nobody wants to bury his head in the sand. Nobody wants a permanent status quo. Everybody wants action and leadership from Governments of any colour. People in this day and age are prepared to accept risks in Government policies if they are persuaded that these risks are worth the goal. They are also prepared to accept extra burdens if they believe the extra burdens are warranted.

I am inclined to think that any Government that has been 10 years in office, no matter how well it has performed, tends to approach a kind of danger period. The seven-year itch in marriage is, I think, a small thing compared with this ten-year-danger period for Governments. My mind goes back to the problems of a Federal Government in 1960, when it had been in office just a shade over 10 years. We also have to recognise here that at this time of change, because of circumstances of which we are all aware, we in Queensland are approaching another kind of political watershed, as it were, which will determine within the next few months or 12 months the directions in which political power and policy will flow for quite some years ahead.

So it seems to me that this is a very sensible time for an administration to take stock of itself, to take stock of how it stands, the way it hopes to stand and to look at not only how well it has done, but, more importantly, how well most people think it has done; in other words, to find out what the electorate really thinks as distinct from what we hope it thinks.

Mr. Sherrington: Does this make any difference with the gerrymandering of the electorates?

Mr. PORTER: I need no help from the Opposition on this.

I would suggest that mid term is always the best time for Governments to ask probing questions of themselves; to ask such questions as: how do we visibly inject more dynamism into our programmes? It does not matter how dynamic a Government thinks it is; it can always, with great profit, look at itself, ask questions, and come up with new answers. How do we best convince people that we are determined to leap forward? How do we best exhibit a new sense of adventure? How do we demonstrate to those people—and this always happens after a Government has been in office for a considerable time—who have grown used to us, and take our excellent achievements for granted, that we have indeed lifted our vision to new and exhilarating horizons?

I believe that a Government must never be afraid of asking those questions simply because it fears that, in finding answers, it may tacitly admit that in the past it has been less than perfect, less than exciting, less than

magnificent. After all, nobody expects a Government to be perfect. What is demanded of any Government is a clear sense of exciting and continuing purpose.

Most Governments in Western countries asking these questions and seeking answers have usually found the answers by regrouping their executive functions—that is, they re-arrange Cabinet activities. They form new patterns and, naturally, they establish some new functions that are necessary because of the times. They relegate some old ones which are no longer regarded as important, to the limbo. By this wholesale shake-up they demonstrate to the electorate at large the directions in which all can expect future policy decisions will flow. They show that a long-established Government has indeed taken on fresh shape and that it has indeed a new access to virility, to new imagination, and to a fresh sense of purpose.

If any such re-arrangement is suggested here—and I for one am suggesting it—I should expect that all would recognise that the key to Queensland's future is in development—development that is diverse, that is multifarious and, if at all possible, development that is decentralised. I think that one of Queensland's problems has been our tendency to adjust too cautiously to changing needs. That is why I wonder whether our developmental needs have been best met by our present arrangements, by which the essential power of decision has been in too many hands. We all know that we have a Minister for Development, but, not content with that, we also have a Minister for Industrial Development. Beyond that, the powers that should attach to a Minister for Development, or a Minister for Industrial Development, are spread among no fewer than five other portfolios. I think this tends to leave us open to some anomalies, some cross purposes, and some delays, which sadly reduce our capacity to compete with other States for industries that might wish to find a home. I do not say this in any critical way; it is simply a matter of record. Our system has been unable to produce here a Sir Thomas Playford of South Australia, a Sir Henry Bolte of Victoria, or a Charles Court of Western Australia.

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

Mr. PORTER: If it is accepted that the key to Queensland's future is development—and I think most members of the Committee would accept that—I should think that equally we will all accept that perhaps a useful change in executive roles would be to create a Minister for Development as such; that is, a Minister who is indeed Minister for Development.

I should think that he would have to be one of the top three men in Cabinet, and, with the Premier and the Treasurer, he would comprise a Cabinet State development committee. Such a committee would permit of speedy top-level determination which could be made—and these determinations need to be made at times—and cut across what might

be regarded as the normal administrative functions of portfolio areas concerned with, say, access to land, harbour, and rail facilities, State road works, housing, and matters of that nature.

But if we are to become strong industrially and make Queensland a State to be reckoned with in Commonwealth matters, then development must be seen as a key to the type of Cabinet action that I contemplate. It must be a key portfolio free from the handicaps of delay or confusion which might occur because essential power, that is, the power of decision, has been left in too many hands.

Having said those things with particular relation to development, let us see the type of Cabinet arrangement that I would envisage as being desirable for a State Government in this space age. I would envisage a Premier and Chief Secretary who also becomes the Minister for cultural activities. Of course, the Premier would retain most of his present responsibilities, such as Auditor-General, Agent-General, Executive Council, Public Service and so on. But as cultural activities Minister he would also be responsible for museums, libraries, art galleries, the conservation of historic features, and also the general development of letters and the arts. This, I think, would recognise a notable gap in our present governmental structure. Man does not live by bread alone, and I would think that as more and more he tends to live in urban areas, so the necessity for seeing that he gets more than bread—that is, that more than his material needs are met—becomes more and more pressing.

Then, if an individual Treasurer is retained—and in some States, indeed the majority of them, the Premier is also Treasurer—I would think his role would cover almost any function that is essentially concerned with the raising of finance and its supervision.

The development Minister I have dealt with. He would handle industrial and general development, electricity and power, and also decentralisation, immigration—

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. PORTER: Not as neglected as it would be under a Government of the hon. member's colour.

He would also handle tourist activities. The tourist industry, with its vast potential and its considerable side effects, and other forms of development, should properly reside in this development portfolio. There, the weight and power of top-level decision could be given to it.

Having established that leading triumvirate who should constitute a permanent Cabinet development committee, my suggestions now are not given in any direct order of preference. I should like to see the Minister for Education become also the Minister for Youth Welfare and Sport. He would then, as he does now, handle primary, secondary and technical schools and colleges, together with native welfare, and I think he should

also be responsible for universities. As I see it, he would also administer a new Division of Youth Welfare and Sport, which would be aimed at a vast proliferation of funds, facilities and trained personnel.

Mr. P. Wood: This was part of Labour policy, you know.

Mr. PORTER: I am told that this was part of Labour policy. I might mention that it was part of the policy of my party years before the Labour Party thought it was worth even talking about. In any case, this Division of Youth Welfare and Sport is needed in order to reduce what is turning out to be the most extensive evils of delinquency and inferior physique. This is in line with what is already being done in many other places. I suggest it is high time that we brought ourselves up to date and stopped being satisfied with the good but meagre activities of national fitness bodies.

I also envisage a Minister for Health who would also be Minister for Community Betterment, with responsibility not only for hospital and allied services, as at present, but also social welfare, family aid, orphanages, relief assistance and so on. Obviously it would be better for functions of a like nature to be under one roof, as it were.

I think the portfolio dealing with primary production could remain much as it is, handling agriculture, stock, irrigation, water supply, marketing boards and so on.

The Local Government portfolio should, in my view, be eliminated as such and replaced by a Ministry of Regional and Urban Planning. Already more than two of every three people in our country live in urban areas; soon it will be three of every four.

Mr. Hinze: A retrograde trend, don't you think?

Mr. PORTER: Whether it is retrograde or not, that is what is happening, and nothing will stop it. I believe that the provision of a ministry concerned with urban matters is long overdue. I see a sensible transitional stage for us in the creation of a portfolio of Regional and Urban Planning, which would absorb Local Government, Main Roads, and the Valuer-General. This Minister would also administer a statutory Town and Regional Planning Authority, which should be set up as soon as possible on a basis akin to that now operating in all other States.

The Mines portfolio should become a Mines and Marine ministry directing mineral development, harbours, fisheries and so on. If we were enlarging the Cabinet, it might be desirable to separate the functions of Justice and Attorney-General. As an interim measure, we continue with the portfolio as it is at the moment.

I should like to see the Transport portfolio become the Ministry for Transport Co-ordination and Railways. The different

terminology means exactly what it says. This Minister should direct another new statutory authority which, in my view, is also long overdue, namely, a State Traffic Authority, with wide and superior powers. A Metropolitan Transport Authority also needs to be set up.

I think that those are changes that would bring us into line with what is practical fact in other places. I have already submitted to the present Minister a very detailed report on these matters following studies that I made in other capital cities earlier in the year, and I propose dealing in greater detail with important aspects of rapid urban transit and effective over-all traffic co-ordination when the Estimates of the Department of Transport are under consideration.

Then, I think a Minister for Lands could effectively also be a Minister for Conservation, administering a new division of wild life preservation concerned with long-range planning for proper conservation of our native flora and fauna. I think this is another innovation that would find the widest community acceptance.

As I see it, the portfolio of Works and Housing could embrace all public works and engineering, including the Co-ordinator-General. It would control the Housing Commission and housing finance; it would administer building societies and be responsible for the registration of builders, and so on; and it would accept responsibility for all land resumptions required for works of any nature or for housing.

Finally, I would transform the Minister for Labour and Industry into a Minister for Industrial-Co-ordination, administering the Industrial Court, factories and shops, controls of standards of machinery, scaffolding, weights and measures, and so on. He could also handle workers' compensation, apprentices, and fire brigades.

I think that leaves unallocated as a major function only the police. I should think this probably would best be part of the Chief Secretary's duties. It could also go with justice, as it goes in some places, and at a pinch it could go to the new portfolio of transport co-ordination.

These are proposals I would make to ensure that not only does a Government display sensible trusteeship in the administering of its financial resources but that it displays also flair, vision, and capacity over the whole forward range of its administrative processes. Although I did suggest earlier that what I would have to say might be considered as being something in the nature of day-dreaming or fancy, I would not want the Committee to think that anything I have said is merely idle day-dreaming or fancy. The proposals I have just made are much more than empty dreams. They are all practical facts in some sphere of government. What I have just proposed is in fact a summation of present practice and experience over the field of ministerial responsibilities in other Governments in this country. In

short, I have not suggested anything that is not being done successfully somewhere at this moment, or that has not successfully stood the acid test of time and practical application somewhere else.

I submit the proposals to the Executive of the Government and hope they will not be brushed aside as unimportant. I believe that what I have touched on must surely be one of the most important aspects of the processes of effective government, and it should never be a matter of unimportance, or of no importance at all, to any Government at any time to do all it can to ensure that its public image is as bright as it can make it.

Mr. Davies: You don't think it is very bright now?

Mr. PORTER: I have not said that. The Opposition's image is so tarnished that one hardly need bother about it.

One of the problems—the Opposition's interjections indicate this quite clearly—is that we in politics tend to live a political existence. In the main, our contacts are people with political attitudes like our own, and, in any case, most people outside politics tell us only what they think we will enjoy hearing. Therefore, over a period, we tend to become insulated from the mainstream of community attitudes, and I suppose that is why it is easy for all of us, whichever side of the Chamber we may be on, to become smug and self-satisfied in what we are doing, to believe that we are always right and that the dissenter or the critic is necessarily always wrong. We reflect each other so much that we eventually become dazzled by the bright light of our own reflected satisfactions, and I think it is for this reason that any Government, particularly one that has been in office for a number of years, can move over into a danger zone without realising that that has happened.

I believe that this large-scale review, this regrouping of portfolio responsibilities, this change of direction in some respects, would be one of the most effective ways available of persuading the electorate at large that the Government is not satisfied with itself; no matter how excellent its record, that it is not content just to rest on its record. It would certainly dramatically illustrate our capacity to get "with it", to undertake forward planning, and planning that is bold, exhilarating, exciting, and even speculative. It would demonstrate, as probably no other single course of action could demonstrate, that a Government is prepared to take risks if those risks afford a better chance of getting needed things done.

I trust that what I have said will be seen by all for just what it is—no more than helpful advice directed at our successful adaptation to the changing times that all of us now know lie ahead of us.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (2.31 p.m.): I do not wish to be unfair to the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat. I think we

would all agree that, in the time he has been in this Assembly, he has displayed an analytical mind particularly so far as the forms and procedures of Parliament are concerned and the relationship of the Cabinet—the Executive, so to speak—with this Assembly in the administration of government.

Perhaps 12 months ago I would have accepted his statements today as being presented in that light purely and simply, but events that have occurred in this Parliament, and outside of it, in the last 12 months suggested to me, as I listened to the hon. gentleman, that this might be regarded as the 1969 preview of the "ginger group" election policy and the new Liberal approach to its coalition with the Country Party.

Mr. Chalk: What would make you think that?

Mr. HANLON: The Treasurer asks what would make me think that. We know that in recent months, in this Chamber and outside of it, it has been made quite clear. I think the hon. member for Gregory, for one, told us here only a month or so ago that there was no love in the marriage and that so far as the coalition was concerned it was a case of dog eat dog. Since then we have had indirect criticism from speakers in the Address-in-Reply debate of the timidity of the Liberal leader in the coalition and I think, to be honest, as a result of that criticism the Leader of the Liberal Party—and I think he is a loyal coalition man in the Government—has been swinging his arms a bit more freely than previously. This has arisen out of the criticism that has been directed from one corner of this Chamber.

In view of the fact that the hon. member for Toowong has presented a reorganised Cabinet today, not telling us just how many of the Cabinet in the new Parliament would be members of the Country Party and how many would be members of the Liberal Party, perhaps he is submitting that, since hon. members in his corner of the Assembly take a lot of responsibility for the Government and accept much of the weight of debate in this Chamber, possibly some of them should be included in the Cabinet, even if they do not take a major part in it as was suggested by his speech.

The hon. member told us that Governments should not rest on their laurels. He told us that his Government—I concede that he said his remarks would apply to any Government that had been in office for 10 years—needed a "Go Go" image, which is more or less a reflection on the present Government. It also reflects some of the concern that has been voiced from fields with which the hon. member would not be unassociated and which would supply Government supporters, namely, the Chamber of Manufactures and the Queensland Employers' Federation, which in recent months have criticised the Government for its lack of initiative.

In suggesting that the Government needed more drive at the top, I think the hon. member was perhaps not only voicing the generally recognised fact that the vigour and drive of the Government has more or less run down over the 10 years it has been in office, but also expressing concern as to whether the incoming Leader of the Country Party will have as much drive when he assumes office as the present Premier when he vacates that office. Those remarks of the hon. member are perhaps more significant in the light of events in recent months.

I do not attribute a lack of drive to the Premier in the present situation. That hon. gentleman has made it quite apparent from his remarks that he intends to relinquish the leadership of the Government within a comparatively short time after serving a record term as Premier of Queensland. Recognising his contribution over what will have been a record term of office as Premier, I think it would be paltry and not at all fair to attempt to be querulous about his leadership at this stage.

However, the criticism directed at the Government is valid. It is faced with the pending retirement of the Premier. Already it has lost the services of the former Minister for Mines and Main Roads, the late Hon. E. Evans, who was a tower of strength to the Government. In addition, Sir Thomas Hiley and Sir Alan Munro have retired from Cabinet. This leaves the Government a Cabinet batting list with a very long tail. Since 1957 Government members have cherished the comment that the Australian Labour Party has not the material to present effective government if it secured the reins of office at an election. But time has caught up with that type of propaganda, as is obvious from the criticism coming from the Queensland Employers' Federation, the Chamber of Manufacturers, the United Graziers' Association and other friends of the Government—even from within the Country Party itself.

I am referring now only to the comments that have been made public, which are sufficient to indicate that there is widespread concern throughout all ranks of Government supporters at its slow rate of activity. Today the boot is very much on the other foot. The public now realises that Labour has the capacity and the personnel to present a very effective proposal to the people of this State for an alternative in Government. The public now realises that with the personnel presently in Cabinet the Government is very much a run-down machine, and that the senior members of Cabinet are not being replaced as they retire with the same quality administrators as we had previously.

During the comparatively short time the present Treasurer has occupied that portfolio we have had some remarkable contributions from him in this Chamber. This time last year I was amazed—as I think were most people who follow matters closely—to hear

that hon. gentleman, as a spokesman for the Government on a matter as important as the Commonwealth Savings Bank of Australia Agreement Bill, which provided for an agreement to continue the arrangement under which we had co-ordinated the activities of and merged the functions of the State Savings Bank with the Commonwealth Savings Bank, say that as the Minister handling the negotiations he had acted—to use his own words—“unethically” on that occasion.

I think that was one of the most remarkable speeches I have ever heard from the Treasurer. I will be referring to some of his speeches. In fairness to him, they were forced on him; they were not speeches that he particularly sought to make. He told us on that occasion that he had acted unethically in “tipping off” the associated banks about details of the agreement with the Commonwealth Savings Bank that had been signed, sealed and delivered by the Government so that, if the associated banks came up with something else, the Government would be able to welsh, to use the vernacular, on the Commonwealth Savings Bank. That was not a very good advertisement for the Government or for its integrity in administration. It came not from the Opposition, but from the Treasurer himself.

More recently, in the Dewar debate, the Treasurer was sent in to bat on what I suppose was the stickiest wicket we could imagine while his captain, the Premier, stood at the other end of the pitch, crouching behind his pads in the hope that nobody would see him. The Treasurer was sent in to do the job—not that he chose to do it himself—and make the captain's innings while the captain himself stood at the other end behind his pads. That was a remarkable speech, because we heard the Treasurer in that innings display all the strokes that are not in the book as he told us how Cabinet had dealt with that matter. Here, again, that came not from the Opposition, but from the Government itself, in an engaging frankness—more or less a remarkable revelation—of just how the Government is governing the State or, should I say, is not governing the State in its approach to these various matters. On that occasion I am sure the Treasurer must have felt greatly relieved in his role when “Umpire Nicholson” upheld an appeal against the light.

Having regard to those speeches that the Treasurer has made, I still find this Financial Statement one of his most remarkable efforts. He did the best carve-up of the Pizzey image that could be imagined. In approximately $1\frac{1}{2}$ pages of his speech, after 10 years of “Pizzeydom”, he has presented to us and documented the deficiencies in our education set-up in this State to a degree that is unmatched by the most severe critic of the Minister for Education and of all the things he has been saying. The Minister told us that the people who are voicing some of these complaints were exaggerating; that they were using them for political

purposes, and so on. In endeavouring to provide a financial explanation from the Treasury point of view, the Treasurer has verified and documented the complaints down to the nth degree. I will have more to say about that later.

Let us now look at the money side and at the monumental tumble-turn the Treasurer has done the taxpayer in relation to that speech he made to us, and to all Queenslanders, last year, when he asked us for a stiff upper lip, a tightening of the belt, all hands to the pump, and everything else that he could think of. He sold in that Budget the toughest State tax line that has ever been inflicted in this State. If we go back to last year's Budget debate, at page 786 of "Hansard", Volume 243, we will see that he said—

"As will be appreciated, with an accumulated deficit of \$7,098,562, the Government must balance its Budget for 1966-67."

I ask hon. members to note those words particularly—"Balance its Budget for 1966-67."

The quotation continues—

"We are not attempting in this Budget to overcome this accumulated deficit."

Not half, as we will go on to see!

He then continued—

"This we shall do gradually over better years to come."

It did not take them very long to come.

Later on, at the end of his speech, he told us that he was strengthened in his resolve by his unbounded faith in Queensland. He asked for a little tightening of the belt to enable him to balance his Budget, not to deal with this great accumulated deficit that his predecessor and himself had managed to run up in this State during their terms of office.

What is the result as outlined in the Financial Statement presented to us 12 months later by the Treasurer? He has been "crying poor" throughout the year at every request for additional expenditure. But consequent upon the savage increase in tax burdens contained in the last Budget he has been able, in one year, to reduce by almost \$3,000,000 the Government's deficit accumulated over the years. Anybody with a substantial overdraft who was able to knock half of it off in one year would consider he was doing pretty well. That is what the Treasurer was able to do in the last 12 months.

In his statement the Treasurer said, "Transactions in the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the year 1966-67 resulted in a surplus of \$257,559." Not only was that surplus 10 times what he budgeted for last year when he told us that we would have to pull our belts in to balance the Budget, but it was also only one-eleventh of the year's surplus of \$2,788,695, which he applied in toto to reduce the accumulated deficit of

\$7,000,000. A reduction in the king-sized deficit accumulated by this Government would be welcome in most circumstances; but it is hardly so in a year that has been marked by widespread dismissals from Government employment and very unsatisfactory allocations.

Mr. Chalk: Where were the widespread dismissals?

Mr. HANLON: You don't know?

Mr. Chalk: I am sure you don't.

Mr. HANLON: If the 500 or 600 dismissed from the Department of Works do not constitute widespread dismissals, I do not know what would. People who have no axe to grind on education, a most desirable and necessary field of endeavour, have been crying out to the Government for additional expenditure.

Government Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HANLON: Why not apply this wind-fall the Treasurer had in the last 12 months to a crash programme of education? I know the Treasurer will say that this \$3,000,000 was available in only one year, so it could only be spent once. But it could have been spent on education! The Vote for the Department of Education, including the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs, was underspent by \$700,000. While people were crying out for more money to be spent on education the Minister for Education underspent his Vote by \$700,000, and the Treasurer had \$3,000,000 tucked into his pocket to offset the accumulated deficit that his Government built up over the years. Why not apply the \$3,000,000 to education in a burst of spending, even though the Government may not be able to continue at that rate in future?

The taxpayers no doubt might feel relieved that the Treasurer has not added to the crushing burden of taxation he imposed on them last year. But it should be noted—and I stress this—that while no more taxes have been imposed, the Budget contains no concessions. It is clear that the taxpayer is still top weight in the Treasurer's handicap although the Government outdistanced him by almost \$3,000,000 last year. We must also bear in mind that the increase last year was not for a full year because many imposts included in the Budget, such as additional stamp duty on the purchase of motor vehicles, required legislation. They did not come into effect until 1 December or 1 January. Therefore the Treasurer got the benefit of those "slugs" for only half of the last financial year and still came out \$3,000,000 on top. This year he will have the benefit of those charges for the full 12 months.

I should say that the Treasurer would hardly have had the hide to increase the tax burden by additional imposts in the

light of last year's results. Last year he said he was not trying to reduce the accumulated deficit by a balanced Budget. He has socked away this \$3,000,000 safety valve to run the accumulated deficit back to \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000 in the pre-election largesse for late 1968 and 1969, if that course becomes necessary. The way the political winds are blowing now, having in mind the result of the Capricornia by-election and the general disdain in which the State Government is held, by Christmas 1968 the Treasurer will have to be the "Daddiest Christmas" of them all if the Government is to survive.

I say in all seriousness that this is the unfortunate pattern of slick political operation being followed in both the Federal and the State spheres. I am not going to say that it is not a temptation to Governments of all political colours. However, I still say that it is an unfortunate pattern and is becoming one of the more obvious resorts of Governments. There is always a big hand-out in an election year. For verification of that assertion, hon. members can go back to 1965-66, when the Treasurer had a deficit of \$3,520,000. There was then no worry over sending the accumulated deficit up to \$7,000,000. After the big hand-out in an election year comes the kick in the pants in the following year. A multiplicity of additional taxes were imposed last year. Half-way through the Government's term scare stories were spread about impending taxation increases. Bookmakers had their pants scared off them by stories of additional turnover tax, and everybody else was worried about, for example, increased stamp duties. Everyone was saying, "What extra taxes are going to be levied?" That was nothing but a lot of propaganda, after scaring everybody half-way through its term.

We now find the smiling Treasurer saying on page 10 of the Financial Statement—

"I am pleased to inform the Committee that, after providing for these and other special needs, the budget for the year is virtually balanced without resort to further taxation increases."

What happened? Just what happens in the Federal sphere. Before the Federal Budget was brought down this year, there were stories of impending increases in taxation on motor vehicles, and so on. When the Budget was presented and it contained no increases, everybody breathed a sigh of relief—not because of concessions or additional benefits to pensioners and other needy sections but because some form of taxation did not, after all, increase.

All those who soaked up the "floaters" of recent weeks about increased taxes breathed a sigh of relief—and for what? Not for concessions of any consequence but a continuation of last year's load of what was described by the Treasurer as emergency taxation. Having made a "cop" of \$3,000,000, one would

have thought that some taxes could have been reduced or that more money could have been made available for education. In the next election year "Santa" Chalk will come to town again and, if the people are foolish enough to return the Government, there will be another big kick in the pants in 1969, after the election.

As an indication of the Treasurer's political cunning in these matters, he included in his Financial Statement a couple of lines so that after the next election he could tell the people that they were given due warning. He said—

"However, I must warn the Committee that, unless there is some drastic rethinking in the matter of Commonwealth-State financial relations, further revision of local taxation rates and charges will become unavoidable in future years."

There are about three lines tucked in there. The Treasurer has already got them framed and set up for his 1969 Budget speech, if the Government is returned.

Mr. Chalk: Thanks, Pat. We will be back.

Mr. HANLON: If the Government is returned—as I said, if the people are foolish enough to return it—the Treasurer will say, "You did not read page 10, line 27½, of my 1967 Financial Statement, where I told you this had to happen." He will not mention it next year in the pre-election Budget.

I think it is time for Governments, no matter what political colour they may be, to strip this slick company-promotional style from their dealings with the finances of the State. It is a sort of "shuffle-oh the buffalo" with funds and taxes to suit the winds of political fortune or expediency rather than to meet the real needs of the State and its people.

The Treasurer has an engaging frankness, as I said, when it suits him. I should like him to be a bit more frank about the paragraph in which he mentions a further revision of local taxation rates and charges. One would think that he has not heard of the increased taxes that Sir Henry Bolte proposes introducing in Victoria. It might be expected that a revolutionary proposal of that nature would call for some passing comment, at least, from the Treasurer in his Financial Statement, but he did not refer to it. He did not say, "No, we will not have anything to do with it." From what one can hear of Sir Henry Bolte's tax proposals, they will be very savage in their application, because they will multiply and chase every transaction through in the form of a receipt duty that will be quite vicious in its effect. As I said, the Treasurer did not say that it is not feasible; he just left it as a sort of "sleeper" that he may use when everybody gets used to it, if the Victorian Government does proceed with its proposal.

If Sir Henry Bolte has any serious doubt about the imposition of this tax, at least he has been prepared to come out and throw down the gauntlet to the Commonwealth Government on the matter that the Treasurer has gone to some length to complain about, that is, the imbalance that exists between the Commonwealth and the States in the matter of finance.

Mr. Chalk: I take it you favour it?

Mr. HANLON: I do not favour it. I said earlier that it is a very vicious tax in its effect. Whether some form of it can be worked out so that it might not be such a burden on the State and taxpayers generally as it would appear to be, I do not know. However, it is not the Opposition's responsibility to tell the Treasurer where to get his funds. We did warn the Government, it is true, in 1959 of the pitfalls in the financial-assistance formula to which the Premier and Sir Thomas Hiley agreed at the Premiers' Conference in 1959. The pages of "Hansard" reveal that, in the first debate in this Chamber immediately after they returned from Canberra, reference was made to the fact that South Australia would gallop away under the formula to which they had agreed. We pointed out to them that all States would be hit by the escalating costs as a result of the time lag in calculating the wages component of that formula, and only this year, some eight years later, was that adjusted, at the Premiers' Conference in June. The percentage increase in average wage, as used to calculate each year's grant, now becomes effective from March in the year of payment instead of being averaged on the wages in the year preceding the payment.

To show the actual cash benefit of this change, which, as I said, was made a feature of discussions in this Chamber by the Opposition in 1959 when the agreement was brought back by the Premier and the Treasurer of the day, the Treasurer has told us that in this year that, in itself, has resulted in an additional \$991,000 to the State in revenue. So, since 1957, although it is not the responsibility of the Opposition to tell the Government where to get its funds from, hon. members on this side of the Chamber have pointed out to the Government at different times methods by which revenue could be obtained.

Mr. Pizzey: Is it your responsibility to tell us where to spend it?

Mr. HANLON: It is the Opposition's responsibility to tell the Government where it is not spending it, and it is not spending it on education to anything like the extent that it should be. When the Opposition challenged the Government last year and said it should not have increased taxation to the extent to which it did on that occasion, the Treasurer said that he had to balance his Budget and asked, "Where will the money come from?"

Here again, if one refers to "Hansard" at page 999 of Volume 243 and page 1457 of Volume 244—I think during the speech of the hon. member for Carnarvon, who used this argument against the Opposition's case on the Budget—it will be seen that we pointed out to the Government that there was an amount which would come in from rentals that had been deferred because of the drought. We pointed out that this amount was not lost to the State; it was only a postponement of revenue and that in due course it would flow into the Treasury and to that extent it would cancel out as much of the accumulated deficit as it had contributed to it. Sure enough, in this year's Budget that argument has been confirmed because the Budget points out that some Crown rents deferred in 1965-66 because of drought conditions were paid in 1966-67, that we gained \$780,000 from this source, and that this sum was used in reduction of the accumulated deficit to which it had contributed. That confirms the very argument we put forward last year.

Mr. Chalk: You didn't tell us it was going to rain.

Mr. HANLON: Whether it came in this year, next year or the year after makes no difference; it is "London to a brick on", as the race-callers say, that that money will come in. It is only a deferred rental and it comes in when conditions improve. If the Treasurer is going to say that it might have to be written off if it never rains, then we have the guarantee from the Commonwealth Government that it will meet the State in any of those factors produced by drought. So, whichever way one looks at it, we have done reasonably well in suggesting to the Government ways in which it can handle its finances in this direction.

As I say, it is not our task to tell the Government where to raise its funds, but it was hardly original for the Treasurer to turn to the poor old motorist last year and select him as one of the first to be hit when he wanted additional funds. It was hardly fair for him to turn to the struggling people on the land, who had already been hit hell west and crooked by the drought, and to ask them for increased freights and other imposts he made on them. With this windfall he has had, has he told them that he is going to reduce any of these charges?

Mr. Chalk interjected.

Mr. HANLON: I am not talking about our Government. The Treasurer's Government is the Government on trial today. We are not looking back through the old legislative or law reports to judge Governments of the past; we are judging this Government because it is the Government the people will judge in 1969 when they go to the polls. Public opinion is indicating quite strongly that the Government will be given a fair trial, and then taken out and hanged and quartered.

I refer to the hon. member for Salisbury in using that expression, because I think it is one that he uses in this Chamber.

I want to deal now with education, because it is quite obvious that it has been one of the matters which the Government is very much on the defensive about, particularly so, as I mentioned in the Address-in-Reply debate, because it made it such a propaganda feature. Again the Government chose its own battlefield so far as education is concerned. Its members made it one of the points of their propaganda but now, of course, the chickens are coming home to roost because the performance has idled down. The problems that all Governments inevitably have to face are facing this Government after 10 years in office and it is now on the defensive. I have a great respect and regard for the Treasurer personally, and I do not think that he would have deliberately sought to have the prospective Country Party Premier shot down in flames. However, if one reads through his Financial Statement one will see that in his remarks on education he simply says, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, that there is nothing wrong with the Minister's 10 years in office except that we would need approximately a further 1,700 teachers in our primary and secondary schools to reduce our pupil/teacher ratio to the New South Wales level; that we need over 800 additional trainees; that our staff are underpaid; that they are not getting the return they should be getting.

Mr. Chalk: Don't twist the words.

Mr. HANLON: I point out that the Treasurer said—

"Now, while I realise that the scale of teachers' salaries in the long run could have a significant effect upon the quality of the teaching services . . ."

I do not know how one would take that; it could be taken several ways.

"... nevertheless it must be admitted that if we divert any available funds into merely providing higher remuneration to existing teachers, then we do not immediately improve the quantum of education being provided in this State."

It is not a matter of whether teachers are getting what they should be getting; it is the fact that the Minister is not going to get any more out of it in the immediate present if he pays them more. He used the words "the long run". This is the difference between Labour Governments and Country-Liberal Governments. We realise that in the exploitation of mineral deposits or anything else, a responsible Government has to have regard to what will happen in the long run. It is "the long run"—the 10 years of office of this Government—that has caught up with it and its education bally-hoo.

The Treasurer says "This will be all right in the long run. Jack Pizzey will probably have retired. I will probably be Governor of Queensland, or something, as Sir Gordon

Chalk. I'll leave that to the 'ginger group' to worry about in the long run. All I am concerned about at the present time is whether I am going to get anything out of the teachers in the immediate present. I will continue to bleed them and underpay them because I am not getting any immediate pay-off out of them."

Mr. Pizzey: Do you suggest that the teachers work less because they do not get higher pay?

Mr. HANLON: I am not suggesting that at all. If anything, the Treasurer is pointing the bone in that direction when he says—

"... the scale of teachers' salaries in the long run could have a significant effect upon the quality of the teaching services."

as if to say that because the present teachers are not being paid as much as they should, we are not getting the same quality of people coming into the profession as we would under other circumstances.

This is the first time I have ever heard any Government spokesman concede that the Government is "bludging" on the non-State schools. In an endeavour to explain the additional spending per head on education in some other States the Treasurer turns attention to South Australia. He says—

"The comparison between certain States is further affected by such factors as the proportion of children being educated in State schools. For example, in South Australia the proportion of children attending denominational schools is considerably lower than in Queensland. Thus, relatively more of the South Australian children need to be catered for by State expenditure. Thus the same rate of expenditure per child attending State schools would mean a higher expenditure in that State per head of population."

Why would it mean a higher expenditure per head of population? Surely to goodness if the non-State schools here are educating masses of children that do not have to be catered for by the State Government, does that not give us more money or more facility to spend money on State schools? The argument the Treasurer uses is in complete reverse to the point he tries to make. He says "In South Australia there are additional children attending the State schools because the denominational schools do not absorb the same proportion of children as in Queensland. In Queensland we can pass the buck onto the denominational schools and let them carry the burden of the great leap forward in education."

There are only two alternatives. Either the Treasurer is denying the denominational and non-State schools in general equivalent recognition of the contribution they are making to education or, alternatively, he is under-spending very severely on his own State school system. The point he made was that South Australia has fewer children at denominational schools and that they have to be catered for under the State system. That means that he has a bonus in Queensland

because a higher proportion of the children are educated in denominational schools. He can either distribute more largesse to the denominational schools—and he does not do that—or alternatively he has more funds available to spend on the State schools. He can have it whichever way he likes.

Mr. Chalk: I will have it as a comparison, as it was intended to be. It is all right in that way, but you twist it to suit yourself.

Mr. HANLON: The Treasurer is like a pieman who sells a pie to a man who finds that when he gets halfway through it he has eaten half a cockroach and, when he complains to the pieman, is told "Take it as a pie, and it tastes all right." The Treasurer wants it as it is; he will not accept it with the little analogy, as it does not suit him. I am not twisting it. Wherever the Treasurer derived this idea about comparing the lower proportion of children in denominational schools in South Australia with that in Queensland, I think he will very much regret it. As I have said, it exposes either that he is denying the equivalent contribution in education to the group of children attending the non-State schools, or, alternatively, that he is not applying to his own schools the money that he should be using for education.

On looking at recent Budgets in Victoria and New South Wales we find that other States, which the Treasurer said have fewer children attending denominational schools, have introduced a new principle in the payment of, for example, \$10 or \$12 for each student attending non-State primary schools. That is a completely new principle.

Mr. Chalk: What did Labour do for denominational schools?

Mr. HANLON: We did a lot for them, not as denominational schools but on the grounds that they were playing a significant part in the education of children in this State.

Mr. Chalk: What did you do?

Mr. HANLON: We were in front of all the other States with the Scholarship allowance and other assistance. No other State was anywhere near us at that time.

With concentration by the Federal Government—and that is fair enough—on channelling certain funds—as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, it is regrettable that more funds are not being channelled to the areas that need them—for secondary education in both State and non-State schools, do not let us run away with the idea that there is no cavair and fish and chips in the State schools as there is in the denominational and non-State schools. As with some of the public schools, there are secondary schools and primary schools in the State which are fortunate enough to be in areas where

money flows in large proportions through the parents and citizens' associations and so on because of the money-raising capacities of the areas. This is the sort of argument we hear sometimes about the crepe-de-chine of the non-State schools, and I am not accepting it does not apply so far as the State schools are concerned.

After this admission by the Treasurer, we find he has not indicated that the Government proposes to recognise the ever-present needs and problems of the non-State schools in the primary field, particularly in these areas of need. If I wanted to be parochial I could cite my own electorate of Baroona. The non-State schools at the primary level are finding it extremely difficult to pay their way because of the necessity to employ more lay teachers, and so on. All these things have worried the non-State schools for so long. Time is catching up with them, yet the Treasurer has given no recognition to their problems although he is saving money through these children being educated at the non-State schools—in greater numbers than in South Australia.

It may be quite true to say that the \$10 or \$12 a year per head for primary students is very small, but at least the Victorian and N.S.W. Governments have indicated that they endorse this principle. Here, again, I should not be at all surprised if the Treasurer is again saving this up for "Santa" Chalk at election time, because we all know that the Opposition was asking for textbook allowances, increased allowances for secondary students, increases for teacher trainees, and so on. They were knocked back at the time but were used as election propaganda for the Government when the election came along. If they are justified they should be introduced in 1967. We should not have to wait and be deprived of them for a couple of years simply because the election year happens to be 1969.

The Treasurer is proud that he will increase the Education appropriation by 11.39 per cent. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, this is an increase based on a Vote that was underspent. In this regard I do not blame the Treasurer, because in some respects the Government has no control over timing so that things work out as at 30 June. The amount on which the Treasurer based his 11.39 per cent. increase included \$1,274,148 for institutes of technology in the last financial year, but only \$893,690 of that sum was used. In comparison, \$1,716,000 is required for this year. Therefore the 11.39 per cent. increase is based partly on money that was not spent last year, although I did not blame the Government for its not being spent.

Compared with that 11.39 per cent. increase, the endowment to the University of Queensland has been increased by 18.54 per cent. If we deduct the amounts allocated to the University of Queensland and to

institutes of technology because they distort the picture, the actual increase in the Education Vote is reduced to 9.7 per cent., which is barely above the percentage of general revenue increase reflected in the Budget.

As the Leader of the Opposition said, the Vote for State schools has hardly increased in proportion. Its increase of 8.3 per cent. is almost the same as the increase in general expenditure from Consolidated Revenue.

I do not decry for one moment the importance of other aspects of the Education Vote, but most parents with children at primary and high schools think in terms of those schools when talking of deficiencies in education. The Vote for State schools is being increased from \$41,255,826 to \$44,660,338, or 8.3 per cent. Therefore, it has not been increased by 11.39 per cent. As has been pointed out, it is not as significant an increase as there was last year, which was 15 per cent.

In his Financial Statement last year the Treasurer said he would restrict the increase in endowment paid to the University of Queensland to the rate applied to other governmental services, particularly education. Referring to the class situation that had developed, he said—

"This has meant that, in these years, the State increased its annual grant at a rate far in excess of what its resources would allow it to provide for other Government services, including primary, secondary and technical education.

The special needs of the University are recognised as continuing into the forthcoming 1967-69 triennium. The Government has the problem of meeting these increasing needs, but must relate any increase in contribution to the increase in its own resources. It has therefore decided that the increase in the State endowment to the University will, for the forthcoming triennium, not exceed one and one-half times that permitted Government services generally."

There has been an over-all increase of 18 per cent. in the university endowment this year. Deducting the Commonwealth contribution of \$4,800,000 and the comparable contribution last year, the increased allocation to the university is approximately 20 per cent. I point out to the Treasurer that last year he told us that he was not going to allow the increase in the university Vote to exceed $1\frac{1}{2}$ times that permitted Government services generally.

Mr. Chalk: You apparently have never heard anything about salary increases at the university.

Mr. HANLON: Again the Minister is telling us that he has not done something that he said he would do. I am not knocking the university; what I am saying is that we must have regard for our other obligations throughout the rest of the education spectrum.

That is in effect what the Treasurer said last year, and for that reason the Government was calling a halt and was not going to allow—

Mr. Chalk: Do you want to lose all the professors and everybody else to the South?

Mr. HANLON: The Treasurer has walked right into this one. He asks me if I want to see professors lost to the university. Let the Treasurer go to the wharf and the airport and he will see the teachers who are being lost to Queensland. That is the point that I am making. I have great respect for the university, the work it does, and the people who work there. But there are no tall poppies and top hats so far as I am concerned. If the Treasurer cannot increase teachers' salaries and give them those things to which he claims they are entitled, he should be equally strong in his dealings with the university. Why does he not say that in the long run increased salaries for university personnel would be beneficial to the quality of the university but would not produce any immediate improvement in the quantum of education?

The Treasurer said in his Financial Statement last year—

"It has therefore decided that the increase in the State endowment to the University will, for the forthcoming triennium, not exceed one and one-half times that permitted Government services generally."

If he admits that the university has him bluffed and he cannot deal with it—

Mr. Chalk: The Commonwealth are involved in it. You are too stupid to understand that.

Mr. HANLON: I know that the Commonwealth Government is involved in payments for science blocks and many other things, and the Treasurer has taken for himself the credit for the Commonwealth's largesse in education matters. If he attends a school speech night he does not say, "I want to remind you that the money for your science block did not come from my Government but from another administration." He says, "Isn't it wonderful to see the progress being made in the provision of new science blocks?" He then bows and takes all the credit. Now he wants to tell us that, because the Commonwealth Government is a party to university matters, he can do nothing about them.

I am not for a moment denying that the Government has a problem in this field. I appreciate that where the Commonwealth Government comes in and requires a matching vote—

Mr. Chalk: Now you are starting to talk sense.

Mr. HANLON: I know that this is a problem. All I want to see is a fair crack of the whip. If the Treasurer is forced by the

Commonwealth Government to do certain things relating to the university, why cannot the obvious needs of primary and secondary schools and technical colleges be forced upon him in the same way? In the case of the university the Treasurer says, "Because the Commonwealth came in, we have had to drop everything else to pay our contribution." I am not saying that that is not a valid argument for him. What I do say is this: do not make those concerned with education at other levels—primary and secondary schools and even creches and kindergartens—the ones who have to pay the cost. Children and teachers have inadequate services and conditions in these schools. Do not put them into the second-class category by saying, "I was forced to spend this money on the university and I had to get it from somewhere. I am not prepared to do it for the schools."

Mr. Chalk: I haven't anywhere to get it from. Do you want a \$5 increase in all taxes, as "The Courier-Mail" has suggested?

Mr. HANLON: In the Financial Statement last year—

Mr. Chalk: You are side-stepping.

Mr. HANLON: I point out to the Committee that the Treasurer admitted that quite freely in his reply to the debate on the Financial Statement last year.

I produced figures from the Treasurer's tables to show that State taxation in Queensland during the term of office of Country-Liberal Governments had increased by 14½ per cent., while it had increased by only 10 per cent. during a comparable 10 years under Labour Governments. The State Government is extracting more from State taxpayers; it is getting more from the Federal Government. Consequently, I do not say that additional taxation is necessary. However, I do say that if the Government has some particular tax in mind, whatever it may be—perhaps something similar to the institution of the T.A.B.—the public would be more prepared to accept it if it was applied in the name of education rather than as a tax to go into the general pool. Although Country-Liberal Governments have not done that, that principle was adopted by former Labour Governments, which devoted the proceeds from the Golden Casket Art Union to financing hospitals to some extent. It is true that, as time went on, the demands of the hospitals completely outstripped the contribution from the Golden Casket, but it still provides not an insignificant amount for the Maternal and Child Welfare Trust Fund. If the Treasurer had done something similar when imposing taxes at all levels, the public would have been prepared to accept it.

I am not going to concede to the Treasurer—I do not think there is any obligation on me to do so—that there should be an additional tax as such imposed for education. I merely point out that when additional money was required for the university, he found it

from somewhere. We do not know where he found it, but he met his commitments. In my opinion, the demands of the other sections of the Department of Education are entitled to similar consideration, and I hope that the Government is going to recognise that.

The Treasurer mentioned that the Education Vote had increased by 11 per cent. Taking only essentials and leaving the university out of it, the increase boils down to about 9 per cent., and I do not think that is good enough. It is no wonder that the Treasurer is getting a "blast" not only from the teaching profession but also from many other sections of the community. New South Wales is going to spend from revenue \$264,000,000 on education this year.

Mr. Chalk: What is the comparison between their revenue and ours?

Mr. HANLON: It is an increase of about \$20,000,000 on last year's figure. If one ignores the university and other bodies that receive from the Commonwealth a much higher rate of increase than the State schools receive from the State Government, one finds that the increase in New South Wales is much the same as that in Queensland.

Mr. Chalk: That is all right—much the same as ours.

Mr. HANLON: In this particular year; but New South Wales has been spending more proportionately than Queensland has for the last 10 years.

Mr. Chalk: From a much larger revenue.

Mr. HANLON: For the last 10 years.

Mr. Chalk: At least you are honest, for once.

Mr. HANLON: I will say not that I have been honest for once but that I have exposed the lack of honesty of the Treasurer in calling on the people of Queensland to tighten their belts and then squeezing as much as he could from them.

There were some other matters that I intended to deal with, but as time has just about caught up with me I will reserve those comments until the Estimates are being considered.

Mr. RAE (Gregory) (3.30 p.m.): In the break since the Treasurer delivered his Budget I have spent a great deal of time considering it, and I am personally of the opinion that it is a good, fair and reasonable Budget, neither relaxing nor imposing taxes, as opposed to the views I have heard today from hon. members on the other side.

I have listened intently to everyone who has spoken so far and I must say that the speech read to us this morning by the Leader of the Opposition was the longest and dreariest contribution that has ever been read in this Committee. I do not think it had any impressive feature in it; it was

obviously prepared, very poorly presented, and indeed was a very weak case on the facts.

The hon. member for Toowong spoke at length on what should and should not enter into consideration in the running of this State by the Cabinet. I respect this member because I feel he willingly accepts responsibility for and gives a vast amount of study to what he considers might be of value to the State. It is quite obvious to me that he has given much appraisal to measures that might in some way lead to an improvement in the government of Queensland.

Now let us look at what this Budget contains and deal with the cries and whingeing we have heard from the Opposition. At the moment these seem to be wholly and solely devoted to the field of education. To be quite honest, I do not understand this extraordinary set-up, this political manoeuvre. Nobody can get away from the fact that it is a political manoeuvre, the aim of which, as I have said in previous speeches here, is to humiliate and destroy the image of a man who has done a remarkably good job for education in Queensland.

Mr. P. Wood interjected.

Mr. RAE: The hon. member is only a boy, young in politics; when he has grown up he can talk to me. We have to look at this matter in its true light. In the western part of Queensland we were for years saddled with an education programme that was anything but good. Today we have high schools and very good primary schools about which I have spoken previously in this Chamber. I would say also that we would be the first Government that has designed and provided accommodation for teachers in the West. As a matter of fact, I could go on reciting a hundred and one blessings that have come to us through a responsible Government that has taken full cognisance of the fact that all blessings should not be conferred on the city.

I know that Opposition members talk with tongue in cheek when they say that this and that is wrong, and that the education system is going haywire. Things are not that way at all. Deep down they know the tremendous strides that have been made under the present Minister for Education and the present Cabinet in Queensland. I feel that a wonderful job has been done with the finance at the Minister's command.

I feel that officers of the Education Department serving in western areas should be entitled to a zone allowance. This is something that we should look at very closely. In all fairness it should be paid as a compliment to them for the tremendously good job they are doing. They are dedicated, highly trained men who are guiding the destinies of the youth of the State and are performing a first-class job. I am very strongly in the

corner of the teacher. To-day there is good co-operation between the P. & C. Association, the student and the teacher.

Mr. P. Wood: In the last speech you made you said they were irresponsible.

Mr. RAE: I am not concerned about the hon. member. He is irresponsible now but when he has been here for a few years he will be an acquisition to the A.L.P.

In my area education is very much on the up-and-up. We had very little 10 years ago.

Mr. Sullivan: Even though that area was represented by the then Minister for Education.

Mr. RAE: That is so, although I am not coming in on that one. He was a very fine man.

The administration of education is a very difficult task. After the Government puts forward its ideas and suggestions at the Loan Council it is allocated a certain sum of money. The chiefs down below decide what it will be. It is an unenviable position. I venture to say that no State gets enough money. Queensland, because of its geographical position in the North, is somewhat remote from all the big interests and combines and power generally. I personally feel that we, as Government members, are little more than a rubber stamp in respect of some of the hand-outs. That is not good enough. When it comes to the real issues confronting this State I would challenge the Federal authorities. They are not fully alive to their responsibility to see that this State makes progress. It is not fitting that our rights should be whittled away so that we have to humiliate ourselves for some grants or monetary blessings from the Commonwealth. It is all very well to condemn and criticise but I do not know what else we can do to advance a story that will be more rewarding for us. If the State is to develop on the lines desired by everybody, with water conservation, advancement in primary industries, industrial organisations and so on, we must have a lot of money—big money—and I do not know how we can get that story across. We have our elected Ministers to do the job and they are doing their damndest in this regard. I know it is very difficult for them and I agree that their lot is far from easy but through them we must convey the message to Mr. Holt, Mr. McEwen, and the senior Ministers of the Commonwealth Government, that if we are to progress we require a much more generous handout.

This brings me to a further matter which causes me concern, namely, the beef roads set-up in Queensland. Some years ago, in 1961, we were promised many things. A lot of money was made available and many roads were built. I am perturbed, however, because nobody seems to quite know where these roads are to commence and where they are

to finish. Plans and surveys have been completed. Roads have been earmarked for completion by 1967, 1968 and 1969. Some roads have been erased from the list and the money for them is to be spent elsewhere. Who has the authority to make decisions on these roads? We had planned to build a road from Boulia to Winton. Half of it has been completed and the other half has been wiped out, and the money which was to have been spent on that road has been allocated elsewhere. Those are disturbing features, not only to me but also to the local authorities. I think Mr. Barton, the Commissioner, is a top-rate officer. I know the Minister is extremely interested in progressive development of the Beef Roads Scheme, but I also know that the Commonwealth officers who are handing out this money are just as interested and by way of a personal impression I have every reason to believe that they can have a persuasive influence as to where the roads are to be placed. This is a disturbing thought. I want to know why we cannot stipulate what we will build.

That brings me to a very serious problem, the Windorah-Currawilla Road. That road was on the list of roads to be built but was removed from it. Now, through my offices and the Minister's personal interest, it is back on the list. I am trying to establish in my mind why we should have the position that it is off the list for six months, on for the next six months, and then off again. Unless there were some inquiries from the local authority in the area I venture to say that it would be off for all time.

Mr. Davies: It is a pity to see you so disturbed.

Mr. RAE: I am disturbed. This is not good enough.

Mr. Davies: Can't the Minister give an explanation?

Mr. RAE: If the hon. member would only stay awake he would hear the answer. This road is to be put back onto the list of roads to be completed under the Beef Roads Scheme. Everyone wants a fair share of the spoils in this regard. The amount to be spent in my electorate will benefit the whole community. The department and its officers are fair-minded, and right and proper in their thinking on this matter. This road has been promised for some time but nothing has been done about it. It will run through an isolated area which has only limited roads, to say the least. Yet it is the centre of an area with a tremendous number of cattle. Yards have been built and water facilities are available at Currawilla. But, because the roads are impassable, this road must be constructed to encourage greater trade on the Brisbane market instead of on the South Australian market which is the main venue for the sale of stock from that area.

I go all the way with the Government relative to rent remissions. I congratulate it on this undertaking, because in this direction it has done a very good job. I venture to say that there is not one man on the land today who could say he has not had a fair hearing, and a fair appraisal of his problem, or that he has not been helped more than generously by the department concerned. When the line was drawn for the purpose of rent remission, matters such as the numbers of stock held and carrying capacity were considered. But we did not take note of the very important issue that it is wrong to differentiate between persons in this State. If it is good for one it is good for the other. This is my own theory and is supported by people with whom I have spoken. The line joins Cunnamulla, Charleville, Longreach, and Hughenden. Companies are excluded. There are many people who, by the very nature of their country, are being penalised in a most extraordinary way. People east of the line do not receive this rent remission. They would be on black country and black country is devoid of edible scrub except for a smattering of boree, gidyea, whitewood, and others. The man on the western side of the line, who is entitled to this blessing, can push scrub over with his dozer and do a good job. Some people on the eastern side of the line have had no hope from the word go. They have had to buy feed or enter into a contract for molasses and salt and meat meal or some other stock feed. Those on the black soil have gone broke well before most others.

I can cite the case of two men on the western side of the line, one of whom was prudent. He drove his tractor every day for 10 months in an attempt to save his sheep, and was successful in saving over 50 per cent. of them. The other fellow on an adjoining property had an equal amount of mulga and did the same thing for a few months but got fed up with it and "gave it away." His sheep were either sold or they died. The fellow who worked hard and saved more than half his sheep is not being granted any concessions at all. He is mentally tired and physically sick and worn out. The other fellow who did accept this pattern is being granted rent remission.

I am not being over critical on this matter, as those who have been assisted are grateful for the recognition given them. What I am trying to show is that the problem is not solved by deciding on a line. No line, no matter where it is placed, is the answer. Let each case be taken on its merits. Let the Government look at the matter in the right light, being fair to all. Drought knows no boundaries. I cannot be convinced that an examination of the position and a half-hour discussion with the people concerned would not provide the correct answer, and I feel that that would be a much fairer way of granting assistance. I recognise quite openly

what has been done, but the mere existence of a line has caused considerable feeling in the West. The people there do not like it. Many who are enjoying recognition have done nothing to warrant it. A line is not the answer to the problem, and I should like to see each case treated on its merits. This would be equitable and just.

Recently I read in the Press a statement by the Leader of the Opposition about gerrymandering of electoral boundaries. I thought then, "I must have something to say on that." One has only to go back to the days when the A.L.P. was in power to find gerrymandering at its worst. I wish to put on record, for the people of Gregory to read, that in gerrymandering nobody could ever hold a candle to hon. members opposite or match their cunning and general ability in that sphere.

Finally, I feel that all the Ministers are to be congratulated on the Financial Statement. It is a very good report, and reflects able administration by the Treasurer.

Mr. Sherrington: You have them all blushing now.

Mr. RAE: Although I possibly have a reputation for being a bit difficult, I am not being difficult today.

Mr. DONALD (Ipswich East) (3.54 p.m.): For many months much has been said on the subject of education, and, as the Estimates of the Department of Education will not be discussed during the present session, I take the opportunity that this debate affords to comment briefly on this subject.

I sincerely sympathise with the Minister for Education in his exacting and formidable task. The very important portfolio of education demands the full attention, not the divided attention, of the person appointed to it if he is to do justice to it. In addition to the onerous task of looking after the growing and expanding needs of the educational system, the Minister for Education has the responsibility of administering the Police Force and a very important section of the traffic laws of the State. Hon. members will agree, I think, that he has his hands full and that he has not been assisted by the Government's attitude towards education.

Hon. members opposite have talked and talked about what the Government has done in the field of education in Queensland until they truthfully believe that it has accomplished something. I am prepared to admit that it has accomplished something. But the Government has not won the confidence of the teaching staff, because if the staff had confidence in the department there would not be a record number of resignations; nor has it produced contentment, because there has never been more discontent among the members of the Queensland teaching staff; nor has it produced harmony, because discord abounds throughout the department.

Unfortunately, the Government has become complacent. This is extremely dangerous, because it is a great mistake to become complacent about the standard of education. The Department of Education is extremely fortunate in having dedicated and competent officers, and the teaching staff throughout the State, in spite of many handicaps and adverse conditions, renders an excellent service to the pupils under its care.

Parents and citizens' committees are a very valuable adjunct to the Department of Education, and the men and women who serve on them render valuable service to the department in a voluntary capacity. Frankly, I do not know what the department would do without such committees. The only reward that they seek is to make conditions in the classrooms more pleasant and comfortable for the teaching staff and the children who attend the schools, to have the playgrounds and fields attractive and tidy, and to have everything in and about the school in a condition that reflects credit not on themselves—as I said, they do not seek credit for themselves—but on the Department of Education.

Unfortunately, far too often these people do not receive the assistance from the department that their time and labour and the money they spend so richly deserve. Every school in my electorate—there are nine of them—is staffed by a competent head teacher and teaching staff and supported by hard-working and conscientious parents and citizens' committees. I shall refer to them later.

The complacency of which I spoke earlier has resulted in Government members finding a good deal of comfort in claiming that Queensland's education system is better than it used to be. It is obvious to every thinking person that it has to be. If it were not, the standard of education would fall far short of what is required. If we are to evolve a system to meet the needs of the State in the not far distant future, we shall have to engage in more extensive research, experiment and questioning than we are at present. No-one would deny that there is a great deal that could and should be done to improve the educational system in Queensland. It is obvious to all who are interested in education that classes should be smaller, because oversized classes and lack of space must result in a sinful waste of human potential as well as imposing an undue strain on the teaching staff, resulting in frustration.

I firmly believe that too often many parents are of the opinion that the success of their child at school depends entirely on the efforts of the teaching staff. Although I readily admit that all teachers are not alike in their teaching ability and personality, that is the case in every calling, whether it be a profession, an office, or a trade. Some teachers are more successful than others in imparting knowledge to their pupils. This is only to be expected because, after all, each is only a human being. But I am sure that hon. members will agree that teachers in

Queensland honestly attempt to fulfil the responsibilities of their important profession as efficiently as possible and with dignity, and that they also render a very valuable service to the community generally.

Parents should, and in the main do, recognise their responsibility in the education of their children. Whether their children do well or otherwise at school depends largely on their home life. Personally—and I emphasise the word “personally”—I am of opinion that where both parents are working the child is at a distinct disadvantage. If the parents are willing to teach their children to express themselves correctly, if they take an active interest in their school work and their activities generally at school, their children are more likely to succeed than children whose parents take little or no interest in what goes on at the school. Strangely enough, this latter type of parent expects his or her child to do well at school; if the child does not, the parents blame the teacher or the child, never for a moment thinking that it is their lack of enthusiasm and interest that may be, and probably is, the major cause of their child's poor showing.

Sisters and brothers who are sympathetic and assist younger members of the family can, and indeed do, play a big part in the success of their younger sisters and brothers at school. If they are unsympathetic and do not assist, the success that should come to the younger members of the family just does not eventuate.

Some time ago I asked the Department of Education to erect a new fence to protect the children who attend the Goodna State School. This school is on the Brisbane-Toowoomba highway, one of the busiest highways in the State. In addition to safety, there is the matter of prestige. Each day along this road go thousands of people, many of them tourists. The two-rail, split-post-and-rail fence is the same fence that was there when I attended the Goodna school over 60 years ago, but it is not in as good condition as it was then and certainly cannot give the Department of Education or the State that good image that is considered so important today. My request for a new fence was rejected because of a lack of finance.

In 1969 this school will celebrate its centenary. It is hoped that a new fence will be erected by then, because one of the projects the school committee has in mind is the erection of centenary gates at the approach to the school. The old approach to the school is no longer usable because of extensions to the school buildings. I make an appeal to the Minister, who was formerly a cricketer of some repute. He represented Queensland Country, then Queensland Colts, and then went on to represent Queensland in Sheffield Shield cricket. I know he has had the excitement and satisfaction of seeing a team-mate score a century, and I hope he uses that feeling to see that

the people of Goodna have a fence erected at their school and are able to celebrate its centenary by erecting the commemorative gates that they are contemplating.

This primary school has several features not found in many, if any, other primary schools in Queensland. For at least the last 10 years the ex-pupils of the school have held an annual get-together. The idea originated from three ladies whose maiden names I will mention because I would not know their married names. They are Dorothy Law, Ivy Chapman and Edie Donaldson. Formerly the function was held in the Botanic Gardens. Last year they decided to move to the Canberra Hotel where they had a very nice afternoon, and this year, a few weeks ago, owing to an invitation from the present head-master, Mr. Hebel, we had the celebration or get-together, as we call it, in the Goodna State School. It was attended by over 120 ex-pupils, dating back a long way.

The attendance at this school today is around 600. At one time there were pupils from 51 nations attending the school, speaking 18 different languages. The head-master claims that in eight weeks he has them speaking very good English. When anyone visits the school the children greet him or her in excellent English and then in the language of their country of birth.

There is an excellent choir at the school, its members coming from seven different nations. Last year the choir gained third place in the Norman Park Eisteddfod. A few weeks ago it again came third in the Maryborough Eisteddfod. The members of the choir travelled from Goodna to Maryborough by bus, and sang during the afternoon session and again in the evening at about half-past ten. That they finished only four points behind the winning choir reflects very great credit on the teaching staff at Goodna, and particularly on their conductress, Miss Harris. Another record for what was originally a small country school is that it has sent three of its pupils to this Legislative Assembly, namely, Mr. H. G. McPhail, who for some years was member for Windsor, the present hon. member for Ipswich East, and the present hon. member for Wynnum, Mr. Harris.

The Ipswich East State School has experienced the same trouble with fencing as the Goodna State School. It also faces a very busy thoroughfare in North Booval. There is very great anxiety on the part of the teaching staff and the parents and citizens' association that children might wander out onto the street and be hit by a car.

Although the Ipswich Opportunity School is in the electorate very ably represented by the hon. member for Ipswich West, for some reason or other that I am not going to attempt to explain I have been patron of the school and the parents and citizens' association look to me to put forward their grievances. They have been asking for

extra rooms but have not been making much progress with their request. It is their intention to meet the Minister as soon as he can conveniently see them to ascertain what can be done for this school. They have worked wonders up there. One has to see how the children behave themselves to realise this.

I pay a tribute to each of the parents and citizens' associations at the schools in my electorate. They have done wonders. They work hard and spend a lot of money. I will illustrate what the Silkstone State School Parents and Citizens' Association has spent since 1 March this year on some of its projects. This list is not inclusive of everything that has been done—

	\$	\$
Excavating, gravelling and bitumenising the entrance to the infants' school and the entrance to the school pool	937	
Complete removal of a tree undermining the baths foundations	140	
Erection of shelter-shed near baths entrance	182	
New motor-mower for mowing school grounds	695	
One hundred Stack-a-bye chairs for arts room	678	
New radiogram equipment (this school's cost)	287	
Shelving for school library (not subsidised)	83	
Total on subsidised items	2,632	
Cost to school	1,316	
Additional	370	
Amount expended on above items by P. & C. Association		\$1,686

At this school there are quite a number of desks and seats that were in use more than 75 years ago, when the school was known as the Newtown State School. They are worn and shabby and should have been relegated to the scrap-heap long ago. The stockroom, which serves over 1,000 children, has never been supplied with shelving. Its walls are partly unpainted, partly undercoated and partly covered by paint that was put on more than half a century ago. It must be the most poorly equipped stockroom in Queensland.

We have heard a good deal of criticism of the Department of Education in Queensland. I will not criticise it but I will quote from "The Courier-Mail", an ardent supporter of the present Government in Queensland and of any other non-Labour Government, so it cannot be said that what I

am saying is biased, or that it comes from Labour sources. I am quoting from the editorial in "The Courier-Mail" of 11 August, 1967. The first paragraph reads—

"The State Government does not appear to be sufficiently concerned at the heavy loss of qualified teachers from Queensland—or, if it is, the Government is not doing enough about this grave matter."

Later, it says—

"It is true that the present Government has increased spending on education substantially. So, of course, have the governments of other States.

"But education is of such tremendous importance to the future welfare of the State and its citizens that the Government cannot afford to ignore the growing teacher crisis. Mr. Pizzey must act swiftly to make teaching attractive enough to keep our teachers teaching here."

I now turn to an article in "The Courier-Mail" of 14 August, which reads, in part—

"But these additional recruits would not help the staff shortage in Queensland to any great degree.

"In fact the best effect it can have is to make the general public even more aware of the desperate position we are in here."

In another article, the following appears—

"Mr. Ted Baldwin, publicity officer of the South Brisbane Secondary branch of the Queensland Teachers' Union, said: 'Queensland loses, Canada gains.

"Teacher emigration means education disintegration for Queensland; teacher immigration means education advancement for Canada."

Staff Reporter Bob Johnson of "The Courier-Mail", who does not belong to a militant union and, to the best of my knowledge, is not a member of the A.L.P., said—

"Next week two groups of young Queensland teachers will head for Canada.

"Conservative estimates put the number of Queensland teachers who will go to Canada this year at well over 100.

"This is one teacher in every 100 in the State."

As that comes from "The Courier-Mail" we must take notice of it. If we are losing one out of every 100 teachers in Queensland there is something seriously wrong and it should be met with sincerity and determination to correct whatever is wrong.

Later, the article continues—

"Since December 16, 1966, there have been 1,726 teacher resignations from the Queensland Education Department."

I will now refer to the position in the Railway Department. For many months railwaymen's representatives have been negotiating with the Government in an effort

to find a solution to the problems of workers who are displaced, principally because of the introduction of dieselisation. Until the recent discussions with the Premier, the unions met with nothing but evasions. Naturally this resulted in widespread discontent in all departments of the railway service throughout the State. The unions claimed that the management must recognise that workers have a right to know what is going to happen to them and also a right to have some say in the conditions of their employment. They desire to be treated fairly, and that is a very natural desire. They can easily recognise any attempt to fool them, and that is what the Government has been trying to do for many months.

Through their unions, the railwaymen have endeavoured to create the necessary attitude of mutual understanding that is so necessary for a peaceful transition, but unfortunately they have been disappointed at the procrastination of the Government. There is no legitimate reason why the railway workers should carry all the risks and disadvantages of the economic dislocation. The Railway Department must be prepared to carry its share of the burden and expense. The cost involved by the department in paying compensation to its employees who become affected would be relatively small, but if the workers concerned are denied such payment the result to them can be very serious indeed.

Generally speaking, the railway employees realise that they and the Railway Department have a common background, and also a common interest in increasing the efficiency and productivity of the railway service in Queensland. However, they also feel, with every justification, that the workers in any section of the Railway Department should not be sacrificed with the view to providing extra revenue for the department.

It appears to the employees of the department that any planning by the Government to meet the situation that has arisen has been concerned only with the financial and technical aspects. That is also the opinion of many observers outside the Railway Department. There is little or no concern for the human element except, where the employees are concerned, the number of workers who would be transferred, downgraded, or temporarily thrown out of work. Good planning includes planning for the all-important human problems as well as all mechanical and financial problems, but the administration has given little thought to this important phase of the problem.

What are the railway unions asking for? No-one can say that they are asking for anything that has not been granted to people on the other side of the world. They have asked that there be no dismissals, that temporary employees with not less than 12 months' service be regarded as permanent

employees for the purpose of redundancy, and that there be no further transfers or down-grading pending agreement being reached between the Government and the unions covering the whole position.

They have also asked that if men are transferred, their homes be shifted free of cost from the original residential site to the residential site in the new area; that should the employee sell his land in the former area and purchase land in the new area, he be paid the difference; and, where this is not applicable and the employee is compelled to sell his land/home in the old area and purchase land/home in the new area, he be paid the difference. Also, by way of disturbance allowance, the unions have asked that an employee be given an interest-free loan for a period. Employees who do not own homes, but are paying rent, and are transferred from one area to another should be given assistance in the difference in the amounts payable. All of these are in addition to the provisions of By-law 690.

The unions request also that a system of severance pay be agreed upon, based on the principle of one week for each year's service at the date the employee finds it necessary to leave the service. This applies to employees who do not desire to continue on after being notified that they are to be transferred. Employees who are downgraded because of redundancy should be credited, at the date they are declared redundant, with their annual leave, long service leave and retiring allowance for the previous years of service at their classified rate at the date determined. The service from that date on should be computed separately.

It is not many years ago that the Government, with a fanfare of trumpets, opened the Redbank Railway Workshops. They were commenced by the A.L.P. Government but were allowed to stand for quite a long time without anything being done to them. At the opening we were told that it was the most modern moulding shop in the Commonwealth and perhaps even in the Southern Hemisphere. But what happened there? The Government saw fit to dismiss men, to downgrade them, and to send them back to Ipswich as labourers. This was done within a few weeks of their becoming entitled to long service leave and, of course, it means their rate of long service leave payment has been sadly reduced.

What is happening in Britain? In the "Railway Advocate" of May, 1967, there appears the following:—

"In contrast to the callous indifference so far displayed by the Queensland Government to the men who have been displaced, here are some of the transfer and resettlement arrangements agreed to by the British Railways Board.

"Transfers

"Under these arrangements, subject to having been permanently appointed to the grade from which he is reduced, and giving a written guarantee that he will accept another position with the same rate of pay and with the same line of promotion within a 'reasonable' distance of his place of residence:

"Pay

"A man who, owing to redundancy in grade or class involving reduction in rate of pay, whether accommodated in his own line of promotion or temporarily accommodated 'on loan' elsewhere, shall... be allowed to retain his rate of pay at time of redundancy, and if redundant in a grade the rate for which is on an incremental scale, be granted incremental increases . . .

"Fares

"In cases where the cost to the individual of the rail travel involved is in excess of that incurred immediately prior to redundancy taking place, free residential travel in respect of the additional mileage involved for a period of five years . . ."

"Moving Home

"When he moves his home . . . he will be granted free removal of furniture and financial help towards the cost of 'disturbance' and cost involved in the sale and purchase of his own house.

"Leaving Service Notice

"Personal notice of discharge owing to redundancy: The minimum period of personal notice will be as set out below—

Length of Service	Minimum number of weeks' notice
5 years or more	6
4 years, but less than 5	5
2 years, but less than 4	4
Less than 2 years	2

"Time Off

"Under the arrangements, time off on standard rate of pay plus free rail travel is given to men declared redundant for visiting a prospective employer to find new employment.

"Resettlement Payments

"Staff leaving owing to redundancy receive 'an assured lump sum payment based on length of service.'

"Weekly Payments

"Continuing weekly payments for a period whilst unemployed amounting to two-thirds of the standard weekly rate, less the unemployment benefit for a single man.

"The payments will continue for a period of two weeks for each five years

of railway service completed under 50 years of age, with further provision for continuing payments related to years of service after 50 years of age.

"Pensions

"There are also provisions covering pensions contributions for men becoming redundant.

"Railway Houses

"Sympathetic consideration will be given to occupants of BRB-owned houses who leave the railway service owing to a redundancy who indicate a desire to retain the tenancy.

"Arrangements for salaried staff provide even more generous treatment."

I cannot see any reason at all why the Railway Department and the Government of Queensland cannot give railway employees what they are asking for. It should be financially possible to meet their requirements, and in this way there would be some recognition of the services that they have given to the State over the years.

Following the conference of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association held in Canberra in 1963, representatives were taken on a tour of inspection of the Snowy Mountains scheme, a project of an Australian Labour Party Government in the Federal sphere which was vigorously opposed by the non-Labour parties there. So little did the then Mr. Menzies (now Sir Robert Menzies) think of the scheme that he refused to attend the opening ceremony.

So impressed were those fortunate enough to be included in the touring party that the general opinion was that the enterprise had to be seen to be believed. Personally, what I saw thoroughly convinced me there and then that the Snowy Mountains Authority should be kept intact and used to plan and develop water conservation schemes in the State of Queensland and prevent the sinful waste of water that flows from our rivers into the sea every wet season. Our thirsty land must have water to nourish man and beast, and the Snowy Mountains Authority should be retained to build dams and construct irrigation schemes to enable Nature's bountiful gift of water to be used to the best advantage of our nation and our people, instead of being allowed to flow away unused, and often causing heavy damage on its journey from the catchment area to the sea. I took advantage of the Budget debate in that year to urge the Government to do everything in its power to obtain and use the knowledge and experience of the Snowy Mountains Authority.

I was chosen to represent the Opposition at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Area Conference in Darwin in June of this year (I sincerely thank members of the Parliamentary Labour Party for extending to me that honour and privilege), and I am again going to take advantage of the Budget debate to express thoughts that

arose from a debate at that conference. The debate to which I refer was introduced by Mr. L. J. Waddy, a member of the New South Wales Government and a son of the late Mr. Waddy of cricketing fame, both interstate and international. Since the conference Mr. Waddy has been appointed an assistant Minister; I think his correct designation is Secretary to the Minister for Education.

Mr. Waddy spoke of containerisation, and, although I agree with some of the thoughts he expressed, I disagree with a great deal of what he had to say on the subject. As we belong to different political parties, hon. members will not be surprised by that.

I want the Committee to realise that, in expressing my thoughts on containerisation, I am not opposed to technological progress, mechanisation or automation where it relieves the burden on the worker and improves working conditions. However, the unemployment that follows the introduction of these methods in industry cannot easily be dismissed. It is society's obligation to see that gainful employment is found for every man and woman who is anxious and willing to work, and to ensure that training is given to those who have been displaced by modern methods of production so that they will be able to live as useful citizens. The worker has a right—a right that he can justify—to share in the benefits that flow from the use of modern methods.

The basic method of loading and discharging cargo carried in sea-going ships remained essentially unaltered from the period when Greek, Roman and Phoenician cargo-carriers plied the Mediterranean and adjacent seas until comparatively recent years. Individual packages of cargo were carried by either men or women, depending on the country, from a wharf onto a vessel and stowed, and a device using booms, pulleys and ropes and man-power—later, steam or electric power—was used to lift cargo aboard, when it was again stowed manually in the vessel.

In the later part of the 19th century and the early part of the 20th century, bulk loaders or dischargers began to make an appearance in industrialised countries. These were, generally speaking, used for cargoes such as coal or ores used in steel production. In many countries, even up to the present, such cargoes are still discharged by manual means, and in some Australian ports manual labour is still employed in loading and discharging ores and in trimming or discharging other bulk cargo with buckets and ship's gear in part of the operation.

However, over the last 11 or 12 years there has been a revolution in cargo-handling techniques, culminating in the development of vehicle-deck and cellular-container ships in the interstate trade. Almost a year ago the unit-load carrier "Killara" was introduced to

the Continental-Australian trade. The introduction of cellular-container ships to the Continental-Australian trade is scheduled for late 1968 and to the Australia-New Zealand-America trade for 1969. The introduction of vehicle-deck container ships to the Australia-New Zealand trade is scheduled for 1969, and there is an indication that similar vessels will be developed to service other trades, particularly those to Japan and the West Coast of America, and that Australian container services will be extended not merely to cater for the Australian coastal trade but also to act as feeders to the international container carriers.

Complementary to these developments has been the expansion of railway container services and the inter-meshing of seaway and road-transport services. Shipping companies have been buying into road-transport companies, and road-transport companies have been entering the field of stevedoring.

When dealing with the development of containerisation and other forms of unit handling and the general effect of these changes, it is necessary to consider other technological developments in the industry the effects of which have been extremely important. In this way a comprehensive grasp of the over-all result of intense mechanisation can be achieved.

The progress of technological change is an accelerating force. The urge to introduce mechanical or automated operation is governed by a number of factors. With improvements in living standards of workers, costs for human labour rise. This need not necessarily mean that the final cost of any article or service rises. This is dependent upon whether there is any increase in productivity, whether engendered by the increased use of mechanical means or by the increased output of the worker. However, speaking in the general sense, employers almost invariably pass on increased wages in increased prices, whether the industry is a service or a manufacturing industry. It becomes the easy way out for sectional interests to then point to the labour costs of an industry as a reason for mechanisation. This approach, so common today, does not take into account the fact that human labour, no matter in which country it may be, is the reason for the product and/or the service. Machines do not eat butter or meat, nor do they buy motor-cars. However, basically, regardless of the validity, this is still the primary urge for mechanisation.

If the Australian stevedoring industry and the shipping industry that serve the country are examined in relation to modern technological changes, it will be seen that the first real developments in this sense were associated with the shifting of cargoes in the wharf area rather than aboard the vessel.

Fork-lift trucks can be said to have been the main instruments in this section of the handling revolution. They have been assisted

by mobile cranes and straddle trucks. The fork lift, the crane, and the straddle truck grow larger year by year, complementary to the growth of unit loads. Fork-lift trucks capable of lifting in excess of 25 tons are now available, and straddle trucks that can pick up two containers, each 24 feet by 8 feet by 8 feet, at once are in operation overseas. There is today, in the over-all sense, very little cargo shifted on the wharf by manual means. The large number of men employed moving cargo from the vessel to the stack or vice versa has in the main disappeared.

The next step in the revolution was related to converting as many cargoes as possible to bulk handling. To name but a few—sugar, chemicals, fertiliser, ores, coal, mineral sands, tallow, edible and commercial oils, and wine. Side by side with this was the introduction of modern bulk-loading and discharging facilities for handling bulk cargoes that had been shipped in bulk but loaded or discharged with ships' gear and manual shovelling. Some instances of this are coal, ores, phosphate and sulphur.

Without attempting to detail all the effects of the changes in regard to employment of personnel, the following outlines are an example of the effects of the change. Prior to 1956 the sugar industry in Queensland was served by 10 sugar-loading ports at which sugar was loaded either in bags or by slitting the bags and pouring their contents into the hold. These ports were Urangan, Bundaberg, Port Douglas, Lucinda Point, Innisfail, Maryborough, Mackay, Bowen, Townsville and Cairns. A large number of men were employed in this method and also in the transport of the sugar to the wharves, and in the many vessels employed in the trade, both coastal and overseas.

By the end of 1965 bulk-loading installations had been provided at Mackay, Townsville, Bundaberg, Lucinda Point, Cairns and Mourilyan. A vessel using the old method would take in excess of 20 days to load a 10,000-ton cargo of sugar; the bulk installations can load a similar cargo in about 20 hours, and do not employ a single waterside worker.

The effect of one of these installations on waterside workers alone is shown by the following figures for the port of Mackay. Bulk installations for sugar loading commenced at Mackay in June 1957 and in the same month the Mackay quota of men employed on the wharf was reduced by the Australian Stevedoring Industry Association from 400 to 80, and the port was subsequently reduced from A to B class status. However, in 1964 Mackay regained A class status.

Other Queensland ports experienced results similar to those at Mackay, some being virtually closed except for sugar. Without detailing every instance of conversion of cargoes to bulk installation, there is now such equipment at Cairns, for sugar; Townsville, for sugar, concentrates and liquid fertiliser;

Mackay, for sugar; Gladstone, for coal, and preparations are being made to handle bauxite; Mourilyan, Lucinda Point and Bundaberg, for sugar; Brisbane, for mineral sands and wheat. There are also bulk installations at a number of ports in each of the other States of the Commonwealth.

Almost all of these developments have one thing in common additional to the great reduction in employment opportunities for waterside workers. It should not be thought that the waterside labour force used for bulk cargoes or cargoes converted to bulk has been reduced only by bulk installations, or that it will continue to be reduced only in that way.

The progress of change has also meant a change in ship design and ship equipment. The tramp ship of 20 years ago has given way to the modern bulk carrier. It has been proved beyond doubt that bulk cargoes are more economically carried in larger ships. The 10,000-ton oil carrier has developed to the 30,000-ton, the 95,000-ton, the 150,000-ton, and on to the 205,000-ton carrier.

"Shipbuilding and Shipping Record" of 8 July, 1965, reported that a Kuwait Tanker Co. tanker of 46,000 tons carried oil around the world £1 a ton cheaper than a 20,000-ton tanker. The Japanese tanker "Nishi Maru", of approximately 130,000 tons, carried oil at 30s. a ton less than a 46,000-ton vessel, and 50s a ton less than a 20,000-ton vessel. The amounts mentioned are in sterling.

In the general and specialised cargo field some ports have seen the spread of shore-based luffing cranes, with consequent increase in the size of slings and speed of handling, yet with reductions in numbers of men used. Newcastle, Port Kembla, Melbourne, Brisbane, Adelaide and Fremantle are the best examples of this. Two 10-ton luffing cranes were found to be capable of discharging a vessel loaded with 7,000 tons of scrap-iron or pig-iron in a matter of nine to 12 shifts employing an average of three men a shift for the crane operation and some six to 12 additional men for cleaning wings and pockets. Previously such a ship would have employed 46 to 60 men a shift.

Complementary to the introduction of cranes has come the pre-slinging of cargoes in unit loads. As the number of cranes in Newcastle used in steel handling developed from two to six, so did the proportion of cargo pre-slung develop. The rate of loading or discharging of all steel cargoes was accelerated, and the number of men used was reduced to approximately 50 per cent.

Timber previously loaded as loose scantlings began to be bundled into packs. In other words, the load was unitised. Even if only ships' gear was used, this meant much larger slings, reduced handling on the wharf and in the hold, and so reduced the

number of men employed. It facilitated the use of mechanical equipment on the wharf and in the holds of the ship. The use of such equipment then developed as it had with steel products, and as it has since developed in general cargo handling.

Coming to general cargo handling, I would say that the development which takes pride of place in everyone's thoughts is containerisation. The word has been described as ugly. The result for many workers can be ugly if they are not protected, but the word—ugly or not—simply describes one basic part, the putting of goods into a container, of a much more complex concept.

To the initiated it means a great deal more than the mere putting of goods into a box. However, it is similar in principle to the concept of pre-slinging unitised loads of steel or timber, that is, that at the point of manufacture the steel or timber is packaged and, at least to the point of distribution, it remains in that single package and is not again handled as separate pieces. This is the revolution in the containerisation concept. This is what the word means to the carrier.

Cargo can be said to have been containerised (boxed) for a great many years, even on the principle just mentioned, when we dealt with such items as motor-cars, lorries and similar commodities. In fact, it was used in Western Europe as far back as 1926 and in the United States of America in 1927 with the transport of loaded rail-cars. But, generally speaking, the transport of ordinary, general cargoes—individual packages of all types of goods travelling all over the world—has proceeded without containerisation up to recent years, and has provided enormous employment for numbers of people, male and female, whether they have been dockers, seamen, truck-drivers, railwaymen, clerks, maintenance staff, insurance staff, Customs or managerial staff.

Containerisation, in the final concept, is the same as the steel example, namely, placing the goods in a container at the point of manufacture, and not handling them again until they have arrived at the point of distribution. In the case of whole container loads this is at the wholesaler and, in the case of less than a full container, at the unstuffing area—at the port of destination.

This concept literally destroys the employment of people all along the line between the manufacturer and the purchaser. It can be likened to a pipeline, which requires only a maintenance staff, although it is true that the container concept requires more than a pipeline. It requires truck-drivers and railway operators, seamen, managerial and other staff. But how many does it require compared with previously? Look at the increased productivity of a single truck and truck-driver, where the loading operation of the truck is a simple mechanical

operation taking only a few minutes. This applies also to the loading of railway wagons and, when looked at in relation to the loading and discharging of a vessel, perhaps 150 man-hours where cranes are carried as shipboard equipment, as against as many as 30,000 or more man-hours with a conventional vessel. If shore-based cranes are used, the man-hour employment of waterside workers can drop to nil. This is achieved because the container concept is not simply the putting of goods into boxes. It means that specialised ships and equipment are also developed.

It is true that containers are carried in conventional vessels as some of the developing history will show, but much of their value is lost because the vessel loses about 30 to 40 per cent. of her carrying capacity without obtaining the turn-round ability to recoup this loss. For this reason the true container vessel is built like a bulk carrier and is divided into cells. The cells are merely perpendicular guides so that the containers, once positioned in them, cannot move. The vessel has no wings. The containers are loaded by cranes—ship or shore based—or special ship-based derricks.

There have been various approaches to this part of the loading or discharging operation. No men are required in the hold. The "Kooringa" was designed as a cellular container ship, that is, it could carry only cargo pre-packed in containers, or cargo carried in frames the same size as the containers. In reality, this means that it can carry virtually anything from timber to yachts—and it does.

This vessel was fitted with two 17-ton gantry cranes and entered the Melbourne-Fremantle trade in 1964. It employed eight waterside workers permanently in Melbourne and six in Fremantle. With four crane-drivers per shift in Melbourne it was capable of loading and discharging about 7,600 tons dead weight in 2½ shifts. This was the longest trade yet entered into on the Australian coast—a distance of some 2,000 miles.

Since that time the Associated Steamship Co. has proceeded with the conversion of four old vessels to handle containers and has ordered two new cellular container ships of 9,500 tons, each capable of holding 1,824 containers, 484, (including 152 refrigerated) of I.S.O. standard, 20 ft. by 8 ft., and 1,340 at 6 ft. by 6 ft. by 4 ft. 2 ins. However, the smaller containers can be loaded into frames and the whole vessel can be easily convertible to carry standard containers.

On the Australian scene, the Australian National Line uses shore-based cranes, the Union Steamship Co. uses ship-based luffing cranes, and Holyman and Co. uses ship-based luffing cranes. None of these vessels is a cellular container ship. The Associated Steamship Co. uses gantry cranes on the cellular container ship "Kooringa" and luffing cranes on its converted container ships.

However, with its order for two new 9,500-ton cellular container ships it has announced that its vessels will have no cranes but will be serviced by shore-based cranes. The international vessels that are expected to be running to Australia by 1968 will be serviced by shore-based, container-transport cranes. It would seem that, for the future, shore-based transporters, or even more complex equipment, will be the rule. This would mean that the use of waterside workers for the loading and unloading operations would completely cease, apart from some drivers of mechanical equipment.

In tracing the history of the development of the container concept it is advisable to look at two fields, namely the interstate or coastal trade and overseas or international development. It will be seen that finally the two fields will merge into a more integrated concept, but historically, and for sound reasons, containerisation, or the unit-load principle, has developed in the short-haul trade before long-distance trade. In fact, from such services as the English Channel, the Mediterranean, or to take the Australian example, the Bass Strait trade, it has developed to the longest at this time in existence, the North Atlantic trade, or the sea-land service, United States to Okinawa, with military cargoes.

In the Australian coastal trade, containers first came into use for all practical purposes in the early 1950's. This was side-by-side with other developments in the unit-load principle, such as pallets. The use of pallets in the early years far outstripped the use of containers. Palletisation and containers assisted to develop the use of fork-lifts in holds, but neither prevented the continuing decay of the coastal shipping fleet.

The type of vessel in use—that is, for the sake of ease, a conventional cargo vessel of pre-war style—could not compete with road and rail services, and shipowners were slow to realise that their virtual monopoly of coastal trade was being destroyed by better roads and vehicles and more intense railway competition.

This picture began to change with the decision of the Australian National Line to enter the Melbourne-North Tasmania trade with a vehicle-deck ship. This vessel, "Princess of Tasmania", was designed firstly as a tourist car ferry to replace the "Taroon", but with the capacity to handle trucks, including semi-trailers. The vessel commenced running between Melbourne and Devonport on 2 October, 1959. There was no question of its success. The vessel carried cars, trucks with containers and unit loads on flats.

The "Taroon" had employed in Melbourne alone about 50 men a shift for six shifts a week, approximately 2,100 man hours a week. The "Princess of Tasmania"

employed 10 men permanently or some 400 man-hours a week and completed three journeys a week.

The "Princess of Tasmania" was quickly followed by an Australian National Line vehicle-deck ship designed to carry cargo only, for the Melbourne-Tasmania trade, to Bell Bay and Burnie. This vessel, "Bass Trader", in addition to trucks, carried flats and containers on deck. It also completed three trips a week and the only additional labour used was eight extra men added to the Melbourne A.N.L. terminal force, and 10 men permanently employed at Bell Bay and 10 at Burnie.

The "Bass Trader" commenced running on 11 April, 1961. The A.N.L. has altered some older vessels to carry containers and has used them in the Mainland-Tasmania trade, and also the Melbourne-Sydney-Queensland trade.

However, these were stopgap arrangements and the A.N.L. has placed orders for two vehicle-deck vessels for the Melbourne-Sydney-Queensland run, and one further vehicle-deck ship for the Bass Strait trade.

As the race to containerisation and unit-load ships is producing giant shipping consortiums and companies throughout the world, so does it sound the death-knell of small stevedoring companies in the local scene. Container complexes have room only for the big. In process in Australia at present is quite a battle for the right to stay in the stevedoring industry. This applies particularly to the independent stevedores. Take-overs are in progress.

Additional to this is the fact that since containerisation involves the integrated use of every type of transport medium, it becomes the direct concern of big transport haulage companies. Thus, big shipping companies are buying into transport companies, preferably edging towards a controlling interest. As an example, the P. & O. group is edging into Mayne Nickless Ltd. through the Associated Steamship Co.

It is obvious from all this that the effects of this cargo-handling revolution are widespread. What then of their effect on the labour forces employed in the transport industry? It must be accepted that workers all along the line, from managerial staff to message boys, will be affected.

Looking at the problem of waterside workers, the effects of all types of technological change on the waterfront of Australia to the present have produced the results disclosed by the following figures taken from the A.S.I.A. reports. In 1951-52 the average number employed daily was 18,354. In 1965-66 it was 13,679, a reduction of 4,675. The number of registered waterside workers in 1951-52 was 24,735; today it is only 20,804, representing a reduction of 3,931. Total cargo handled in 1951-52 was 24,687,000 tons. In 1965-66 it was

37,268,000, an increase of 12,581,000. Man-hours worked in 1951-52 amounted to 40,864,019, and, in 1965-66, to 28,953,000, a reduction of 11,911,019. With an average number of 4,675 fewer employed daily in 1965-66 than in 1951-52, 12,581,000 more tons of cargo were being handled.

Mr. Carey: And this brings prosperity to the State of Queensland.

Mr. DONALD: The hon. member shows that he is not interested in the workers of Queensland if he thinks that this sort of thing brings prosperity to all of us. If he had to live on the dole or hump his swag from job to job—if he could get a job and hold it—he would not think that ours was a very affluent society. If he lost his job through automation and had to earn his living by the sweat of his brow, he would be on the dole and supporting the Communist Party and the groups of Reds who say, “The evils of the social order can be met only by Communism.” If the hon. member who interjected lost his seat in Parliament, he would be a supporter not of the Labour Party or the Liberal Party but the Communist Party. So far is he removed from the common struggle of working men that he does not understand their problems at all.

I said at the beginning of my speech that I was not against automation and technical improvement as long as its fruits were enjoyed by the worker as well as the employer.

(Time expired.)

Mr. WHARTON (Burnett) (4.53 p.m.): I rise to take part in the Budget debate and compliment the Treasurer on a very good and well-presented Budget. At least members could hear what he said, which is necessary if one is to assess the Budget and decide whether it is good or bad. I am sure that even his critics would concede that the Treasurer is not too bad at all. I think that he is very good, and that he presented the Budget very ably.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the Leader of the Opposition and, from the Government's point of view, I compliment him on his contribution. As long as he is the Leader of the Opposition, it will be a long time before hon. members opposite attain the Government benches. I feel that he made no contribution at all to the many problems confronting the State.

Mr. Sherrington: Who would you be to judge?

Mr. WHARTON: I am no judge at all, but I like to consider these things, and if the hon. member who interjected could only see himself as others see him, he would get a beautiful picture on TV!

I listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. member for Baroona, who made a very entertaining contribution to the debate. However, to say that “Chalk is chalk” does not achieve anything for this great State.

The hon. member who preceded me in the debate dealt with containerisation. I have read a good deal on that subject and listened to quite a number of papers on it, and the hon. member for Ipswich East did have his facts straight. The hon. member for Albert interjected at one stage, but I compliment the hon. member for Ipswich East on that part of his contribution to the debate, which was factual and easy to listen to.

The hon. member for Condamine suggests to me that the hon. member for Baroona might lead the Labour Party. I do not think he will. In politics one is a member of a team, and that applies in every party; that applies in the party to which I belong, too. Things happen in chronological sequence.

The Financial Statement that the Treasurer has presented to the Committee on this occasion is much better than the one that he presented last year, when the Government was very much concerned about the State's finances. When an overdraft can be reduced by almost half in one year, the person concerned should be complimented. It is a sound business principle, of course, for every Treasurer—the Treasurer of the State, the treasurer of a school committee, or the treasurer of any other undertaking—to try to balance his budget, and the Government would fail dismally if it did not keep that consideration in mind.

Mr. Bromley: You don't have to push the public while you are doing it.

Mr. WHARTON: I do not say that is always necessary. I agree with the hon. member to the extent that I believe that money in the hands of the people is better than money in the hands of the Government. However, I am sure that the hon. member for Norman would accept that the Government must undertake some work. It should keep affairs in their correct perspective and not take too much money from the taxpayers for this purpose. I am sure, too, that the hon. member will share the Treasurer's real pleasure in the fact that there has been a reduction in the accumulated deficit without recourse to Loan Funds with consequent loss of capital-work opportunities and abnormally high Sinking Fund costs. What has been achieved has been achieved with credit to the Government and to the Treasurer.

The Government has not neglected in any way the continuing progress of the State. As I said earlier, it is a fine effort on its part to reduce the State's overdraft by a half; but it is not worth while if it is achieved at the expense of selling assets, reducing spending, and retarding progress. The Government must keep its finances in correct perspective consistent with continuing progress, and that is what the Country-Liberal Government has done ever since it came to office.

I do worry to some extent when I see that the highest increase in revenue is from succession and probate duties. As I have said before, the State must get revenue from some sources; but, speaking as a country representative, I think that probate and succession duties are fairly severe. I made the point that with land a man builds up an asset, the magnitude of which is not realised until he passes on or makes a sale but from which he gets little return during the process of building it up. As the hon. member for Albert said, the Labour Party would put on a capital gains tax. We do not want to do this.

Mr. O'Donnell: You put a sectional tax on the primary producers and then withdrew it.

Mr. WHARTON: We changed our minds, and the ability to do so is desirable. If we can bring about some reduction in probate and succession duties it will be a good thing for country people and probably for every person in the State. It is better for a man to pay his way as he goes along than to have the total amount taken off in one slice at the end of the road.

Mr. Chalk: Are you in favour of an increase in taxation and less probate and death duties?

Mr. WHARTON: It is far better for a man to pay as he goes along than to have all of it taken in death duties. As the Treasurer has given local authorities the right to pay on terms, why not give us the right to die on terms? It would be easier to pay and much better than a tax which is levied in full in one year. I think we should see if some relief can be effected in this direction. Other States have very good probate and succession duty legislation. It is good for the individual and it does not hurt the State. If we can make the people of the State happy we achieve something, whether it is done Budget-wise or in some other way.

Mr. Sherrington interjected.

Mr. WHARTON: I could not make the hon. member happy. That would be impossible, although I notice he has a smile on his face now, which is quite remarkable.

One gratifying aspect of meetings of the Australian Loan Council is the fact that local authorities have been allowed to increase their borrowings from \$200,000 to \$300,000. I think this is a step forward because local authorities play a very important role in government. They are very close to the people, and I admire my particular group of local authorities for the work they do and the attitude they adopt towards the progress of the districts they represent. We must commend them for it, and in order to assist them must see that they have ample funds. In these days of rising costs,

it is appropriate that we should increase the amount of their borrowing so that they can continue to do all the work possible.

It is not our prerogative to do local work. That is the work of local government, but it is up to us to see that they have ample funds with which to do it. I make the point too that local authorities—and I refer particularly to those in my own electorate—need to keep their work forces fully employed. Over the years they have built up a plant and work force and that work force belongs to the community. We must endeavour, as far as we can, to keep that work force fully employed.

I know that the Main Roads Department works on an intensive basis and must maintain its work force, but we must see also that each local authority work force is maintained in full employment. I know hon. members will support this contention because such a work force is an important part of the community and, indeed, many communities depend on it. We must endeavour to maintain that work force in the country districts. I know that the Government does this. I am reminded by the hon. member for Condamine that the Commonwealth Government did a grand job in providing drought relief to local authorities.

Mr. Davies: Far too late.

Mr. WHARTON: I would not say that it was too late. I am sorry that the hon. member is always late. At the same time it is better late than never.

As a result of the assistance provided by the Commonwealth Government and the State Government, Gin Gin is now well served with such amenities as kerbing and good footpaths. The work force that was thrown out of employment mainly as a result of the drought and the consequent effect on the cane crop was kept employed. That is one area that benefited greatly from the Federal Government's allocation. This is the sort of thing we should foster. I hope that in the future the Main Roads Department will ensure that sufficient work is available to maintain the work force in that area. The people of Gin Gin would be lost without it, and so would any other country town, district or shire.

I compliment the Treasurer on his statements about the attitude of the Commonwealth Government towards the allocation of funds to the State. In the past we have suffered because of the inadequate allocation of funds. Queensland is a vast State with long distances to be covered by road and rail transport and it has only a small population. At the same time, it is a developing State and I endorse what the Treasurer said about this matter. Nevertheless, we have to remember that the Commonwealth Government is responsible for defence. This poses a complex problem. Expenditure on defence will rise as the years go on. Perhaps this is one

of the reasons why we should tackle some of the problems ourselves even though I have always been inclined to think we should not. To do the job ourselves if we possibly can is an attitude that we have inherited. I am sure that all will agree that money must be allocated to defence so that our nation can be defended. A glance at the map of the world reveals how isolated is Australia, and if America should leave the Vietnam scene—

Mr. Newton: Do you think that more defence money should be allotted to Queensland?

Mr. WHARTON: I agree. Development of roads in Queensland is vital. We have to foster road construction and electricity development in this State. This Government has done that.

Defence is an all-important matter. The Communists are trying to win the war, not by fighting but by peace talks. We did not win the war in Korea; there were only peace talks. I am reliably informed that those peace talks are still continuing. The same thing applies to Vietnam. Instead of bombing Hanoi, where all the artillery and ammunition and other means of warfare is coming in, we are having a little scrap, and they say, "We will not finish this war until we have a peace talk." We will never win the war by peaceful means. We must get into this war. I say that the Commonwealth Government is right in its attitude and in its international dealings, if we want to win the war. If we do not win it, and the Commos. win it, Australia will be left like a shag on a rock.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. WHARTON: The hon. member does not have to listen. There is one thing about debates in this Assembly and that is that an hon. member does not have to listen. I was good enough to let an hon. member read a lengthy communication a little time ago, and I listened with interest to what he had to say. The hon. member can listen, but if he does not want to do so, he need not. That is an important privilege of democracy.

Mr. Sherrington: What do you think about what Zara said about "getting with it"?

Mr. WHARTON: I sometimes think that if the hon. member got "with it" on occasions he would be really "with it".

I have a few remarks to make about education and I believe they are warranted. We have heard much talk about education in this State, some off the beam, and some on the beam. An assessment of what has happened in our electorates, as we see it, is the best criterion of progress. There is no doubt that much has been done. I do not wish to reiterate what the Treasurer has said as I may be accused of tedious repetition. There is no doubt that, under our Government, the State has progressed in

the field of education. That is undeniable; the figures prove it and so do the amenities that have been provided. If we look at the Burnett electorate we find that between 1957 and 1967 almost \$2,000,000 has been spent on school buildings. And that is in only one electorate! Burnett is not the most favoured electorate in the State. Although the Minister is present—he is a very good Minister—I repeat that Burnett is not the most favoured electorate. The Minister does a very good job. When we became the Government there was no high school at Gayndah, no secondary department at Gin Gin, nothing at Miriamvale and nothing at Rosedale. They are there now.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. WHARTON: Good representation and good government. The Government assessed the needs and built the secondary departments, high tops and high schools in the various centres. The hon. member for Maryborough knows what has been done. When I was a child I had to go to the Maryborough Grammar School to get my education. My parents were poor, but they had to pay. My children did not have to go away; their received their education at the secondary departments in Gayndah. I was one of the few who went away in those days but nowadays children do not have to go away to get a decent education. The great majority proceed to Senior. Is that not progress for the people and their children? We had no free road transport, but we have it today. Those in the outlying district can catch the school bus.

Mr. O'Donnell: The Labour Government introduced free transport. Do not take away credit for that.

Mr. WHARTON: I would never take credit from anyone. If the Labour Government did it I have yet to find the pages in the history book. I would like to see it afterwards. If the Labour Government did it, it must have put it on half a page.

I have referred briefly to secondary departments and school buses. We now have thousands of school bus runs. Gayndah, Biggenden, Miriamvale and Rosedale have secondary department buses and primary school buses that were not in operation before we became the Government. These are the things that are appreciated by the people. The attitude of the present generation is to want more and more, and is that not a good approach? If we stop demanding progress we will not make progress. The Government is well seized of the education position and has done a good job in that field and will continue to do so. The Budget provides for an increase of 11 per cent. in expenditure on education. That is what the people, the children, and the Government of Queensland want.

Mr. Houston: Don't you think you had better sit down now?

Mr. WHARTON: No. I listened to the Leader of the Opposition and was disappointed with what he said. He should let me say something and he might be able to support it.

Mr. Houston: Tell us whether you want redistribution.

Mr. WHARTON: I thought that the Leader of the Opposition would move the customary amendment to reduce the salary of the poor old Aide-de-Camp by \$1 so that we could discuss redistribution, but he did not.

The Leader of the Opposition represents people who enjoy amenities such as shops and stores, transport right at the doorstep, the choice of 10 picture theatres, electricity right at the finger-tips, and lawyers and solicitors laid on all over the place.

Mr. Houston: Because the laws are so mediaeval.

Mr. WHARTON: The Opposition helped to make them.

Mr. O'Sullivan: They could walk around their electorates in half-an-hour.

Mr. WHARTON: That is true. Opposition members represent unions in which one person speaks for a thousand people. Like many country members I represent pioneers who went out into the country and developed it. They are miles from anywhere. They do not have good roads, although this Government has provided them with much better roads than they had. They have been given better schools. Power has been reticulated in many remote areas. These people need good representation because they are individualists. They do things for themselves and, although they never look for Government help unless they cannot do without it, they need it in some cases. Metropolitan members could represent up to 100,000 people, and that is fair enough. I am quite happy to represent 10,000 people out in the country who are doing a grand job for the whole State of Queensland and for the Commonwealth. On the international level this could win peace for the world. Unionism, because it is centralised, is destroying the progress of this State. We want decentralisation so that we can get people out into the country. The greatest disadvantage in the country is that it is so sparsely populated. We need more people there to consume what is produced there so that we do not have to pay the freight to Brisbane and back again, because that hinders the progress of the State.

Mr. Houston: Do you think it is fair that your electorate has fewer electors than Cook?

Mr. WHARTON: I am not concerned with numbers; I am concerned with areas.

Mr. Houston: Cook is a larger area than your electorate.

Mr. WHARTON: Quite so.

Mr. Houston: And it has more people. Is there any justice in that?

Mr. WHARTON: What is wrong with it?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. WHARTON: I shall be very glad to do that, Mr. Hooper. Without changing the subject too much, I say that all the arguments about redistribution will work themselves out. I hope that it will be done in a just way, not as the Leader of the Opposition would have it done. We will see that people living in the country have ample good, solid representation. They deserve it, and we are the Government to give it to them.

I now wish to deal with water conservation, which is an important subject in this debate and one close to my heart. When I hear of the money to be spent on education, I wonder what will happen if, having educated the people, farmers have no water for the production of crops. A proper balance has to be maintained. I make the point that water is of vital importance to the State.

I suppose no other State of the Commonwealth needs more money for water conservation than does Queensland. I know that a good job has been done with limited financial resources, and I appreciate that there is a reluctance to take money from other votes for this purpose. I compliment the Treasurer and other Ministers on the increased allocation for water conservation. I know that many schemes deserve attention, and many have in fact been carried out. The Wuruma Dam scheme, planned for completion in 1968, no doubt will be of great assistance in my neck of the woods.

What is being done is good, but it is not enough. This is what has to be constantly repeated, because once we stop saying, "It is not enough" we will go backwards instead of forward. The Kolan scheme has been submitted to the Federal Government, and has been commended by both that Government and the State Government. It is a fairly costly scheme involving over \$20,000,000, and for that reason beyond the State's present capacity. If it were undertaken by the State, its progress would be so slow that its benefits would be lost.

It may be of interest to hon. members to know that this season the Gin Gin mill has broken many crushing records, which reflects great credit on those who are operating it. I know that I had something to say when ownership of the mill was changed, but the important thing is that it was maintained in the district for the benefit of the farmers and the community. I think it is important that the mill is now operating efficiently and has broken crushing records. The Kolan water conservation scheme will bring security to the mill, the sugar industry, and the farming community round Gin Gin. Although the proposal has gone to the

Federal Government, and although the promise was made at an election held some time ago, no funds have been allocated to any of the States.

Mr. Davies interjected.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Maryborough is not in his usual place.

Mr. WHARTON: I respect that ruling, Mr. Hooper. I will not answer the hon. member's interjection.

The matter is urgent, and I give credit to the Queensland Cabinet for acting quickly, surveying the scheme, approving of it, and putting it before the Federal Government. As I said, no action has been taken. I have been informed—I hope reliably—that this is because the other States have not yet submitted all their schemes. It is similar to going to a meeting early and having to sit round waiting for others to come.

Mr. Davies: We can teach them a lesson at the Senate election.

Mr. WHARTON: I do not think that the hon. member for Maryborough teaches anyone much. How he ever taught children in the schools, I do not know. However, that is in the past, so I will not go into it.

The district badly needs a water scheme. Bundaberg, which I believe is the best provincial city in Queensland, is progressing rapidly, but it needs water.

Mr. Sullivan: Wasn't a symposium held there recently?

Mr. WHARTON: Yes. The Minister for Education made a very valuable contribution to it. What he said had meat in it. Earlier today the hon. member for Baroona said, "Chalk is chalk". That does not mean anything; it has not any meat in it.

The scheme has been listed for Federal aid and will be very satisfactory if it receives approval. However, the area does not want to be left sitting out on a limb. If it misses out on Federal aid, it wants to go back on the State list from which it has now been removed.

On this occasion I am pushing the barrow for the sugar industry and for Bundaberg. That city has had a good deal of trouble with its water supply and underground levels are now being reduced. For this reason, I am concerned for the sake of the citizens. In my opinion, a good deal of the responsibility rests with the city council, and if I were a member of the council I would try to tap available water supplies. There is water at the Bingera Weir, but a number of farmers in the Woongarra Shire are wholly dependent on underground supplies. I believe that the water should be shared equally, and it seems wrong that the farmers should be asked to give up their water

supplies. They have been involved in heavy capital costs in providing bores, wells, and pumping equipment. I have no real worry about licensing, but the question is: what is the point of licensing without restriction? I am against restricting supplies in this area because the farmers have committed themselves to heavy capital expenditure in augmenting supplies.

I feel that the State Government, although I am not in any way derogatory of it, should play its part, and we have to see that this district gets its share of water without unduly taxing underground supplies. That is why this Kolan-Burnett scheme, submitted to the Commonwealth Government, is most important to the farming community, though it will concern not only the farming community but also the population of Bundaberg which is very rapidly expanding. Bundaberg is a very progressive town. The population has increased and the town has progressed in line with demand. Greater areas of agricultural land are under sugar, tobacco and other crops, and we are now turning to vegetable growing and processing. This is an important adjunct of primary production. Steps are now being taken to set up a processing plant for vegetables and other products. This is a good thing for both the town and the district because not only will it provide a handy market for those who produce the goods but it will also provide employment for many people who depend on the district for employment. Those interested in the sugar industry will appreciate how important it is to have labour when it is wanted, but at the end of the season that labour becomes surplus.

Mr. Davies interjected.

Mr. WHARTON: There is no doubt that the hon. member is always thinking of his "tummy".

To continue on the aspect of the importance of water in our district, I know I may come up against some other members who want water in their districts, but I think I have a good case. If we consider the Nogoa Gap scheme we must realise that when the water is made available—at considerable cost—we then have to find people, a township, roads—

Mr. O'Donnell: Are you criticising the Premier's policy?

Mr. WHARTON: I did not make the Premier's policy. As a matter of fact, I had no part in it, and the hon. member would know this, too.

Mr. Sherrington: We all have a share in making our policy.

Mr. WHARTON: The hon. member may have had a share in making his party's policy but all that concerns me is that this Kolan-Burnett scheme should be completed to serve the city of Bundaberg and district. All we want is water. We have everything else. If

a man in the business world wants one thing only, he does not look for money for something else. If the district has everything except water, money should be put into water, and I hope this scheme will be realised with the Federal Government's assistance. I may be having two bob each way but, as long as I achieve something for the people I represent, I will be satisfied. That is my main consideration, and I think I have established that these people have a very deserving case.

I want to say something about the sugar industry because it is very important in my electorate. We have five sugar mills. It is not a thriving industry at the moment but it has played its part. Many of those in the industry are struggling because of the cost of expansion, the drought, and a few other factors which have all culminated in making this a very difficult time for sugar-growers.

I feel that, as a Government, we have done something for the sugar industry, and I respect the attitude of the Commonwealth Government in its allocation of \$19,000,000 for the industry last year.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the hon. member for Tablelands and the hon. member for Albert desire to have a conversation I suggest they go outside the Chamber.

Mr. WHARTON: The Federal Government has made a further allocation of \$15,000,000 in this year's Budget. These things all help. I know that we cannot interfere in international agreements, but we can use every effort to get a much better return for the sugar industry. It is a vital industry, one that has played a very important role in the State's economy and has been the producer of reasonably cheap food. Of course, the industry is restricted to Queensland and northern New South Wales. We must do everything possible to keep it prosperous because of its importance to the State and the nation, and our other markets.

Mr. R. Jones: What do you say the State Government did for the sugar industry?

Mr. WHARTON: It has done a lot. The hon. member would know if he studied some of the things it has done. I am glad to be associated with a Government that has received this kind of assistance from the Federal Government.

Mr. R. Jones: What do you suggest it should do in a bad year? Do you think there should be more loans?

Mr. WHARTON: I do not think I need answer the question. I am talking about sugar. I am not altogether in favour of loans at any time. Loans do play an important part if a bright future can be seen. The sugar industry is a very competent industry. It is well organised and well able to help itself. The industry says that the sugar price will come right at some time in the near

future. If the industry believes this, I think we should lend a hand to try to make sure it does come good.

Mr. R. Jones: Do you think that Queensland should be represented at the International Conference?

Mr. WHARTON: That is a matter for that body. Our Premier went over to help. He did a very good job then and no doubt he will do it again if the occasion arises.

Mr. R. Jones interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is not obliged to answer interjections.

Mr. WHARTON: Thank you, Mr. Hooper. It is a bit hard to answer some of the questions when they are so stupid.

I compliment the Treasurer upon the action taken by the Agricultural Bank in landing money for the development of sugar farms and other types of farm. The Agricultural Bank plays an important role in many industries. I am glad to see the allocation has been increased by at least \$1,000,000, but I feel that that is not enough. In this modern day and age primary production needs greater funds than ever before. Higher costs of development create a need for greater funds. I feel that the Agricultural Bank could play a much more important role if more funds were available to it. I look upon it as our State bank for the primary producers. Although the other banks have played a magnificent part, the Agricultural Bank, which is purely and simply an agricultural bank, has played an all-important role, and we want it to continue to do so. It cannot play its correct role unless it has ample funds. The Agricultural Bank reinvests funds made available to it through the Treasury. It can well be realised that it does not make a great deal of profit out of its transactions.

We have to go beyond the old-fashioned ideas about finance that we have had over the years. We have to do something different about finance. We have to allow the Agricultural Bank to play a greater part. I look forward to the day when we can facilitate the work of the Agricultural Bank by making more money available to it.

At this stage I should like to deal with drought relief, the provision of which is one of the functions of the Agricultural Bank. I appreciate the assistance provided to dairy-farmers, graziers, and sugar-growers. Someone asked if I believe in loans. Loans are essential and some do not attract interest for a time. They help an industry to get over some problems, and provide a breathing space for getting over a drought. However, we cannot give grants to farmers. If we did we would have to give grants to workers. We have to maintain a balance and keep our feet on the ground, with a policy that can be applied to workers and farmers. Businessmen cannot get grants because of the

dry period, and because some people do not pay their accounts. Likewise, farmers cannot be given grants because of a drought.

An Opposition Member: What about the tax on co-operatives?

Mr. WHARTON: The hon. member is wide of the mark. I could talk all day about that if he wishes. I know a little about it.

There is one aspect of drought relief on which I must offer some criticism, namely, drought relief assistance, and the way it affects dairy companies and, I take it, other associations that collect the loans on behalf of the Agricultural Bank. I agree that a dairy company, or a miller, or whoever is charged with collecting loans, should co-operate and collect funds from the sugar-grower and dairy farmer or whoever it might be. I agree that it should act as a medium of collection. If a dairyman sends his cream to the factory it is a simple matter for the factory to retain certain proceeds and return them to the Agricultural Bank. That is fair enough. I am sure that the dairying industry, or any other industry, would co-operate in doing that. However, I object strongly to it and strongly criticise the system whereby a dairy company has to collect final amounts due from a farmer, after receiving a note from the Agricultural Bank saying, "So-and-so has not paid his drought relief account; go and collect it; the only way you can collect it is to sell him up." I think it is the bank's function to collect money when it comes to selling a property or something of that nature. A dairy company or a mill certainly should, or would, collect proceeds from crop returns but in the matter of non-payment of loans any normal bank would sell up its client or prosecute the client to collect the funds. Why should not the Agricultural Bank do the same rather than ask the dairy company or milling association to do it? That is wrong and I think we are exceeding our functions as a dairy company or a milling association when we have to do that. That is the responsibility of the Agricultural Bank and I trust that the Treasurer, at some time, will amend the drought relief regulations so that the final collection of drought relief loans, especially when a farmer has left the industry, is kept in its proper perspective. In my area a farmer left the industry, and I know some at Milmerran who have left the industry and are working on the road, and the dairy company has received a notice from the Agricultural Bank saying, "This man owes us some money; you go out and collect it." In all sincerity, how can we collect it? It is the bank's job to sell up its client if it wants to collect; it should not be the responsibility of the dairy company.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: Do you think the term of the loan should be extended?

Mr. WHARTON: I do not think that is relevant. It depends on the circumstances. Extending the loan could help considerably and, if it helps without detriment to the bank, it should be extended. Some people do not need an extended term and others do.

The Vote for the Department of Forestry has been increased by 20 per cent. That is good, but we have not done enough soon enough. Our forestry reserves have been sadly depleted and it is a grand thing that we have reforestation. I am glad of the Commonwealth assistance in this regard to expand forestry.

A new forestry area has been declared around the Elliott River in my electorate. It is being replanted. I congratulate the Minister for the progressive attitude he has adopted and for the long-term nature of his plan. The buildings are a credit to the department. Forestry workers have to go into the forest—I was going to say "bush" and it is bush—and they deserve all the amenities that can be provided by the department in the way of decent buildings. I congratulate the department on what it has done because if we are to have long-term expansion in that industry we must do things properly.

I hope to see more expansion in the Biggenden area. Many people have left the district, mainly because of redundancy following dieselisation of our railways. Six families in the Biggenden area who were gainfully employed by their respective departments have left the district. There is a drift of population from the dairy industry which is suffering dry times. We could keep Biggenden as a grand little community if we could keep the people there. A large area of land has been set aside for reforestation, and the sooner we get on with the job the better. If we lose employment in one field we will gain it in another.

It may be of interest to hon. members to know that the Goodnight scrub area is the largest self-generating pine forest in the world. I was surprised to learn that myself. It is something of a credit to the district. It is proving a boon. Tenders have been called for the mills to take the hoop pine that is there and I believe there will be further reforestation in that area.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: I think you have impressed the Minister.

Mr. WHARTON: If I have, I have achieved something. A pleasing feature of the Budget is that it contains no increase in rates, fees, freights, or fares.

Mr. Sherrington: That is not what you said last year.

Mr. WHARTON: The hon. member is always trying to be two jumps ahead of me. He should let me say what I want to say. It is good that there is no increase in these things because such

increases make a Budget unpopular. The Government has achieved something if it has been able to reduce its overdraft by half. If we have been able to do that I am sure the people are happy.

We have a good railway system and it is getting better with dieselisation. But we are lagging with passenger traffic.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: When did you last travel on the Biggenden train?

Mr. WHARTON: It is really the Gayndah-Monto train. I have travelled on it. It is a good train and the fellows working it are good blokes. They are good to me and I hope I am good to them. We would attract more passengers if we had cheaper passenger fares, and there would be no loss of revenue because at present some carriages are empty. I was on this train recently. There were 14 seats in the carriage and I was the only passenger.

Mr. Sherrington: You didn't pay then.

Mr. WHARTON: I will have to pay that one! I am offering this suggestion as a means of gaining revenue for the State and gainfully employing railway staff. I think that reducing fares considerably and attracting more passengers would achieve two things—obtaining revenue for the Railway Department and, as a safety measure, getting people off the roads. The State has not as yet enough roads, and most accidents seem to occur because motorists "run out of road." One means of meeting the situation is attracting people to train travel till the Government's great road-building programme is completed. If more people would use the railways, even at lower fares, some advantage would be gained by the Government. After all, the railways have to be made to pay.

I now want to deal with something of a controversial nature, namely, road taxes and fees.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: Can you tell me how many tobacco farmers you have in your area?

Mr. WHARTON: About 367. I am glad to say something about them because they have produced excellent crops and have been able to sell them, and for this they should receive every encouragement. After all, if something cannot be sold, it is not worth anything. Some have had difficulties but, over all, they have been able to sell their product and sell it well. Although they are limited by quotas, they have been able to sell what they have grown in excess of them, and that is very important.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: Don't some grow cane as well?

Mr. WHARTON: Yes, but that is beside the point.

I now wish to say something about road-transport fees. I think that the free limit of 25 miles should be waived. I know that a lot of people will prick their ears at that. I think that the limit of 25 miles should be removed and everybody should pay, which would mean that only a small amount would have to be paid in the country and everyone would, in general, be happy. I know that some people in the cities will say, "That is pretty crook." Of course it is, but what about the fellow in the bush? It is more than "crook" for him. There has to be a system based on equity and justice, and this is one way in which people in rural areas could be given relief in taxation, which is one of the things that drive them to the cities, where they add to urban congestion and other problems. Everything should be done to keep people in the country and help develop the State on a basis of decentralisation.

I was going to deal with containerisation. The hon. member for Ipswich East said a great deal about it, including much against it. It is one of the best things to come to this State, and it was the wharf labourers, and no-one else, who caused its introduction. If people are happy, and fully employed and doing a good job, there is no need to alter anything.

(Time expired.)

[Sitting suspended from 5.54 to 7.15 p.m.]

Mr. O'DONNELL (Barcoo) (7.15 p.m.): Tonight I feel very disappointed with the Budget that has been presented by the Treasurer.

Mr. Chalk: I would not expect otherwise.

Mr. O'DONNELL: No doubt the Treasurer would not, because he has "scrubbed" me for everything that I have been promised over the last two years.

Mr. Chalk: Why don't you represent your electorate better?

Mr. O'DONNELL: I represent my electorate exceptionally well. As a matter of fact, I made representations to the Treasurer at Aramac, and also to the Premier, and, if the Treasurer's crocodile tears, together with those of the Premier, had been desalinated we would not have had a drought in the West. The Treasurer and the Premier returned to Brisbane and they were not even game to make representations to the Minister for Health to obtain a hospital for Aramac.

The Treasurer "scrubbed" me for a separate high school at Emerald. He "scrubbed" me for the Gindie State School, which has been promised for over two years. The police station at Emerald, which is the old black trackers' quarters, is still not replaced, although it was promised two years ago. In addition, the proposed new courthouse at Emerald has been completely forgotten. There may be some reason for this departmentally of which I am not aware. I

do not want to be unfair; because of expansion at Emerald the plans for the court-house may have to be redrafted.

All I am getting out of my representations is a few small improvements at Blackall hospital, and a few miserable dollars in order to draw up plans for a Primary Industries Department building in Emerald. The Treasurer led with his chin and I have great pleasure in whacking it.

It is a most unusual Budget that the Treasurer has presented to the Committee. I feel that the parade of Ministers through my electorate during the last 12 months was completely show and nothing else. We had the Minister for Works and Housing in the electorate, and I know that he returned to Brisbane astounded at the knowledge that he would have to erect a high school, a police station and a court-house there. Because it was a Labour electorate—it could not have been for any other reason—the plans were “scrubbed” to get the department out of trouble.

This Government is condemned by its Treasurer's reports. If hon. members read back and see what has been listed and what has been completely forgotten simply for the edification of certain electorates in this State, they cannot do other than condemn the Government.

I should like to say that the representations I have made over the years have been fairly successful and I was hoping that the items I listed tonight would round matters off and make a complete job so far as the development of my electorate is concerned. Some hon. members opposite are rather filled with the after-dinner spirit. They see merit in the Government's approach to these matters, but we have witnessed rather a strange attitude by this Government over the last couple of years.

The big excuse that is put forward—to some extent justifiably—is the disastrous drought the State has suffered. In order to justify itself in the eyes of certain sections of the community, particularly where the votes are the strongest, the Government brings down a Budget that is a very great disappointment to the rural population.

I was provoked into making these remarks, but I do want to point out what is happening in various departments. I was told the other day that in the town of Alpha, which is almost in the heart of the State, despite the great heat during the summer months the Government has refused to subsidise the purchase of fans for use in the school, even though the local people are prepared to pay half the cost. What a strange attitude on the part of the Government! The Government also refuses to fly-proof a Government building in Jericho because of its location.

Mr. Camm: It is 50 years old.

Mr. O'DONNELL: It is a new building; it was erected during this Government's term of office. This is supposed to be a Government dominated by a Country Party that appreciates the needs of the population of the rural areas, yet it says that the school in Alpha does not need fans and the police building in Jericho does not need fly-proofing.

Let us look at the Railway Department under the control of Mr. Knox, who goes for a swim every morning. That is a strenuous exercise in physical culture for the puny purpose of saying “No”. He says that railwaymen at Barcaldine, Blackall and Jericho do not require cold water in the summer months; that it just is not an amenity they deserve. If a cold-water system was installed at Barcaldine railway station it would be a necessary amenity for the staff of nine and also for the clients of the Railway Department—the people who help make the railways pay. The average number of passengers travelling to or from Barcaldine on the Midlander would be about 30. They and their friends who come to welcome them or see them off cannot get a cold drink because this Government is too miserable—

Mr. Rae: Now you are talking!

Mr. O'DONNELL: I am talking about water, not hotels. The Midlander arrives in Barcaldine at 7.15 a.m.

It is regarded as totally beyond the capacity of this Government to supply fans in the offices of the Railway Department. The engineer can have one, for one person, in his office, but in the main office, which is occupied by the station-master and his staff, no fan is supplied. What a generous attitude on the part of this Government, which claims that it is so benevolent to the people of Queensland!

Let us consider some of the Government buildings. I will tell the Treasurer how to pay for the amenities I have mentioned. If he looks at some of the schools that have been built by the Government he will see the waste of space in stair-wells that have been provided and that, in themselves, are a fire hazard. There is space for an additional room in the stair-well and the stair-well itself is an additional cost that could be saved by providing stairs projecting from the building, with a cover.

Mr. Carey interjected.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I do not wish to listen to the incompetent member for Albert. He makes his speeches only through interjections.

In the last 12 months, after repeated representations—and after 78 years of service—the Government has decided to dispense with the Jericho railway station. It is erecting a very good building, which is appreciated. However, there is no thought of providing a raised platform for the benefit

of the people. Jericho is a railway refreshment station, and a raised platform should have been provided. If an architect with an eye to economy had looked at the plans he could have allocated sufficient money for a building and thus applied the money saved to the building of a raised platform.

Probably one of the most attractive railway stations in the Central West will be without a raised platform for the benefit of the people who have to get off the train to use the refreshment rooms or to catch the train to Blackall. This is a strategic point, but the Government does not seem to think of these things. It is becoming rather more concerned with Brisbane, Rockhampton and Townsville to the detriment of Blackall, Longreach, Barcaldine, Jericho, Alpha, Aramac, and so on. I say without fear of contradiction that if the hon. member for Gregory would stop muttering he would agree with me on these matters.

Mr. Rae: I am doing a pretty good job in my area. All your people are asking me to help you.

Mr. O'DONNELL: The hon. member for Gregory made a very short speech today.

Mr. Rae: But to the point.

Mr. O'DONNELL: It was to the point, and the point was exactly this: there is a coming vacancy in the Cabinet and he thought that if he did the right thing this time his previous sins of omission might be forgotten. I am sorry that the Minister for Education was not in the Chamber.

Mr. Rae interjected.

Mr. O'DONNELL: In answer to that interjection, and in all fairness to the hon. member, we would prefer a Minister who came from the West. We would accept the hon. member for Gregory in preference to the hon. member for Condamine.

To return to a note of seriousness, if the Treasurer and his Cabinet colleagues moved around the country a little more than they do, they would appreciate that there is a feeling of unrest in the western areas over the high cost of living. I have previously raised this matter in the Chamber. I have been astounded by the number of people who raise this matter with me repeatedly. I do not go into my electorate to discuss politics. People who know me well know that I go there to listen to what my electors have to say.

Wherever I go people ask me what can be done about the high cost of living. They point out they can buy cigarettes in Brisbane and in Blackall, Barcaldine, or Longreach at the same price. But what intrigues them is that this does not apply to other items. They are greatly concerned about it and feel that in this matter they are getting a very rough deal, and that the powers that be that meet in Brisbane and are supposed to represent country people are not giving sufficient thought to this aspect of government.

The feeling of unrest is growing. I agree with the hon. member for Toowoomba West, who just prompted me that what happened in Capricornia could be a barometer reading of what will happen in the future and that the Government could well take heed of it.

I shall come back to this later in greater detail. I feel that among primary producers there is still a strong feeling of resentment against the Government for the iniquitous rail freights and road-transport charges imposed in last year's Budget. They have not forgotten, and the feeling of resentment is growing. I also assure the Committee that the people have not forgotten the closure of the Roma-Injune railway line.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I shall take it a little further. The hon. member for Roma, whom I congratulated on winning the by-election, did not do so well. He would have done much better had the Roma-Injune railway line been left open. The Minister for Primary Industries should take a drive through the Arcadia Valley. It might open his eyes.

Mr. Row: I was there with you.

Mr. O'DONNELL: That is right. He should take another drive up there and have a look at it now. I was there last week with representatives of the Rural Fires Board and the Minister for Lands. It is evident that the Arcadia Valley needs the introduction of the tractor and the plough. This would not only safeguard against the danger of fire but would also convert the land, which is in danger of being reclaimed by brigalow sucker, into a prosperous agricultural and grazing area. This is important. But the rail outlet has been taken away. This is very disappointing indeed. These freight charges are of great significance and the Government will have reason to remember my words on this matter, as well as those that I uttered on the cost of living.

In Central Queensland we have a wonderful opportunity for development provided we have a sympathetic Government. A sympathetic Government is essential to these people. From time to time I have referred in this Chamber to the position of the sorghum industry. I have demonstrated that it is a low-profit industry and that I am most concerned about the rail freight rates as they affect this industry in an area which is taking part in the development of the State.

Sir William Gunn and his progressive colleagues will develop a sorghum industry in the Northern Territory. A sorghum industry will also be developed to the north of Central Queensland. In areas adjacent to the coast there will be an export trade to Japan with which the farmers in Central Queensland will not be able to compete. As a consequence, they will lose their incentive.

I warn the Government—I am not advising it—that this is an important matter. I have already spoken about the safflower

industry in Central Queensland. I went to a great deal of trouble to reassure the growers, when a kite was flown about a glut, that the position was very good and that contracts would be honoured. I took that matter up with the people concerned, including the Department of Primary Industries and the grain-growers themselves, so that producers would not feel any qualms or start to panic. Even in that short period when there was talk of a glut, bank managers started to reach very quickly for their zip-fasteners to close off credit.

I have spoken repeatedly about the necessity for confidence in the industry as a result of a close association between the Department of Primary Industries, the Grain Growers' Association and the farmers in the field, so that the producers can go about their work in the full knowledge that their next season's crop is protected.

Mr. Camm: This was made possible, was it not, by the trade agreement with Japan, which was opposed by every Labour member in the Federal House?

Mr. O'DONNELL: So far as Central Queensland is concerned, I want to see our sorghum going to Japan. I am not interested in what the Minister has to say. He may be wrong.

Honourable Members interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hodges): Order! The hon. member for Barcoo.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I return to the point that I am trying to make. It is important that an industry be kept informed of developments and possibilities, and I have quite frankly advised safflower growers, with the approval of the relevant bodies, to see that their contracts are good before they proceed. I have also had an assurance from Pacific Safflower that all their contracts will be honoured. Let us see, first of all, that there is no "jumping the gun" in the expectation that certain things will happen. Let the advice given be sound, and nobody will be critical and nobody will be hurt. What is important in primary industry today is the right advice and protection for those engaged in it.

So far this has been a rather noisy session. I now wish to deal with the Minister for Mines and Main Roads. He has been on tour and, although he was very courteous to me, I want to take him to task somewhat over his statement concerning Blair Athol.

Mr. Camm: Now you are talking about something of which you know nothing.

Mr. O'DONNELL: This is a matter that I do know something about. The Minister said that there was a big future for Blair Athol.

Mr. Camm: That is right.

Mr. O'DONNELL: He spoke about the extraction of oil. We have known about the extraction of oil from coal for donkey's years. Technical men have long been searching for a cheap method of extraction, and about 12 months ago the possibility of such a cheap process became a reality. We also know about the by-products of such a process. That is "old hat". I do not mind the Minister's making such statements and saying that Blair Athol has a wonderful future. But I have been in that area for a long, long time—

Mr. Camm: You didn't have the courtesy to go there when I visited it.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I should like the Minister to withdraw that remark, because I had to be in Barcaldine to honour a commitment that I had entered into earlier. I would have been with the Minister if I possibly could; I make it a practice to do that.

I say to the Minister through you, Mr. Hodges, that over many years we have seen kites flown about Blair Athol. When he makes a statement such as that, will he please tell us the date when it will become a reality?

Mr. Camm: I did not give a date; I said "in the future".

Mr. O'DONNELL: It might be 25 years.

Mr. Camm: It might be more.

Mr. O'DONNELL: The Minister did not say anything about a power-house at Blair Athol.

Mr. Camm: Don't talk to me about power-houses! We saw your rulers go to Collinsville and cause disruption up there.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I will deal with Collinsville now.

Mr. Camm: Don't come here talking about power-houses. Go down and tell Egerton and Macdonald and the Disputes Committee at the Trades Hall.

Mr. O'DONNELL: Collinsville was a State mine. A Government of which the Minister for Mines was a member sold it, and a power-station went up on that very site.

Mr. Camm: This Government put it there.

Mr. O'DONNELL: Yes.

Mr. Camm: And you have been up there ever since trying to disrupt its construction.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I should like to know how many tenders would have been received for the mine at Collinsville had it been known that a power-station was to be constructed there. I should like to know this, too. When the Minister for Local Government came to Emerald, he announced that a

power-station was to be built at Blackwater. He made that definite statement in the presence of the Press.

Mr. Camm: When was that?

Mr. O'DONNELL: That was when the Nogoia Gap project was in the air and our friends from Canberra were up there having a look round. The statement was made at that time.

Let us not forget the rumour that all these people are following with interest. There is the Collinsville mine and the Collinsville power-station; the Blackwater mine and the possibility of a power-station; prospecting rights have been given to people in the Theodore area and there is talk of a power-house there.

Mr. Camm: That is correct.

Mr. O'DONNELL: Let us talk about the power-station for either Blackwater or Theodore. I wonder how many people are running up and down the back stairs at the State Electricity Commissioner's office, putting their cases. I should like to know that, and I should like to know also what happened before the power-station was built at Collinsville.

Mr. Camm: The power-station is not there yet, and you and your colleagues are doing your best to see that it does not go there.

Honourable Members interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hodges): Order! I remind hon. members that continual interjecting is a breach of the Standing Orders. As such, it will be dealt with under Standing Order No. 123A.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I have been giving a few members a send-off because they interjected, Mr. Hodges.

I was very interested in the section of the Treasurer's Financial Statement dealing with the brigalow land development. To be brief, I will summarise it. The Treasurer said that when areas 1 and 2 are completed 140 new blocks, covering 1,500,000 acres, will result, and that when area 3 comes into operation it is expected that another 130 new blocks, covering possibly 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 acres, will result. I am going to be quite frank about this and say that I think it is quite possible that when the history of this Government is written, the brigalow land development scheme could be its major accomplishment. But I am going to say this, too: that if I were a teacher in the Department of Education and Mr. Pizzey were the Minister and I made statements about the department similar to those which I am going to refer to the Committee which this gentleman made about the brigalow lands development scheme, I think I would be taken to task fairly severely.

Hon. members know very well that there is a committee of review relative to the brigalow lands development scheme ballots

and that every applicant can be called in for interview by this committee of review. Is it not astounding that a man who has the responsibility of selecting the people for ballots—he not only assesses them personally but also assesses their financial resources and industry capabilities—should come up with a statement such as this man made? It does not matter about his name but if anyone wants to know it, it is Graham McCamley.

Mr. Pizzey: A very sound man, too.

Mr. O'DONNELL: That may be so but, as I say, this is related to the promotion of this scheme. He is the man who is brought in to select the people who will participate in these ballots, and he said that the scheme had its problems and predicted that perhaps half of the settlers would fail financially on their cattle operations. That is not good. The other half, he considered, would probably do very well. Even the failures would most likely be able to sell out at the end of their period of personal residence at a considerable capital gain. He said he thought it was a pity that applicants were not required to have \$24,000 in hard cash rather than impermissible borrowed money as is the position at present. But in his book they should have the money readily available. His observations were that many of the battling settlers should never have applied for a block because, as they did not have \$24,000 in hard cash when they started, this meant that their standard of living became appalling as Government loans did not cover allocations for housing, etc.

I would say that that is an indictment of the person who is making a selection of the people who are going to ballot.

Mr. Camm: That is his honest opinion.

Mr. O'DONNELL: It may be an honest opinion. If the Minister for Mines will allow me to finish, he will see that I am putting reason into this. This is the type of man on whom we possibly depend for the success of this scheme, which, as I said before, is probably the best thing this Government has ever done. It is the first scheme in history in which the Commonwealth Government is lending—not giving—money to allow people to go onto the land. I think the Minister for Lands has done a pretty good job, although the Minister for Mines might not like it.

I will tell the Minister for Education right now that I feel that in any reallocation of portfolios in the foreseeable future there should be no alteration so far as the Minister for Lands is concerned. I think his knowledge of the brigalow scheme, his experience of the difficulties over the years, and so forth, can be of great advantage. Area 3 is coming up very soon and needs the benefit of his advice, as well as his practical approach and control. He has seen the mistakes that have been made; he has

assessed the dangers that can accrue from the present agreement. The first agreement has been altered, but even the second agreement needs the benefit of his experience to make it a success. Also, the agreement relative to area 3 must incorporate the lessons of previous experience.

I think this is important and, as I have said before, this scheme could be the best thing the Government has ever done. I disagree with the freehold tenure idea, but I do not disagree with the principle of putting people on the land with Government loans to assist them. If we could have a similar scheme introduced in the Gulf Country and in other sections along the coast we would be well on our way towards ensuring that Australians were fulfilling the duties to which their inheritance obligates them, and doing what they should be doing for their own benefit and for the benefit of the nation as a whole. I do not object to the presence of Americans. The Australian Labour Party does not object to it. We cannot allow the land to remain idle merely because Australian capital is not prepared to go there. Such a scheme has great possibilities for the future, and I want to see it working. However, I do not think such criticism as I have mentioned should be voiced by anyone on the committee of review. It is a tremendous responsibility; the Minister cannot do everything personally and he has to throw onto that committee the onus of selecting the right type of settler for brigalow development. Those who have been through the brigalow country know what the difficulties are. These pioneers are a wonderful set of people. What a terrible thing it would be for 50 per cent. of them to go to the wall. I do not think that percentage of them will, because I think they have more guts and tenacity than that. I think a higher percentage than that will succeed, even though it will be tough for them. Let us see that the men who go into area 3 are properly geared for the job if what Mr. McCamley says about areas 1 and 2 is true.

Last year the Treasurer introduced a Budget containing a number of steep increases in State taxation. They were very controversial issues then. Perhaps the Treasurer thinks the dust has since dropped to the ground, but do not let him be under a misapprehension about that; he will hear more about it as time goes on.

A quick calculation indicates that increases in rail freights, State transport fees, motor vehicle registration fees, stamp duty on worker's compensation policies, stamp duty on motor vehicle transfers and registrations and increases in hospital fees were expected to return to the Government last financial year \$8,750,000, but during this financial year, when the full impact of the additional taxes will be felt, the return to the Government will result in a return of approximately \$15,430,000, which is a considerable sum

of money. Consequently, I felt impelled to look at the reports submitted to Parliament by the Minister for Transport.

In my parliamentary duties I cannot take the interest in every section of Government activity that I should like to and, for that reason, I have not gone as fully into this matter as I would have preferred. However, I was astounded when I looked at State transport revenue for 1964-65, 1965-66 and 1966-67. Over the last three years there has been a steady increase in revenue. This was so in relation to both goods and passengers. So far as it relates to air transport it was fairly static. The sale of hire licences in 1964-65 was confusing because the Department of Transport sold 50 taxi licences at \$6,500 each, for a total of \$325,000. If we exclude the taxi licences we have an upward trend. With the additional taxes imposed in 1966-67, there was a very sharp upward movement.

This is where the rural population is vitally concerned. I have said before that if the Government is to assist the man on the land it must reduce his costs of production. How else can the Government do this other than by providing these services at the lowest possible rate? That is the only way it can be done. The Government will face trouble in the wool industry if it allows costs to continually rise, as it is obvious that wool prices will not rise commensurately with the increase in costs. If the Government wants development in the low-profit grain industry such as sorghum it must do something about freight costs. If the Government wants to capture the export market—as it should for Central Queensland—it will have to provide competitive prices, particularly if the grain is going to Japan.

Mr. Lickiss: That is not the whole answer. The size of the unit is the most important aspect.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I realise that. The hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha has referred to the size of the units. He is referring to something that is not adjustable at present unless one primary producer can buy out another. In the main these are new settlers, and associated with them is a strong section of share farmers who are looking for a place in the sun. The only way they can get it is by good luck through beneficial seasons as well as the right price, with the minimum of costs.

If the Government is to encourage these people onto the land it must do something positive. These people feel that with Utah and Thiess Peabody Mitsui coming here and getting contract prices for the transport of coal, they are being harshly treated because they are not given some consideration in the movement of their grain to the coast.

The Treasurer may think this is being a little wall-eyed. I refer to a statement by Mr. P. J. C. Brauns, Manager of Pacific Seeds, which appeared on the front page of "Country Life" dated 7 September, 1967. When talking about the safflower areas I

told hon. members that the acreage under that crop was increasing to 150,000 acres. Mr. Brauns said—

"The anticipated crop could result in an intake of 30,000 tons, compared with last year's record 21,000 to 22,000 tons. Two inches of rain in the next two to three weeks would ensure this tonnage."

Unfortunately we have not received it.

The article continues—

"The crop was, generally, a month off flowering."

He then referred to the \$98 a ton, delivered to Sydney. That is a really good price. I congratulate the people concerned, the grain-growers and the association of grain-growers. Thanks to Pacific Safflower they were given this break, which is so important. I point out that this has been done without the assistance of a board. They are doing excellently. If we can continue to do this we will achieve something.

Mr. Lickiss: We probably can if we keep out of the hands of the board.

Mr. O'DONNELL: They may have to resort to the board principle to protect the industry. Boards have a use. We are not against boards. They can give protection to an industry if there is a threat to exploit the industry. That is our belief and our policy. It is important. Boards can, and do, function very satisfactorily. Mr. Brauns admitted that there were transport and storage problems ahead. I know that on one occasion the hon. member for Condamine drew the scorn of the industry with which he is associated relative to storage. But there are storage problems. Mr. Brauns said that most of the grain would be sent by rail transport but that road transport had been organised ahead to take the edge off transport problems. In other words, he is saying that the railways cannot carry to port, to the crushing centres, or to the agents, the product of Central Queensland in a peak season.

There is competition from wheat, and probably wheat has preference. Here is business for the railways and they cannot cope with it. That is the admission of the people connected with the industry, and it is obviously the admission of the department. Evidently big movements of coal are profitable when done under contract rates, but compare the \$3 a ton on coal with the \$10 a ton on grain. Is it conceivable that any grain-grower would not have anything but a feeling of resentment over that difference? Rockhampton is interested in grain and wants the Wheat Board facilities shifted from Gladstone to Rockhampton. But of what use are the desires of the Gladstone Harbour Board or the Rockhampton Harbour Board if the industry is to be killed in the fields by high transport costs? The cost of production can only be beaten from the Government angle by a reduction in

freight charges. If it is good enough for coal it should at least be a consideration for grain.

Mr. Chalk: Don't you take the quantum of grain movement into consideration?

Mr. O'DONNELL: I am glad the Treasurer raised that point.

Mr. Chalk: How could it be moved economically if that is not taken into consideration?

Mr. O'DONNELL: If there is one profitable section in the department, surely some of that profit could be used to assist another section which is profitable to the State but not to the department.

Mr. Chalk: That has been Government policy all along.

Mr. O'DONNELL: But the Government is not doing that.

Mr. Chalk: The grain freight has been looked at, and you were given concessions in relation to grain-growing.

Mr. O'DONNELL: We were given one concession, namely, the 182-mile concession. On the Darling Downs the wheat-growers are looking for individual freight rates, not the equalisation rate.

Mr. Chalk interjected.

Mr. O'DONNELL: Do you mean they are not going to get individual freight rates?

Mr. Chalk: It won't suit the majority of the growers.

Mr. O'DONNELL: That was one of the arguments the Government used when it closed the Roma-Injune line.

Mr. Chalk: The department is prepared to carry it on a ton-per-mile basis if the grain-grower wants it, but that is the board's decision and the grain-growers' decision.

Mr. O'DONNELL: Does not the Government assist certain industries?

Mr. Chalk: Quite true.

Mr. O'DONNELL: Is the Government not assisting Austral-Pacific Fertilizers Ltd. by granting a lease at 1-3/7ths per cent instead of 3 per cent.? Of course it is. I suggest that the Treasurer work out the figures. That company is an overseas organisation.

Mr. Chalk: They still pay the same freight rates as everybody else.

Mr. O'DONNELL: It is not a matter of freight rates. Is the Government not assisting that industry by granting a reduced rental under a special lease? Of course it is. Why cannot something be done for those people who are developing a part of the country that has been crying out for decentralisation? What will happen if the

sorghum industry fails in Central Queensland? I am on the side of the grain-growers in this matter. I do not care what the Minister says.

Mr. Chalk: What did the Government do to assist grain-growers in that area? You cannot tell me anything about that one. We brought sorghum to Brisbane from that area. Why? To provide grain in Brisbane so that the grain-grower on the Downs who grew sorghum could send it across the border. What do you want?

Mr. O'DONNELL: I am talking about the future of this industry, which has got into its present position because of high costs.

Mr. Chalk: Because of certain board elements. The board could not control it.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I know that boards have difficulties. I have seen the change from a State board to a Central Queensland board.

Mr. Chalk: One per cent. of the sorghum went through the board and you know it.

Mr. O'DONNELL: The Minister is throwing the onus on the grain-growers.

Mr. Chalk: Back on the board administration.

Mr. O'DONNELL: Don't forget that there is also Section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution.

Mr. Chalk: I know that. That is what wrecked it.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I agree with the Treasurer to that point. But does he think that the Government should continue to let the problem drift along? Cannot something be done to assist these people? There is a big difference between the freight charges for grain and coal.

Mr. Chalk: And there is a terrific difference between the tonnages carried. One is transported in train-load lots and the other in individual truck-loads.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hodges): Order! I hope the Treasurer will allow the hon. member for Barcoo to make his speech.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I am endeavouring to get something done for these people, and I think something could be done. If the Minister is going to wipe them completely, well and good.

Mr. Chalk: We have not wiped them completely.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I should now like to make a few observations on the subject of education. There have been some very profound attacks on certain points of criticism that have come from several sources. The Queensland Teachers' Union has been mentioned, and mention has also

been made of "dissident groups" and "political groups". These groups or sections were attacked by the Minister for Education, and also by the Minister for Labour and Tourism, who has just entered the Chamber.

Another very important group has been overlooked. It is not actually allied with any of the three that I have mentioned, but comprises a large percentage of those who are well educated and most competent to criticise the attitude of the Government and what is happening in the field of education, which, since the war, has assumed greater importance than ever before.

Mr. Pizzey: You would not say Baldwin was competent?

Mr. O'DONNELL: I do not know Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Houston: Did he attack the Government?

Mr. Pizzey: Yes.

Mr. O'DONNELL: If the Minister will listen, I said that besides the people mentioned by him and by the Minister for Labour and Tourism, there is a group that, although not vociferous, is well-educated and competent to criticise. It does a lot of thinking about the important subject of education.

I say this: that this is the best administration we have had; we probably have the best set of teachers we have ever had; we probably have, if they are evaluated, the best set of students and pupils we have ever had. If we denied any one of those aspects, we would have to state categorically that our education system has failed. Having made that point, I ask the Committee not to forget that the group about which I am talking is the key group in this matter. The people in it are the ones who will make the decisions about education, and they are able to appreciate the position coldly and analyse the significance of developments. As I have moved among these people I have been surprised by their thoughts on the matter, and the Government should pay careful attention to them. Never in my association with the Department of Education have I heard so many top teachers being so critical. I do not say that they all are, but I have heard many top teachers being very critical.

Mr. Carey: You are kidding yourself.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I ask the hon. member for Albert to be quiet and listen. This group is thinking about educational problems.

Mr. Pizzey: I hope it is.

Mr. O'DONNELL: It is. If we go back 40 or 50 years, at that time the majority of the population were not as competent as they are today to discuss the subject. The history of education is fairly short; there is still a long way to go in education. It behoves any Government to give the greatest

thought to this important subject because the progress of the State depends on the education of its citizens. If we do not go from strength to strength we will fail, and I believe that one of the most alarming aspects of the discussion or controversy—hon. members can call it what they like—is that some people are more concerned about whether a stick of chalk writes better in 1967 than it did in 1957 than they are about the true aims of education. Until this is brought to its correct level and people discuss the true aims of education instead of discussing what is being done and what has been done, we will not get the appreciation of the strong, silent and thoughtful group in the community.

Mr. KAUS (Hawthorne) (8.14 p.m.): I congratulate the Treasurer on bringing down his second Budget. He does it at a time in Queensland's history when the State, the slumbering giant, is awakening and gathering momentum, having finally thrown off the shackles of Labour Governments that held it back for years.

This is a Budget for continuing development, a "push-ahead" Budget, good for the people and for the State in general.

I should like to open the eyes of the Opposition on the progress this State has made, is making, and will continue to make under this Government. The sustained and rapid development that has taken place in Australia in the post-war period has been remarkable, but it would not have been possible without the ever-broadening basis provided by the diversification and development of secondary industry.

Industrial development, of course, is not proceeding at a uniform rate throughout Australia, and it is a fact that growth in Queensland was relatively slower than in the other Australian States. However, in the past three or four years this position has changed and the rate of growth in Queensland has been higher than for the rest of Australia as a whole. This is because of good government.

Throughout its history Queensland has been mainly dependent—

Mr. Thackeray interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hodges): Order! I warned the hon. member for Rockhampton North before. One further transgression and he will be dealt with under Standing Order No. 123A.

Mr. KAUS: Throughout its history Queensland has been mainly dependent on the income derived from its general rural industry. However, the value of the State's secondary industry production has now overtaken that of rural production. The turning point came only as recently as the 1964-65 financial year.

For many years Queensland's primary industries have made a major contribution to the national welfare and have provided

vast sums in the form of overseas funds for the purchase of capital goods—indeed, for the establishment of secondary industry all over Australia. However, Queensland, and for that matter Australia, can no longer maintain an acceptable growth rate based predominantly on the export earnings of our rural industries. In Australia, our goals are to obtain rapid population growth, rising living standards and full employment. These have been so strongly entrenched in our thinking that they could be described as national aspirations. Of course, to be fully effective they must be achieved together.

Industrialisation, which is the key to economic growth, is the way these goals may be achieved. It provides scope for the absorption of large quantities of resources, both labour and capital, and it gives the impetus necessary to stimulate the over-all rate of growth. It multiplies the avenues available for the employment of labour and capital in the tertiary section. As hon. members will be well aware, in modern society this section employs the major proportion of the labour force. Indeed, in Australia more than 60 per cent. of the work force is engaged in the so-called service industries—a percentage exceeded only in the countries of North America.

I mentioned earlier the contribution our rural industries had made to the national economy in the past, and while there is no doubt that they will continue to do so, the future of Queensland will lie in the establishment of industries based on the vast reserves of raw material which exist in the State. Industries such as these will be based on exports, and their contribution to the domestic economy will be on a great scale through the creation of work opportunities.

The events of recent years clearly indicate that the current trend towards the development of the State's natural resources which lend themselves to large-scale operations, and have a high export potential, will make the greatest contribution to our industrial growth. By their very nature these major activities will attract associated industries and their integration into compact industrial complexes will, in turn, create opportunities for the establishment of industries on a smaller scale commensurate with local or regional requirements.

There is little doubt that minerals will offer the most spectacular opportunities for profitable investment and industrial development, but it must not be forgotten that the processing industries have a wide variety of raw materials in this State in the rural industries. Minerals are available in quantity in Queensland. There is coal, copper, bauxite, natural gas, nickel, phosphate rock, mineral sands, limestone and oil. As all hon. members would be well aware, some of these have been established to exist in vast quantities, while others are still being evaluated. Copper has long been an important factor in the economy of this State

through operations at Mt. Isa and Mt. Morgan. The giant alumina plant at Gladstone came into production this year, processing 1,200,000 tons of bauxite from Weipa into alumina. Within a few months of beginning operations the company concerned announced that it would begin an immediate expansion programme to increase the output by 50 per cent. Already the new refinery has attracted two large aluminium extrusion plants to Queensland, and the possibility of the ultimate establishment of an alumina smelter at Gladstone must be considered good.

The main coal development in the State at the present time is for the export trade. While it is providing considerable support for our overseas balances, there is no doubt at all that it will be as a source of cheap power that coal will ultimately prove of greatest benefit to us.

Plans which have been announced for the utilisation of the State's natural gas reserves in the production of fertiliser will have far-reaching effects on the industrialisation programme in Queensland. The importance of the alumina plant and the proposed fertiliser project is that both are international industries based on the State's raw materials and with firm export outlets. It must be appreciated that it would not be possible to establish industries fully utilising raw materials available in Queensland without large capital investment and assured export markets.

The domestic market could not absorb anything like the present production of the Gladstone plant. In fact, 80 per cent. of the alumina produced there is exported. The new fertiliser plant will export 50 per cent. of its initial production of 200,000 tons a year.

Both these projects are indicative of development which can, and will, take place in the future in utilising other mineral resources that are available. There is little doubt that world attention is focussed on the industrial raw materials available in Australia at the present time. This is particularly so in Queensland. There is also no doubt that vast sums of capital are needed for this type of development and that such capital as is available in Australia must be supplemented by overseas sources.

It is fashionable at present to question and criticise overseas investments in Australia, but the facts are that imported capital usually brings with it not only new processes and techniques but also assured export markets. The very nature of companies concerned in Queensland Alumina Ltd. and in the new fertiliser project, Austral-Pacific Fertilizers Ltd., ensures operations on an international scale, with their products capable of competing on world markets. This ensures development to the optimum degree.

As Queensland possesses many of the raw materials that the world is actually seeking at the present time, it is logical to assume that the recent alumina development and the projected fertiliser development are but the

forerunners of other large companies—large industrial plants around which complexes will develop in the future.

Though minerals are the glamour materials of the recent period, the prospects for growth of industries based on rural production must not be forgotten. The rising world demand for food is not likely to lessen. At present, substantial capital expenditure is being undertaken by the Government to improve transport facilities and to develop millions of acres of land to bring a marked expansion in beef-cattle production. Even though large sums of money have been spent by private enterprise in the past few years on abattoirs and other food-processing plants, this is a field of secondary industry that must increase in relation to world population.

Only last week I had a pleasing duty to perform in my own electorate of Hawthorne when I opened a food-processing factory. This is but one of the many success stories of New Australians, or newcomers to this country in the post-war years. This firm of Hans Continental Smallgoods is one of them. This partnership of Hans and Louis, as I shall call them, has built up a successful enterprise in the short period of eight years, with trade throughout Queensland and interstate. Manufacturing activity is the road to progress and this industry is an integral part of the general broad base of secondary industry which has developed in this State over recent years, and has developed only because of good government.

There is no doubt that processing the output of the land is a section of industry which affords great opportunities for expansion. In the years ahead I am sure that we will see great complexes based on such industries. This is the type of industry which could quickly develop a large export trade. It was pleasing to see when we visited these new premises that they were geared to cater for the markets of Asia. Too often we find the smaller type of industry in this State satisfied with marginal operation, but that is not so with this company. It has continually sought new outlets and the new plant is the result of the activity and initiative of these two partners and the competent staff of 24 they now employ. While there I congratulated these gentlemen on the job they are doing not only for their personal achievement but also for providing a work opportunity for so many people and catering for the welfare of quite a number of families in the area. This company is an example of what can be achieved by enterprising people in this rapidly developing State. This has occurred only because of very good government. In wishing them every success I said I hoped that they would grow with the State and make a contribution to the overall economy. These two gentlemen are doing a good job.

At present a Melbourne company is establishing a malting plant at Redbank at a cost of \$1,000,000. The plant will use Queensland barley as feedstock. Another

example of the benefits which flow to primary industry from the establishment of secondary industry is the intake by the alumina plant in Gladstone of Central Queensland grain sorghum to produce 3,000 tons of starch annually for use in the alumina process. That will probably be doubled in the near future. It will become more evident each day that the future of Queensland's industry will lie in the optimum use of its vast and varied raw materials. In the next decade we will see many industrial complexes based not only on alumina and natural gas but also on nickel, phosphate rock, mineral sands, and rural products, particularly beef. There is a full appreciation of this by overseas industrialists. I hope that the years ahead will see greater participation in this type of development by Australian entrepreneurs.

The development of mining in Australia, particularly in the last few years, has had two favourable effects: it has given Australian engineers and companies much greater skills in mining ventures and exploration, and has made the Australian investor more enthusiastic. The problem of full development lies in the scarceness of large amounts of capital, and the vital requirement of export market outlets. The development of Australian and overseas partnerships is the ideal solution. One thing is certain, and that is that there must be optimum development if there is to be growth at a desirable rate.

I should now like to refer to "The Australian" supplement of Tuesday 3 October, 1967. I hope Opposition members have read it. Under the heading, "Slumbering giant awakes" this appears—

"Immensely rich in both natural resources and natural attractions, Queensland is the slumbering giant that only recently began to wake.

"And while critics within say it could stir a lot faster and more decisively, it is undoubtedly on the move—to the extent in fact that its economy is now expanding at a rate faster than that of any other State or the Australian average.

"Long recognised as a great primary producing State, the changing emphasis in its economy is such that when 1966-67 figures become available, it is probable that the net value of factory production will exceed the total for rural and mining for the first time."

As stated earlier, it exceeded the total for rural but not mining. The article continues—

"Queensland is Australia's second largest State in area and third in population. It covers 667,000 square miles—or more than seven times the size of the British Isles, three times the size of France or one-fifth of the U.S.—and has 3,236 miles of coastline. More than 50 per cent. of its area—360,000 square miles—is north of the Tropic of Capricorn. Its population in last year's census was 1,661,240.

"Its scenery ranges from coastal beaches to scrub and desert in the far west and between these extremes are lush rain forests, mountain ranges and the grass plains of the tablelands.

"One sign of its waking is in education: in the past three years three Institutes of Technology have been established, and from the beginning of 1970 the Townsville University College will become the State's second university—and Australia's first in the tropics.

"It is already Australia's leading tourist State. One of the world's wonders—the Great Barrier Reef—stretches for 1,250 miles along its coast and 18 reef islands now operate as holiday resorts."

Mr. Hinze: Tell us about the famous Gold Coast.

Mr. KAUS: It also mentions the Gold Coast. It refers to—

"... the 20-miles stretch of beaches south of Brisbane, which confidently predicts that within 10 years it will be able to provide accommodation for 200,000 visitors—making it the biggest tourist resort in the world."

It concludes with this statement—

"In the race to develop Australia, Queensland has a lot going for it."

On the back page the heading is, "This place 'is going to be a heart of Australia'." I am sorry that the hon. member for Townsville North (Mr. Tucker) is not here, because this article is referring to Townsville.

Mr. Davies: No mention of Hervey Bay there?

Mr. KAUS: No, he did not mention Hervey Bay.

Mr. Davies: He has never been to Queensland.

Mr. KAUS: He did not mention Maryborough, either.

The article says—

"'This place' is Townsville: communications, industrial and commercial hub of North Queensland, second biggest city and second busiest port in the State."

That should gladden the heart of the hon. member for Townsville North. The article continues—

"Through it in one direction each year pass vast quantities of minerals from Mt. Isa, raw sugar and molasses from the Lower Burdekin—an area bigger than Victoria and Tasmania together—and canned and frozen meat from its two meatworks."

Later it deals with tourists, and the heading is "Tourists just keep on pouring into Queensland". On one of the pages inside the heading is "Did you know that 55 million pineapples were grown last year". On another page the heading is "Queensland

needs a steel industry and more electric power"—and it will get it, too, under this Government.

Mr. R. Jones: Anything about Cairns?

Mr. KAUS: No. The writer has never heard of Cairns. Two other headings are "Rockhampton—the friendly town that's bound to grow", and "Railway speeds up the process of going modern". Under the Minister's able administration, there is no doubt that the railways are progressing and that a remarkable job has been done in their modernisation and dieselisation.

I think I have got the story across and put the Opposition on the right track, so I shall conclude at that point.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT (Chatsworth) (8.43 p.m.): I am very pleased indeed to speak tonight in support of the second Chalk "push-ahead" Budget. As did the first document, it demonstrates that we have a Treasurer who has a very firm grasp of the financial intricacies of this State and who is very competent to administer them.

The document that the Treasurer presented to the Committee this year showed a brighter picture and an improvement on the situation that he covered 12 months ago. There is no question that the balanced Budget that he presented vindicated the increased taxes that he found it necessary to implement in his first Budget. He was able to say that the situation had eased somewhat because the drought had broken, and, because of this, it is to an even greater degree a "push-ahead" Budget. But the reference to drought was timely, because even when the Treasurer said that the season was better, we were in fact faced with the grim prospect of a further drought of possibly even worse proportions over the whole of the continent. The message that we should all read into this is that in Queensland we have a two-pronged task.

On the one hand we must continue to seek, in every way possible, the alleviation of drought, the means of easing its impact, and secondly, we must pursue vigorously our industrialisation programme so that whenever we are unfortunate enough to be inflicted with the scourge of drought we have this buffer effect that industrialisation provides to us. So that, even while this note of optimism was introduced into the Financial Statement, we should never depart from the principle that we must be ever mindful of drought and its terrible effects.

The Treasurer's Budget was a balanced one and he was able to tell us that there is some reduction in the deficit. Looking at the results of Budgets over the last few years, I find that the Treasurer's assessment for the year recently concluded was the closest to the budgeted figure of any of the Budgets recently presented. I hesitate to say whether that is good luck or good management; nevertheless the Treasurer's effort in making

predictions for 1966-67 was a very good one. Looking at these figures, we find that in 1963-64 receipts exceeded the budgeted amount by \$5,024,000; in 1964-65, the receipts were under the budgeted amount by \$5,233,000; in 1965-66, receipts were over the budgeted amount by \$4,413,000; and for the year recently concluded the Treasurer was so close to the estimate as to be a mere \$1,083,000 under the budgeted amount.

Again looking at the Estimates of expenditure we find that for the year just concluded the expenditure was under the estimate by \$1,314,000. The Treasurer is therefore to be complimented on the closeness of his budgeted figure to the actual figure.

The way the Treasurer presented the Budget and the knowledge that he demonstrated in the figures that he outlined to us established beyond any doubt at all that he is a vigorous, hard-working leader. He is a person who is firmly in the saddle, a person who commands the respect and loyalty of every member of his team, a person who is, in fact, the leader of a united team. One should put the proposition to this Committee in unambiguous terms that the oft-referred-to "ginger group" in this Chamber is nothing more than a figment of the fertile imagination of the hon. member for Townsville South. I am always amazed at the fact that this is the member upon whom all vituperation is poured by members of the Opposition yet, parrot-like, they repeat his catchcry in this Chamber.

It is a remarkable situation that in the Senate we find that parliamentary tactics are dictated by the former Leader of the Labour Party in this State, Senator Gair, and in the State House the trend of parliamentary tactics is set by the hon. member for Townsville South.

When we consider the State Budget we should take into account the impact of external spending by the Federal Government. There can be no argument at all that that Government's commitments to defence and to external aid have a very real impact upon the spending of each and every State. It also affects the Federal Government's own expenditure in the field of social services. It is a fact that the Federal Government spends some 5 per cent. of its budget on defence and something like 1 per cent. on international aid. While some of us might cavil at the size of the defence Vote, I do not think any would challenge the Federal Government's obligation to help those undeveloped countries in the way it does.

It can nevertheless be said with complete honesty that because the Federal Government has to meet these external obligations the expenditure in each and every State is proportionately reduced. However, it would be wrong to suggest that if the Government's commitments were not of the order they are we would enjoy reimbursement to

the same extent. We all recognise the fact that if these obligations were reduced there would be a real clamour for tax reductions at a political level which could not be denied. I should like to hope that if these obligations were not of such an order the social services expenditure in this country would be dramatically increased. I should also like to think that if we did not have to discharge these necessary obligations we could wrestle with poverty in Australia, the poverty which does exist.

A survey on this subject has established that something like 6 per cent. of the Australian community lives in substandard conditions. I think this is a statistic that demands from each and every one of us compassion, sympathy and understanding. For the benefit of the hon. member for Maryborough, who wants to twist what I am saying, may I tell him that 6 per cent. in world figures is a reasonably respectable figure, the comparable figure in the United Kingdom being 14 per cent. It would make no difference to me if it were only 1 per cent. I would still say that it is a great shame that because there are necessary external commitments we cannot wrestle with this very real problem.

Returning again to this particular theme of my speech, I say that there can be no doubt at all that State and national development and social programmes suffer because of the external obligations which we must discharge. It is a remarkable situation that at a time when we are reaching for the moon, when we embrace the earth with sophisticated communications, when we control disease to such an extent that over-population becomes a new concern, when we provide ourselves with every material comfort and every crutch for easy and gracious living, we are at the same time on the very brink of total annihilation. The goal of peace on earth and goodwill towards men is as elusive today as it was in the days of the Founder of our faith.

Some of the salient features of the Budget should be commented upon. It first of all demonstrates a very creditable marshalling of funds under difficult conditions. It outlines an impressive list of new works to be undertaken, and it shows quite conclusively that it is the best effort possible in the restricted field in which we move.

When we speak to a Budget I interpret our function to be to criticise and to interpret. I do not believe it is necessary, nor do I believe it is desirable, to read long lists of figures that are published in the Budget which, in any case, can be studied and analysed by hon. members in their own time and in their own circumstances. I believe that we should make comment on the rise in the Education Vote. It is a commendable increase and the Treasurer in his speech demonstrated quite conclusively that we are conscious of the problems in this field, and that we will continue to wrestle with these problems.

I am always fascinated by people who try to present arguments in terms of percentages in order to suggest that other States spend a higher percentage of their Consolidated Revenue on education than this State does. In all honesty their argument in that isolated way cannot be argued against, but what the same critics do not recognise, or will not recognise, are the unusual and peculiar problems that beset this State alone.

For people who indulge in this exercise in percentages it would be useful, for example, if they looked at our expenditure on the problems of Aborigines; it would be useful if they looked at the percentage of our expenditure on harbour development; it would be useful if they were to look at our percentage of expenditure on railway development. Of course, if they considered the railways at all, they would acknowledge the long mileages that we have to service—mileages that would leave the distances in Victoria and New South Wales for dead.

I think there is a requirement that hon. members on both sides of the Chamber should approach the problems in a sense of fairness. If this sense of fairness permeated our considerations, on many occasions our conclusions would be much more objective than they are.

The Budget outlined the continuing expenditure on the Moura railway line, on the Gladstone port and on Weipa, and indicated quite clearly that all these works would be continued. It was timely also to find the continuing expenditure that will be devoted to the Wilbur Smith plan. The Leader of the Opposition referred to that subject this morning and, like many of his colleagues, he tended to labour the problems of resumption very much indeed. This is a problem; it is a problem that we acknowledge, and it is a problem that we feel we have wrestled with in a singularly successful fashion.

That is one aspect of the problems. We should look at the operational pattern and look at what the Wilbur Smith plan is doing. I like to think that the Wilbur Smith plan is part of the great development that is taking place in the City of Brisbane. Beside it, we have the City Square initiated by another administration; let me take the words out of the mouths of the potential interjectors. There is the Anzac Square development, the Bligh Plan, for which we claim credit, the development soon to take place in Fortitude Valley, and the development that is anticipated opposite St. John's Cathedral. I believe that, in ten years' time, because of these schemes, the City of Brisbane will hold its own with any capital city of Australia. I think we are going through a wonderful, exciting transitional period in this city and that we have something in the making of which we can all be justifiably proud. To say that the Wilbur

Smith plan is part of this pattern is, of course, a truism and for that reason I am pleased to see that it is to be pushed ahead.

In his speech the Treasurer outlined 42 positive steps for the continuing development of this State in the ensuing 12 months. Those 42 points are so impressive in their own right that they need no verbal bolstering by me. Each commends the Treasurer personally.

Today a few speakers have already referred to the Commonwealth-State relationship. I have the feeling that this is a theme that is possibly becoming a little overworked, because we are all theorising about it. I think we are all in agreement on some aspects, namely, that the position has to be looked at critically, that Federation is under severe strains, and that some thinking anew has to take place on it. It is interesting to note that we are so dependent upon Commonwealth handouts. In 1963-64 40.7 per cent. of our Consolidated Revenue came from Commonwealth sources. In the following year the percentage was the same, in the year following it was 43.6 per cent. and in 1966-67 it was 43.1 per cent. This throws a heavy responsibility onto any Government and at the same time reduces us virtually to the role of mendicants for approximately 50 per cent. of our funds each year.

The Treasurer's comments were constructive and useful, and I hope they are read in the right place and that some action is taken upon them. I hope further that the Treasurer himself in the fullness of time might see his way clear to initiate some of those steps himself.

Other State Premiers at different times have aired some criticisms. Henry Bolte, who of course has been a trenchant critic for many years, has found it necessary to impose new forms of State taxation. Mr. Dunstan, the newly installed Premier of South Australia, has gone so far as to suggest that the existing State boundaries will in the course of time disappear completely.

The only revenue fields left to the States that they can rightly exploit are inflationary, inequitable, expensive to collect, and regressive in their total effect. Therefore the answer to many of all of the State's problems does not lie in the exploitation of internal tax fields but in looking anew at disbursements from the Federal level.

It is significant that while State debts mount year by year, the Commonwealth public debt is diminishing. We are told that this year, to service the Queensland public debt, \$54,506,890 will be required. That represents 12.6 per cent. of all revenue.

Mr. R. Jones: You have been reading "The Sunday Mail".

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: I read a little deeper than that. Reducing that State debt to a per-capita basis it represents \$604.03

per head, which in itself is an increase of \$24.28 on the previous year's figure. Not for this reason alone but for others we should look critically at our relationship with the Commonwealth, and I believe that this approach on the basis that our State debt rises substantially year by year while the Commonwealth public debt diminishes presents a sizeable argument to deal with.

My friend the hon. member for Toowong reminds me that Commonwealth capital works are financed out of revenue. This has been happening for many years, to such a degree that even the gigantic Snowy Mountains project was financed almost entirely out of revenue.

Commonwealth participation in the State activities takes place in a variety of ways. The main categories are payments under the taxation agreement, payments under the Financial Agreement, unconditional grants to State revenue, and payments for special purposes. I think some of these require close examination.

May I say that I take some exception to the description of one of those categories as "Financial assistance". We see in the regular gazetted figures and in the Treasurer's official figures "financial assistance". The mere term indicates that we are mendicants in need of assistance. A change of words does not produce another cent, but it restores some of our dignity and some semblance of sovereignty. I hope that the Treasurer will see that the term "Financial assistance" is abandoned. Money that is coming to us as our right should be given a better description than "Financial assistance".

The formula by which these moneys is distributed is a matter of some disputation. In the course of time, when the present agreement expires in 1969 or 1970, we must think anew about a new formula. In this year of 1967 we should be getting some build-up towards the new formula. I think there should be thinking on the whole issue now while there is still a period of 2½ years of the old formula to run.

I shall now deal briefly with Commonwealth grants to the States conditional upon matching expenditure. This is a method of Commonwealth financing that is coming more and more into vogue.

In all fairness to the Commonwealth Government, I make two points. There are some fields that the Commonwealth Government cannot enter because of certain constitutional problems, and under those circumstances it can only say, "We will supplement your expenditure." In other fields, where the State makes an approach for assistance on the undertaking that it will provide the money and merely asks for supplementary expenditure, again it is defensible. But where the Commonwealth initiates a scheme and indicates that it will make certain funds available conditional upon the

State's providing matching finance, I believe that that represents a marshalling and a regimentation of State expenditure, and I think it is a principle that needs close analysis.

Not only are we looking to the Commonwealth for something in excess of 40 per cent. of our Consolidated Revenue but, in addition, we are surrendering the right to determine how to spend some of our own money. On most occasions I like to think that it is useful expenditure in useful fields. However, returning again to the sovereignty of the States, we must have the right to say how and where we will spend our money.

I think that the Commonwealth Government should be encouraged more and more to do one of two things: either make a greater amount of funds available to the States unconditionally, or assume, where it is constitutionally permissible, full responsibility for projects in its own right. I believe that if we make a stand on this issue we will be striking a blow for the sovereignty of our State.

It is interesting to note that in February of this year the Federal Government made offers of general research grants to the universities of New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania conditional upon matching expenditure by those States. The news item that I have here indicates that the three State Governments concerned have made it clear that they will not match dollar for dollar the Commonwealth contribution to the specific research allocations granted by the Australian Research Grants Committee. The Commonwealth Government, in answer, has made it clear that it will not pay anything to the States concerned if they will not match the Commonwealth grant. I think that there is a clear example of the Commonwealth's trying to apply the heavy hand and saying, "You spend your money on this project, otherwise our money is not available." It is interesting to note that Queensland has assumed the entire cost of this project, and \$200,000 is appropriated this year for the first year of the triennium.

A further aspect of Commonwealth-State relationships is the question of interest on some of the funds made available to the State. Returning again to the theme that the Commonwealth makes money available to the State out of revenue, we should remind ourselves that that revenue is money that has been paid by the taxpayers, so that when money is lent to the States the taxpayers in them are in effect paying interest on money that they have already provided by taxation. Again I say that this is something that should be looked at critically and taken into account when reference is made to the mounting burden of our own State Public Debt and the diminishing burden of the Commonwealth Public Debt.

This Budget, as do all Budgets, projects our thinking for 12 months. It outlines the anticipated expenditure; it outlines the anticipated revenue. As an exercise, this is good; but I often worry about the possibility that we do not plan enough. In a vigorous, dynamic State such as this, is it good enough to know merely where we are going in the next 12 months? I should like to know where we are going in the next 5, 10 or 20 years.

If I want planning, I suppose I should exercise my mind and say what form of planning I want. I think that, at times, people of my political complexion have been so frightened of Socialism that they have shied completely away from any suggestion of planning. In retrospect, I do not think that Socialism has done much harm in Queensland. It is true that in the 1920's, when there were State cattle stations, mines, butcher shops, fish shops, and so on, the impact upon the revenues of the State was severe. But we learnt our lesson and overcame these losses, and I think we are all a little wiser because of it.

Mr. Murray: We still have some legacies.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: The legacies are still there, as my friend the hon. member for Clayfield rightly points out. However, we must be careful that, in avoiding any suggestion of Socialism or State ownership, we do not go so far the other way that we do not have any suggestion of planning.

Hon. members well know that on 13 February, 1963, the then Prime Minister of Australia (R. G. Menzies) set up the Vernon Committee, and its commission was to inquire into and report its findings on the 14 specific matters set out in the terms of reference. When the very bulky report was presented—it was a wonderful exercise in investigation—the Prime Minister, in tabling it on 21 September, 1965, repudiated it in these terms—

"It seems to us that the Committee . . . has predicated a degree of planning and direction of the economy which in our opinion would not be either appropriate or acceptable in Australia."

In other words, the Prime Minister of the day thought that the committee went too far in its recommendations and its findings.

Mr. Hanlon: If they had been members of the Australian Labour Party, he would have said they were Socialists and rejected it on that basis.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: Not necessarily, because the committee acknowledged the possible shortcomings when it conceded this—

"Attempts to forecast in quantitative terms the behaviour of the economy 10 or 15 years ahead are extremely hazardous, could prove positively misleading and are almost certain to be inaccurate."

That admission was made by the committee itself, and its submission was completely vindicated when some of the charts that it projected were hopelessly out of date only

two years after the report was printed. A classical example of that was its suggestions relative to population growth and the migrant intake, which were both hopelessly astray.

However, the specific recommendations of the Vernon Committee are that there should be set up a special projects commission and an advisory council on economic growth. The first of those, the special projects commission, cut right across many established government authorities and government bodies; the C.S.I.R.O. is one that may be cited as an example. It should be stated that, at one time during his career, R. G. Menzies suggested to the States that an order of priorities should be drawn up of the major public works for the whole of Australia, and the screams of the Premiers were of such an order that if one goes outside on a calm night one can still hear the echoes of them.

On the second point, the advisory council on economic growth, this was, of course, a departure from basic principles, and in dealing with it Menzies said—

"Political policies cannot be based upon pure economics and, for the sake of the adequate handling of international problems of defence and of social and industrial justice and progress, we hope they never will."

May I, as a Liberal, say "Amen" to that sentence. On the one hand we have planning to such a degree that it would almost replace Parliament, and Parliament must always make the ultimate decisions. On the other hand we have planning which can be a useful guide, which can project thinking but does not carry any degree of inflexibility in its make-up and can be used for a host of different reasons.

It is on this loose-knit arrangement that I make my suggestions. I believe that if planning is accepted on this loose-knit arrangement as something no more than a guide, but a useful one, then a useful purpose may be served in projecting planning to a greater degree than at present.

In recent years we have accepted the principle of town planning, and I think now that town plans are universally accepted in Queensland. Our only regret probably is that we did not implement them sooner. Under the persistent advocacy of my friend from Toowong and my friend from Mt. Coot-tha, I feel sure that in the fullness of time we will see regional planning, which projects planning a little broader than the confines of a city. Again I think this will be a good thing, but I advance the further stage that there could well be State-wide planning.

I wonder at times whether we should not define the outer limits to which cities should expand. I wonder at times whether we take a great enough interest in domestic water, its supply and its use. I use the term "domestic" water to draw a clear distinction from industrial water and water for primary-production purposes. It is interesting to note that some American cities are experiencing great

demands for domestic water and, with the difficulties of bringing it great distances, they have now implemented schemes by which they use the same water three or four times over. I wonder whether this sort of thing is being looked at in the State of Queensland. I wonder if planning could extend itself to looking at the feasibility of establishing satellite towns such as the one that was successfully established at Elizabeth, in South Australia. I wonder at times if we know exactly where our harbours are going, the areas they will ultimately be called upon to service, and to what degree they will need to be developed. I wonder if it is time to look at a State-wide transportation survey and the question of co-ordination throughout the State.

I feel quite sure that the Department of Industrial Development has made a number of projections for industry in this State, but it is something that needs to be looked at continually—some form of guide to industrial development 10, 15 and 20 years into the future. Certainly we need to look at some projections of the over-all economic growth in the State.

Turning from planning of that nature, I look at some of the industries that are established in Queensland and I return again to a matter that I dealt with briefly in my Address-in-Reply speech—the dairying industry. This industry is one of continuing concern to me, particularly with the possible entry of the United Kingdom into the European Common Market. It is interesting to note that the Federal Government recently introduced a new five-year dairying industry stabilisation plan which provides for \$135,000,000 as a bounty to be spent over five years at an annual expenditure of \$27,000,000. A Labour spokesman made the very significant comment, "How long can the Government protect an industry by subsidy when nothing is being done to rehabilitate the major deficient areas?"

This, of course, highlights the great problem in the dairying industry. Those who have looked at it critically, long and hard, with a much more expert approach than I could pretend to have, contend that, overall, the dairying industry is efficient and has a good future in this State. But what about those sections of the industry that are not coming up to scratch? I believe that those sections that cannot raise their standards to a defined limit would possibly be better off if they were helped out of the industry. I wonder whether it would be kinder to those sections of the industry if we helped to rehabilitate them in some other industry. It is a question of planning. I wonder at times whether we make the mistake of looking at the dairying industry as a whole instead of trying to fragment it and help the section that has a good future to stay there, and help the section that does not have a good future by assisting it to get out of the industry.

I hesitate to speak about the sugar industry because there are many hon. members in this Chamber much more aware of its problems than I pretend to be. In retrospect I think we acknowledge the fact that the increased acreage policy implemented a few years ago was probably wrong. But that is now a matter of history. What we should be satisfying ourselves about is whether the slump is of a temporary order and whether rising demand, returning markets and improving prices will rehabilitate the industry, or whether ultimately it will return to a situation where acreages have to be reduced. I should hope that this matter is looked at critically so that we can understand where we are going.

I wish to deal very briefly with coal. It is remarkable the number of people who say, "Are you doing the right thing selling these millions of tons of coal to Japan?" I say to those people what I say to every hon. member in this Chamber tonight, "I do not know." I do not think any of us will know that with certainty in our lifetime. This is the judgment the way I see it: we run the risk of exhausting supplies which would otherwise be available for future generations, or conversely, we sell a commodity now which might well be superseded in 20, 40, or 50 years' time. That is the judgment that has to be made. I do not think that our judgment for or against will be vindicated within the lifetime of many of us here.

My reference to coal is to highlight the benefit of many of the by-products of coal. I was interested to learn that there are hundreds of uses for these by-products. I will mention just a few of the things that are manufactured from the by-products of coal: perfume, plastic gramophone records, nylon stockings, aspirin, dyes, artificial rubber tyres, fertilisers and insecticides. It seems that the availability of coal because of the rich resources of this State places us in a fortuitous situation in trying to sponsor some of these industries. Although I cannot in all honesty say whether it is a good thing or a bad thing that we are exporting millions of tons of coal, in the short-term outlook I say it is a good thing, but we should be looking for the creation of some of these industries that can utilise coal as a product.

Exploration for oil over the whole of the continent has now reached exciting proportions. I believe that in the next few weeks we will enact legislation in this Chamber that will provide certain conditions under which off-shore drilling may take place. Hon. members may not realise it, but the Australian Federation is pioneering something in this field that is unique in the whole of the world. We have been able to reach agreement between the Commonwealth Government and the States that cannot be found in any other federation in the world. That is a tribute to the legal brains in this country. I say those things merely to lead into the point that there is an exciting new

field for off-shore exploration. Certainly it is primarily a Commonwealth province, but I wonder if we are looking at the question of seeing what we can do to expand dramatically the exploration for oil off the coast of Queensland.

Again, talking about planning, the hon. member for Ipswich East made a very impressive speech in this Assembly a few weeks ago when he spoke about fuel policy. I think that is a speech that repays close study based on the question of whether we are to have a sane fuel policy in this country.

A distinguished economist, W. Arthur Lewis, wrote a book on the subject of planning. In his work, "Development Planning", he posed the proposition that planning should cover these features: it should have a survey of the current economic situation; proposals for improving the institutional framework of economic activity; a list of proposed Government expenditures; a review of major industries; a set of targets for the private sector; and a macroeconomic projection for the whole economy. These headings were dealt with in detail and I do not intend to elaborate on the points tonight. He made a final observation in these terms—

"All in all, the critic of Australian practice on the score of Development Planning might argue that what prevails is a sort of pragmatic method of approach; but in a less kindly phrase, Australian practice looks to be a version of 'systematic ad hocery.'"

I content myself with those few remarks on State planning. I think there is a necessity for it in such terms to project our thinking a little bit further ahead than 12 months.

If there is a necessity for State planning on this basis, I think there is a necessity also to look at the matter of administration. I believe that we could usefully employ in this State a committee which, for want of a better name, I would describe as an orders and methods committee. Such a committee should continually look at the functions of the various Government departments and satisfy itself that there is no overlapping, that the methods used by employees are up to date and satisfactory, and it should apply itself to the containing of administrative costs. I think that is very important.

In his speech today the Leader of the Opposition referred to the growth of the Public Service. One should not be over-critical of the growth of the Public Service because, reducing it to simple terms, if we want a welfare State we have to pay for it and, to the greater degree that we invite Government participation in activities, so must the Public Service be greater. That is a truism.

As a statement of fact I point out that from 1957-58 to this year there has been a significant increase in the size of the

Public Service. In 1957-58 it represented 15.23 per cent. of the Queensland population and, in the year just concluded, 18.19 per cent. Deducting teachers and policemen, who cannot be described merely as administrative staff, we find that the percentage was 6.9 in 1957-58 and rose to 8.25 in 1966-67. I wonder whether the orders and methods committee I envisage could help to eliminate some of the overlapping and duplication that possibly exists.

Looking further at administration, I am not content to let it rest in its entirety with the Public Service no matter how efficient that Public Service might be. I aspire and champion the cause for the creation of a parliamentary public works committee and a parliamentary public accounts committee. For the sake of those in the ministerial ranks, may I say that when I set myself up to be a carping critic I can fill the role pretty well. I do not know where I will get, but that is the advocacy I am entering upon and I will return to this theme as long as I sit here or until such committees are established.

It was a delightful occasion last week when, hungering for the parliamentary atmosphere, I tuned into Canberra and listened to the Federal Minister for Works, Mr. Kelly, introduce a Bill outlining certain public works expenditure. He prefaced his remarks by saying, "The Parliamentary Public Works Committee has authorised this." I thought that was delightful.

This is the eleventh Budget that has been presented in this Chamber by the present Government. It continues the march of progress that was pioneered by my predecessor in the seat of Chatsworth, Sir Thomas Hiley.

I think a few broad observations should be made about the Government's image, and I content myself with these few comments. Firstly, there are thousands of people in the State of Queensland who readily acknowledge that this Government has done an outstanding job. They look around and they see new industries, new schools, and the bustling atmosphere that prevails. This is tangible evidence to every unbiased critic who cares to look around.

Those same thousands of people do not want to return to a Labour Government. Their memory is too fresh. Situations and events are too recent. They can cast their minds back and can remember administration under a Labour Government. The contrast is still too real. They respect what we have done. They do not want to return to a Labour Government.

Mr. O'Donnell: What about Dawson and Capricornia?

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: This talk of Capricornia has been thrown around the Chamber today. I say to the critics on the other side of the Chamber that they should look at those figures objectively and analytically. If they looked at the figures in that light they

would realise that on 25 November, at the forthcoming Senate election, Senator Heatley is already home, hosed, and dried.

While the people acknowledge those true facts that I have referred to, they nevertheless look for some new injection of dynamic approach. They want no part of indecision. They want a firm hand and a good administration that makes up its mind and knows where it is going. Some of them ask if we are too institutionalised. If we are, we must look critically at ourselves. These people will tolerate mistakes if those mistakes are made genuinely and in an effort to advance this State still further. But they will not tolerate pussyfoot politics, and in this mid-term period in which this Government now finds itself it must continue to apply policies with firmness and decision and with action. If this is done there is no doubt that we will continue to enjoy many years of office.

I conclude by posing the question, "What is needed?" The Budget has fulfilled its requirements. It has been presented by a courageous Treasurer who has assessed the financial requirements of the State for the next 12 months and has dealt with them accordingly. We need, first of all, a fresh appraisal of our financial relationship with the Commonwealth. We need a clear pattern indicating our objectives and where we are going. We need policies that are firm, positive, attractive, appealing, and inviting participation.

More than anything—and this is the crux of Queensland's problems—we need people. We need people to increase the productive capacity of this State; people to justify the creation of more townships and industries; people who, in their turn, will justify greater financial reimbursements from the Commonwealth; and people who, in their own right, will expand our taxing capacity within our own boundaries.

We are in the last months of a distinguished premiership. A Premier who has led the Government effectively and administered the affairs of this State competently and well, will soon step down from office. He will go into retirement carrying the warm wishes and high regard of every member in every section of this Assembly. To the new Premier, whoever he may be, the new times will present new challenges. He will have behind him a team anxious to work for the betterment of the State and willing to offer him every degree of loyalty, support and respect that is necessary. We ask from him—and confidently expect to receive—a response to these challenges so that the problems that continue to beset us will be approached in the same positive and dynamic fashion, and the State's fortunes will continue to be administered in the best way possible.

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 9.39 p.m.