

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 12 OCTOBER 1967

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 12 OCTOBER, 1967

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

QUESTIONS

MANNING OF AMBULANCE VEHICLES

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

(1) From what Queensland Ambulance Transport Brigade centres, sub-centres or sub-depots in Brisbane and for what hours are ambulance vehicles manned by only one driver/bearer for accidents, emergencies or other transport?

(2) In the public interest, will immediate steps be taken to ensure that any such vehicles are manned by two bearers at all times?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "My Department has avoided where possible any infringement on the autonomy of local ambulance committees. The information sought by the Honourable Member is not available in my Department, and I would suggest to him that he might direct his inquiry to the parent centre, Queensland Ambulance Transport Brigade, Brisbane."

TEACHERS OF GERMAN IN STATE HIGH SCHOOLS

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

How many teachers at each of the Balmoral, Brisbane, Cavendish Road, Corinda, Inala, Kedron, Kelvin Grove, Mt. Gravatt, Salisbury, Sandgate District and Wavell State High Schools (a) are qualified to teach German and (b) do actually teach German?

Answer:—

	(a)	(b)
"Balmoral	3	3
Brisbane	10	9
Cavendish Road	5	5
Corinda	4	4
Inala	2	2
Kedron	4	3
Kelvin Grove	3	3
Mt. Gravatt	5	4
Salisbury	3	2
Sandgate District	3	3
Wavell	5	5"

SALE OF RAILS IN STORE AT STUART, TOWNSVILLE

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

(1) Has a quantity of rails stored at Stuart been sold to an outside firm and, if so, what is its name?

(2) Was the sale carried out by public tender or private agreement and were any new rails included in the sale?

(3) Did Railway Stores employees load the rails at Stuart on behalf of the firm and were they consigned from Stuart immediately to an overseas buyer via the Port of Townsville? If so, what was the estimated loading cost?

(4) What tonnages of these rails passed through Stuart Junction during the months of July, August and September, 1967, and what was the return to the Department?

(5) If the stores are surplus or obsolete, why did the Department not negotiate directly with the overseas buyer and retain the full profit?

Answers:—

(1) "A quantity of part-worn rails stored at Stuart has been sold. The names of the successful tenderers were—Abrahams and Williams Pty. Ltd., E. R. Bowman and Co. Pty. Ltd."

(2) "Public tenders were invited and no new rails were included."

(3) "The basis of the sale to Abrahams and Williams Pty. Ltd. was 'free on rail' Stuart, and the responsibility for loading the rails rested with the Department. However, to help with the loading, Abrahams and Williams Pty. Ltd. supplied two cranes at that company's cost."

(4) "3,308.38 tons for a return of \$94,288.83."

(5) "Public tenders were invited. No tender was received from an overseas buyer."

CONSTRUCTION OF ZILLMERE OVERPASS

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

(1) Have all resumptions involved in the construction of the proposed overpass bridge and its approaches at Zillmere been effected? If so, what was the amount paid?

(2) Are any resumption payments outstanding? If so, what amount?

(3) Will construction of the overpass commence at an early date? If not, what is the reason for the continued delay?

Answer:—

"The proposal does not involve any declared road under the control of the Main Roads Department. It is understood to be a Brisbane City Council matter."

T.A.B. SPONSORING OF RADIO BROADCASTS
OF RACE MEETINGS

Mr. O'Donnell, pursuant to notice, asked
The Treasurer,—

As (a) A.B.C. broadcasts are giving inadequate race coverage, (b) the Federal Government has increased communication charges through the P.M.G.'s Department, (c) rural commercial firms are not of sufficient financial magnitude to sponsor full-scale programmes and (d) the Totalisator Administration Board has obtained tremendous support from the betting public, will he ask the Totalisator Administration Board to sponsor complete State-wide radio coverage of all race meetings on which it operates on Wednesdays, Saturdays and race days of national importance?

Answer:—

"I do not consider that it is the function of the Board to provide such a news service."

REVIEW OF INDUSTRIAL LEGISLATION

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

(1) What action, if any, has been taken to implement his promise at Warwick which was reported on April 28, 1965, that a Committee would be appointed to investigate the State's Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Acts and recommend amendments?

(2) If no action has been taken, will he urgently consider this important matter in view of the considerable industrial unrest which has apparently been caused by the legislation?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "Consideration has been given to this matter but no decision has been made."

STATE CONTRIBUTION TO UNIVERSITY
FUNDS

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

(1) What is the maximum Federal subsidy available in this financial year to the university and allocated on the basis of \$1 to \$1.85 of funds contributed by the State and fees paid by university students?

(2) What is the amount allocated by the State towards these costs in this financial year?

(3) By what amount would the State have had to increase its allocation so that the university would receive the maximum Federal subsidy without shifting the burden on to the students?

(4) As this is the second occasion in recent times when students' fees have been increased because of the Government's attitude towards education, will he endeavour in the next financial year to avoid the imminent danger of placing a university education beyond the economic means of working families?

Answers:—

(1) "\$4,933,100."

(2) "\$5,760,000."

(3 and 4) "\$370,000. However, I would remind the Honourable Member that special consideration was given to university financial requirements in this year's Budget and the amount of endowment was increased from \$8,950,690 in 1966-67 to \$10,610,000 in 1967-68. This increase of 18.54 per cent. might be compared with the increase of 8.06 per cent. in the State's available financial resources. I believe that the Honourable Member will agree that the Government has dealt generously with the university in this year's Budget. Indeed, the Honourable Member for Barooka, in his contribution on the Budget Debate, apparently felt that the State had been over-generous in this regard."

CONTROL OF PESTICIDE RESIDUES IN
PRIMARY PRODUCTS

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

What steps are at present being taken and what long-term plans are being formulated to reduce the level of D.D.T. and other pesticide residues in butter and other primary products to ensure that safe tolerance levels, based on accepted world standards, affecting human consumption may be obtained?

Answer:—

"The matter of pesticide residues, including chlorinated hydrocarbon residues, in primary products has been under continual surveillance by the Australian Agricultural Council and by my Department for some years. One of the major problems has been that there have been no internationally accepted tolerance levels for most agricultural chemicals and tolerance levels set have varied considerably from country to country. Frequently the levels set have had no sound basis either as regards scientific knowledge of the effects or the requirements of good agricultural practice. For a major exporter of rural products such as Australia, this lack of uniformity has created problems. The question of safe residue levels has been under study by a Joint World Health Organisation/Food and Agriculture Organisation Expert Committee of the United Nations for some

time and consideration of the recommendations of this body by the F.A.O. Codex Alimentarius Committee began last month. There is little doubt that we will have to conform to whatever standards are finally agreed upon and since the destination of most of our rural products is not known at the time of production it is obvious that the domestic market supplies will need to conform to the same standards as exports. On the domestic front a considerable amount of progress has already been achieved, particularly over the last two years or so. This progress has been made possible by close co-operation between Commonwealth and State authorities, including my Department, the rural industries concerned and their organisations. One recent major advance in this direction was the promulgation of regulations in July last limiting the use of D.D.T. and methoxychlor in cattle and sheep and regulating the use of all insecticides, including chlorinated hydrocarbons, in other stock. Similar progress has been made in other fields, such as the use of mercurial compounds in the fruit industry. There are, of course, still a few problem areas. There is in existence a Co-ordinating Committee on Pesticides, which was set up by the Australian Agricultural Council some time ago to co-ordinate activities in this field. In addition, my Department's technical and extension services are giving a high priority to the subject. The Agricultural Chemicals Distribution Control Act, which was passed by this Parliament in 1966, will in future provide a good vehicle for assisting in control of residues, whilst the Agricultural Standards Act enables control to be exercised over registration of chemicals for particular purposes. I would, however, stress the need for farmers and graziers, when using chemicals, to use them strictly in accordance with recommendations, particularly as regards the type of chemical, its dilution and application rates and time and frequency of application. These recommendations are being constantly reviewed in the light of overseas developments regarding residue tolerances. Finally, I would add that the whole agricultural chemical control and residue position has been vastly improved and this improvement will continue."

POLICE INVESTIGATION OF CRIMINAL OFFENCES

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

(1) How many cases of a criminal nature, including petty offences, were committed and reported in each of the years ended June 30, 1965, 1966 and 1967?

(2) What was the number of cases investigated and cleared up annually?

(3) What was the number of plain clothes personnel engaged in the investigation of such offences in each of the years?

(4) How many crimes of this nature were reported but not satisfactorily cleared up and/or proceeded with to completion annually?

(5) What number of detectives was employed at the C.I.B., Brisbane as at June 30, 1965, 1966 and 1967?

Answers:—

(1 and 2) "All cases of a criminal nature reported to the Police Department, whether they be classified as serious or petty (e.g., petty thefts), are recorded at the M.O. Section, C. I. Branch, Brisbane. Statistics from that section indicate the following:—Year ended June 30, 1965—Offences reported, 37,748; offences cleared up, 14,194. Year ended June 30, 1966—Offences reported, 39,948; offences cleared up, 15,661. Year ended June 30, 1967—Offences reported, 40,748; offences cleared up, 16,345."

(3) "As at June 30, 1965, in Queensland a total of 347 personnel performing duty in plain clothes were engaged in the investigation of crime. As at June 30, 1966, the figure was 371, and as at June 30, 1967, the figure was 395."

(4) "Statistics to enable an answer to this query to be supplied are not kept and it would be impossible to supply an answer without proceeding to investigate the situation in relation to each individual offence reported."

(5) "190, 199 and 221 respectively."

MEANS TEST FOR PATIENTS AT DENTAL HOSPITALS AND CLINICS

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

Further to his Answer to my Question on October 10, is a young member of a family living at home as a boarder and earning under the basic wage eligible for treatment at a dental clinic irrespective of the parents' income?

Answer:—

"No."

ACCOMMODATION FOR HOMECRAFT CLASSES, ATHERTON HIGH SCHOOL

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

In view of the poor and shabby condition of the building in which homecraft lessons are given to pupils of the Atherton High School and as it is not conducive to good work by the students and is unsatisfactory for the teachers, how many years

has this arrangement for homecraft education been in operation and what is the cost of transporting pupils and teachers to and from the high school?

Answer:—

"Pupils from the Atherton State High School have been receiving instruction in homecraft subjects in accommodation constructed for that purpose but located in the grounds of the Atherton State School, since 1959. My Department pays on the average sixteen dollars per week for the cost of conveyance between the schools."

REMOVAL OF TAILINGS, IRVINEBANK STATE TREATMENT WORKS

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

Further to my previous Questions concerning the disposal of crushing tailings at Irvinebank,—

(1) To date have any tailings been removed by the contractor?

(2) What was the time condition in the contract?

(3) What were the other conditions and have all of these conditions been carried out?

(4) In view of the need for extra water storage which would be provided by the removal of tailings, will he consider their expeditious removal?

Answers:—

(1) "No, only samples have been taken."

(2) "The treatment of the tailings must be commenced by July 1, 1968."

(3) "On application to the Department of Mines a copy of the agreement entered into with Mr. A. M. Abernethy for the treatment of the tailings may be examined. The only variation to the conditions has been the postponement of the commencing date for treatment of the tailings."

(4) "The provision of an area for mill circulating water in the Loudon Mill dam was a major factor leading to the calling of tenders to treat the tailings. The Department is also desirous of having them treated as expeditiously as practicable."

AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM, GILBERT RIVER AREA

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

Further to my Question to the Minister for Primary Industries regarding a pilot farm at Gilbert River, will he consider having a pilot farm established in the area, where unlimited water and suitable land

are available to carry out the necessary experiments with crops which could be grown in those parts of North Queensland?

Answer:—

"Pilot farms aimed at illustrating commercial production are normally established where major water conservation projects have been investigated. No such project has yet been planned for the Gilbert River, and establishment of a pilot farm is not considered necessary at this stage. Local landholders wishing to establish irrigated production could obtain technical or technical and financial assistance for establishment of irrigation facilities through the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission if investigation indicates their proposals to be sound. Technical advice on irrigated crops is available from the Department of Primary Industries."

RESUMPTION OF LAND AT SHORT AND ALICE STREETS, BRISBANE

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

Does the Wilbur Smith Transportation and Traffic Study include resumption of the land presently occupied by a stone-crusher operated by Wm. Collin and Sons Pty. Ltd., situated at the riverside corner of Short and Alice Streets? If so, when is it expected that the resumption will be made?

Answer:—

"Yes. The land has been resumed and negotiations on compensation are in progress."

EXPENDITURE ON ROAD WORKS

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

As the Minister for Mines in *Hansard* of September 7, 1967, stated that the figure of \$4,471,902 quoted by me as being the amount spent by the Main Roads Department on permanent works and maintenance in Brisbane over the past ten years ignored the fact that this amount was really \$15,631,475 because of spending from Commonwealth Aid Fund, Road Maintenance Fund, Traffic Engineering Trust Fund, Treasury Subsidies on road, street and bridge works and the Urban Roads Construction Fund, what were the amounts spent from each of the funds in all areas of the State, other than in Brisbane, expressed as amounts for the northern, central and southern divisions and exclusive of the amount of \$291,389,000 spent over the past ten years in areas of the State other than Brisbane from the Main Roads Department Permanent Works and Maintenance, Beef Roads, and Brigalow Roads Construction Funds?

Answer:—

"The Treasury financial records for the funds indicated are not dissected in such a way as to enable the desired information to be obtained."

COMPLETION OF SEALING, MOSSMAN-
DAINTREE ROAD

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

Has his Department plans for the bitumen sealing of the remaining four-mile section of the main road between Mossman and Daintree? If so, when will work commence?

Answer:—

"It is proposed to bitumen-seal 2½ miles of the section during the financial year 1969-70. The remaining 1½ miles, together with a bridge over Barrett's Creek, are programmed for 1970-71."

COMPLETION OF SEALING, BIBOOHRA-
MT. MOLLOY ROAD

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

As the unsealed section of the main road between Biboohra and Mt. Molloy is in a bad state, has his Department plans for the bitumen sealing of a section of this road? If so, when will work commence?

Answer:—

"The Main Roads Department has plans in hand for bitumen surfacing a further section of this road. At this stage it is not practicable to say when the work will be commenced, pending advice from the Commonwealth as to the availability of beef road funds."

NEW POLICE STATION AND RESIDENCE,
MAREEBA

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

As the police station and residence at Mareeba are dilapidated buildings and a disgrace to a centre with the population of Mareeba and district, will he sell the buildings for removal and replace them with new ones?

Answer:—

"The erection of new police buildings and residence at Mareeba is listed with other essential building works in the Police Department's programming, but it has not yet been possible to allocate finance for the work to be carried out. The project will receive consideration later when funds are available."

DRAINAGE WORK, MANLY RAILWAY
STATION

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

(1) As the Railway Department has excavated an open drain on land adjacent to Manly railway station which has already proved a danger and a hazard to children attending the local school and to railway travellers, will he urgently consider action to overcome the problem?

(2) Why was the twelve-inch drain at the end of Yamboyna Street not connected to the storm-water drain, a distance of four feet, both of which are on railway property and constructed by his Department?

Answers:—

(1) "During recent bridge works at Ernest Street, Manly, previously excavated railway side ditches were cleared of grass and silt to take the discharge from the roadway drainage system. The side ditches are on railway property, are well away from the normal formed pathways, and are essential for the proper drainage of the railway track."

(2) "To afford the Brisbane City Council the opportunity to discharge run-off from the adjacent channelling in Yamboyna Street, the 12-inch drain at the end of that street was not connected to the storm-water drain. The Brisbane City Council has now advised the connection is not desired and the opening between the 12-inch drain and the storm-water drain will be closed at an early date."

PAPERS

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

Reports—

Department of Primary Industries, for the year 1966-67.

Director, Department of Children's Services, for the year 1966-67.

Fish Board, for the year 1966-67.

North Queensland Fish Board, for the year 1966-67.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

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

Order in Council under the Harbours Acts, 1955 to 1966.

Regulations under the Apprenticeship Act of 1964.

ADDITIONAL SITTING DAY; DAYS ALLOTTED TO SUPPLY

Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Premier): I move—

“That, during the remainder of this session, unless otherwise ordered—

(1) The House will meet for the dispatch of business at 11 o'clock a.m. on Friday in each week, in addition to the days already provided by Sessional Order, and that Government business do take precedence on that day;

(2) The House may, on the days allotted for Supply, continue to sit until 10 o'clock p.m. Each of the periods between 11 o'clock a.m. and 4 o'clock p.m. and between 4 o'clock p.m. and 10 o'clock p.m. shall be accounted an allotted day under the provisions of Standing Order No. 307. Three allotted days shall be allowed for the discussion of the Estimates of a department. At the termination of the period so allowed the Chairman shall put every question necessary to decide the Vote under consideration and shall then proceed to put the question for the balance of the Estimates for that department; all such questions to be decided without amendment or debate: Provided that, if the discussion of the Estimates of a department be concluded before the expiry of the three days so allowed, the period remaining shall be allocated to the discussion of the Estimates next brought before the Committee. All provisions of Standing Order No. 307 shall, *mutatis mutandis*, continue to apply.”

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT— RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

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

Debate resumed from 10 October (see p. 796) 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. MULLER (Fassifern) (11.29 a.m.): In making my contribution to the debate I should like to congratulate the Treasurer on having made the best of a very difficult task. I feel that I would not be honest if I said that I am completely satisfied with every detail of the Budget. There are, of course, exceptions. Nevertheless, I realise that the circumstances are particularly difficult. By “circumstances”, I mean the present financial relationship between the State and the Commonwealth. As a matter

of fact, one cannot help thinking that, under the present financial arrangements, the States are slowly but surely being starved to death.

My thoughts this morning go back to what happened when uniform taxation was introduced. I remember sitting over on the other side of the Chamber when the Premier of the day, Hon. W. Forgan Smith, introduced the proposal for uniform taxation. He was very reluctant to do so. In fact, he opposed it very definitely at the beginning, but, under the circumstances then existing, finally agreed.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is far too much conversation in the Chamber. If hon. members wish to converse in loud tones, I suggest that they leave the Chamber before doing so.

Mr. MULLER: I wonder what is going to happen later in my speech, Mr. Hooper. I have not said anything to cause hon. members opposite to interject; before I finish my speech they may have cause to interject.

As I said, I am mindful of what happened at that time. Among the words used by the late William Forgan Smith were these—

“If you forfeit your right to tax, you eventually forfeit your right to govern.”

I have never forgotten those words, and I think they appealed to all members who were in the Chamber at that time. However, because Australia was at war, the States were obliged to agree more or less reluctantly, to uniform taxation.

The longer uniform taxation is in existence, the more certain it is that the day will come when future members of this Assembly will have to exercise great vigilance if they hope to retain the present form of government in a democratic State. There is no doubt that the States are shareholders under this system; but they are not directors. Even though from time to time Governments plan many things that they wish to do, they are largely frustrated by Commonwealth policy. It is true that this State had an immediate gain under uniform taxation; but it is my firm opinion that the present system will eventually lead to a uniformity of administration of the States. I believe that the continent of Australia is too vast to be governed from one point.

I turn now to a few questions that are under consideration at the moment. Much has been said about what the Commonwealth Government is doing to assist the States to develop their water resources. Ever since I first entered this Parliament there has been a great deal of talk about greater Commonwealth assistance in the conservation of water, but no more than lip service has been given by the Commonwealth Government up to the present. Some time ago it promised to make available \$50,000,000—I ask hon. members to note that it is dollars,

not pounds—over 10 years. Spread over such a long period, it is so small an amount that it is really not worth talking about. As a matter of fact, it will not do much more than provide for the construction of a few small dams in the various States.

Investigational work has been going on, and hon. members know that a number of Federal parliamentarians have visited Queensland to check on the proposals that this State has put forward. I suppose the money will be forthcoming eventually, but I do not think anything practical will happen for some time.

Queensland's resources have been talked about for many years, but they are not of very great value until they are developed fully. Under the present system of finance the States are hobbled in their attempts to develop the territory they control. This must be kept in mind, and it is time that an attempt was made to impress upon our friends in Canberra that something more must be done in the field of development.

Mr. Sherrington interjected.

Mr. MULLER: Nothing was done when the A.L.P. was in office. Hon. members opposite should be the last to complain. Country-Liberal Governments in Queensland have done more in 10 years than A.L.P. Governments ever did. We who were then in Opposition could not interest former Labour Governments in such schemes.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. MULLER: At one time I begged the Labour Government to do something about building small dams and I presented deputation after deputation in an attempt to interest it in what is now the Moogerah Dam. I was told by a Minister of the day that there was no water there. Admittedly the Labour Government went on with the Mareeba-Dimbulah project. There is not the slightest doubt that that is a good job, but it was proceeded with more for political purposes than anything else. These things must reach the stage where they become accomplished facts. If ever anything has been done to build up the finances of this State it has been this Government's efforts in the field of water conservation, and it has been done with the small amount of money that has been available to us.

If hon. members look at this year's Financial Statement they will see that there is no Federal money available for this work and that the amount that is available is not nearly as large as it should be. About \$7,000,000 is earmarked this year. That has been the position for a number of years, yet with it we have built half a dozen small, very useful dams.

Passing on to the brigalow land development scheme, it is true that in this instance the Commonwealth Government is advancing several millions of dollars. This is very useful, but when the position is examined in

detail it will be found that the money advanced for brigalow land development is purely a loan. We have to pay interest on it and, of course, the money has to be repaid, which means that again it is wholly a State effort. The benefits accruing to the State Government from the scheme are virtually nil, whereas the Commonwealth Government will gain considerably from it through increased taxation revenue. I therefore say that if our friends in Canberra wish to do something for this State they will be obliged to make more money available for developmental purposes.

I mentioned previously, in relation to water conservation in the U.S.A., that the Federal Government of that country finds all the money. It provides \$160,000,000 a year for water conservation, and that money is spent in 16 States. In other words, \$10,000,000 a year is spent in each State. That money is made available at the rate of 2½ per cent. for 40 years. The States pay 2½ per cent. interest, and that represents the repayment of the loan. In other words, in fact the States contribute nothing.

Something similar to that will have to happen here if we are to carry on with a policy of rural development. This class of development is tremendously important, as is also the development of secondary industry. Wherever one looks, the development of secondary industry has been really amazing. It is not just a question of hearing or reading about it; it is there to see. One cannot go in any direction around the city of Brisbane and its suburbs without seeing industries springing up. Why did that not happen before?

Mr. Hanlon: It did happen before.

Mr. MULLER: It did not happen before.

Mr. Hanlon: In 1957 industry was springing up everywhere around Rocklea.

Mr. MULLER: Between the city and Ipswich there was a break with virtually no industry.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. MULLER: These things have happened. If both primary industries and secondary industries are built up, the State becomes prosperous and the people living in it become happy and contented.

Mr. Hanlon interjected.

Mr. MULLER: It is not a bit of good the hon. member trying to question these things, because they are here. If any hon. member does not believe it I will pick him up in a car this afternoon and take him round. Hon. members opposite are not only blind, deaf and dumb, they are blind, deaf, dumb and silly.

The Treasurer has not been able to provide for any reductions in road taxes or rail freights. This is of great concern to country

people. We talk a great deal about development. We have to think of the people who live on the land—those who are prepared to live in the outback parts of the State and endure all sorts of difficult conditions. Almost without exception they will say that transport represents about 25 per cent. of their costs. It is a pity that it has not been possible to reduce these charges. However, I am sure the Treasurer will deal with that subject in his reply, because I know that it is on the lips of many people.

What I really rose to speak about is what has been done in the development of the State. I have just returned from a fact-finding tour that was organised by the Minister for Mines and Main Roads. It was a wonderfully organised and well-equipped trip. On the tour of inspection we had with us the Deputy Main Roads Commissioner, and we were joined at Rockhampton by the Assistant Commissioner for the Central Division. Also in the party were the Under Secretary of the Department of Mines and the Supervisor of Metalliferous Mines, Mr. Anderson, representatives of "The Courier-Mail," the country Press and the Australian Broadcasting Commission. On the trip we were met by the district members, Mr. V. E. Jones, the hon. member for Callide, and Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt, the hon. member for Mackenzie. What impressed me most was the confidence evidenced by the representatives of the various local authorities. We had every reason to be proud of the confidence that was displayed when they met the Minister. I feel that the confidence that is evident between local authorities and the Minister augurs well for the further development of the State.

It must be remembered that before embarking on a policy of development it is necessary to have roads. Where there are no roads nothing can happen. Without roads and without people there can be no development. Unless some amenities are provided in a district we cannot expect people to live there.

One reason for my being so willing to join the Minister on the trip that I mentioned was that I had not seen the territory that we covered for about eight years. I was really amazed at what had taken place in the construction of roads and what goes with it. Thousands and thousands of acres of land had been brought under cultivation since I previously visited that part of the State, and this has contributed very largely to the economy of that district.

My main purpose in making the trip was to have a look at the brigalow lands development. I do not propose to be critical of anybody or anything. We all know that brigalow development is a difficult job. Although we all realise that it is important to develop the brigalow country we may differ slightly on the approach and the method of financing the scheme.

Before dealing with that matter, I should like to give the Committee a short resume of what we saw. After arriving at Rockhampton we had a look at the nickel find, just outside Marlborough. I was surprised to learn that nickel is not found in the same way as other minerals. It is not noticeable to the eye. The people in charge of the work—representatives of Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. and the Canadian Metal Exploration Company—took us to the top of the mountain, which is about 1,200 feet high, and showed us where they were drilling for this mineral.

After drilling—and we were told they have already drilled about 1,000 holes—they take samples. From merely looking at the samples it is impossible to tell what they contain—they may be good, bad or indifferent—so they are sent to Sydney for analysis. We do not yet know whether this is an economic proposition but we do know that it has great possibilities.

Another remarkable feature about the nickel discovery is that another company operating on the same mountain, the Capricornia Mineral Co. has found chrysoprase which is a gemstone. From the information I have gathered it appears that chrysoprase forms as a result of nickel content in the soil acting on other minerals. As the result of that find, the geologists got on the track.

We had a very close look at the deposits of chrysoprase and to me they indicate that the nickel content in the soil is considerable, and that it will be an economic proposition. It is a little too early to know just what will be done.

I point out to the hon. members the change that has taken place to induce these people to engage in this class of work. In days gone by they did not go in for it, but today they are prepared to put their money into it. I assure hon. members that the cost of the exploration work that has been carried out is considerable.

Under the guidance of the hon. member for Callide we looked at the limestone deposits at The Caves. I was amazed to see the vastness of the lime deposits and to see what is being done within 7 miles of the cement works. I estimate that there is sufficient lime there to last for the next 2,000 years, and it is of excellent quality.

We then went to look at the Calcap Power House. I mention it because it has such a bearing on development in the North Burnett area. As well as roads and water, which are necessary to develop both secondary and primary industry, power is essential. The Calcap Power House, just outside Biloela, is one of the most up-to-date plants of its type I have ever seen. What is equally important, only a mile away there is sufficient coal to provide the necessary power for the next couple of hundred years. What was left undeveloped in the past is now being developed.

We also went to the Moura coalfield. The machines in operation there, particularly the huge dragline, are unique. In the powerhouse at Calcap there is an indicator showing the power being used at Moura. It rises and falls when the big dragline is in operation. The dragline weighs 6,500 tons and it cost over \$16,000,000.

If hon. members turn all these factors over in their minds they will realise what private enterprise has done. That machine is operating very successfully. The task at Moura is not easy. The overburden is very thick and hard, and it is very expensive to remove. Despite all these things, as hon. members know, the operations are showing a handsome profit. I ask hon. members to consider what this operation means to Moura. When I last visited the town there was virtually nothing there but today it is really a city on its own, growing every day.

We then went to look at some of the brigalow development work and proceeded to Rolleston, where we were again met by local authority members. A plane was provided so that we could inspect some of the brigalow development work. Not very much can be seen from the air. We could see what can be done but we did not know the nature of it as we were at too great a height. Nevertheless, everything humanly possible was done to show us what had been done.

In my opinion it was a mistake to close the Roma-Injune railway line. The only way the brigalow country in the Arcadia Valley and round Rolleston can be developed is by cultivation, and if the land is cultivated something must be grown on it. Part of that country has been under cultivation for a few years and is growing grain, which has to be marketed. I ask the Government to reconsider this matter, because that area is too remote to use road transport. It is about 130 miles to Roma and 80 to 100 miles to Springsure and Emerald, and grain cannot be carried that distance economically. We travelled on the road from Springsure to Emerald, and I did not imagine I would see such a road in that area. That is the effect this scheme has had. A few years ago that part of the State was running a small number of cattle, whereas now quite an area of it is cultivated and is growing wheat. Some of the country is very good. The farmers were short of water and had there been another fall of rain the crops would have been equal to those grown on the Darling Downs. We cannot expect such an industry to prosper and grow unless some reasonable means of transport is available. This is one instance in which I fear a mistake has been made. Some of the buildings on this line have been demolished, but I implore the Government not to pull up the rails for the time being.

That district has possibilities, but without cultivation it has none. I am firmly of the opinion that brigalow cannot be controlled except by the use of the plough. It could be done in some cases with luck. I suppose my

opinion is open to debate, but it is my honest opinion. I have seen brigalow development in the Moura, Springsure, Emerald, Clermont and Marlborough districts. I had a good look around and I estimate that 10 per cent. of it has been cultivated, that 15 per cent. is reasonably clean, and that 75 per cent. presents a problem. But I think it could be handled if it was tackled in the right way. Most of this land is good, although the quality varies. Some parts are better than others. Most of the settlers have 8,000 acres of brigalow, which is more than they can handle. It has to be cleared of scrub and then it must be looked after because the suckers will come, and unless it is properly looked after there will be trouble again.

Mr. Rae: Do you think the areas are too big?

Mr. MULLER: In some cases the settlers are not able to handle it. Handling 8,000 acres of brigalow requires a large amount of money. It is not only a question of pulling the scrub but also of dealing with the suckers and the re-growth, which will come and come again. The only way to beat it is by using the plough, and nobody can plough 8,000 or 10,000 acres unless he is in a mighty big way. It would have been better had the settlers been given 4,000 acres on a freehold basis. That would have catered for the small man.

A man going onto that land with only the required amount of \$24,000 cannot handle it, nor could he do so even if he had twice that sum. He would find himself faced with a mounting load of debt, and eventually he would be financially crippled. I have no doubt that he could get out of his predicament, but I do not think the way in which that could be done is good business for the Crown. After such a settler had held the land for the required period, a lot of the area would still be undeveloped and he could sell that land. In effect, he would be selling the Crown estate, and by that method he would probably get out of his predicament and make a profit.

I believe that more people and closer settlement are essentials for development, and what I have just mentioned is not conducive to closer settlement. I think it would be very much better, in the interests of the settlers and the State, if blocks were smaller so that they could be better handled. I am no stranger to that district. I saw the country round Moura when I worked there in political campaigns 20 to 25 years ago. The other day I saw land on which brigalow was ringbarked about 22 years ago, and it looked then to be a good kill. When I saw it last week it was showing a crop of brigalow suckers. I spoke to the owner about it and he said that the surprising thing was that when he pushed the scrub and dry timber to get it out of the way, the suckers came to life. That man also told me that he has 2,500 acres of land and that both his family and his son's

family are doing quite well on it. He told me what he is growing and the number of sheep he is carrying. He is using all of his land.

Those settlers with 8,000 acres, 10,000 acres, or even 6,000 acres, cannot use it all. If land is held without being used, with the rates and taxes that have to be paid on it, it becomes a liability rather than an asset. Those are things that need very careful consideration. In a great many cases the blocks held are twice as large as those holding them can handle, and I have no doubt at all that they will never be able to handle them. There is no question of pushing scrub, throwing grass seeds in, and becoming a grazier overnight. That simply does not happen. This fellow that we call the brigalow sucker is a nasty chap; he will come and come again, and if you do not get him, he will get you.

Much has been said about private enterprise and men with a lot of money obtaining blocks at auction. I do not know how much money they have; that is their own business. I do think, however, that some similar provision should be made for men of lesser means. We should allow them to compete for smaller blocks. There is, of course, the question of whether auctioning is the best way of disposing of blocks. I am afraid that under such a system the smaller men would not get blocks, anyway, because they would be out-bidden. That is one of the things I fear. If this type of land settlement is to be a success, I think it has to be reviewed along the lines that I have indicated.

Wheat, barley and safflower can be grown in this district. In the western part of it many graziers are growing safflower as a stand-by crop. I have never seen any other crop stand up so well to dry weather. Safflower will be blooming when everything else has disappeared. I do not know its effect on the land; it may be rather detrimental to it. It is a strong plant, with deep roots, and it may take all the nutrient from the soil. However, in dry country, in which nothing else can be grown, it is a valuable stand-by. The best evidence of that is the acreage of this crop and the number of people who are growing it. When nothing else is available for stock, they can be turned onto it and saved.

Some of the cultivated land in the Emerald district and near the properties once held by the Queensland-British Food Corporation, with which I shall deal later, was never cultivated till a few years ago. As late as last week I saw a train-load of three-year-old bullocks in prime condition being loaded. They were taken off country that had been cultivated and had grown sufficient feed for the winter months to enable the bullocks to be fattened and turned off now. If that had not been done, they could not have been fattened. I should

say that every bullock I saw was in prime condition and beautifully finished. They were a credit to their owner.

Leaving that subject, I shall deal now with what Utah Development Co. is doing at Blackwater. We went to look at the Blackwater mine. To me, it was the greatest surprise of the whole trip. I did not imagine that such development could take place in 15 months. In my mind's eye, I pictured Blackwater as I used to see it—a coal-mining centre with a few mines and a few cottages not far from the railway line. The company went there 15 months ago and the State built a 12-mile branch railway line. The company has all the country cleared; it has been drilled; probably sufficient overburden has been removed to keep the mine operating for 18 months; and plant of a very high quality has been installed. Every detail has been worked out right to the day—the system of planning used was a very good one—and everything has gone according to plan. It is expected that the first coal will be railed in November.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: How many men will be employed there?

Mr. MULLER: About 440 men are employed there now.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: I mean, when they begin operating.

Mr. MULLER: I do not know, but it will be quite a number. I do not know how many the hon. member will employ next year.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: I think you are in for a big surprise.

Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt: There are 425 at Moura.

Mr. MULLER: I welcome that interjection. They are almost all Australians. The only Americans are the executive staff, and mighty men they are, too. What appealed to me was that they are young. The hon. member for Mackenzie was a member of the party, and I think he would bear me out when I say that they are about 40 years of age. They are doing a remarkably good job and employing about 445 men. I said, "Do you have any trouble with labour?" They said, "None at all."

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. MULLER: They pay them good wages and I do not know why anyone should object to a project of this type.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: We are not objecting.

Mr. MULLER: That is all right.

Mr. Newton: No; but we want to know how many will be employed later.

Mr. MULLER: The company provides the money, the machinery, and the know-how. After browsing round the whole of Queensland, Utah Development Co. chose this site because it was the most economical and the overburden was the easiest to deal with. I

think it varies in depth from about 40 feet to 100 feet; it would be safe to say that it averages about 60 feet. It is very easy to handle. The dragline used is only about a quarter of the size of the one used at Moura, but it is working very efficiently. What the company has done in three months with the dragline is almost incredible.

Mr. Sherrington: How much royalty is the State getting?

Mr. MULLER: It depends on how much coal the company takes out. The State gets royalty, whereas previously the coal was simply lying in the ground.

The company went into dense brigalow country, and whoever knew earlier that the coal was there was not game to undertake the work needed. After removing the scrub and boring every 20 or 30 yards, the company knew exactly what was ahead of it, and the country is opening up just like a book. As I said earlier, what has been achieved in such a short time is a revelation. Those people do not rely on talk; they get things done.

Industries of that type are worth encouraging. They bring money to the State; they know where they are going; so the State must benefit considerably from them. That also is very true of the operations at Moura. Surely no-one would complain about what has been done at Moura, where the rocks in the overburden are a tremendous size.

Since these people came into the area they have revolutionised the whole process; they work around the clock. But let me draw attention to their sad experience recently—and I should like hon. members of the Opposition to listen to this. There were 445 men working at Moura in one week recently but no trains were running because the railwaymen at Mt. Morgan said they had to stop. This not only stopped the people employed at the works, but there were ships waiting in the harbour and others coming in. Hon. members will appreciate that to carry on a business like this plans have to be drawn up and transport has to arrive on schedule and leave on schedule. In this instance the whole box and dice was shut down because a few men at Mt. Morgan said, "These trains are not going to run." I ask in all reasonableness: how can a country survive under conditions such as that?

Mr. Sherrington: Why did they say that the trains should not run?

Mr. MULLER: Nobody knows what it was about. Everybody was given all that the court awarded and nobody knew what the complaint was. As a matter of fact, something like 22 trains were running and they were all brought to a stop.

We have reached the stage when something has to be done. We cannot go on this way. If half a dozen men, or even 100 men, can hold the whole industry of the country to ransom, something must be done. This is the lifeblood of the nation; do not forget

that. We all live in intimate association with these industries and if half a dozen men can destroy the whole thing, where are we going?

Mr. Hanlon: If half a dozen men at the head of Thiess-Peabody-Mitsui decided to stop the work, what would you do? That is just as bad.

Mr. MULLER: Queensland is part of Australia, and we in Queensland have done pretty well. Let the Yanks look after America. I am talking about the fellows here who simply say, "This thing has to stop."

Mr. Melloy: Do you know why?

Mr. MULLER: Nobody knows why, but it is something that has to be handled urgently. It is no good squealing that we have no money to do this or the other thing when industries which provide the wherewithal to finance these things are destroyed. We have to make up our minds whether we stand behind constituted authority or whether we will let a few "dingoes" run the country. That is what it amounts to.

Before I resume my seat I should like to contrast what I saw previously with what I saw recently on some of the properties that were used by the Queensland-British Food Corporation some years ago. When the enabling legislation was introduced in this Parliament we had a socialistic idea of producing food—pigmeat in particular—for the people of Great Britain. Ministers of the day told us what was to be done. They seized the station properties of Retro, Cullin La Ringo, Peak Downs and Wolfgang, which were all outside Capella and Clermont. The proposal then was to grow millions of tons of grain and the result, following four years of operation, was that after an investment of £2,500,000 in the scheme, £900,000 of the capital was lost.

Mr. Walsh: Tell the whole story; they made a profit.

Mr. MULLER: No-one can tell me anything about what happened at that time.

Mr. Walsh: Tell the truth.

Mr. MULLER: I did not wait to read about it in the Press. With other hon. members from both sides, I went out there to see what could be done. Make no bones about it; they could grow sorghum, but they ran themselves into the ground and the whole show went broke. It was handled in such a way that it ended up a complete fiasco. Since private enterprise came in these farms have become a credit to those concerned, and they are now growing not only sorghum but other grain crops as well, including wheat, barley and safflower, and they are also running sheep.

Hon. members should go out there and see what is being done. At one time all kinds of excuses were being made. We heard it said, "This is in the dry belt. You can't do these things. We are too far away. Freights and that kind of thing kill it." I could tell the Committee stories about what I saw in

the wet weather when people were getting bogged at the roadside. They filled the roads with sorghum sacks to prevent the trucks sinking in the mud. On one occasion a tractor was lost. Nobody knew where it was, but when the water went down it was found in the bed of a creek. That is the sort of thing that happened.

On one occasion I accompanied a departmental officer on an inspection of some back paddocks of sorghum. At one stage I saw at the roadside a track 3 miles long where sorghum had been dropped. In this black-soil country, even if you do not plough, you get some germination of seed. I asked, "What happened here?" The departmental officer said, "A chap went out one day to plant sorghum. He didn't know the planter was not out of gear, and he planted 3 miles of sorghum on the road." All these things happened. There was no supervision. It is no good spending money unless there is supervision.

These farms are now held by small holders and the position is very different from what it used to be. That is real development.

In my time as Minister for Lands we opened up Orion Downs. Actually it was opened up just before I took over. On an inspection of the place I called on these young men. They were a lot of unhappy young fellows but, nevertheless, very keen. They did not have enough money, like most of us on the land. They were struggling. I flew over that property again last week and when I attended a function in the area I learned that these chaps are now contented and happy. They have successfully faced up to a very difficult task. Give private enterprise some encouragement to do that kind of a job and it will do the job. If we find the money for these people, as long as the business is sound they will repay it. It is a matter of choosing between Socialism and private enterprise. In order that all these things could be done, the Government had to get busy and build roads. Those roads are now built. Without roads in that locality people could not live there.

I repeat what I said earlier: there is some limitation on what roads can do. If a product has to be carried too far by road it becomes an uneconomic proposition. That was my reason for throwing in the thought I did about the Roma-Injune branch line. The heart of that territory is so far removed from the railhead that I feel that these people cannot make a financial success of a crop.

I will return now to the Budget itself. A good deal of propaganda has been circulated about our education system. I have already said that we cannot get nearly enough money to develop the land. I did not spare our Commonwealth friends. What they are doing they might be doing unconsciously. I feel they do not have the correct approach to development.

In considering the serious matters for which we are responsible, such as maintaining our education system, our Police Force, and the

other departments that keep the wheels of the State turning, I find myself very perturbed, as the hon. member for Gregory was a few days ago—he was so annoyed he could not control himself—about some of the unfair criticism levelled at the Government. He told us what had happened in the West. Wherever I went on my recent trip I saw new primary schools, new high schools, and so on. Almost without exception the people were happy and pleased with these things, and told us they were miles ahead of what they expected. Despite all this, almost every day we hear howls about how we are neglecting the education of our children. Nothing is further from the truth.

Mr. Sherrington: Where is this howl coming from?

Mr. MULLER: All of them. The hon. member can go to Moura, Biloela and Emerald. He can come to my district, and I will show him three of the most beautiful high schools he has ever seen.

Mr. Chalk: I think we had better put you on the right track. The hon. member for Salisbury asked you where this howl was coming from.

Mr. Sherrington: He has answered it to my satisfaction.

Mr. MULLER: A lot of it is coming from the hon. member.

Mr. Sherrington: You just told us it is coming from all over Queensland.

Mr. MULLER: The present howl is coming from me.

When continuous lies are circulated throughout Queensland I think someone has to take a stand. We have only to examine the Estimates, and we do not have to go far. If any department has received generous treatment it is the Department of Education. Last year the number of teachers and so on totalled 16,654. This year the number is 17,992, an increase of 1,338.

Mr. Newton: What was it the year before?

Mr. MULLER: I will give that information to the hon. member if he wishes. I will go back to the year I came here, when Labour provided about \$4,000,000.

Last year the total sum required for education was \$80,527,537. This year the estimate is \$90,270,935, an increase of almost \$10,000,000. To go a little further taking the figures as a whole, the total amount from Consolidated Revenue and Trust and Special Funds for last year was \$93,379,906 and for this year it is \$106,659,932, representing an increase of \$13,000,000. No other department enjoyed treatment such as that.

When we see what has been done to raise the standard of education, and see how many children are reaching the top at an early age, we realise the amazing advances that have been achieved. If I wished to raise

something for political purposes in an attempt to belittle the efforts of the Government, the last thing I would attack is education.

Mr. Lloyd: A lot of people disagree with you.

Mr. MULLER: I have listened to the complaints. In many instances the statements are not true. They are not made to help our children but to gain some political advantage. There is a very old saying which is very true—if enough mud is thrown some of it will stick. It is being thrown for that purpose.

Mr. Newton: Mr. McMahon found that that was quite so.

Mr. MULLER: I do not know what Mr. McMahon said. He has nothing to do with me; he can look after himself. The hon. member would do well to look after himself.

I am reminded of what happened a few weeks ago at the time of the march by the university students. I walked up to King George Square quietly while hon. members were doing their duty at Parliament House. I do not always believe what other people tell me, so I went up the street to see who was there. The hon. member for Mackenzie went with me. Jack Egerton opened the meeting and then handed over to Frank Nolan. There were all these fellows from the Trades Hall, and 1,500 boys and girls were crowding around them. These people clapped and cheered. The cry was not that the children are not being educated but that they wanted to down the Government, and this looked a good opportunity.

Mr. Davies interjected.

Mr. MULLER: It is the silliest thing I have heard of. It was a ridiculous idea. I expected to see the hon. member for Maryborough join in with them. This was not a case of belittling the standard of education but of promoting the cause of Communism; no more, no less.

These young people have not had sufficient experience in life to possess sound judgment, and they were carried away with this rubbish. When we look to our future we look to our schools and our standard of education, and when any political party will seize an opportunity like this to gain some political advantage or kudos by telling our children that they are not being properly educated, we have reached a pretty low level in the affairs of State.

In all the circumstances the Treasurer has done a really excellent job. I have had some experience in budgeting. Each department is looking for a fair share of the available funds. With the present inflationary trend the amount available to the States is not sufficient. The Commonwealth wins every time. It does not matter what the inflationary position is, the Commonwealth gets its share by way of taxation.

while the States are confined to a fixed amount of money which is never sufficient to do all they desire. In a Budget debate the main and all-important aim should be the development of the State. I said earlier—and I repeat it—that Queensland is only as sound as we make it, and the only way to make it sound is to build up industry. If industry is not prosperous, nobody is prosperous. I was asked a moment ago how many people the coal-mining companies employ. They employ a large number of people.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: What about in the future?

Mr. MULLER: The hon. member for Tablelands cannot foretell the future. He does not know whether he will be here tomorrow. I did not ask these people what number they would employ in the future because that would be a difficult question to answer. They do not know what will happen to their business in the future. They have machines which do a good deal of the work, but they still employ a large number of people who are happy and contented. One company is providing homes, water and other amenities.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: Didn't the Government supply some of those?

Mr. MULLER: No; it provided only the railway. The company is doing the rest.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MULLER: From what I could see, nothing has been spared to ensure that these men are working in the greatest possible comfort. We cannot expect more than that. But I do not know how many the company is likely to employ in the future. The plan for the first year is to export 750,000 tons of coal. Next year it is proposed to export 1,200,000 tons, and 2,000,000 tons in the third year.

Mr. Wallis-Smith interjected.

Mr. MULLER: If the hon. member made use of a little of what we have "on top", he would be able to work out for himself that when production is doubled it is only natural that the demand for labour will increase. What is more, further contracts are being sought, and there is reason to believe that they will be obtained.

What is really important is that an industry has been brought into an area that can be described only as a wilderness. It was dense brigalow scrub. Where once the only life was a few wallabies, an industry has been set up and an export trade developed. There does not appear to have been any industrial trouble. I am not in a position to say what will be done in a few years; the only thing that concerns me is what has been done. All that I talk about is what I have done, not

what I am going to do, because that is very debatable. Neither I nor anyone else knows that.

Although the Budget does not contain everything that I should like to see in it, we can rejoice that the State is on a sound financial basis. Unless there is a war or some similar catastrophe, the State must continue to prosper if it proceeds along the present lines.

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) (12.27 p.m.): Before proceeding with my speech on the Budget, I wish to refer to a remark made by the hon. member who has just resumed his seat when he mentioned recent industrial activities in Queensland. I refer in particular to his reference to "dingoes running this country".

Mr. Miller: He didn't say that.

Mr. MELLOY: He did. His general remarks on this subject are typical of the thinking of Government members. They do not have the ability to understand what motivates the workers of this State. They fail to understand that the workers of Queensland—and of the whole of Australia, for that matter—are people, and that they are constantly striving to maintain and better their working conditions. For this they are prepared to fight. On the other hand, the employers are constantly fighting to reduce the standards of the workers in this country.

Mr. Chichen: That is not true, you know.

Mr. MELLOY: It is quite true. There is a constant battle between the workers and employers over conditions and wages, and the workers are forced to resort to the strike weapon to maintain and improve their working conditions.

The reference to "dingoes running this country" can, I think, be applied to members of the Government. They have shown their complete inability to understand industrial relationships. They do not understand the working people in the community. They come from a different social category, and they have never had to battle for the conditions under which they work. As a matter of fact, even the conditions they enjoy today were obtained for them over the past 50 years by the unions of this country. Hon. members of whom the Government is composed will not recognise the work that has been done by the unions, and the cry all the time is that they must consist of Communists because they fight for the conditions of the workers.

The hon. member for Fassifern said that the recent disturbances connected with civil liberties were created to promote Communism. How ridiculous that suggestion is! It is another illustration of the attitude of the Government. It is prepared to deny civil rights and liberties to 99 per cent. of the members of the community in an endeavour to clamp down on one or two whom it believes to be Communists. In effect, it would kill the lot to destroy one.

Something similar is happening in Vietnam. The Americans are prepared to use bombers to destroy a people so that they may kill one or two who they think are Communists.

Mr. Hinze: That is not true.

Mr. MELLOY: It is true, but I shall not discourse on the subject at this stage.

The attitude of the Liberal and Country Parties is that they are not concerned about whom they hurt if they can achieve their objectives. That is why I am disturbed. One has only to look at the recent Capricornia by-election to see the depths to which the coalition parties will stoop in an endeavour to win a seat. I understand that a book will be brought out shortly. It will be written by McMahan, published by Holt, and distributed by Pilbeam.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! When the hon. member refers to another hon. member in this Assembly, I ask him to refer to him by the name of his electorate.

Mr. MELLOY: I refer to the hon. member for Rockhampton South. I understand that the title of the book is "How Not to Win a By-election".

I shall now deal with the Budget. Much has been heard about the pressure of so-called outside influences on the Australian Labour Party, and it has been said that the Labour Party jumps whenever pressure is put on it by outside interests. But I think hon. members have seen a very striking example recently of how much the coalition Government is dictated to by interests outside this Parliament, and that is not by any means desirable. An article in "The Courier-Mail" of 21 July this year said this—

"The Premier (Mr. Nicklin) and the Treasurer (Mr. Chalk) yesterday met representatives of the Chamber of Commerce and the Chamber of Manufactures on the coming State Budget.

"Mr. Nicklin said last night that he was fulfilling a promise to both organisations to have pre-Budget discussions with them.

"We discussed a wide range of subjects," Mr. Nicklin said. "They put up some propositions and we told them of difficulties facing us."

"Mr. Nicklin said the Government welcomed the exchange of views. Proposals made would be considered when the Budget was being framed in the next few weeks."

The Premier and the Treasurer, perhaps because of their immaturity or inexperience, decided to go outside and consult the financial moguls of the State in an endeavour to bring down a Budget that would suit not only the members of the Government parties but also the bosses of those two parties, who in most instances are members of the Chamber of Manufactures or the Chamber of Commerce.

That is all right, but apparently what has happened has not been to the satisfaction of those two bodies, because in "Queensland Industry" of October 1967, there is an editorial under the heading "Mature and vigorous leadership needed." "Queensland Industry" is the official journal of the Queensland Chamber of Manufactures and this editorial was written subsequent to the discussions that the Premier and the Treasurer had with representatives of the two bodies I mentioned. The editorial criticises this Government. Among other things, it says—

"The tolerance of mob rule at Collinsville, where physical violence has been done to union members trying to carry on their work, and the timidity of approach to matters concerning the Brisbane City Council, are among things causing citizens to wonder about the quality of their leadership."

That is the leadership of Queensland under this present coalition Government.

It continues—

"There has also been a grave breakdown in the public relations of the Queensland Railways as the public was left completely in the dark as to the Railways' policy regarding the union claim of redundancy which led to the recent strikes."

Then the editorial lays it on a bit more heavily and says—

"Whatever one thinks about the recent student demonstration, the fact remains that the Government's handling of the situation was more than clumsy; it was downright childish."

Those are the words of the Queensland Chamber of Manufactures, not the Australian Labour Party, in criticism of the Government. These people are the mates and bedfellows of Government members. They finally round the editorial off by saying—

"The citizens of Queensland have every right to expect more mature and vigorous leadership than they have been receiving over the past few months."

I do not know what the Government wants before it pulls up its socks, when these people, who normally support the Government, are inclined to, and in fact do, criticise the Government to the extent disclosed in this editorial. I think it is a pretty clear indication that the Government has failed in its efforts to control the affairs of this State.

In the August issue of "Queensland Industry", the official publication of the Queensland Chamber of Manufactures, there is another editorial which says—

"It is the clear duty of the Government to keep the economy expanding by the full use of all of our resources.

"At the moment our labour force is not being fully used, large sectors of private enterprise are operating under full capacity, and the rate of investment has slackened in many fields."

That is despite the claims of this Government about the favourable climate it has established for industry in Queensland. These statements deny the claims that have been made by the Government, and, despite the remarks of the Treasurer or any of his supporters during this debate, these things stand on record as plain proof that industry itself is dissatisfied with the manner in which this Government is controlling the affairs of this State.

The article is rounded off in these words—

"The Government must keep firmly in mind the fact that only in a fully employed and profitable economy can it derive maximum tax yields with which to purchase the goods and services needed to carry on all the essential functions of Government."

Those are the things that people are saying in condemnation of this Government. The whole truth of the matter is that the Government came to office totally unprepared to accept the reins of government. If we have to look for the reason why the Government has not fulfilled the requirements of capable government, we have only to look around members of the Cabinet to see it. I give a certain amount of credit to the Treasurer. I think he is outstanding in the Government. I want him to understand, of course, that I am not spitting in his pocket, but we have only to look at the personnel of Cabinet to realise how the bottom of the barrel of the political parties in control has been well and truly scraped.

Mr. Chinchin: On what grounds are you criticising them?

Mr. MELLOY: They are unable to control the affairs of this State adequately. That is a very sorry state of affairs. The older members of Cabinet spent too long a period in Opposition. At a time when they should have been retiring they found themselves suddenly plunged into the responsibilities of Cabinet rank. The younger members have neither experience nor knowledge. They have been forced to accept responsibilities for which they have not been properly prepared. When Cabinet does get a member with a few brains he becomes an embarrassment to the others, so the necessary action is taken to see that he is "hoisted". When comparisons become embarrassing, it is necessary to remove the cause of the embarrassment.

There are several matters in the Budget itself to which I wish to refer. The Government talks about the confidence of the community as far as industrial and pastoral development is concerned. I will refer to a section of the Treasurer's Estimates which indicate a little bit of pessimism on the part of the Government. I draw attention to the

appropriation for "Rebate allowed by Department of Railways in freight on Fodder and Starving Stock", "Rebate allowed by Department of Transport of fees on transport of Fodder and Starving Stock", Subsidy on Road Transport of Fodder from Railhead to Property", "Amount to be credited to Drought Relief Fund", "Grants to Local Bodies for Relief of Unemployment in Drought Stricken Areas" and "Miscellaneous Drought Relief Expenditure".

The Estimates indicate that \$4,888,000 was spent under those headings last year for relief in those various directions. As an indication of the Government's pessimism we see that it is allocating a similar amount for this financial year. The Government is already preparing its excuses for an unfavourable Budget at the end of this financial year.

I have something to say about the Estimates of the Department of Education. I will refer firstly to the teaching position. I shall not deal with this subject at length because the story has been told so often, so well and so justifiably. I will draw attention to the expenditure per head on education in the various States of Australia to indicate the failure of this Government to provide adequate funds for education services in Queensland.

Mr. Muller: Give us something new. We have heard that story hundreds of times.

Mr. MELLOY: Hon. members opposite will hear it hundreds of times more, because one cannot repeat the truth too often.

I cite these figures of expenditure per head on schools in the various States for inclusion in "Hansard", and to add a little bit of coal to the fire—

	\$
Queensland	26.23
New South Wales .. .	35.41
Victoria	32.31
South Australia .. .	37.57

Those figures clearly indicate that of the four States mentioned, Queensland has the lowest expenditure per head on schools.

The same remarks apply to universities. In this instance the Queensland expenditure was \$2.73 per head. South Australia, at \$5.95, had the highest expenditure per head. The other States were in between, but Queensland again had the lowest figure.

The same remarks apply also to technical colleges, to libraries, and to museums. In the over-all total for education Queensland had a per capita expenditure of \$31, the lowest, compared with \$44, \$43 and \$45 for the other States. Our position is not very bright.

I am concerned particularly about the individual schools in my electorate. First, I shall refer to the department's responsibility for school grounds. The Boondall State School is in my electorate and it has a rather serious drainage problem. Repeatedly, with my assistance, the department's attention has been sought in an effort to alleviate this

problem. The Minister wrote a rather lengthy letter to me and pointed out that the department had spent some \$6,400 on the school grounds, and later he said—

"My Department has discharged its responsibility in relation to the Boondall school-grounds . . ."

I want to know how, when work remains to be done, the department can claim that it has discharged its responsibility. When work is waiting to be done, and there are undesirable circumstances associated with the school grounds, the department's responsibility has not been discharged.

I have some more comments to make about expenditure by the Department of Education. Some weeks ago the Minister said that the Government had paid out \$493,135 in subsidies to schools. This highlights the very important fact that parents and citizens' associations have contributed at least a similar amount. I will now deal with what has happened with the nine schools in my electorate. Up to the end of December, 1966, they had spent \$40,702 on projects, school grounds and amenities within the school buildings. In the same period they received subsidies of \$13,000. That means that the schools in my electorate have spent \$27,000 more than they have received in subsidy. I point out that, included in the \$13,000 is a \$10,000 subsidy for a swimming pool. These facts highlight the work done by the parents and citizens' associations at the various schools, but insufficient credit is given to them for the work they are doing. Some schools in my area have spent large sums on school projects, school grounds and amenities. Last year Zillmere North spent \$3,199 but received only \$10 in subsidy from the Government.

The figure quoted by the Minister gives no indication of the work carried out by parents and citizens' associations at schools throughout the State. If the same proportion prevails at other schools, then throughout Queensland these associations have contributed \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 towards the upkeep of schools. The Government claims it is subsidising the work that these associations are doing, whereas in fact the associations are subsidising the Government in the work being carried out at various schools.

Another unfortunate aspect relative to the work done by parents and citizens' associations is that the parents in some areas enjoy a much higher standard of living than those in other areas. Schools such as Boondall, in my electorate, would come into the former category, whereas parents at Cribb Island, which is also in my electorate, are not able to provide nearly as much for school amenities. As the Government has failed to provide these necessary amenities, children attending such schools have to suffer because their parents are not affluent enough to provide the amenities that are available in schools in better-class areas. The Government should ensure that there is no discrimination between children attending

different schools. The children attending Cribb Island school are just as entitled to every facility and amenity as are children at any other school.

There is a serious drainage problem at Banyo State High School. Many complaints have been lodged by residents living in houses adjoining the school grounds. The run-off of stormwater from the grounds is causing them considerable inconvenience. The Department of Education refuses to accept any responsibility for this.

Mr. Smith: It is a council matter.

Mr. MELLOY: No, it is not a council matter. In a letter dealing with erosion on the school grounds, not the dispersal of water outside the grounds, the Under Secretary, Department of Works, says—

“A complete drainage system is necessary to drain stormwater away from the buildings.”

Surely it is the responsibility of either the Department of Education or the Department of Works to drain water away from the school buildings and through the school grounds. This is how the Government tries to pass the buck instead of fulfilling its responsibilities and ensuring that the council does the same.

The letter continues—

“However, as the Council has no storm-water drainage system as yet in the vicinity of the High School, little can be done to alleviate the problem at this stage. If and when a Council system is provided, the matter will again be considered.”

This is what riles me.

The letter continues—

“Development of the area below the oval”——

that is the sports oval at the Banyo High School—

“——is generally a matter for the Parents and Citizens' Association under subsidy.”

I refuse to accept that. The development of school grounds is the responsibility of the Department of Education. The parents and citizens' associations are at present carrying too great a burden. They are concerned mainly with providing certain sporting facilities and classroom amenities for the children. When the department tells a parents and citizens' committee that it is responsible for the development of school grounds, and particularly for their drainage, I think it is taking the responsibility of such a committee a bit too far.

Mr. Smith: It does not say that; it says there is nowhere to drain because the council has not a drain there.

Mr. MELLOY: I think the hon. member for Windsor left high school a little too early.

Last year we provided for pupils of the Banyo State High School a very fine eight-lane swimming pool. In its construction it was necessary to shift the cricket practice wickets in the school grounds. Incidentally, those wickets were provided by the parents and citizens' association some years ago. The Department of Works decided to construct the swimming pool in a position that necessitated the digging up of the practice wickets. That was done after consultation with the Department of Works. Although several sites for the swimming pool were suggested, the department decided that it could be placed only where the cricket practice wickets were.

As the removal of the wickets was the result of a departmental decision, the parents and citizens' association asked that their replacement be subsidised, which to me seems reasonable enough. The Minister replied to that request in these terms—

“It is standard practice that if my Department in the course of a building project interferes with some facility provided by the Parents and Citizens' Association activity, the Department restores or replaces it elsewhere.”

That is the policy of the department.

The Minister's reply continues—

“However, if the Parents and Citizens' Association is responsible for similar interference then it is the Association's responsibility to replace that item at its cost. The fact that my Department approved the location of the proposed swimming pool at Banyo High School has no bearing on this policy.”

That is a completely misleading statement. The Minister said that his department “approved” the location of the swimming pool. In fact, his department dictated it. I therefore claim that replacing the practice wickets is the responsibility of the department. As the matter now stands, the Government has refused to “come to the party”.

What annoys me is that the Government takes everything provided by parents and citizens' associations. It says, “You can establish a swimming pool but, as soon as you do, it becomes the property of the Department of Education.” The practice wickets were the property of the department, but, when it comes to replacing them, it denies all responsibility for them and tells the parents and citizens' association to replace them at its own cost.

I also wish to make some reference to the Police Department. Each day the need for additional police becomes more and more evident. The figures that I obtained from the Minister, and which I shall quote later, show that the position is increasing in seriousness. It has been stated by the Government, the Commissioner of Police, and the Queensland Police Union that there

is a waiting list of recruits, so the Government has no excuse for the shortage of police in Queensland.

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

Mr. MELLOY: When the sitting was suspended for lunch, I was dealing with the failure of the Government to provide sufficient police to give adequate protection to the community in Queensland. I asked the Minister for information relative to the number of offences, including petty offences, that had been committed in the past three years, and his answer was very alarming. The question I asked was—

“How many cases of a criminal nature, including petty offences, were committed and reported in each of the years ended 30 June, 1965, 1966 and 1967?”

His answer was—

“Year ended 30 June, 1965—Offences reported: 37,748; offences cleared up: 14,194;

“Year ended 30 June, 1966—Offences reported: 39,948; offences cleared up: 15,661; and

“Year ended 30 June, 1967—Offences reported: 40,748; offences cleared up: 16,345.”

The total number of offences unsolved in the three years mentioned was 72,244, which means that at large in the community are persons who have not been apprehended in connection with those offences. That, in itself, constitutes a menace, and unless sufficient police officers are made available to pursue investigations to finality, the position will become increasingly worse.

The only solution is to increase the number of police, and it has been submitted to the Minister repeatedly, not only by hon. members on this side of the Chamber but also by the Queensland Police Union, that such an increase is essential. Every time the matter is raised, the Minister says that the number is being increased, but I cannot see any evidence that it is.

The Minister has also supplied me with information in reply to a question that I asked him relative to the number of plainclothes personnel investigating the offences to which I referred earlier. He said—

“As at 30 June, 1965, in Queensland a total of 347 personnel performing duty in plain clothes were engaged in the investigation of crime. As at 30 June, 1966, the figure was 371, and at 30 June, 1967, the figure was 395.”

The figures in preceding years must have made it plain that the number of personnel engaged in the investigation of crime was not sufficient; but, in spite of that, the Government increased the number by only 24 in each of the years ended 30 June 1966 and 30 June 1967. That is quite out of proportion to the increase in the number of offences committed.

The police themselves cannot be blamed for what is taking place if they have not the staff to investigate the offences being

committed. I am quite sure that those who are engaged in the investigation of crime are doing all they possibly can. I have heard that uniformed men who have been put on cases referred to them have made routine inquiries and that is all that is heard about the matter, and the same thing often applies to plainclothes men investigating crimes. They cannot possibly pursue any particular case to its conclusion when they are quite often called off it and given a more recent, or what is considered a more serious and more important, crime to investigate. It appears, then, that the wave of petty thieving and other petty offences that is occurring in the community will continue.

The Police Union is very concerned about the situation, and in “The Courier-Mail” of 20 June of this year—the day following a disturbance in the city at one of the Sunday dance halls, or whatever they are—I forget what they call them—discotheques—

Mr. Newton: Sound lounges.

Mr. MELLOY: Yes, sound lounges. Following that incident, Mr. Callaghan, secretary of the Police Union, said that unless Brisbane soon received another 200 police it would face a threat of more hoodlum violence like the Sunday-afternoon city fracas which had occurred the previous day. He added that 200 was the minimum needed. He also said he was shocked when he read “The Courier-Mail” the previous morning and saw the photographs published in it.

What the Government is doing is not very satisfactory, and the Acting Police Commissioner has put his finger on the point at issue. It is not so much a matter that men are not available for the Police Force. The Government of this State is not prepared to increase the strength of the Police Force to cope with the situation that exists in the community today. Commenting on the recruitment of police, Mr. Palethorpe, Acting Police Commissioner, said that there was a waiting list of applicants for appointment to the Queensland Police Force. He said that recruiting had improved considerably in the past two years but that the question of whether extra police would be supplied was one for the Government. The Government is not facing up to its responsibilities in this direction. Until it does, we will have a repetition of these outbreaks of violence in the community.

I intend to conclude my speech on that note. I feel that the Budget has failed to indicate to the people of Queensland any progressive thought on the part of the Government, and that unless we get some new blood in the Government, some men of ability—

Mr. Carey: Whom would you recommend?

Mr. MELLOY: Not the hon. member for Albert.

I feel that only a change of Government can provide the answer and the new blood needed for a competent Cabinet in Queensland.

Mr. HINZE (South Coast) (2.24 p.m.): Contrary to the opinion expressed by the hon. member who just resumed his seat, I want to join with hon. members on this side in conveying my congratulations to the Treasurer for the work that has been done on the Budget and for the manner in which it was presented. On this occasion the Treasurer spoke for about 100 minutes in delivering his Financial Statement, in which he gave the Committee an indication of the State's financial affairs and what we can expect to be undertaken by the Government in the next 12 months.

I should like to emphasise one or two points the Treasurer made. He pointed out that no further increases in State taxation rates, fares, freights or fees would be required to balance the Budget this year. He said that it was the Government's desire to refer to this Budget as another "push ahead" Budget for the development of the State. He offered some constructive criticism of the Commonwealth-State Financial Agreement. Nowadays it seems that almost all States and all members of Parliament comment on the very unsatisfactory Commonwealth-State financial arrangements.

In a developing State like Queensland we appreciate the points brought out by the Treasurer. Speaking of the Commonwealth Government he said—

"In a year in which that Government set out to limit expenditure in the public sector, it has budgeted for an increase of 9.3 per cent. in its own capital requirements apart from defence. If this is a fair indication of the degree of necessary restriction in capital expenditure, it seems obvious that the States were unduly limited in holding the increase in their governmental works and housing programmes to about 5 per cent. I am yet to be persuaded that the capital needs of the States are any less pressing or important than those of the Commonwealth and greater equality in the relative treatment of the two arms of Government is obviously desirable in the interests of federation."

I think all hon. members will agree with that comment.

Later in his Financial Statement he said—

"I believe that it will be apparent to all thinking citizens that the only real means by which Queensland can make any substantial improvement in the level of its expenditure comparable with other States is for the Commonwealth Government to escalate the rate of improvement in Queensland's Financial Assistance grant."

Later, he stated—

"I believe that basic rethinking in Commonwealth-State relations is overdue."

We had a statement from the Premier the other day indicating that, even compounding at the rate of \$2,000,000 a year, it would take us 18 years to catch up to South Australia's allocation. We all realise, of course, that South Australia is only the fourth-largest State in the Commonwealth.

My own thoughts about the Commonwealth Government at this stage are that I believe it fails badly in standing up to its responsibilities. We must realise, of course, that it has to find \$1,500,000,000 to \$2,000,000,000 a year for defence.

Mr. Bromley: And nothing for pensioners.

Mr. HINZE: In providing that money it is quite obvious that roads, hospitals and, as my friend says, pensioners, have been neglected.

I strongly believe that this nation has never been more affluent than it is at the present time. If ever the time was opportune for the Commonwealth Government, if it so desired, to impose a slight increase in income tax, I believe this is it. It is not much use any member of this Committee standing in his place and continually criticising the State Government for not allocating funds for hospital works, roads or education, when we all know that lack of money is the cause of the problem, and, under the Financial Agreement agreed to by all States, we have to get our funds from the Commonwealth Government.

I now wish to refer to the erosion problem on the Gold Coast and point out how extremely disappointed I am that, 3½ months after the erosion caused a serious disaster, we have not received any confirmation from the Commonwealth Government that assistance will be forthcoming for the State and the local authority to build a protective wall. The Gold Coast has never been more vulnerable to erosion than at present. Although there has been a very good build-up of sand by natural causes in some places, it must be remembered that the cyclone season is drawing closer and we have not yet commenced the protective rockwall, which is considered to be the only remaining method of providing protection for the sea-front properties in the absence of wide beaches and substantial frontal dunes.

We know that John Kindler, the Chief engineer of the Co-ordinator-General's Department, has been conducting an ocean-going survey on the "Si-Bon", measuring the waves, currents and movements of sand and all the other factors required by his department to indicate the type of protection necessary in the Gold Coast area. We also know that the survey will not be completed before 1969 and, quite obviously, it is not in the best interests of the Government or the area for any work to be undertaken until the survey is completed and we know exactly

what we are doing and where we should apply corrective measures to combat this serious problem.

I should like to see a trial carried out by the use of sand traps. I have previously suggested that at the mouth of the Tweed River there is evidence of what happens when sand is trapped by groynes or retaining walls, or what we call "sand traps". It is obvious that these are by far the most economic way of building up the sand on beaches, but we do not know at this stage whether they should be one, three, or five miles apart, nor do we know the effect they may have on beaches farther north, where additional erosion could occur.

I commend the Treasurer for allocating sufficient funds this year and indicating to the Gold Coast City Council that the Government will back it in any protective work carried out. The Gold Coast is the tourist capital of Australia, and the most important assets we are selling are our natural attractions. It is essential that we build up the sand, as it is useless having a Gold Coast without beaches.

Mr. Chalk: A section of the Gold Coast City Council does not want to go on now.

Mr. HINZE: Anybody who suggests that we should not undertake the necessary work to protect the \$80,000,000 worth of property on the Gold Coast needs to have his head read. Such people would be no-hopers and "nongs"; they would not have a brain in their heads.

Mr. Chalk: The Government is ready to look at it as soon as they want us to.

Mr. HINZE: I could not personally commend the Treasurer for his activities in this matter any more than I have. I thank him sincerely for his interest. The State Government has done everything possible. Unfortunately, I cannot say the same for the Commonwealth. Federal Ministers come to the area, tell us what a wonderful place it is, laze around in the sun, tell us it is a great place, and say that it is the tourist capital of Australia. But now that we are in a position somewhat as bad as Tasmania experienced we are not offered even a brass tack.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Hanlon: Do you think Harold needs a good shake?

Mr. HINZE: Some of them need a bit of a shake.

On Tuesday last the hon. member for Toowong said there is a continual drift of people to the cities. He gave the ratio and said there was a build-up in urban areas. He also said that irrespective of what he thought about it, it is a natural consequence of events and is something we have to accept. I say clearly and plainly that it is something that

as Queenslanders we should not accept. We are letting our forefathers down. They went to every part of the State and developed it. Quite the reverse is taking place now because of all sorts of factors that the Federal and State Governments and local authorities have allowed to develop, and people are drifting into the cities. It is the worst thing that can happen to Queensland. It may have some advantages politically, but for the State it is the worst thing that can happen. We must not let it continue.

The Commonwealth Government can assist, if it wants to, by granting tax concessions to people who are living away from city areas. As a State Government we should do everything possible to provide roads, hospitals, air-conditioning certainly in some western areas, water schemes, and all other amenities necessary to keep people away from the cities. The local authorities could assist by giving an incentive to industries to establish themselves in country areas.

Mr. R. Jones: We need regional planning.

Mr. HINZE: I am fully in accord with the idea of regional planning.

The work that devolves on a member of this Parliament is greatly increased if his electorate is growing fast, and in this respect I refer to my beloved Gold Coast area. That is an adjective I have pinched from my old mate Tom Aikens. The growth rate of population on the Gold Coast is 9 per cent. a year, compared with less than 2 per cent. for the State as a whole.

As Queenslanders we can all take some pride in possessing Australia's No. 1 tourist resort. Next to Canberra, with its dictated rate of growth, it is the fastest growing urban area in Australia. Many visitors to the Gold Coast get their first impression of Queensland there, so we must put on a good show in that area. It is the gateway to Queensland. The facts substantiate that a large number of people come to this State and, before they travel farther, for instance, to North Queensland, to see some of the other very attractive areas of the State, they stay on the Gold Coast for two or three days, a week, or a fortnight, so that the Gold Coast is the gateway to the tourist State.

Mr. Bromley: Do you say there are better-looking girls there than in other parts of Queensland?

Mr. HINZE: There is not much doubt about that. The hon. member no doubt knows that.

Mr. Carey: Quite a number of the American servicemen would not stay in Sydney. They had to come to the Gold Coast to get what they were looking for.

Mr. HINZE: All sorts of problems have been sorted out. Brisbane has 25 full-time, salaried aldermen and 24 members of Parliament, a total of 49, to assist citizens with their problems. In comparison, the Gold Coast has a full-time mayor—a very capable

little fellow, too—10 unpaid aldermen and two very knowledgeable State members of Parliament. All the aldermen earn a living from their other jobs. In my electorate, where development is fastest, there are five unpaid aldermen only. Hon. members can imagine the multitude of issues that they must try to handle for the people with a dozen Government departments.

I want to refer now to the problems encountered in developing an area that is growing as rapidly as the Gold Coast is, and the duplication of work in Government departments. In an area such as the City of Gold Coast, surely it would be reasonable to set up some sort of local co-ordinating authority. For example, those who are seeking approvals for subdivisions in the canal estates in the Albert Shire have to obtain the approval of the Department of Harbours and Marine and the local authority. If the land concerned is near a main road, the approval of the Main Roads Department is required. If it is on Crown land, it requires the approval of the Department of Lands. There are all sorts of frustrations and time lapses before a person can take over a piece of land and build a house on it.

To eliminate much of the present red tape, I suggest that consideration be given to setting up, as one hon. member previously suggested, some sort of regional planning authority. At present we do not have that, and there is too much duplication and waste of time. I suggest that such a committee should include the two State members, the mayor of the City of Gold Coast, and the chairman of the Albert Shire Council. I also suggest as a member a divisional engineer of the Main Roads Department, with full authority to act, such as Mr. Colin Bird, who is a very capable officer attached to the Main Roads Department and who at all times goes out of his way to assist local members and local authorities.

I also suggest that the co-ordinating body include a representative of the Department of Harbours and Marine, possibly Mr. Peel; a representative of the Department of Lands; local engineers; and, very definitely, two town planners.

Development of the Gold Coast is only starting, and we must aim to put it in top world class as a tourist resort to attract visitors from within Australia and from overseas. We must have a proper system of arterial roads to overcome traffic congestion along the coastal fringe. We must also have a modern city centre for the coast. It is the only city in Australia with vacant land right in its centre to provide space for the movement and parking of thousands of cars. Hon. members have no doubt recently seen in the Press and on television a fine design for this centre. It is a voluntary effort by a Queenslander who believes, as I do, that this State has the opportunity of planning the first really modern city centre in Australia. No other State has a similar opportunity.

We can produce something that people will come to see, and this proposed city centre, together with an arterial road system, will ease the growing traffic congestion on the Gold Coast.

The Government has already approved a modern arterial road plan for Brisbane, for which resumptions will cost \$102,000,000 and which will require the demolition of 5,000 houses. On the Gold Coast, the land for arterial roads and the city centre is still virtually vacant and, compared with the cost of the Brisbane project, can be acquired for "peanuts".

In my electorate we also have the opportunity of planning a canal from the Nerang River to the Tweed River. Nearly all the route covers low-lying country. This would be a great future tourist attraction.

It is also necessary to plan some form of future rail service. Already the Gold Coast is the largest city in Australia with no railway, either internal or external. Plans for a modern rail link must be made. The Treasurer referred in the Financial Statement to the fact that a considerable sum—I think approximately \$750,000—was lost last year on the operations of the standard-gauge railway line linking Brisbane and Sydney through Kyogle. I am not suggesting that a line should be constructed through the Gold Coast to remove that loss of \$750,000—I know that is not possible—but I do suggest that it would be very desirable for some interstate authority to give consideration to the proposal, and perhaps the Government of Queensland could approach the Government in the neighbouring State of New South Wales for that purpose. If it were possible to board a train in Sydney at 8 o'clock at night and wake up on the Gold Coast at 6 o'clock the next morning, the tourist industry would receive a big boost. As you know, Mr. Hooper, 2,000,000 people live in Sydney, and that would be a wonderful market to tap. The only way people living in Sydney can get to the Gold Coast now is either by driving along roads that are already congested or by air.

I point out to the Committee that the Gold Coast City Council has given consideration to taking over the Coolangatta airport. As we all know, in a very short time aircraft that are referred to as "jumbo jets" will be carrying about 400 to 500 people. One can imagine what this will mean to a tourist area such as the Gold Coast, and it must be ready to receive aircraft of that type carrying visitors from overseas.

Mr. R. Jones: When the Treasurer tore up the railway line, he said you could go by helicopter.

Mr. Chalk: So you can. I will take you down some time and show you.

Mr. HINZE: I should like to return to the proposal to which I referred very briefly earlier. Hon. members have heard of Mr. Bill Herbert, an economist, who put forward

a proposal for a city plan. He has done quite a lot of work on it. He mentioned it first about five or six years ago and people thought, if I may use a current colloquialism, that it was too "way out". Today those same people think it has possibilities. When one sees the number of resumptions that have become necessary in Brisbane as a result of the implementation of the Wilbur Smith Report, a practical proposal such as that which Bill Herbert has put forward may perhaps be considered favourably.

This proposal could give Queensland the first major city in Australia with a centre designed for the motor age. There would not be anything like it in Australia. No other State could match it for many years, for nowhere else is there a fast-growing city with empty space at its centre.

This centre and the arterial road scheme would rescue our largest tourist resort from congestion. There definitely is congestion there now. Hon. members who have been there during a Christmas-New Year period know what a problem it is to move along the only highway now available. It would go further and itself attract tourists and new business because of the spectacular hill-top setting of the new centre.

There are sound economic reasons for expecting the Gold Coast region—the Gold Coast City and adjacent parts of the Albert and Tweed Shires—to continue its very rapid growth. This growth will be based mainly on the tourist industry, but manufacturing and other industries will increase in relative importance as population grows.

Not all of this growth is assured. The tourist industry faces a considerable threat from increasing traffic and parking congestion along the coastal frontage. An early requirement is the start of an arterial road system to give non-tourist traffic a route alternative to the Gold Coast Highway. Within 20 years the Gold Coast's population may be 250,000 to 300,000, and there will be heavy traffic on the new arterial road system.

It is equally important to provide the future city with a centre of modern design. The design of the future centre seeks to combine beauty and utility. A magnificent setting is provided by an elevated site commanding a panorama of ocean and mountains. Without detracting from its appearance, many thousands of motor vehicles can be parked and moved, and pedestrian plazas are provided to separate people from traffic. The aim has been to design a centre which in itself will be an attraction to visitors, and at the same time provide the central facilities for a city of 250,000 people.

So much for development. I think that was one of the main points that the Treasurer was trying to make—that it is our duty to continue to try to develop the State with the resources that become available to us. In my own area I can really boast that that is exactly what we are doing. The capital inflow from private enterprise is amazing; it is consistent and, as I said, we have a building programme

of some \$2,000,000 a month, which is continuing and increasing. It is particularly important, of course, that we have sufficient funds from Government sources for the services that are necessary for a very quickly-growing area such as the Gold Coast.

Mr. Newton interjected.

Mr. HINZE: The sand-mining companies, particularly Associated Minerals, are doing nobody any harm. They have some \$8,000,000 or \$9,000,000 invested in the area; they employ hundreds of people; they are a good company to work for, and nobody can prove that the fact that they are taking the mineral sands from the beaches is detrimental or causes erosion. I know of nobody yet qualified to say that this actually happens. All in all, if the hon. member is talking about mining companies, we must give top marks to Associated Minerals for being as good as their word. After the erosion they gave their word that they would not mine around Palm Beach and they have not been near the area since. I give them top marks for their support and their development of the area.

Turning to primary industries, we hear periodically that Britain intends to enter the European Common Market. I do not think any of us should quibble about this. There is no doubt that Britain, for very many long years, has undertaken more than her fair share of assistance to all the developing nations and now finds herself in the position where she believes that for her own benefit and interest she must try to enter the European Economic Community.

We must consider what that will mean to this State. Queensland is one of the biggest primary-producing States in the Commonwealth, yet I do not hear anybody suggesting what we are going to do when this event actually takes place. We know it is going to affect the sugar industry, the dairy industry and some of our other major primary industries, and I believe we should be taking the initiative. I think we should suggest to the Commonwealth Government that surely the time is ripe to give consideration to the setting-up of a Pacific economic community amongst countries bordering the Pacific Ocean. I refer particularly to Australia, New Zealand, Canada, America, Indonesia, the Philippines, Japan and Malaysia. One can appreciate very quickly that if it is possible to formulate the type of economic community I am referring to, this will more than compensate for the loss of trade that will occur when Britain enters the European Common Market.

Over the last few years I have had the opportunity of meeting some of our friends from Malaysia when they have visited the Gold Coast. One was the Deputy Prime Minister. I had a long talk with him and I mentioned this matter. He said, "As a matter of fact, we have already started

something like this. We have started a type of economic community which includes Malaysia, Indonesia and Thailand."

Our Asian friends are therefore thinking seriously about this problem. We should definitely indicate our intention of getting into some economic community such as this, because our destiny is very definitely in the Asian market.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: Has our standing there improved?

Mr. HINZE: I do not know about our standing, but it is simply a matter of common sense to consider our geographical position. This is where we are. Every day we have some of these people coming into our area and, as I have already said, I met one of them and became quite friendly with him. He wrote to me and said, "I like your country so much that I started to play your share market, with some satisfactory results." And he is coming back here. He is quite a good fellow.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. HINZE: I merely indicate to the Committee that he holds a very high position in the Malaysian Government.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: He is after the mighty dollar.

Mr. HINZE: No-one can blame him for that.

In his Financial Statement the Treasurer refers to the fact that he has again allocated the sum of \$750,000 for the dairy pasture subsidy scheme. There is no need for me to go into the benefits of this wonderful scheme which the Government has introduced. However, I remind the Treasurer that in his policy speech the Premier indicated that \$1,500,000 would be allocated annually for this purpose. I know the position: even if it were allocated it could not be spent this year. The allocation last year was not spent for the simple reason that this is a major programme requiring a great deal of departmental work and study. I appreciate the fact that the amount allocated is a realistic one. I only make the point, to put it on record, that the Government has committed itself to a figure, and the industry wants to know that this amount will be available when it is possible to take advantage of it.

I should like to refer to a couple of statements that have been made in the Chamber and that I just could not let go unanswered. The hon. member for Nudgee referred to an editorial in "Queensland Industry" which suggested that the Government requires mature and vigorous leadership. That is a rather strange statement for such a responsible body to make, but as it has been made it cannot go unanswered. If ever this State has had mature and vigorous leadership, now is the time.

It is rather strange to me that Mr. Suggars, or whoever wrote the article, because one of his friends tried to put a milk label on a bottle of water, should refer to the margarine versus butter problem in this way. The editorial states—

"We had asked the Government to allow manufacturers to use the name 'peanut butter' in Queensland as in most other States and overseas countries so that the necessity of preparing two types of labels and advertising material could be avoided."

Without going into the matter too deeply, all I want to say is that one of this body's own members was very disappointed when he tried to do something but the Government refused to let him get away with it. Under the Pure Foods Act "butter" is very definitely defined. Naturally when we have built up the image of something over many years we guard it jealously; we do not want anyone else to use the name of our product. This is what has happened in the dairy industry. It said very definitely that "butter" was the name of its product, so why should it allow that name to be used by other industries that are in strong competition with it?

Mr. Suggars does not need to go any further to get mature and vigorous leadership. Could anyone suggest that our present Premier is not mature? He could hardly be described as a youth.

What about this other fellow—James, of the Queensland Employers' Federation? If he had been in charge when the recent incident occurred at the end of George Street, I suppose he would have got out the fire hoses or called out the firing squad. These people want to look after their own business and leave the government of the State to people who are quite competent to govern. James just would not have a clue. He would not know what to do in the circumstances. We can all be wise after the event. I can tell anybody what horses won at Albion Park last week. It is all very well for Mr. James to try to tell us now what we should have done about the University students who were silly enough to lie down on the street. To criticise the action of the Government now is only being wise after the event.

Mr. R. Jones: Does this apply to all of his statements.

Mr. HINZE: Not all. He is the advocate for the Queensland Employers' Federation.

Under existing arrangements it is evident that all local authorities are having real difficulty in getting sufficient funds, either from rates or from loans, to carry out the necessary works to maintain or extend their services to the extent desired.

The State Government is unable to render all the relief that it may wish. It too is restricted in the funds available to it, despite the fact that it has explored a number of

fields to yield additional income for the important role it has to fill. If this was a temporary situation, one that was likely to improve rapidly, we could accept the position with equanimity. However, there is nothing to indicate that any substantial relief can be obtained. Indeed, so far as shire councils are concerned, increasing population tends to worsen their position, as this increases the need for the many services they offer—more roads, water, footpaths, parks, channelling and all the many services which have come to be expected these days.

Among the serious effects of the steady upsurge in the development of housing, with inadequate finance to enable councils to maintain adequate services and standards, is the gradual denudation of the natural forests which presently surround our cities and towns, without the adequate replacement of ornamental and other suitable street, park and highway trees and shrubs. Councils are certainly doing their best, but the rate of new development is such that the gap is widening and soon—probably on an increasing scale—our cities and towns will tend to become concrete and brick deserts, to the detriment of the whole community.

It can be argued, of course, that councils should merely adjust their rates to the level needed to carry out all their functions at an adequate level, but this merely begs the question. A fact of life which any democratic council cannot ignore is that it must at all times have regard to the capacity of rate-payers to pay. Present levels are a severe burden on a great many ratepayers and any increase at all would impose hardship, yet demonstrably even such high rates are not enough to enable councils to carry out all the works and services which a cultured, sophisticated community such as ours would regard as adequate and, in some cases, minimum standards.

It is evident that some new and additional form of income is necessary to enable councils to develop and maintain the standards which citizens feel they have a right to expect in a country like ours. My concern is for the beautification of our towns and cities. This is not only one of the yardsticks of a city's culture and an amenity which makes life more pleasant for all, but it has been demonstrated in city after city all over the world that beautification has a definite economic value to a city as it is one of the chief magnets for the tourist trade.

If we consider our city as it is now—and this is true whether it is the Gold Coast, or Brisbane, or Caloundra, or Townsville, or anywhere else—and compare it with its projected population in, say, 10 or 20 years' time, we shall see that the total area of the city will be greatly increased. If we can visualise this city yet to be, we should realise that virtually every one of the millions of trees which at present adorn the area of future development will be removed and the

land cleared of every vestige of plant life as land developers prepare it for sale as home sites. When and as these houses are erected, streets will be built and councils will have to plant other trees to replace those removed in the development. Until this is done houses will stand, as stark monuments to progress, like rows of graves in a cemetery.

As councils already have difficulty in keeping up with development, how are they to cope with the continuous growth of new areas and also provide all the amenities required of modern cities?

The suggestion I make to meet the cost of reforestation and street, park and highway beautification, is to levy a small fee, say, 1 per cent. of sale price, on the sale of the original subdivided land, probably in the form of stamp duty or by any other means convenient to the Government, the proceeds of this revenue to be shared by the Government between the Main Roads Department and councils in proportions to be mutually agreed. It can be argued that this would be a tax on developers and would retard development, but that deals with the effect of the spread of development and not its cause.

Surely it is incontrovertible that the cause of the spread of our urban areas is increased population, resulting from the birth-rate and immigration, and sustained by the growth of industry, due no doubt to the positive and progressive policies of the Nicklin-Chalk Government.

The land developer has no part in causing this increased population outside his own family. He does not create the demand for home sites; he merely caters for that demand which the other factors abovementioned have caused. His role is an important one. He is an entrepreneur, a salesman, who selects what he considers are new areas most capable of being sold at a price that he will accept, and so, bit by bit, area by area, he develops little pockets of desirable land, until finally all the area is filled and becomes criss-crossed with streets.

In the process the land developer generally removes most or all of the trees, for this facilitates development and sale and, of course, he has to do this to leave room or to provide for streets. So bit by bit the new area becomes denuded of its trees and other forms of plant-life and it stays that way until councils, if and when they can find funds, replace what the developer has removed.

If the scheme of levying, say, 1 per cent. as a stamp duty is adopted, then both the highways department and each of the local and city councils throughout the State would have the funds on hand earmarked for the specific purposes of beautifying streets and highways and providing new parks. Moreover, these funds would be available as they were needed.

It is proposed that the stamp duty be levied only once, that is, at the first subdivision of the land for housing or industrial purposes, and be paid only as and when each block is actually sold, so that developers would not have to find the money until they in turn were being paid for the land.

I am aware that at present the State levies on the sale of the land a stamp duty of \$1.24 for each \$100 selling price of the land, but this is for State revenue purposes and is paid by the buyer. What I am proposing is that the duty be paid by the developer who, presumably, would include it, as a foreseeable expense, in his cost when assessing the cost price and selling price of the land, just as he now does for removal of trees, levelling, filling, preparing the land for sale, legal costs, advertising costs, selling commission and, where required, the provision of water, light, kerbs, gutters, roads, and other things. As he generally is responsible for the removal of the trees, it is not unreasonable that he should provide for their replacement. Indeed, one occasionally finds a developer like Bruce Small, who set so high a standard on the Isle of Capri that at his own cost he has planted street trees to beautify his area.

While theoretically the 1 per cent. forming part of the cost would be passed on to the buyer in the price, in actual practice the price asked, whilst having regard to cost, is based on what the market will bear, that is, what it can be sold at, so in fact the net result may be that the developer, when he sells his land, would get a little less profit. It is not an extra tax for him, for to get the trees planted and new parks established in his area he would merely pay it this way instead of through additional council rates. In practice, who pays is more obscure than that, for land prices reflect supply and demand more than cost, as can be simply and effectively demonstrated. In conclusion, I am pleased to see an allocation in the Budget for a new police station at Surfers Paradise. There has been a good deal of publicity recently of the Gold Coast area, and it is most important that the large number of people coming into the area from all parts of the world should receive police protection. The only criticism I can offer is that sufficient funds have not been provided for an extra 300 or 400 police officers this year. No doubt in next year's Budget, or possibly before then, funds will be provided to allow an increase in the police strength in this State.

This is supposed to be a debate on the Financial Statement. We would have to stretch our imagination considerably to agree that this is a debate in that form. I am not trying to turn the place upside down, nor am I making any suggestions that have not been made before, but the quicker we decide not to sit in the mornings the better. We should hold our party meetings and committee meetings, meet deputations, attend to phone calls and do all the other work in this regard

during the morning. There is nothing more frustrating than the present position, and I hope that the time is not far distant when members have the opportunity during the morning to attend to all their work outside the Chamber—complete their mail, make phone calls, receive deputations—and then enter the Chamber and have four or five hours of really good, ding-dong debate. That is what is needed, and we are not getting it now.

I thank hon. members for their courtesy in listening to me, and I again indicate my support of the Treasurer in the presentation of his Financial Statement.

Mr. P. WOOD (Toowoomba East) (3.11 p.m.): I was most interested to hear the hon. member for South Coast say in the first part of his speech that the Commonwealth Government has failed to live up to its responsibilities. All members on this side of the Chamber will agree with him on that matter. I suppose that he, in common with many other members on his side of the Chamber, will be campaigning prior to the forthcoming Senate election, and I hope that he will then be brave enough to repeat some of the statements that he has made now.

A Government Member: Realising that the A.L.P. won't do so well.

Mr. P. WOOD: The recent Federal by-election has shown quite clearly, I think, that this State will be returning three Labour senators at the coming election.

It is traditional that opportunity is taken during the Budget debate to discuss a wide range of activities.

Mr. Carey: Work the parish pump.

Mr. P. WOOD: It is all very well for the hon. member for Albert to work the parish pump, as he does so often. That is perhaps all that he can do. I, however, have some matters to raise that are above the level of the parish pump and are important for all members and the State of Queensland.

One thing that is most important, and which has been recognised as such certainly by members on this side of the Chamber and by some on the other side, is decentralisation. The hon. member for Toowong seems to accept a situation in which there is an increasing flow of people from country and provincial areas to the city. We on this side of the Chamber do not take that view.

Mr. Pilbeam: It's a pity you didn't do something about it.

Mr. P. WOOD: I can inform the hon. member for Rockhampton South that members on this side sincerely hope that he will be elected as campaign director for the Liberal Party for the State election.

I think it is a great pity that there is not on the other side of the Chamber, particularly on the front benches, anyone with any interest

in decentralisation in Queensland. If the Treasurer lifted his head from the newspaper that he has been reading for the last hour, he might hear some things of interest to him. Much has been said about the Government's lack of initiative and leadership. Whilst much of that criticism has come from this side of the Chamber, it has also come from sources not usually favourably disposed to my party. It is a pity that there is not on the other side of the Chamber anyone who is prepared to work vigorously and energetically for decentralisation in this State.

Mr. R. Jones: And sincerely.

Mr. P. WOOD: Yes, and sincerely.

Mr. Chalk: You are a babe in the woods.

Mr. P. WOOD: At least I am not a senile old man.

Honourable Members interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Smith): Order! The hon. member for Toowoomba East.

Mr. P. WOOD: From time to time we hear a great deal about industrial development throughout Queensland. We hear of the development of oil, the development of bauxite at Weipa, and of the great expansion in the coal industry. I concede that development has taken place in these fields. But I point out that in 1966 the Government received \$723,000 in oil royalties, \$57,000 in royalties on bauxite at Weipa (I am speaking in round figures), and \$127,000 in royalties on coal—in all, \$908,000. I am sure that the Treasurer is appreciative of receiving that revenue. However, although hon. members opposite are very proud and boastful of that development, they do not tell us in the same breath that another field of decentralisation much boosted by the Treasurer—I refer to T.A.B. agencies—is much more profitable to the Government than the royalties on oil, coal, and bauxite. As I said, those royalties amount to over \$900,000; but the activities of the T.A.B.—I concede that a considerable sum is returned to race clubs—result in a profit of \$1,465,000. I do not think it is generally recognised in Queensland that the Government receives more revenue from betting shops than it does in royalties from oil, bauxite and coal.

Mr. Chalk: You are twice a babe in the woods. Tell us what rail freight we get from the coal. \$2,000,000!

Mr. Hanlon: Tell us what Thiess gets out of coal.

Mr. P. WOOD: On the subject of decentralisation, I think it is a shame that no one person is responsible for decentralisation in this State. No one person is responsible for development in Queensland; it is parcelled out round the countryside. The Government should appoint a Minister to direct development throughout the State.

I wish to refer now to what I regard as the most distressing aspect of the Government's neglect in the field of decentralisation. It is its failure to use the railway workshops to their full capacity, and that, of course, raises the whole issue of redundancy in the Railway Department. The railway workshops provide a ready-made opportunity for decentralisation throughout Queensland, but the Government has not seen them in this light. It has progressively reduced over the years the amount of work made available to railway workshops, and that has not been only as a result of dieselisation. The Government has built up something of a myth relative to dieselisation. It has tried to get the people of Queensland to believe the story that redundancy in the Railway Department has been caused by dieselisation alone. But that is not so, because half the problem arises from the fact that railway workshops are not being given the amount of work that they used to be given. I cannot see any reason why the railway workshops are not given the opportunity to provide all the rolling stock needed by the Railway Department. In fact, that is not being done and many contracts for rolling stock are being given to foreign interests.

The Government is to be condemned for its lack of interest in decentralisation in Queensland; but the most serious charge that we can bring against it is its disregard for the welfare of railway men who are affected by redundancy.

Mr. Chalk: No, no.

Mr. P. WOOD: I hear the Treasurer say, "No, no." I say again that the lack of sympathetic consideration shown to railway men affected by redundancy is the most serious charge that can be laid against this Government.

Mr. Chalk: If that is the most serious charge we will face up to it.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Smith): Order! There is far too much cross-firing in the Chamber. I ask hon. members to desist.

Mr. P. WOOD: I raised this matter in my maiden speech on 21 August last year, when I spoke of the serious decline in railway morale and also of the need for sympathetic consideration from the Government for railwaymen affected by redundancy. I want to spend some of my time today speaking on the same matter. I ask the Government to give railwaymen affected by redundancy nothing more nor less than those same railwaymen have given to the Railway Department during their careers in that department—that is, an Australian fair go. These people have been loyal to the Railway Department for many years; many of them have worked in remote parts of Queensland in the service of the Railway Department and of Queensland. Many of them are now at an age when it is extremely difficult for them to find employment other than in the railways.

They are trained in trades that are peculiar to the Railway Department. The Government is to be condemned for its indifferent and callous attitude to those who are affected by this problem.

The Government has made some gestures of sympathy to them, and one of the most ridiculous was the offer that the homes of railwaymen affected by redundancy would be moved free of cost by the Railway Department. I should have liked to see the Treasurer when he moved from Toowoomba to the riverside at Indooroopilly, or wherever it is, do the same thing. I should have liked to see him, at his own expense, pull his home down brick by brick, get it to the railway siding and have it loaded in wagons. The Railway Department would shift it to Brisbane free of cost, and then the Treasurer, at his own expense again, would shift it from there to the site.

Mr. Hinze: That is a bit nasty.

Mr. P. WOOD: I hear someone on the other side say "It is a bit nasty." I have never heard a more ridiculous suggestion than that put up by the Government; that it would be prepared to shift the homes of railwaymen. I am only suggesting that the Treasurer would not have done what he is suggesting railwaymen should do. I do not suppose one railwayman has accepted that offer, and no wonder, because it is impossible.

It is ironic that many of the men affected by redundancy entered the Railway Department at a time when employment generally was very hazardous, in order to get security of employment. Many of them joined in the years following the depression or during the early years of the war when private employment was not always secure, and one of the reasons for their doing so was that railway jobs were regarded as secure. In those times a man was considered fortunate to obtain a position in the Railway Department, because it offered security in times when security was most important. It is ironical now that these same men who entered the Railway Department to obtain security find that that is the last thing offering in this department. They find that their contemporaries who entered private employment, no matter how insecure it might have been in the years following the depression, are now virtually assured of secure employment, while their own employment is insecure.

Mr. Chinchen: They have never had offered to them as much as the railwaymen have been offered.

Mr. P. WOOD: I suggest that the hon. member has never, to my knowledge, displayed any interest or sympathy for railwaymen and he should look at the terms of some of the agreements reached between the British Railways and British railwaymen regarding redundancy. Instead of interjecting, hon. members opposite should

examine their own consciences on this issue. They have some degree of responsibility for it. They cannot keep passing the buck to Cabinet Ministers, as is frequently done by them. Over and over again we hear members of the Liberal Party say, "You cannot blame the Liberal Party. It is the Country Party that did this. We have a Country-Party Government." I see that the Treasurer is laughing at what I am suggesting, but I have heard that sort of thing said time and time again. Members of the Country Party say, "We cannot do anything about this because we have a Liberal Minister for Transport" or, "The Liberals are dominating us on this." They want to have it both ways, but they can't: all of them have some degree of responsibility. I wish they would realise it and face up to it.

For the benefit of the hon. members for Clayfield and Mt. Gravatt, and so that they may be informed to some degree of the plight facing railwaymen, I refer them to this portion of a letter from a railwayman's wife which was published in "The Toowoomba Chronicle"—

"My husband has received a redundancy notice after many years' service, much of it out of town. He transferred to the Willowburn Workshops to have a home where he could educate his four children. Now, in his fifties, he faces a grim prospect.

"How do you tell a girl of 15, who has set her heart on being a teacher, that she may have to leave school after Junior and be a shop assistant?

"How do you tell a boy who plans to be an astronaut that he will have to forget about a science course?

"How do you take a little girl, who has topped her class with 97 per cent., to the bush, away from the competition she needs to bring out the best in her?

"Who cares?"

Certainly I do not think anybody on the opposite side cares very much about the difficulties facing railwaymen. The Government should set an example in sympathetic consideration but, instead, is choosing to be harsh on this issue.

I wish to make a few comments on the role of the Treasurer in the matter. Since he first entered Parliament he has displayed a dislike of railwaymen, and has conducted a campaign against them, against the Railway Department and against Labour Ministers in charge of the railways. I was not in Parliament at the time but his campaign against the railways was publicised freely by the newspapers sympathetic to the then Opposition parties. His campaign against the railways became almost an obsession with the hon. member for Lockyer. So vindictively did he pursue the campaign that he reduced himself to a laughing-stock throughout Queensland. As fate would

have it, he became Minister for Transport. I refer him to the following comments he made when he first presented departmental Estimates as Minister for Transport in 1957, which appear in "Hansard", Vol. 218, at page 822—

"The Government's aim, and mine as Minister, is to preserve and not disturb the employment of the railway staff."

Mr. Chalk: Quite true.

Mr. P. WOOD: We would have no quarrel with that statement had the hon. gentleman in fact lived up to it.

Mr. Chalk: I have never sacked a permanent railwayman.

Mr. P. WOOD: He has shown them the door; he has aimed a boot at them. He might not have sacked them but he has shown them the door.

Mr. Thackeray: He sacked 117 in 12 months in Rockhampton.

Mr. P. WOOD: I am glad to have those figures. Let me tell the Committee what has happened in Toowoomba since 1957. Since 1957 there has been a decline of 950 in the number of railwaymen employed in the district based on Toowoomba, the whole South-Western Division. That figure represents a decline of 25 per cent. in 10 years. When the Treasurer was Minister for Transport he said that it was not his aim to disturb the employment of railway staff. I should hate to see what he would do if he ever set out to disturb it.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Maryborough and the hon. member for Cairns are interjecting to the Government side of the Chamber. If they must have a conversation I ask them to retire to conduct it.

Mr. P. WOOD: Last year the Railway Department lost 911 employees. I am not saying that they were sacked, nor do I say the 950 who left the South-Western Division in 10 years were sacked.

A Government Member: Did they retire?

Mr. P. WOOD: Some of them retired but most of them left reluctantly because they could see the writing on the wall, and knew that they would have to get out. They were forcibly ejected. Last year 911 employees left the Railway Department, and ten years after the Government came to power we find 7,000 fewer employees in the Railway Department.

I looked up the present Treasurer's remarks on the Railway Estimates in 1954. At that time he most vehemently criticised the Railway Department and alleged that railwaymen were not working as they ought to be working, and were not doing their job properly. He also said that there were too many men in the department. He is no

longer Minister for Transport but his policies are being carried on by his successor who has just entered the Chamber. Whether he is willingly doing exactly what the Treasurer tells him to do or whether he is doing it reluctantly I do not know, but doing it he is, and he is as culpable as the Treasurer.

The people of Toowoomba are vitally concerned about the problem. I see that the Minister for Transport has a great big smile on his face.

Mr. Chalk: That is the third time you have said it.

Mr. P. WOOD: The Minister for Transport has only just come into the Chamber. The people in Toowoomba are very concerned about this problem.

Mr. R. Jones: The people of Queensland!

Mr. P. WOOD: I understand that; I realise that.

I want to indicate the degree of concern expressed in Toowoomba about this.

An Opposition Member: Members on the Government side are not very much concerned; most of them have left the Chamber.

Mr. Thackeray: Where are all your numbskulls over there?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Rockhampton North has made a disparaging remark about members of this Chamber. I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. Thackeray: I withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to return to his place in the Chamber.

Mr. P. WOOD: I wish to quote some comments that appeared in a leading article—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the hon. member for Rockhampton North must interject I ask him to do so from his own place in the Chamber.

Mr. P. WOOD: I will quote some statements published in a leading article in "The Toowoomba Chronicle". It is a paper which, traditionally, has not favoured the Labour Party. It has always supported the Country Party and will always support the Country Party for the limited time the Country Party remains in existence. By way of an aside I point out that, in its presentation of news, there is no better newspaper in Queensland. It is extremely impartial and very fair in its presentation of news, but editorially it is not a supporter of the A.L.P. In a leading article on railway redundancy on 12 September it said—

"Unless the human problems associated with the dieselisation of the Queensland Railways are tackled with a greater degree of consideration to the railwaymen concerned the Department will find itself in bad odour."

That has the general support of the people of Toowoomba and district. I shall go further down to another portion of the article which will be of interest to hon. members.

Mr. Chalk: Read the whole article.

Mr. P. WOOD: I shall let the Treasurer have the article later on. It reads—

"When The Toowoomba Chronicle, through its Country Press news service in Brisbane, asked the Minister for Transport (Mr. Knox) and the Commissioner for Railways (Mr. Lee) to comment on points raised by Mr. Bousen, they refused to do so. Their reticence is neither reasonable nor reassuring. Indeed, it suggests some doubt about the merits of the Department's case.

"What is clearly and urgently needed is a thorough airing of the issue."

It concludes—

"A certain amount of upset is inseparable from the 'winds of change', but loyalty cuts both ways."

I endorse what is contained in that article. I shall pass it across to the Treasurer.

Mr. Chalk: I read "The Toowoomba Chronicle" every morning.

Mr. KNOX: I rise to a point of order. The hon. gent has read, or has purported to read, a leading article in a newspaper. He read only certain sentences.

Mr. P. WOOD: The Minister may read all of it.

Mr. KNOX: I want to make this explanation in view of the hon. gentleman's statement. He said that the Minister and the Commissioner had refused to comment. This is not so. His comment is not true.

Mr. P. WOOD: It is on the desk. The Minister can read it if he wants to. The comments are not mine, but I endorse them.

All sections of the community in Toowoomba, and I am sure in Queensland, are concerned about this problem.

An Opposition Member interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the hon. member for Rockhampton North is reflecting on the Chair by making that remark I warn him. The Minister rose on a point of order and until he has taken his point of order I have to listen to him.

Mr. THACKERAY: I rise to a point of order. I did not even speak.

Mr. P. WOOD: I am making the point that all sections of the community in Toowoomba are concerned with this problem. The Mayoress of Toowoomba, who is a member of a political party represented on the other side of the Chamber, had this to say on the issue of railway redundancy—

"While we cannot blame the Government for wanting to gain full advantage

of economies through dieselisation, there must surely be other ways of attacking the problem of staff readjustment than that of sending railwaymen away from their own environment."

She also said—

"... decentralisation, which was the policy of the Government, should be implemented to a far greater degree than was at present the case;"

If the Minister wants to have a look at that he can do so.

Clergymen in Toowoomba have raised this issue. The Government has been attacked on this issue by the Chamber of Commerce, a body not normally sympathetic to the Australian Labour Party. The Government is completely underestimating the degree of public sympathy that railwaymen have received on this issue.

I conclude my remarks on the railway redundancy problem by saying that more work should be given by the Government to the railway workshops. They should be able to manufacture and repair all rolling-stock in the department. Repair work of other types could be done in smaller depots. Certain manufacturing could be done. I am sure that the Redbank workshops could be used more than at present.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: And by Government departments other than railways.

Mr. P. WOOD: As the hon. member for Tablelands said, there is no reason why they should have to do only railway work.

I introduced redundancy as one feature of the problem of decentralisation that the Government has not appreciated. Industrialists will not be attracted to rural and provincial areas merely by a friendly smile and a warm handshake, which is all the Government is prepared to do. They must be given some positive incentives. This again becomes a matter of freight concessions. Toowoomba, which is only one part of Queensland, has lost an industry which those managing it contemplated establishing there until they found that it was not possible because of the freight disadvantage compared with the metropolitan area.

Mr. Chalk: You know that that is not true.

Mr. P. WOOD: Will the Minister give details of that case? Another industry considering establishment in Toowoomba is faced with the same problem. Whether it will be overcome, I do not know.

Mr. Chalk: Name it.

Mr. P. WOOD: I am not going to name it because it has still to be decided whether its establishment in Toowoomba is possible. To mention its name would be doing it a disservice. The Minister for Transport probably knows to what I am referring. Why, then, am I asked to announce it publicly in the Chamber?

I now wish to move to another important Government activity on which I have spoken previously, namely, education. I refer particularly to the complete inadequacy of primary and secondary school libraries. The day has long passed when libraries were considered as merely desirable extras. Libraries are provided by the activities of parents and citizens' associations and the payment of 50 per cent. subsidy by the Department of Education. It is axiomatic that if a parents and citizens' association is energetic and puts a lot of money into a school library and the Department of Education pays the 50 per cent. subsidy, a school has a good library. But not all parents and citizens' associations are either able or prepared to spend a lot of money on school libraries. In some cases parents and citizens' associations are spending money on large projects. Many schools are building, or have built, swimming pools. High schools are being provided with assembly halls, and primary schools are obtaining general-purpose buildings. Those are expensive projects, and it is not surprising, when parents and citizens' associations are working hard for such purposes, that funds are conserved and that other things must suffer. Unfortunately what suffers is, in many cases, the school library.

I am not denying the right of parents and citizens' associations to provide amenities such as swimming pools, assembly halls, general-purpose buildings, playground improvements, and other expensive items. What I am saying is that the situation has been reached at which the State Government must either substantially increase subsidy payments to schools for library purposes or assume full responsibility for them.

Mr. Sherrington: They could take over some of the school-grounds improvements.

Mr. P. WOOD: That is a good point, too. I am bringing before the Committee what I believe to be the completely inadequate spending by the Government on libraries in State schools. The figures that I am about to quote are based on enrolments in 1965 in State primary and secondary schools, and the subsidy payments for the year 1965-66.

According to the annual report of the Director-General of Education, the total enrolments in 1965 were 269,746. Information given to me by the Minister in reply to a question shows that subsidy payments for library purposes in high schools and primary schools for 1965-66 was \$68,607. So, taking the amount raised by parents and citizens' associations together with the Government subsidy, a total of \$137,215 was spent on library facilities in that year.

It is only a matter of simple arithmetic, which I am sure even the hon. member for Albert could do——

Mr. Carey: It is very kind of the hon. member to say so. I was taught by a good teacher who saw the light and did not go into politics.

Mr. P. WOOD: I am glad to hear it. Simple arithmetic will show that the amount spent by parents and citizens' associations plus the Government subsidy gives a total expenditure for each pupil of 58c a year on library books. Surely no hon. member will suggest that 58c a year for each pupil is anywhere near enough to provide adequate library facilities in Queensland schools!

If we take the amount that the Government spends by way of subsidy on library facilities, we see that it is only 29c for each pupil.

Mr. Chalk: You are on awfully dangerous ground. Wait till I have a look at what Labour spent.

Mr. P. WOOD: I am ahead of the Treasurer. The Estimates presented recently show that the amount spent in grants in aid of school libraries in the year ended June, 1966, was \$70,077, so that is an additional amount provided by the State Government for library purposes. Although \$70,000 may sound impressive on the surface, the fact is that only 25c is spent on library books for each child in a primary or high school in Queensland.

Mr. Sherrington: Out in my electorate they have to use libraries for classrooms.

Mr. P. WOOD: That is a point I wish to deal with. Especially in high schools, in which accommodation is at a premium, the library is not a library any more; it becomes a classroom. To begin with, the books are inadequate. But how can children reasonably use a library when it is being used as a classroom for most of the day?

Mr. Carey: When the A.L.P. was on the Treasury benches, we were taught under the camphor laurels.

Mr. Bromley: You can't even spell "camphor laurel"!

Mr. P. WOOD: Libraries have become so important in education but the Government is prepared to spend only 54c a year, exclusive of the contributions of parents and citizens' associations, for each child attending a high school or a primary school! That amount would barely cover the inevitable wastage of books in school libraries as a result of wear and tear.

A great deal is heard about failure rates at universities. I do not propose to go into that question at the moment, because there are many reasons for it. But surely one of the reasons is that children attending high schools receive inadequate training in the

proper use of libraries. There is a big transition from high-school education to university education, and one of the major factors is the use of research facilities. Students at a university have to use their own resources far more than do students at a high school. They have to rely very heavily on library facilities. In their high schools they have not been trained in the use of library facilities and they go to the university lacking this training. I am sure this is one of the contributing factors—only one, I add—in the high failure rate at the university.

Mr. Aikens: There are too many loafers on the academic staff at the university.

Mr. P. WOOD: The hon. member for Townsville South knows all about loafers. I will not attempt to advise him on that.

If for no other reason than to reduce the failure rate at universities, we should considerably increase our spending on school libraries. And although the greater proportion of our students do not proceed to university, their education to the maximum standard is equally important, and this can only be done with adequate library facilities. I suggest that the Government should either considerably increase its subsidy to parents and citizens' associations for library purposes or assume full responsibility for providing school libraries.

I have some further comments to make on one of the most serious aspects of education in Queensland, the declining attraction of teaching for young men. It is readily admitted that young men trainees at the teachers' colleges will be the long-term teachers in Queensland. They are the ones to whom we have to look for a lifetime of service to the Education Department and to Queensland children, and the Government should be doing a great deal more to attract them into the Education Department. Of all the Government's failures in education, I think one of the greatest is its inability to attract into this department sufficient young men.

This year 409 young men were admitted into the Education Department from the teachers' colleges, and, according to figures issued by the Minister for Education, next year only 324 will be coming into the department from those colleges, a decline of over 80. To August this year 320 male teachers resigned—almost as many as will be entering the Education Department at the beginning of next year.

Mr. Bromley: Most of the teachers in primary schools are female teachers.

Mr. P. WOOD: That is so. I think we should have a reasonable balance, as between male and female teachers, in our primary schools.

Mr. Miller: What are you afraid of?

Mr. P. WOOD: I am afraid of getting an imbalance in teaching. We are training temporary teachers because hon. members

opposite know very well that most of the young girls entering the Education Department will marry and leave the department. Yet we are training predominantly young women. After marriage many of them will come back to the department as temporary teachers. It may be shortly afterwards or many years after, but even then they will still be only temporary teachers.

Mr. Carey: Do you think we should pay male teachers a greater incentive than women teachers to come into the organisation?

Mr. P. WOOD: I think we should encourage men teachers into the department. In 1969 the decline will be even greater. I said that 324 young men will be admitted to the Education Department at the beginning of next year. In 1969 only 248 young men will be entering the department and the Government has no remedy for this problem. Its only suggestion was to put up a poster at high schools advertising the merits of teaching. I suppose children sitting in their crowded classrooms may get some incentive from looking at an attractive poster offering them a teaching career. I can see no reason for the department's refusal of the proposal of the Teachers' Union that a recruiting team be sent around Queensland. The Education Department allows into high schools recruiting teams from the Army, the Navy and the Air Force. It allows representatives of banks into high schools but it refuses to allow representatives of its own department to attempt to recruit young men into the Department of Education. The suggestion that a few posters scattered around the school might have some effect is all very well, but it will be a very limited effect.

All hon. members will agree that we should attempt to obtain teaching staff as highly qualified as possible. In the few years for which I have figures available the percentage of highly qualified teachers in Queensland has progressively declined. The highest qualification a teacher can obtain under our Queensland system is Class 1 Division 1. In 1959 27 per cent. of teachers were Class 1 teachers. By 1965 the percentage had declined to 24 per cent. The actual number of Class 1 teachers had increased but their percentage of the whole body of teachers had declined. This year, on figures provided by the Minister for Education, there has been a further decline in the percentage of most highly qualified teachers. Only 22 per cent. now have Class 1 status. I can see no indication that this progressive decline in the percentage of most highly qualified teachers in the Department of Education will be stopped.

Mr. Aikens: Does that apply to primary and secondary or just primary teachers?

Mr. P. WOOD: Primary and secondary.

To obtain Class 1 status teachers were required previously to obtain six units of a university degree. They were required to do this in their own time. Most of them studied externally, if they did their course outside

Brisbane or Townsville. If they lived in Brisbane they could do it by evening study at the university. This has presented many teachers who were anxious to obtain their top qualifications with numerous problems. It is by no means easy for a teacher, faced with a heavy burden of work during the day, to return to his living quarters in the evening to pursue his university studies. They are given virtually no incentive by the Department of Education to do so. When they reach Class 1 status they receive higher remuneration and a degree allowance of \$160 a year if they obtain a degree. I do not know any other employer who would offer only \$160 as extra remuneration for a university degree. If teachers sat for their examination in the morning they were required to return to their school in the afternoon. It was stated that the reason for this was that if they did not do so it would impose unreasonable burdens on their colleagues who remain at the school, a point which might be disputed.

I make the point that it is very difficult for teachers, particularly those in remote and unfavourable areas, to obtain six units of a university degree. That requirement has now been altered. The Government offers no incentive for teachers to try to achieve these qualifications. The Minister for Education has been quite happy to accept the situation where he has a certain number of teachers reaching Class 1 status with the rest remaining at Class 2 status. Those who remain at Class 2 status receive less pay. It must be a big saving to the Department of Education every year to have to pay only a limited number of teachers of Class 1 status, with the larger number at Class 2 status. The department should reimburse teachers pursuing university courses the fees they have paid for the subjects in which they are successful. That would go a long way towards encouraging more teachers to obtain the higher qualifications that we agree they should all possess.

A great deal has been said about Queensland teachers leaving the State for service overseas and in other States. That is happening. We should be offering them some form of encouragement to return to Queensland. At present, if a teacher is away from Queensland for a period longer than 12 months he loses his superannuation and long service leave privileges. If he returns within 12 months after leaving the Department of Education he can reimburse the superannuation fund the amount paid to him, plus arrears and interest, and contribute at the old rate and, if eligible, he can have long service leave privileges restored to him. That has been of value in encouraging teachers who have gone overseas to return within a year. But not all teachers are able or willing to return within a year of leaving, and for those who find it necessary or desirable to be away from Queensland for longer than one year I believe the period of grace should be doubled, making it two years.

Mr. Miller: Would you say that should apply to all Government employees?

Mr. P. WOOD: I see no reason why it should not be offered to all Government employees. I am not completely familiar with the situation in other Government departments so I would have to do a little research to become fully conversant with it.

If as an incentive we were to offer teachers who returned in two years the right to make the necessary refund to the superannuation fund and any other adjustment for long service leave payments made in lieu of long service leave and so regain their full entitlements for superannuation and long service leave, many more than are doing so at present would be prepared to return to Queensland. I offer that suggestion to the Department of Education.

I now have a few comments to make about matters relating to Toowoomba. Some weeks ago I asked the Minister for Education if he would acquire land at Toowoomba for a university. I did not expect that a university would be built at Toowoomba next year, the year after, or within five years, but the Minister's response was that the Martin Report had indicated that an institute of technology should be built at Toowoomba and that that was what the Government had done. It has been built and we are happy to see it there, but it is not a university; it is an institute altogether separate from a university. In his reply to me the Minister implied that there is never likely to be a need for a university in Toowoomba. That reply is not taking a reasonable view of the situation. I do not suggest that the Government should immediately build a university in the Toowoomba area but, as a long-term measure, in five years, 10 years, or longer (at some time in the future) additional university facilities will be necessary in Queensland.

A second university is to be built in Brisbane, and the Townsville University will be autonomous shortly. Sooner or later university facilities will be required outside Brisbane. I am not saying that Toowoomba is the only logical site for such a facility, but at some time in the future one of the logical cities must surely be Toowoomba. If the Government, at some time in the future, acting on a report similar to the Martin Report, decides that a university college at Toowoomba is required, it will need land for that purpose. I suggest to the Minister that he should acquire land for that purpose now, while adequate land is available. We know that universities require a large area of land. The land could be obtained at a more reasonable cost now than in five or 10 years' time. I am disappointed that the Minister is not prepared to look to the future in this regard and to recognise that additional university facilities will be required—not might be required—and that a logical site is Toowoomba.

In Toowoomba we also look forward to the time when a teachers' college will be established there. I do not say that

Toowoomba is the only logical site. There are problems associated with the recruiting and training of teachers. One problem is that children are reluctant to leave their home areas and travel to the city to attend a teachers' college, and their parents are reluctant to allow them to because it places an extra cost burden on them. In the interests of obtaining more teachers it is logical to provide college facilities in as many areas as possible.

Mr. Carey: I thought you were not going to push the parish pump.

Mr. P. WOOD: I am not.

Mr. Carey: You have done nothing but push the parish pump since you stood up.

Mr. P. WOOD: I have spoken of the need for teachers' colleges throughout Queensland and I have suggested that Toowoomba is a site, not that it is the only site for such a college. I have suggested further university facilities throughout Queensland, but I have not suggested that Toowoomba is the only site; I said it is a possible site. A teachers' college and a university in Toowoomba would be of as much use to the Gold Coast as to Toowoomba; in fact, they would be of as much use to any part of Queensland as they would be to Toowoomba. This is not a parochial matter. The training of teachers and the provision of university graduates is a matter for the whole State, not just Toowoomba.

It is hardly necessary for me to say that the people in the area concerned and in Toowoomba generally are grateful that a new high school will be established in Toowoomba. There has been controversy in Toowoomba on the name of the school. I am only too happy to know that it will be established.

Mr. Chalk interjected.

Mr. P. WOOD: Only a few months ago, in response to a question I asked, the Minister for Education said there was no need for a third high school in Toowoomba in the foreseeable future. I am pleased that the representations made by the hon. member for Toowoomba West and me have convinced the Government that a third high school is necessary.

I refer now to the Department of Works premises in Hume Street Toowoomba. The Minister for Works is not unsympathetic in this matter. I suggest that funds should be made available for the replacement of those premises. They are completely inadequate and a disgrace to a city with the civic pride of Toowoomba, and I urge the Minister, as soon as possible, to look to the reguiling or re-siting of those premises.

Mr. Duggan: Sooner, if possible.

Mr. P. WOOD: That is a very good suggestion.

Mr. Chalk interjected.

Mr. P. WOOD: I agree with the Treasurer on that point. The way the hon. member for Toowoomba West and I have been able to work in harmony has been one of my happiest experiences. I know I speak for both of us when I say that we are a very happy team.

My final point relates to electoral boundaries. The hon. member for Toowoomba West and I represent 30,097 electors, and I think we represent them very effectively. It is hardly necessary for me to claim there has been gerrymandering with the boundaries in this State when we realise that electorates held by Country Party members have only half that number of electors and even less than half the number in seats held by metropolitan members. The electorate of Balonne, which is not far from Toowoomba, has 6,967 electors, compared with 15,344 in Toowoomba West. It is a matter of simple arithmetic that it takes twice as many votes to elect a labour member as it does to elect a Country Party member. The electorate of Condamine, which is also not far from Toowoomba, contains 7,186 electors, which is less than half the number in either Toowoomba West or Toowoomba East. A comparison can also be made with some of the electorates in Brisbane—for example, that of the hon. member for Salisbury. What we see there is part and parcel of the gerrymandering of electoral boundaries in this State.

(Time expired.)

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) (4.11 p.m.): I was rather interested when the hon. member for Toowoomba East was speaking, but when he finished the long diatribe that he inflicted upon the Committee by referring to electoral boundaries and gerrymandering I felt that I would have to go outside and be sick if you did not stop him, Mr. Hooper, or if he did not stop himself. If he looks at the gerrymandering that was done by a Labour Government in 1949 in preparation for the 1950 election, he will see what gerrymandering really is.

The hon. member says that he has about 14,000 in his electorate. I had nearly 16,000 in mine—probably more than that now—and I can ride round it on my bike in three hours. It is impossible to drive a car round a country electorate such as Gregory, which is larger than the State of Victoria, in two or three weeks, yet those who represent pocket-handkerchief electorates, such as Salisbury, claim that there should be an electoral redistribution. The Tories say the same thing; indeed, in this matter those on the Labour side who clamour for redistribution are blood brothers with the "ginger group" of the Liberal Party who believe that the Gerties, the Flossies, the spivs, the hangers-on in Brisbane, and the "pork-and-beans", should have the same voting strength as people in the country, who are really doing something for the nation's welfare.

If hon. members wish to address the Committee on any subject, for goodness sake let them be reputable and responsible.

Although many people have asked me to do so, I had no intention whatever of saying anything in this Chamber about the recent local-authority election in Townsville at which the whole of the 11 T.C.A. aldermen were thrown out, lock, stock and barrel, by a long-suffering public. Now that, for a particular reason, I have to mention it, I may say that once again time has vindicated me. Many hon. members will remember how the Premier, some Ministers (fortunately not all), and Mr. Speaker used to take a sadistic delight in pointing a sneering finger at me every time I mentioned the T.C.A. aldermen in Townsville and charging me with conducting a vendetta against them.

I shall not weary the Committee with a recital of the sleepless hours that I spent in bed at night rolling and tossing, unable to close my eyes, and the meals that I missed, because of the worry of this baseless charge, which upset me to such a great extent. I sometimes wonder how I was able to return to the Chamber and tell hon. members and the people of Queensland, through the country Press, what was going on in our city.

I should like to mention that if I had anything to do with the tossing out of the T.C.A. aldermen, perhaps that could be proved by the full, detailed report of the election that I have here and that any member is at liberty to peruse. As everyone knows, postal votes are polled up to about the Friday night before polling day. In the postal votes, the former Mayor of Townsville, Angus Smith, running as an alderman, polled 1,077 votes, and a chap named Moran, who was running in Dr. Scott-Young's team, polled 470.

In the mayoral contest Alderman George Roberts polled 1,059 votes, and "Lucky Harold" Phillips, the Dr. Scott-Young mayoral candidate, polled 764 votes. In the positions for 10 aldermen that were contested, postal votes that were cast up to the Friday night showed that only one of the Dr. Scott-Young team candidates was in the first 10, and that was Dr. Scott-Young himself; the other nine were all T.C.A. aldermen.

This may only be a coincidence, of course, but the following day, after my telecast, when the people went to the polling booths and cast their votes at the ballot boxes, the man Moran, whom I mentioned earlier, ran tenth and was elected as an alderman of the Dr. Scott-Young team and he defeated Angus Smith by 1,600 votes out of the ballot boxes; whereas "Lucky Harold" Phillips, for the votes cast at the ballot boxes next day, defeated Alderman George Roberts for the mayoral position by 15,000 votes to 10,000. As I said, it is remotely possible that what I said on my telecast on the Friday night may have influenced

people in casting their votes on the Saturday. Whether it did or did not, I do not know; it is purely conjectural.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: You must not be modest.

Mr. AIKENS: When all is said and done, if the hon. member comes down to my room he will see a big news sheet published by "Sunday Truth" newspaper when it ran a full-page biography on me in 1961. It is headed "Modest Tom—the Voice of the North".

If there was any reason for the people of Townsville turning out the T.C.A. aldermen, I think it can be summed up in two words—arrogance, and discrimination. Where there is discrimination, there are charges—whether they are soundly based or not does not matter—of nepotism, favouritism, graft and corruption, and it is true that the T.C.A. aldermen did show a great deal of arrogance and discrimination.

There I let my part in the last municipal elections at Townsville end. To Mr. Speaker, the Premier and the Ministers of this Government who used to crawl and cringe and toady to the T.C.A. aldermen by charging me with conducting a vendetta against them, I say, being a generous and warm-hearted gentleman of the old school, that I forgive them and I am prepared to let the dead past bury its dead.

However, I wish to continue and say that the discrimination by the T.C.A. aldermen did not end with their defeat at the polls. For some years I have regarded with a considerable amount of concern the way in which quite a number of people have become members of public organisations, such as show societies, school committees, and parents and citizens' associations, and captured those organisations and have then begun to use them for putrid political-propaganda purposes. But I did not think that putrid politics entered into such a worth-while organisation as Rotary, and I will be very loath and reluctant to believe that it has entered into all branches of Rotary. Following the council elections in Townsville this year, I wish to mention an incident connected with Townsville Rotary. Other people besides myself were blamed for taking a very keen interest in the defeat of the T.C.A. aldermen. We have in Townsville two bishops, one a Roman Catholic bishop, Bishop Ryan, the other an Anglican bishop, Bishop Ian Shevill, and we are particularly fortunate in having such men in North Queensland. Not only have they been pillars of their own respective denominational faiths; they have also proved themselves over the years to be sterling citizens of quality and substance.

We are losing Bishop Ryan, who, I understand, must retire because of an age limit. I do not know whether there are any Eeertons in the Vatican who have imposed this age limit on Catholic bishops, but, if

there are, I am sure they have done a disservice not only to the Catholic community but also to the whole of North Queensland in insisting that Bishop Ryan, the Roman Catholic Bishop of North Queensland, shall retire under an age limit. I for one, and other citizens of North Queensland, irrespective of their religious beliefs, will be sorry to see him go.

The other bishop, the Anglican bishop, is also a very forthright man and, like Bishop Ryan, he is a man of substance who believes in expressing his opinions quite forcibly, a man who, like Bishop Ryan, has proved himself to be a very eminent citizen of Townsville and North Queensland.

Just prior to the municipal elections, Bishop Shevill wrote a very scaring article in "The Northern Churchman", which I understand is the Anglican journal in North Queensland. That article was picked up by a Brisbane Sunday newspaper. In it, Bishop Shevill castigated the Townsville City Council for its lack of energy and initiative in dealing with the pressing mosquito problem. Consequently, when the T.C.A. aldermen were thrown out holus-bolus on 29 April this year, those who supported the T.C.A. aldermen went around looking for scapegoats. I was one, I do not know why; nevertheless, I am prepared to accept that position. Bishop Shevill was another. These people blamed Bishop Shevill for being partly responsible for their ignominious defeat and this later had repercussions to which I should like hon. members to listen in order to see how vicious and vindictive some of the T.C.A. ex-aldermen of Townsville and their supporters were.

One of the members of Townsville Rotary was Dean Tringham, the Anglican dean in Townsville, who had retired because of ill-health. On his retirement, Bishop Ian Shevill was nominated as a member of Townsville Rotary, and I should think that it would be an honour for Rotary to have the Anglican bishop replacing the Anglican dean. Believe it or not, the Townsville Rotary Club immediately rejected the application for membership made on behalf of Bishop Ian Shevill because some of them—the controlling clique—considered it as a way of getting square with him for playing a part in the defeat of the T.C.A. aldermen.

Mr. Hanson: They blackballed him.

Mr. AIKENS: That is so. In case the Committee would like to know what this is all about, I should like to mention that the chairman of Townsville Rotary at that time was a man named Griffin. His son, of course, is also named Griffin.

Mr. Chalk interjected.

Mr. AIKENS: You have to mention these things to clarify the issue when you are talking about North Queensland. Griffin Junior is a member of the T.C.A. executive and he was to be the next man appointed,

through the back door, to the Townsville City Council when Alderman Angus Smith, after he had ensconced himself as chairman of the Townsville Harbour Board, retired from the council. Griffin was to go in through the back door and become a Townsville City Council alderman.

However, ex-Alderman Smith's plan to become chairman of the Townsville Harbour Board became unstuck, first of all because his party was defeated at the polls, secondly because the new council did not appoint him to the harbour board, and thirdly because the present Treasurer, with the considerable courage for which he is noted, steadfastly refused, despite tremendous pressure placed upon him by many sections of the community in Townsville, to appoint Angus Smith as Government representative on the Townsville Harbour Board. Once Alderman Smith got onto the Harbour Board he was known to be lined up to become chairman in place of ailing Bill Tomlins, who has given yeoman service to the board.

Bishop Shevill was blamed not only for playing a part in defeating the T.C.A. aldermen, but for the resultant stopping of young Griffin from going on to the Townsville City Council through the back door. Then, of course, these people vented their spleen, spite and vindictiveness by refusing this noble and eminent North Queensland member-ship of Townsville Rotary. With that background to the scene of municipal politics in Townsville, is it any wonder that I say I am being magnanimous when I forgive the finger-pointers and the smearers who charge me with conducting a vendetta against these T.C.A. gentlemen?

I wish to deal now with something that I consider vitally necessary in the interests of people in North Queensland. It has already been dealt with in a minor way in the Federal Parliament by the newly elected member for Kennedy, Bob Katter.

Although we all know that the Treasurer was for many years Minister for Transport, quite a number of people do not know that intrastate airline operations come under the control of the State Minister for Transport. Some years ago there was a Federal referendum to hand these powers over to the Federal Parliament, but the people refused to do this, so that every intrastate air service comes under the direct control of our State Minister for Transport. On one or two occasions I drew to the Minister's attention some of the remarkable activities of Ansett-A.N.A. For some reason or other—perhaps he may care to explain it to the Committee—he was reluctant to deal with Ansett-A.N.A., and said that all these things were arranged by a clerk in the D.C.A. office. I am speaking now from memory—and mine is usually very retentive—but I think the then Minister for Transport—now the Treasurer—told us that any airline operator in Queensland merely has to ring up some faceless clerk in the D.C.A. office and ask for an altered

run or an altered schedule any time he likes, and he can fly his plane when and where he likes. The State Minister for Transport, who is ostensibly in control of air transport within the boundaries of the State, does nothing about it, except perhaps to have his fortnight's holiday at Hayman Island.

We have really only two airlines operating internally in Queensland. There may be one or two small ones operating but the only two major ones operating internally in Queensland, and operating internally in Australia, are Ansett-A.N.A. and T.A.A. When anyone wants to fly it is a matter of Tweedledum and Tweedledee. He can fly Ansett-A.N.A. and take his chance of being burnt to death or fly T.A.A. and take the risk of being tossed off at the last moment so that his seat can be given to some sponging V.I.P. who is travelling at the taxpayers' expense.

The point I want to make is that unless we get more competition among the internal airlines of Australia, our present internal airline services, which must be, without doubt, the worst in the civilised world, will become even worse.

I am not going to tell the Committee of all the incidents that have happened to me, because I feel sure that everyone who has flown with either Ansett-A.N.A. or T.A.A. could probably give even more shocking and monstrous examples of their complete disregard for the comfort and convenience of passengers than I can. I will refer to just one instance, without elaborating on it. When I was first given air trips at the taxpayers' expense to come to Brisbane for parliamentary purposes, I decided I would give Ansett-A.N.A. and T.A.A. a more or less equal share of my business.

I want to clear up one point before I go any further. I have no adverse comment to make about the courtesy and efficiency we get from the fellows at the counter at either the Ansett-A.N.A. or the T.A.A. office, or from the hostesses on the planes.

It is true that now and again we strike a snooty or a stuffy hostess, but such persons are likely to be met with in any avenue of employment and I do not blame the airlines for that. By and large, the service rendered by the men on the counter and the girls on the plane could not be better. It is the fellows behind the scene—those who are faceless; no-one knows them—who juggle around with the airline services and airlines like a boy juggling with his toys, or perhaps a two-up player juggling with his pennies, that I complain about. Until recently no-one complained, but now quite a number are complaining. People such as Katter, various chambers of commerce and many others are starting to complain about the way both airline companies completely disregard the passenger's plight, the passenger's convenience, and the passenger's business.

On a couple of occasions I flew down here in what is known as the through service from Townsville to Brisbane. It is advertised by Ansett-A.N.A. as the premier through service. We were coming down one morning and, over Mackay, we circled around and landed. I thought we must be landing for some emergency, or because the plane had gone "bung" in some way or another. As we got to the end of the runway the hostess said, "Everyone up to the front, please." We all got up to the front seats, and lo and behold, Mr. Ansett himself and eight or nine men from Hayman Island, in various stages of sobriety, got on the plane. We landed at Brisbane 45 or 50 minutes late. When that was done to me the second time I said to myself, "Well, that is fair enough. I have given Ansett-A.N.A. a fair run; I will give them away and give all my air custom to T.A.A."

For a while I got reasonable service from T.A.A., except for the happenings that I will mention later. Hon. members will scarcely believe what happened. I came down here one week and booked home on the 7 o'clock T.A.A. Sunday plane, which was scheduled to touch down at Bundaberg, Rockhampton and Townsville. When I got to the airport terminal at Creek Street, in plenty of time to catch the airport bus, I was told that the bus had gone and that the plane was leaving 25 minutes early that morning. I said, "Why weren't we told?" The reply was, "Oh, I don't know why you weren't told, but you will have to do a dash to Eagle Farm otherwise you will miss it." I had to do a dash to Eagle Farm by taxi. The taxi-driver charged me \$2. I knew I was being overcharged, but as the plane was getting ready to take off I could not stop to argue. I climbed on board the plane and we took off. As the hostess was bringing the breakfast I said, "Isn't it peculiar that the plane left 25 minutes before time without the passengers being told?" She replied, "That's nothing; they didn't even tell us." At Bundaberg we took on a number of Spanish dancers who were going to Rockhampton for the Rockhampton show. When we got to Rockhampton we were told, "Everybody out here." I said, "We are going on to Townsville." They said, "No, you aren't going on to Townsville for 3½ hours." I said, "Why are we waiting 3½ hours?" They said, "We could not pick up all the Spanish dancers in one load to bring them to Rockhampton so we are going back to Bundaberg to pick up the rest of them." That was a Sunday morning, and I thought the airline must be bringing the dancers up for some emergency. However, they were not booked to appear in Rockhampton until the Monday night.

Luckily, I was able to get on the phone and get hold of my friend Rex Pilbeam, who came out to the drome, picked me up and took me out to show me the barrage on the Fitzroy River, and gave me a cup of morning tea. I was able to fill in my 3½ hours very comfortably and profitably,

but the other passengers sat and cooled their heels at the Rockhampton terminal while the plane flew back to Bundaberg and picked up the rest of the Spanish dancers. By the time we got to Townsville seven hours had elapsed since we left Brisbane.

Being an easy-going sort of fellow I said to myself, "Well, that is only one instance." A couple of Sundays later, however, I was flying back on the same plane, and I got to the depot in Creek Street, in plenty of time on that occasion. The chap behind the counter said, "What are you doing here, Mr. Aikens?" I said, "I am going home on this plane." He said, "You aren't booked on this plane." I said "Here is my ticket, issued by T.A.A. in Townsville." He said, "You aren't on the plane. In any case, it wouldn't matter if you were because it is not going for 4½ hours." I went around to Ansett-A.N.A. after he rang and arranged it, and got on one of their planes and arrived home some time that afternoon.

They are two of many incidents I can recount, and I am sure everybody who flies in planes could recount similar incidents. The airline officials do not bother to tell their passengers whether a plane is delayed or is leaving early, or in fact anything at all. If the Minister for Transport happens to be listening, I should like to know when was the last occasion on which a plane left Eagle Farm for the North on time. I have not been on one plane this year that left Eagle Farm for North Queensland on time.

It is possible sometimes to leave Townsville for Brisbane on time but not to go north on time. Passengers here have to wait for the plane to come down from the North, and if it is delayed they hear over the loud-speaker, "Passengers on flight 464 (or whatever the flight number is) are informed that their plane will not be leaving until such-and-such a time." It is usually 45 minutes or an hour and a-half later or even longer. Among the passengers are women and children. The passengers are of all kinds, shapes, and sizes. They sit there and the first intimation they have of the delay is a sepulchral voice over the loud-speaker saying that they must sit and cool their heels for anything up to three hours before the plane will leave. Apparently nobody in the Government seems to bother about these things, although the Government controls the intrastate airlines in Queensland. I want to know why, and the people of North Queensland want to know why.

I mentioned Bishop Shevill a while ago. I have here an article which appeared in "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" last Monday. The Bishop talks about a T.A.A. flight from Cloncurry to Richmond. Anybody who wants to suffer inconvenience should travel on that route. I travelled on it once this year, and that was enough. Morning tea is served and, believe it or not, I was given my cup of morning tea when the plane was actually touching down at Garbutt. It is not that a cup of morning tea matters very much. I mention it to show the slap-happy, haphazard way these air services are run.

Bishop Shevill wanted to travel from Cloncurry to Richmond, an air distance of 150 miles. T.A.A. said, "We aren't going to land at Richmond today." Believe it or not, he was flown from Cloncurry to Townsville and from Townsville back to Richmond. It took seven hours to do the 150-mile trip. I shall read the whole article because it is well worth reading because most hon. members are too lazy to go into the Parliamentary Library and read it. That is what it says—

"Bishop Calls For Air Service 'Shake-Up'"

"Brisbane, October 8.—The Bishop of North Queensland, Bishop Ian Shevill, today called for a shake-up of T.A.A.'s monopoly air services in North-West Queensland, with which he said there was something 'monumental' going wrong.

"He issued in his official publication, the Northern Churchman, a page-long criticism of the operations of what he called 'this alfresco air service'.

"He called it, 'those amazing aviators in their flying machines, or how I flew from Cloncurry to Richmond in five hours 11 minutes'.

"He said the T.A.A. service had been 'the cause of endless heartbreaks and human sorrow as the people of the West go to their aerodromes for planes which never land, in order to collect essential parts for their tractors, cars and agricultural machines, whilst the women wait for days for medicines for the children, a dress length or some flowers for a wedding'.

"Newspapers arrived too late to be of use with what was intended to be timely news, because planes overflow places like Julia Creek, for example.

"The Bishop said, 'It does not matter what the schedules say—the plane just flies overhead.

"I might still be standing at this airport if it had not been for the kindly intervention some time ago of the flying surgeon who used his wireless to talk to the pilot of the scheduled aircraft and begged him to come down as he had a passenger'.

"But the bishop's pet peeve was this: 'This astonishing air service was to take me from Cloncurry to Richmond on 1 September, a one-hour trip of less than 200 miles.

"They took me on the day mentioned—but via Townsville—a 680-mile journey which took five hours flying time.

"The Mt. Isa manager rang me the night before to give me warning of the excursion arranged, and when I demurred starting quoting me the small type on the tickets.

"However, he deferred the matter to Melbourne, where a faceless clerk seems to rule the destinies of the material and spiritual well-being of the western folk.

“This functionary decreed that I should fly over Richmond and then return from Townsville to Richmond in a special plane with two pilots, two hostesses and the mail.”

“The bishop also quoted an instance where one town council ordered two identical parts for a machine—one to be delivered air express, the other by rail.

“The tortoise beat the hare by several weeks,” he said.

“Tonight the T.A.A. Queensland manager, Mr. Ben Cochrane, was unavailable for comment.”

I read Mr. Cochrane's comment in a later issue of “The Townsville Daily Bulletin”, and it was the usual evasive stuff that one expects from representatives of such monopolies.

The point is that there are two airlines operating in Australia—Ansett-A.N.A. and T.A.A.—and neither gives two hoots in hell for the public. Each knows that if passengers do not fly with it, they have to fly with the other monopoly. In fact, they cross-book; if a T.A.A. flight is full, T.A.A. will arrange for a passenger to fly with Ansett-A.N.A., and vice versa. They know that passengers have no choice except those two airlines.

If I have read the Federal Act correctly, it is part of policy that there must be no more than two airlines operating on the main internal routes in Australia. The long-suffering public have to put up with it; they are told that it is all part of an arrangement to ensure competition between airlines. I challenge anybody to tell me where competition between airlines exists in Queensland today. It does not matter whether a person flies with Ansett-A.N.A. or T.A.A.; he flies when they will take him and at their convenience, and they care very little about his convenience. They care little about time lost by passengers, and they certainly do not care how much their passengers lose in cash as a result of delays.

I know that in making this protest I am simply beating the air. I do not expect from the Minister for Transport any more action than was received from the former occupant of this portfolio, or Labour Ministers for Transport. For some reason unknown to us, but probably well known to them, they show a remarkable reluctance to deal with the airline monopolies, whilst those whom they are alleged to represent in this Parliament are being kicked from pillar to post. I repeat that this is not being done by those who are employed in the terminals and depots, or by the hostesses and pilots, but by the “faceless clerks” who alter the schedules.

What a monstrous thing it is that if an aircraft is booked to fly direct from Brisbane to Townsville, all that a “faceless clerk” has to do is to ring an equally

faceless officer in the Department of Civil Aviation and say, “We want to divert this flight to Roma.” The passengers, who believe they are flying direct from Brisbane to Townsville, are taken to Roma, from Roma to Rockhampton, and then on to Townsville.

I recently read of a case in which a T.A.A. aircraft on a main trunk route was held for 40 minutes waiting for a Mr. Myer, of the Myer Emporium, who was having a cocktail and a cup of tea in some place and did not feel like joining the plane till he had finished them. The passengers and everyone else were held for 40 minutes waiting for Mr. Myer to condescend to go out to the airfield and board the aircraft. I repeat that the 40-minute late arrival of that aircraft would mean a 40-minute delay in the departure of the same plane on the return journey, or on another trip.

Some metropolitan members of Parliament and some who represent electorates that are so close to Brisbane that they do not need to use air services may think that this is not a matter of great importance. I seriously suggest to them that they get in touch with some of their friends out in the country and ask them what they think of the services that are being rendered by Ansett-A.N.A. and T.A.A.

I am not going to digress again, Mr. Dean, to remind the Committee of the \$100,000,000 a year of ratepayers' money that is needed to keep Ansett-A.N.A. and T.A.A. operating. I am not going to remind hon. members that every time Ansett-A.N.A. and T.A.A. sell an airline ticket the taxpayers of Australia pay a subsidy of \$6 on that ticket. We pour taxpayers' money into these two airlines, but, because of the attitude of the Department of Civil Aviation and because of the apathy of the State Minister for Transport, the people of Queensland are fed up to the back teeth with them. When all is said and done, when an election comes round it is not a single item that will elect a party or prevent a party from becoming the Government; it is an accumulation of all the matters that are affecting the people and causing them some concern. I assure you, Mr. Dean, that nothing is causing the people of North Queensland more concern at present than the way the two airline companies, T.A.A. and Ansett-A.N.A., have decided to use the monopoly granted to them by the Commonwealth Government as an instrument to bludgeon the people into being—this is what would happen if they had their way—spineless paying passengers who have no right to complain, no right to say anything, and no right to expect decent service.

I wish to mention something that I think is quite insincere. Perhaps the hon. member for Baroona, who takes an intelligent interest in these matters, might be able to advise me on this point. I am very interested, as is everyone who has the interests of the people

at heart, in the situation in the field of education today. I have attended meetings of parents and citizens' associations; very recently I have attended a couple of school speech nights. Everyone wants to know what is wrong with the education system. Every now and again someone brings out a pamphlet or comes along with a slogan to chant, and I think Queenslanders must be the greatest slogan-chanters in the world. It only needs someone to begin chanting "Freedom of speech", or "Civil liberties", or "Vote for Gough Whitlam", or "All the way with L.B.J.", and people, without thinking, begin chanting it themselves, and after a while they begin to believe it. The point that is hammered everywhere is that Queensland is spending less on education per head of population than any other Australian State. For all I know, that might be true.

I intended to deal with this matter in more detail, but the hon. member for Baroona dealt with it in detail from another angle earlier in the debate. I should like to know, in order to get a true picture of Queensland's spending on education relative to the spending on education in other States, how much is being spent in Queensland for each primary and secondary-school pupil and how much is being spent on a similar basis in other States. I have always held the opinion that, because of circumstances that need not be elaborated here, more primary and secondary-school pupils attend denominational schools, grammar schools and other non-State schools in Queensland than in any other Australian State.

Mr. Chinchon: Proportionally, yes.

Mr. AIKENS: If that is so, then there we have the answer, I think, to this catchcry that more money per head of population is being spent in other States than is being spent in Queensland. That is not the true picture. I think the Minister for Education owes it to himself, to hon. members, and to the people of Queensland, to state how much is being spent for each pupil, primary and secondary, on education in Queensland and how much is being spent for each pupil, primary and secondary, in other Australian States. We will then have some idea whether Queensland is spending more or less on education than the other States.

Ever since that claim was made and ever since I have heard it vociferously chanted by various people, I have thought, "There is some catch in this." I doubted—and I am not an apologist for this Government—whether the figures quoted for Queensland could be so low in comparison with those for the other States. I looked around for some reason for it. I thought that perhaps the hon. member for Baroona would tell us that he had taken out the figures. It is true that in Queensland we have a tremendous number of pupils attending denominational schools, grammar schools and non-State schools. I feel sure that the proportion of these pupils in Queensland is much higher

than in any other State, and that that is the reason why so much per head of population is being spent in the other States.

I am always on my guard when someone quotes generalities and percentages instead of actual figures. For instance, someone recently said to me, "How can you claim that Townsville is going ahead when the figures published at the time of the last census show that Townsville increased in population by only 11 per cent., whereas Gunn's Gully increased in population by 50 per cent.?" There were only 20-odd at Gunn's Gully and four babies were born during the year and a man, his wife, and four children came to live there. Therefore, there was an increase of 10, or 50 per cent., in the population of Gunn's Gully. The increase in population of Townsville was 6,000 or 7,000, which is only 11 per cent. Consequently, I am always on my guard when anyone quotes percentages, and I was on my guard when I began to hear ad nauseum this chant that Queensland is spending less on education per head of population than the other States.

My time has not run out, Mr. Dean, but I do not propose to weary the Committee by carrying on any longer. However, I again offer any member of this Chamber, or any member of the public, the opportunity, if he wishes, to peruse the remarkable result of the city council elections held in Townsville on 29 April.

Mr. CHINCHEN (Mt. Gravatt) (4.52 p.m.): It is my desire to congratulate the Treasurer on the presentation of this, his second Budget. What has happened here, of course, is an indication that the financial set-up in this State is a very real and true thing, something of which we in this State can be very proud. The strength of this Budget is indicated by the inability of the Opposition to really probe into it or make any attack on it. There were some small matters raised, of course, but nothing very effective.

I was surprised when the Leader of the Opposition, in an uncertain and dreary manner, read every word of his speech, without any fire or conviction. It indicated to me that he had been handed something which he had to get through. He did this, and that was that. I feel that this is most ineffective and indicated a certain weakness in the Opposition, because it did not try to put its case in a forcible manner. I think it was a very weak performance indeed.

This Budget indicates great financial stability, and this is what we all wish to see. We hear so much about stop-go budgets and this sort of thing, but here we see a Budget being introduced in a reasonably difficult year—much better than the previous one, but not a good year because of the remaining effects of drought—without any increase in taxation

but an increase in the over-all Budget of some magnitude, with a great proportion going to education.

I think I would be in order in saying that this indicates the thinking of the Government in regard to education—and it is not unusual. Each year more and more of our money has gone to education, but as it has happened again this year after a certain amount of opportunism being developed around the question of education, some people obviously will be claiming that they are bringing about the spending of additional money for this purpose. However, I am quite sure that I am right in saying that that has not been the cause. This is the Government's thinking; it is the Government's will and wish to give as much money as possible to education without denying the proper growth of other areas in a developing State such as ours is.

The figures presented to us in the Treasurer's Financial Statement and the Estimates of the Probable Ways and Means and Expenditure are made available in the traditional form, showing in great detail the three types of account, what goes in and what goes out, and showing all the loans in great detail, with what we pay for them and when they are due. All this information is very important. However, from a personal point of view certain information is not conveyed to me which I, as a member of Parliament, feel I should have some responsibility for.

The documents I have referred to show us what we receive and what we spend. They do not endeavour to show us whether the money is spent in the most efficient manner. It may be asked, "Why is this of great importance?" I am a great believer in efficiency. Efficiency helps the people who are providing us with the money. We are the people who are authorising the collection and expenditure of the money, so I believe that we have a responsibility to make absolutely certain that every dollar is spent to the best advantage. As members of Parliament, it is our responsibility to know whether all Government departments are operating as efficiently as they should and whether we are spending the money in the best possible avenues. This is impossible to ascertain from the information presented to us.

We all know that in the normal world of commerce, or in free enterprise, competition itself provides a built-in efficiency system that, of necessity, demands operations of the utmost efficiency. Anyone who becomes inefficient in competitive industry soon goes out of business.

How is efficiency measured in Government departments? I can well imagine that we have very capable public servants who endeavour to watch such things, but it does appear that year by year—this matter was mentioned by the hon. member for Chatsworth, and his reference to it was a very

good one—there is a natural tendency to add to the administrative staff in most departments. There are exceptions to this. There are some excellent exceptions in the documents presented to us. In competitive industries we find that two, three or four times the volume of production is being turned out with fewer administrative staff than existed five or 10 years ago. It is a matter of survival.

For some reason or other this sort of thing does not happen in Government departments. There may be reasons, but we do not know why these increases occur. No explanation is given to us. I can understand additional school-teachers being required. I can understand the need for more technicians, technologists and agrostologists, but we find surprising increases in what appear to be clerical staffs.

I think we should interest ourselves in such matters. We cannot find the answers from what we are given in the documents. By some means or other we should be able to learn, for instance, that a particular department is operating more efficiently because it has done \$x work on roads with only $\frac{x}{100}$ administrative charges as against last year, when it was a greater fraction. This result may have been achieved in many departments. A budget is estimated for a department, but at that stage certain projects cannot be envisaged. What happens is that the work is done and it eats into the money. The staff is always there. The remarkable thing about work, particularly in an office, is that it will always expand to take care of the existing staff. I know from experience that this is true.

There may be six people to do a certain amount of work, and they get it done. If two more are put on in the same office the work expands to take care of them. They are all busy; there is no doubt about that. If another two are put on in 12 months' time, they are still all busy. This facet must be watched. It may be watched, but I do not know as we are not told.

The Treasurer said—

"I again express my appreciation to the executive officers of these Departments for their co-operation in adhering to a budget which of necessity could not contain all the provisions sought by them."

I, too, congratulate the senior officers of the various departments. They are hard-working, dedicated men, but that does not say that the departments are working to maximum efficiency. Working within a budget in those circumstances is not difficult. There is a fixed staff (or an increased staff), and they just cut out their work in accordance with the amount of money they have. It is very easy to live within a budget. If they had a budget which demanded that certain works had to be done, and they had to live within

it, that would be a different story, but that is not how it is done in Government departments.

I should like to be assured that, by some method, all our departments have controls which ensure that in all their aspects, whether in administration, transport control, labour, or whatever it is, they are working to modern methods of the highest efficiency, with scientific management, as can be seen today in some of the biggest businesses in this State or in the Commonwealth. I say this because our departmental business today is enormous business.

We, as parliamentarians, must be able to tell the people we represent that we know our internal economy is as good as it can be. We should not ask for money from the public until we can say that. We cannot establish that that is so from what is given to us, so let us look around other Governments and other Parliaments to see how they deal with this matter. We find in other Parliaments budget control through various committees, which, during the year, are allowed to make certain investigations. They may be public accounts committees, public works committees, or estimates committees. These activities are carried on by members of Parliament who conduct investigations and can call for figures and files to ensure that Parliament itself, through its own committees, knows how the money is spent, and if it is spent in the best possible way.

By going outside our own country—and I think we should do that occasionally—we can discover what happens. I found what happens by reading the July, 1967, issue of a journal titled, "The Parliamentarian—Journal of the Parliaments of the Commonwealth". It is available to everyone, although I do not know how many hon. members have read it. I was very impressed to read an article by Mr. S. L. Shakhder, Secretary of Lok Sabha, New Delhi. The article is headed, "Administrative Accountability to Parliament in India." I will not bore hon. members with all the information in the article, but it is extremely interesting and valuable. We can learn much from it.

It appears to me that the Queensland Parliament, under almost 40 years of Labour Government, was stripped of all the checks and balances so necessary in normal parliamentary procedure. The Upper House was abolished, committees as they are now known in other Parliaments do not exist, and questions without notice, which were the practice here years ago, are no longer allowable. The procedure was streamlined so that executive decision could wade straight through without any hindrance and become law, and investigations, either before or after, were not countenanced. For some reason or other we are inclined to carry on the same system although it would seem that we are feeling our way out of it. This is a

problem that has been with the Parliament in Queensland for years, but we can learn from what happens in other areas.

With your forbearance, Mr. Hooper, I should like to read from this article concerning the Parliament in India. We should remember that we consider India as a backward, under-developed country and it is remarkable, I think, that we can learn a great deal from it.

Mr. P. Wood: It is not backward.

Mr. CHINCHEN: I do not think it is backward, although it is considered to be so. In this aspect it is way ahead of us. I think this will at least interest the intelligent members in the Chamber. The article reads—

"Administrative accountability in financial matters is so rigid that, if any amounts have been spent in excess of the parliamentary sanctions, they may have to be made good by the individual officers who may have exceeded the powers conferred upon them, unless the excess is regularized by Parliament; and regularization by Parliament can take place only after full explanations have been submitted to it through its committees and the committees have recommended it. Nevertheless, officers cannot escape departmental punishments of various types, depending upon the seriousness of the irregularities committed. The administration comes under close scrutiny of Parliament when the budget is under discussion."

Mr. Newton: Couldn't you table this?

Mr. CHINCHEN: I shall if the hon. member so desires, but I should like to read it for the purpose of the record.

It continues —

"Each Ministry, department, and office is on trial and can be sanctioned money only after its activities during the year have been closely examined and discussed. There is no matter which cannot be raised during the debate. Questions of policy, economy, grievances, complaints, adequacy or inadequacy of projects, schemes, and outlays can always be raised and the Minister has to give satisfaction."

The article then mentions that there is scrutiny by committees, and that there is a Committee on Estimates, a Public Accounts Committee, and a Committee on Public Undertakings.

It is extremely interesting that in India members of Parliament themselves scrutinise the estimates before they go before Parliament. That means that Parliament itself is playing a part in the financial affairs of the State. There is nothing to say that they will alter anything, but they have satisfaction in their own minds, which I have not at the moment, that they really know what is going on, and I think that is what is expected of us.

The article continues—

"These committees are vested with adequate powers to complete detailed examination of accounts without at the same time impinging upon the day-to-day activities of the administration. Through them the administration is in direct contact with Parliament. The top officers of the administration have to satisfy the committees that the amounts voted by Parliament are being or have been spent on the purposes for which they were sanctioned. They have to explain why irregularities have taken place, what action has been taken against the defaulting officers, and how it is proposed to plug the loopholes."

Surely that is a function of a committee of Parliament. Surely that is right.

The article continues—

"They have also to satisfy the committees that all laws and rules governing the administration and financial activities of the departments have been complied with; that the organisation and the manning of jobs have been efficient; that the performance has been commensurate with expenditure involved and that all possible methods of ensuring economy consistent with efficiency have been tried."

A committee of Parliament has to satisfy itself that this has been done. Here, we do not do this. We work on the trust system. I have no doubt that in 99 cases out of 100, or even more, there is no doubt or question, but surely we, as parliamentarians, are obliged, in the job we are doing, to ensure that this sort of thing happens in the State of Queensland.

The article continues—

"The examination is severe and the committees frown on shortcomings, lackadaisical attitudes, and on incompetence of the administration, and they do not let off the guilty easily. The committees perform very useful functions. They keep the administration on its toes and, more than bringing out the flaws, they are instrumental in inspiring reverence for parliamentary control among all the sections of administration so that misuse of money and administrative powers and faults of like nature are prevented. Reports of committees are treated with respect. Each recommendation is carefully analysed and processed, and the administration makes an effort to give a better account of itself next time."

That is true of the committees on financial matters, namely, the Committee on Estimates, the Public Accounts Committee, and the Committee on Public Undertakings. Here is a country, India, that can show us the necessity and requirement for committees of this type. Yet, for some reason or other, apparently we feel they are not necessary, so we have done nothing about them. We should do something about this matter.

Mr. Murray: The House of Assembly of Papua and New Guinea does that.

Mr. CHINCHEN: Exactly. Most Parliaments that we know of do it. Parliamentarians take this type of interest in the State and the people they represent.

It is interesting to note that, apart from the Finance Committee, there are other committees of scrutiny to whom the administration is answerable. There is a Committee on Government Assurances, a Committee on Subordinate Legislation, and a Committee on Petitions. The Committee on Subordinate Legislation is, of course, a very important one.

The article goes on to say—

"... the Government's power to make rules is enormous. If this power is not properly checked by Parliament there is danger that a Government might gradually usurp the legislative powers of Parliament, or that the rules might go beyond the powers conferred on it."

That is our responsibility, and we should have a Government committee considering subordinate legislation. There is no question about that. It is done, I think, in every other Parliament in the Commonwealth. It is a committee that most people feel is necessary.

This passage, also, is interesting—

"Parliament also has summary methods of control. They are more in the nature of political control over the executive. First on the list of these summary methods is the short-notice question. Where the news is disquieting, Parliament likes to be informed immediately of the facts."

That reference is to the question without notice, which is used sensibly when the news is disquieting and the people wish to have an immediate answer. That is normal procedure in other places, but not here.

In matters of definite and urgent public importance, the adjournment motion is used. That method also is followed elsewhere, but not here. Either this Parliament has been stripped of all those things or it has never had them. I do not know why. It seems strange that we in this State do not accept methods that are used elsewhere, and have proved to be of great advantage to the operations of Parliaments in other States and countries.

This is a very long article. Another section that I would like to place on record is this one—

"During debate and discussion on legislative proposals of financial Bills or Motions to consider and approve government policies, Members are free to express themselves and to say what is good for the country and what modifications of the existing policy are required. The Government is sensitive to parliamentary opinion and in most cases

anticipates it, in some cases bowing to it, in others feeling that it cannot make any change consistent with its commitments and political philosophy. Nevertheless, during discussions Members have full liberty to criticise the administration for its past performance and suggest how it should behave in the future or how a particular measure should be implemented. These discussions are important, for they indicate parliamentary mood and bring the impact of public thinking on the administrative apparatus which may otherwise remain immune to public sentiments and feelings."

There is a very forthright statement by an Indian member of Parliament in regard to his own Parliament. To my mind, what he says makes sense, and I hope hon. members will give a lot of thought to it so that we, too, may have additional aids to enable us to become more effective.

I was particularly interested in the speech of the hon. member for Toowong, who suggested some rethinking in the allocation of portfolios. I thoroughly agree with him. He has given a lot of thought to this matter, and his contribution was a very valuable one. I, too, have given much thought to State development in general. All hon. members know that the various Government departments are doing a wonderful job. They are competent and, whilst they suffer from lack of money, they do not suffer from a lack of know-how. I think it will be appreciated that in major projects nothing can be done in isolation.

It is not my purpose to move into the realms of regional planning. What I am thinking of is a step in that direction, a step that could be accepted in Queensland for the benefit of the State as a whole.

Any major project that is proposed by a department must have a big influence on many other areas and many other people in the State. It must affect them in a hundred and one ways. Whatever it is, it must impinge on some other department or some other authority, and problems may arise from the planning being done in isolation. I think there should be an overriding committee composed of people of a certain type whose job it is to study the proposal and see what its over-all effect will be on the people, on the State, and on adjoining areas.

It is interesting to read in "The Age", a Melbourne paper, of 9 October (that is only three days ago) an article headed "Metro-towns urged in new report". It says—

"'Metro-towns', with populations of 100,000 people, and a single planning authority for Victoria, have been recommended to State Cabinet by the Town and Country Planning Board.

"The Board, Victoria's senior planning authority, also recommends that it be reconstituted and given authority to plan an area covering 7,000 square miles."

It continues—

"If State Cabinet accepts the Board's report, released at the weekend, it could mean the Board of Works and other planning authorities would lose some of their planning powers.

"The Board of Works at present has authority to plan for about one-tenth of the area the Town and Country Planning Board seeks to control."

The suggestion there is for a major authority for purposes of regional planning.

At this stage of Queensland's development, it is my thought that a committee, which might be called the State Planning Advisory Committee—hon. members can call it what they like—should be established. It would be purely an advisory committee of experts in particular fields. I suggest that it should have a permanent chairman, who would be a Supreme Court judge, to handle matters of sociology and law, and it should be composed of an engineer, an economist, an ecologist, and a planner. The persons sitting on the committee, or commission, would be the people with the best brains in their particular fields.

When any major proposal for development was put forward by one of the departments for approval, I would suggest that Cabinet, in its own interests, would say to the State Planning Advisory Council, "Will you please go to work on this?" What would happen from then on, of course, would be decided by the committee. The experts would look into all aspects of the project relative to the State in general.

It might be surprising what would come from an organisation such as that. The project might relate to harbour development or development of some other form that would have a big influence on other matters affecting the State. Cabinet might be disposed to accept the proposal for reasons given at the time. However, it would not know the information that was not available to it, and only an expert body of the type that I have suggested would have the ability to say, after carrying out a complete survey, "Yes, this is sound", or perhaps to suggest something different.

Of necessity, the experts should not be departmental officers. That is most important, because it would be necessary to have people sitting in the position in which judges sit. They would be outside the Public Service; they would be people of very high integrity; they would be working together in the interest of the State. I think they would provide the balance needed in approving any project.

One might say, "Where have we gone wrong?" I do not think we have gone wrong to any great extent, but I think the time is coming when we could be going wrong and

a committee of this nature could save us millions of dollars. I think perhaps we have gone a little wrong with the brigalow scheme. Perhaps it was a little early, in view of the problems that we know exist there today. I am sure a committee of this nature would highlight these and, in fact, a number of other matters that might arise.

Perhaps a water scheme might be required for the Albert Shire. These are the people to whom we could put such a suggestion. They could carry out a survey and have a look at it. The result of this could be that what is required is not a separate scheme for the Albert Shire but a south-east complex to handle all water problems. That is the sort of thing on which people such as this, with their particular knowledge, could come up with a much better answer than we could get from isolated shires, industries or departments.

I say this sincerely because I can see that from this sort of development we could lead into regional planning in a very natural manner, and that is the sort of thinking that is necessary. I think that a competent body to give our Ministers, and Cabinet in general, advice in the State's interests, is very necessary. It might be thought that perhaps a wise thing would be to have the heads of the various departments sit together and do this job, but I do not think this would work. I know there is consultation at the present time among heads of departments. That is very necessary and good, but I think there always will be departmental loyalties and, for all I know, perhaps departmental jealousies, and I think it is better to have a superior body, as an advisory body only.

These people would not have the power to say, "No, this is no good." They would be the people who would carry out the necessary survey and say, "Yes, this is excellent, but we would suggest some addition, or some change, or some modification, because we see it on a broader scale in relation to the State rather than as an isolated unit," or whatever it may be.

I think that after this committee had been operating for some time, vetting all major projects, they would develop the information that could allow them to move into an initiating capacity. There are so many things that need to be looked at in this State from the over-all point of view. There is the question of power and its use. There seems to be current thinking that there should be a new power-station in Central Queensland. It would be easy to say, "We will have a power-station," but where is it to go? There may be many considerations under various heads and I think such a matter is bigger than a Government department. It is more than a power decision. It requires planning far beyond the question of a power-station and power-lines. That is the sort of thing these people could investigate.

I think the Barrier Reef, for instance, is something that must be taken into consideration by some competent authority. What is to happen to it? I understand that somebody has applied for a licence to mine some of the dead reef. This should not be a decision for a mining warden. That would be ridiculous. There are many considerations to be given to this, well beyond the ability of a mining warden to understand. This requires scientific information and much knowledge that is not generally available.

There is the question of drilling for oil off our shores. Here again the question will rise, "Can we use the reef as a platform?" The platform is an expensive part of this undertaking. What damage would oil do to our valuable reef? That is a big problem that somebody has to handle, and I feel that a committee of this nature, with the background and knowledge of its members and the knowledge they can draw to themselves, could handle problems such as this.

There is also the question of port development in this State, which I think is being handled generally in a piecemeal fashion. I feel there is competition between ports and money is being expended at this very moment which perhaps is not justified, because there is no authoritative body to examine the over-all situation.

The State as a whole and its industries of the future must be considered, as must also the great mineral resources in the North-west. A committee such as I suggest could undertake surveys of this nature and prepare proper information for the development of the State.

There are things happening today to which we could take great exception. Timber is coming from Malaya to Darwin, yet we have in North Queensland a timber industry that is starving. For some reason or other we seem to be unable to do anything to get our timber out of that part of the State. All the ships are full by the time they get to North Queensland. Cement and fertiliser are coming from Japan to Darwin, yet nobody does anything about it. A lot of these things should be investigated.

What is the ultimate use of the wallum country? This is a particularly interesting question, one that has not been answered. We are looking at grazing at the present time. Forestry is very important. Who is to make the decision whether some of the wallum land should go to forestry or grazing, or be put to some other use? It could be said that this is purely a matter for the Department of Primary Industries. I say, "No." Bigger considerations enter into it. Our thinking has to be broader than just a consideration for the immediate future.

I should like to think that any major project was first looked at by a committee of the type I have suggested so that we know that anything done at this moment

will be done by the method that is most conducive to the further development of this State.

I think probably the best example of a body of this nature is the National Capital Development Commission in Canberra, which is very effective. Nothing of major importance is done without its being involved. We should learn from this and appoint a similar committee at this stage in an advisory capacity to ensure that all major decisions are made only after consideration from the point of view of the State.

The next subject I mention may surprise a number of hon. members. I have done a considerable amount of reading in recent times about the Parliamentary Commissioner. Many people would feel that there is no need for an ombudsman in a place like Queensland or, for that matter, in Australia. I was rather interested to read the history of the Parliamentary Commissioner, as I prefer to call him, and the part he plays. He does not cut across the activities of Parliament at all. He assists the parliamentary system. We know that there are many individual grievances, some of which are handled by members of Parliament and the relevant departments. Of course, there are legal remedies, but they are not always availed of. The greater the Government activity—this is becoming greater all the time—in our every-day life and in our business life, and the more a welfare State we become, the greater are the possibilities for individual grievances, because there are greater discretionary powers.

Occasionally there can be abuse or unwise use of power. Thus, problems arise which require unravelling and decisions have to be made. Only recently we had the situation with the Brisbane City Council where there was an abuse of power or, shall we say, an unwise use of power, as was proved by the report of the Brisbane City Council Subdivision Use and Development of Land Commission. Had there been a person such as a Parliamentary Commissioner, handling both State and local government matters, all this would have been prevented. Perhaps in the early stages, when people felt they had been denied their rights, their cause would have been presented to such a person. He would have looked into the complaints and decided whether they contained some substance, and something would have been done about it.

Similarly, we know full well in our own field what happens when people feel that perhaps in some areas they have not been treated as they would have wished. We know what is open to us. We write to the Minister, or approach him. He investigates the matter through his department, and obviously he will end up with the person originally involved in the problem. Back comes the answer from the person involved, or his superior, and we are told, "This matter has been investigated and we find

no reason for any worry. The official concerned has used his discretion in the proper way and everything in the garden is lovely."

It is true that on many occasions the department realises that another approach should be made. This would be where the Parliamentary Commissioner would play his part. He would open the file for reconsideration at the administrative level, which is so necessary.

Mr. Hanlon: And the administrative officer knows that that power is there.

Mr. CHINCHEN: That is very important.

We know that in nearly every case departmental officers do their job correctly and well, and there are no problems. However, there are occasional problems and we will get more of them because of the diversity of departmental activities; more and more people will come into this field and will want to know where to go.

Sweden was the first country to have such a person appointed by Parliament. This is not a new idea. If anyone is interested in this matter there are many good books concerning it that I have read. I should say that the book by Geoffrey Sawer titled "Ombudsman" contains an excellent record of the history of what these people have done. It is a small book, easily read, but it deals with an extremely important subject.

This is a momentous matter. I do not say that we should hurry into it at this moment, but our people are important and their rights and liberties are extremely important. This is a means by which they can obtain their rights, because their case is taken up by this person. They do not have to prove anything. They simply say, "This is the situation."

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. CHINCHEN: I have no right to delve into problems such as these people have. I take them to the Minister.

Mr. Carey: This man would have more rights than a member of Parliament.

Mr. CHINCHEN: Not more rights, but different rights. He is appointed by Parliament to act for Parliament in a certain capacity.

Mr. Hanlon: The same as the Auditor-General, in a different context.

Mr. CHINCHIN: Yes, in an entirely different context. Furthermore, he represents the Parliament.

I cannot say when this type of person was first appointed but, going back to 200 or 300 B.C., in China, and in the Roman Republic, people identical with those I am advocating were appointed. In the modern world such a man was first appointed in Sweden, in 1809.

The book that I have referred to says—

"His main function has come to be the receipt of complaints of maladministration from citizens, the investigation of

such complaints (with full access to officials and their files) and, if he thinks the complaint justified the making of representations to the official and department concerned with a view to righting the wrong. He has no power to overrule any official decision, and will only rarely question the way in which a discretionary power has been exercised if it was clearly within the ambit of the relevant power. . . . Also, besides acting on complaints, he carries out a continuous chance-sample inspection of departments and authorities at work."

Because of Sweden's experience, Finland decided in 1919 to appoint a similar gentleman.

The article continues—

"For example, the Danish Ombudsman can ensure the provision of free legal aid for a citizen who he thinks has some chance of successfully asserting a legal claim against the government or an official. He is expressly directed to draw Parliament's attention to defects in existing laws, which brings him into another problem area in which Australian progress has been patchy—systematic law reform."

We badly need a law reform committee but we have not got one. A person such as this, dealing with the public, will, in the interests of individual people, find weaknesses in the system, and that is all to the good.

Such persons were appointed in Denmark in 1953, in Norway in 1961, and in New Zealand in 1962. Since 1800 there has been a Council of State in France. It is in the form of a court and handles similar problems. A Council of State appeals to me very much because a person could approach it knowing that it is a court of officials considered to be the top in the law profession. It is extremely important to the French people.

After describing the Council of State, this book records—

"The Council of State has developed varying procedures to deal with different types of case. Provided a citizen acts within two months of a grievance arising, he can initiate a petition, without need for any intervention by lawyers, at a cost equivalent to about £5. The Council's inspectors then go straight to the local or central department involved and ascertain the facts as seen there, in a manner very similar to that of the Scandinavian Ombudsmen, and if the complaint is at once seen to be justified, remedial action often follows forthwith. If, however, the official or department responsible for the matter of the complaint is not inclined to reconsider or make amends, the inspectors make contact with the petitioner in order to complete their report; the petitioner can employ a lawyer independently and place evidence, etc., before the Council, or can leave it entirely to the inspector to complete a statement of the case, and eventually the

matter is determined by one of the specialized judicial sections of the Council, with no further cost to the petitioner."

The Court in effect takes the interest of the petitioner to heart, ferrets out the information, and makes a decision. That is entirely different from the attitude, "That is our decision. You fight it and try to break it down."

If a person feels he has a grievance he has this outlet to which he can go to have his case examined, and, if the discretionary use of power is used wrongly, an immediate remedy is available and the wrong is righted. This is of vital importance. Individuals suffer great misfortune because of small problems, and they lose time because of the difficulties involved.

These things could be happening in State departments. I do not think they are, because I hear of very few cases. When a departmental investigation is made relative to a police matter we are told, "An investigation has been made by a senior inspector and no further action will be taken." I have had three or four cases which I have put before the Minister. I feel that a correct investigation has been made and that a correct decision has been given. But it does not only have to be done correctly; it must appear to be done correctly.

Police investigating police is not the answer. What I am suggesting is that the matter should be put before this person, who would go to the department and have a look at the position, speak to one of two people, and find the answer. The person concerned would be happier if it was done that way.

Mr. Carey: If you were the Minister in charge of a department, would you be happy to have an ombudsman go into—

Mr. CHINCHEN: Very happy indeed. These are people of great intellect, and are selected very carefully.

We read recently that the ombudsman in New Zealand is apparently an excellent man, which indeed he would have to be to do this type of work. A person in such a position would have to be interested in Governments, Government departments, and the people, and would always have to be looking for the correct and honest answers to problems. Those in these positions do that sort of thing well.

Mr. Carey: When you were manager of the Ford company—

Mr. CHINCHEN: That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. Carey: I am merely trying to ask a question. When you were manager of the Ford company, did you want somebody coming in and inspecting everything you did?

Mr. CHINCHEN: When people came from head office, whether they were from sales, service, or any other branch of operations, they had every right to look into all those things. If a complaint went to head office, they had every right to investigate it. There was no problem there.

Mr. Carey: But this is the head office of the State.

Mr. CHINCHEN: This office is an adjunct to Parliament; it is a parliamentary appointment. The task of such a man would be to see that things we want done are done as we want them done. I see nothing wrong with that. Some years ago I could see no reason for such an appointment; today I can.

Mr. O'Donnell: You want someone from your own Government.

Mr. CHINCHEN: It has nothing to do with the Government at all. That is a very foolish statement. If the Labour Party ever got into power, such a man would certainly be needed. I am merely saying that because there are gaps in the administrative law and, because of the cost factor, things that need correction are not brought forward, there should be someone able to rectify misuses of power or discretion. I think most hon. members will agree that, with the appointment of the right person, this could be done easily and to the satisfaction of the people in general.

The functions of the Parliamentary Commissioner, as he is designated in New Zealand, are expressed in this way—

"The principal function of the Commissioner shall be to investigate any decision or recommendation made (including any recommendation made to a Minister of the Crown), or any act done or omitted, relating to a matter of administration and affecting any person or body of persons in his or its personal capacity, in or by any of the Departments or organisations named in the Schedule to this Act, or by any officer, employee or member thereof in the exercise of any power or function conferred on him by any enactment."

That is the description in the New Zealand Act of the work of this man.

This is the procedure in New Zealand—

"Complaints must be in writing and a fee of £1 paid; there is discretion to waive the fee. On receipt of the written complaint, the Ombudsman considers it to see if it is on its face within his power and not fit for discretionary rejection; he then sends it to the permanent head of the relevant department or organisation for his comments. This often leads to immediate remedial action. If it does not, the Ombudsman obtains relevant files, interrogates any officials he thinks fit, obtains any further information he needs from complainant and sees the latter's documents and, if relevant, witnesses, and can at any time consult a relevant Minister.

He has power to summon witnesses compulsorily and examine on oath. No government documents or information can be kept from him unless disclosure is certified by the Attorney-General to be prejudicial to security, defence, international relations or police detection, or would disclose Cabinet or Cabinet Committee deliberations or proceedings. Investigations are private. There is no general right on the part of anyone to be heard by the Ombudsman, but before making any report or recommendation injurious to any department, organisation or individual he must give the affected department, etc., a hearing."

That is the whole question. It is a question of this man's ability to go right into the department and sort things out in the interests of the citizens. In nine cases out of 10 he would have power to see the thing through, but in the tenth case regulations might have to be changed.

A Government Member: Could he control a local authority?

Mr. CHINCHEN: Local authorities could be investigated, as they are in France. That could be done in Brisbane. Matters could be investigated if they reached a certain stage.

I raise this matter because I think it is worthy of consideration. It is working in other areas, and it has a purpose. I think it would help considerably in a number of instances that would come to your mind, Mr. Dean, and be within your experience. Although I know that the Premier has said on occasions that we have 78 ombudsmen here, I do not think that is correct. I do not think I have the powers that this man has. They are not granted to me.

Mr. Carey: You agree that he would have powers equal to those of a royal commissioner?

Mr. CHINCHEN: That is not true. He has considerable power, if he wishes to exercise it, to summon people to give evidence in the interests of the individual.

Mr. Carey: Is not that a small royal commission?

Mr. CHINCHEN: The hon. member can describe it as he wishes. I make the point because I think the matter is worthy of consideration and future discussion in this Chamber.

There is another matter that I think is of great importance because it causes serious hardship to individuals. We are all aware, I think, of the hardship created for individuals by the red lines drawn on maps as a result of the Wilbur Smith survey. Although it is known that many of the proposed roads might be half a mile away from where they are indicated on the map, the map was circulated and published. As a result of that, certain properties have become unsaleable,

and that is creating problems. In my opinion, there should be some method of preventing local authorities, or State Government departments for that matter, from publishing plans showing that they propose to resume private property unless they are obliged to buy the property concerned within a reasonable period.

On 12 May this year, the Brisbane City Council published in "The Courier-Mail" a plan showing in great detail almost 2,000 acres of land that would be involved in a park and recreation area project. Much of that land is in my electorate, and one young man there who almost had his farm sold—he wished to buy a bigger farm farther out—now cannot sell it. He went to the Brisbane City Council and asked, "How long will this be?" He was told, "It might be 10 years or 15 years, mate. I can't help you." That was as far as he got. Another man rang me and said he had been in touch with the council. They said to him, "We can't help you. We are taking over a little bit of it. We don't know when the rest will be taken over."

I think the scheme is a first-class scheme, but I do not think it should be announced unless the council is willing to take over the land. Some means should be evolved to prevent this sort of thing happening and a number of people being placed at a great disadvantage.

Mr. Dewar interjected.

Mr. CHINCHEN: If there is a willingness to settle in a reasonable time the owners must get a reasonable amount for it, according to the laws of resumption. But if a property is not going to be resumed for 15 or 20 years and the person concerned cannot sell it, it will be heartbreaking for him. I do not know how the difficulty can be overcome, but I think announcing long-range programmes of this type is entirely wrong. If they are promoted, there must be a willingness on the part of the authority concerned to take over the land within three, four or five years.

In conclusion, I compliment the Treasurer on a first-class Financial Statement. It augurs well for the State in the next 12 months and for the future.

Mrs. JORDAN (Ipswich West) (5.50 p.m.): I rise to support the Leader of the Opposition in his criticism of the State Budget and of many aspects of Government policy. I know that many people in my electorate are far from happy about Government actions in relation to the Railway Department which have had, and are continuing to have, a detrimental effect on employment at the present time, and which do not augur well for future prospects in Ipswich.

There is also much concern on the question of education at all its levels and in terms of both teachers and students. There is

further concern about the small allocation of Housing Commission homes for the civilian population of Ipswich, for, although the number of Commission homes would seem to be quite high, they are almost entirely allotted to Air Force personnel.

I will deal with these points as I proceed, but before I deal with the main points in my speech I should like to make some remarks on the dispute that has arisen at Ipswich between the Fire Brigade Board and the firemen there, a dispute which has boiled up over an order to firemen to do domestic work in the officers' quarters. This dispute has gone on for over a week now and is continuing to build up. Firemen were suspended because they would not do this work; auxiliary firemen who were called in were also suspended; sub-station firemen who were called in to do the work have also been suspended; and only officers remain to carry out the work should a fire occur. I know, too, that remarks have been made that if these firemen, in an emergency, go to a fire, they will be pushed off the fire-engine.

I feel that the position that has arisen is one for concern. Discussions have been held between officials of the United Firefighters' Union and the secretary of the Fire Brigade Board, and certain agreements have been made. The men did return to work after being given certain guarantees and undertakings, but, since then, there has been constant pin-pricking which has again resulted in a cessation of work.

Perhaps there may be faults on both sides, but from what I have heard, and from analysing newspaper reports, there is much evidence of inconsistency in statements given to the newspapers by the secretary of the board. Both sides in this dispute—board members and union officials—are respectable citizens and people who have previously believed in doing the job that each is put there to do. I believe the matter was supposed to be referred to the Industrial Registrar early last year, but, on inquiry by union officials, this was found to be not so. However, I think that this was done as late as yesterday.

Even so, I am concerned because, even if the matter is dealt with by the Industrial Registrar, the men themselves will not have a chance of putting their case as the United Firefighters' Union, of which they are members, will not be heard, because the award under which they work has been one of agreement between the board and the A.W.U. The A.W.U., of which they are not members, will be the union that is heard. That union is not in the dispute. One can readily understand that a conference on these lines could be, and probably would be, abortive.

Other branches of this union are discussing the point that Ipswich firemen should not alone bear the brunt of this dispute wherein firemen are being asked to contravene their award, as they see it, by doing domestic work in the officers' quarters, the point over which the dispute has arisen. All branches feel that the Ipswich men have a just cause. The whole matter, because of this feeling throughout the various branches of the union, which covers 50 per cent. of the firemen in Queensland, could very easily escalate and affect a big area of southern Queensland. Therefore I appeal to the Minister for Labour and Tourism, whose portfolio covers fire brigades, to step in, in an endeavour to iron out the dispute before it gets really out of hand.

I sincerely believe, in view of what has happened so far in the dispute, that some statements by the secretary of the board have been untrue, and do not stand up to investigation. Guarantees given to officers of the union were not adhered to. The union representatives were told by the secretary of the board that the board had met last Thursday, when in reality, the board did not meet last Thursday and in actual fact did not meet until last night, that is, Wednesday night, a date which did not suit some members of the board.

We have seen a lot of backing and filling and statements in the local Press to the effect that the men had not been ordered to clean out the officers' quarters, yet a week ago the same secretary made a statement to the Press that he had ordered the men to clean out the officers' quarters. This cleaning out involves only the polishing of a very small piece of floor in the quarters in the new fire brigade building. In the old building the men were not asked to do this, but so that everything would be spick and span for the official opening of the very attractive new building the men agreed to do all sorts of work over and above their award. So it seems that this has grown out of a very small thing. The men feel that they have been treated unjustly in being asked to continue to break their award, so this small matter has built up into a rather difficult situation and, as I said, the trouble could escalate. In the interests of the firemen and the board I think the Minister should look into the matter.

At 1 o'clock today a rather fiery meeting of the union was held at Ipswich. At that meeting a resolution was passed they they have a 24-hour stoppage again as from the meeting time. Following that an amendment was moved that this action be deferred until the secretary of the Ipswich branch of the union discussed the matter with the State Management Committee on Monday. That is how the situation stands at the present time.

Mr. Miller: Is this all over this piece of floor?

Mrs. JORDAN: Yes. It seems a small matter but it could mean that all firemen in South-Eastern Queensland will be affected. I

feel it is important that the Minister should intervene in this dispute to prevent it from developing into a major dispute that could be a threat to the people in the southern part of the State.

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

Mrs. JORDAN: I will return to some of my initial points. First I will refer to the railways and the effect of Government policy on the railway workers and their families. This, to Ipswich, is a vital question and I have spoken about it on a number of occasions in this Assembly.

When I spoke of the effects of Government policy in my maiden speech last year there were some who thought I was being pessimistic, but time has shown that what I said was true—even truer than I then indicated or thought. I was pleased to hear my Leader, the Leader of the Opposition, speak on this matter on Tuesday, to add his protest on the redundancy question, and to express the opinion that he, too, believed that more railway work should be given to railway workshops rather than to outside and even foreign interests. This matter is of much concern to me and the people of my area, particularly the letting of contracts outside this country. I am a great believer in supporting the industries of Ipswich wherever and whatever possible and also in supporting the campaign to "Buy Queensland made". The latter is something that the Government itself advises but does not carry out to as great an extent as it could. It could do much more than it does in direct Government buying for its various departments of Queensland produced machinery, equipment and school textbooks, just to mention a few things.

There are items of machinery that are made in Queensland which are equal in quality to similar items made in the South, and they are sold at a cheaper price. One firm in Ipswich, Scotts, makes a very good grader, the Goodwin grader, of which the Main Roads Department has bought a few, as have some local authorities. I believe the Government could push the buying of equipment made in Queensland much more than it is doing.

Last Saturday, "The Queensland Times", the Ipswich local paper, produced a tabloid supplement to publicise buying better in Ipswich. This supplement is worthy of much commendation both for its layout and content, and on the initiative displayed in the publication of such a supplement. Among the excellent contributions by prominent people and by organisations were articles by the Premier, the Minister for Transport, the Minister for Industrial Development, and the Minister for Mines. It was indeed pleasing to read their articles. I felt there would have to be a lot of hope—hope that they would back their words with actions—to maintain Ipswich as an industrial centre.

I will now refer hon. members to the article by the Minister for Transport, Mr. Knox, under the heading, "The Railways—A multi-million industry for Ipswich", in which he said—

"Ipswich has been known as a railway town ever since the first railway line was built in Queensland. Today Ipswich is more a railway town (or correctly a railway city) than ever, with an annual railway payroll of \$6,434,000 for its 3,182 railway employees.

"The importance of this huge amount to the economy of Ipswich is apparent and when the usual formula of one wage-earner maintaining a family of four is applied, it will be realised that the Railways are also an important factor in maintaining the city's population at its present level."

At a later stage he said—

"The workshops today cover 56 acres, with 13.6 acres of roofed building. In addition another workshop complex has been developed at Redbank for the major overhauls of the growing diesel-electric locomotive fleet.

"However, by far the larger workforce is maintained at the Ipswich workshops, which still remain the State's largest single railway installation with 2,787 employees and facilities for the construction, repair and maintenance of all component parts of railway rolling-stock, including the newer type of steel waggons, air-conditioned passenger carriages and suburban carriages."

Again at a later stage he said—

"Although the manufacture of new steam locomotives has ceased, repairs to those still in service are still carried out at the Ipswich workshops. A modern new sawmill is currently under construction within the workshops area.

"The workshops at Redbank are capable of handling up to 60 locomotives a year for overhaul. The latest addition to the equipment is a new load-testing shed for locomotives after undergoing major overhaul.

"An important feature of railway workshop employment is the wide variety of trades available, particularly for the employment and training of apprentices.

"The Railways employ some 760 apprentices, including 102 enrolled as the current year's intake. More than half of this intake are employed at the Ipswich Railway Workshops."

Mr. Wallis-Smith: Who said that?

Mrs. JORDAN: Mr. Knox.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: What date is that?

Mrs. JORDAN: Last Saturday.

It would seem then, from that article, that he has realised the importance of the railways to Ipswich. But apparently that

is as far as he goes. I hope that the Minister has some pride in the department under his control and that he is really concerned with the adverse effects this modernisation is having on the railway worker and his family, and on the community in Ipswich. People come first, before machines, and we must consider the human effect. I hope that the Minister will consider the human effect. Without people there would be no call for machines, and scientific and technical advances would be useless; in fact they would not be required at all.

In the supplement there is also an article by the Premier. It is headed "The Largest Provincial City Work Force". He said—

"Ipswich, the oldest provincial city in Queensland, today is the prosperous, progressive and economic centre of a rich primary producing and industrial area.

"The people, industries and vast natural resources of Ipswich and the West Moreton district are making a valuable contribution to the economy and the development of Queensland.

"Since the State's first railway line was opened from Ipswich to Grandchester in 1865, Ipswich has been an important trading centre and the main outlet for the rural wealth of its highly productive surrounding district.

"Traditional industries have been coal mining, the State Government's railway workshops and wool milling.

"Today the value of factory production in Ipswich is the highest of any provincial city in Queensland.

"Industrial production added \$23,300,000 to the State's economy last year compared with \$16,400,000 in Townsville \$11,400,000 in Rockhampton, \$13,800,000 in Toowoomba and \$8,700,000 in Bundaberg.

"Ipswich also has the largest work force of any provincial city in Queensland with more than 6,700 workers receiving \$13,700,000 in wages and salaries."

It would seem that the Premier, too, is aware of the contribution that Ipswich workers have made, and are making, to this State's economy, yet the Government, by its actions, is depleting the things of which he spoke.

In the light of Ipswich's contribution to the economy of the State, surely the Government should adopt a more sympathetic attitude to the claims of the unions on the redundancy issue, on which the member for Toowoomba East spoke in relation to his city. I hope that some effort will be made by the Government and the Minister for Transport, in consultation with the unions, to bring some relief to the families which today are suffering insecurity, uneasiness, and financial loss as a result of redundancy and the Government's action in closing some branch railway lines. I make a special appeal to the Government and the Minister for

Transport for a more sympathetic and humane outlook on this question and proof, by their actions, that they were sincere in their eulogistic references to Ipswich in this supplement which was published last Saturday and to which apparently they were happy to contribute.

I turn now to the subject of education. Many other members on this side of the Chamber have spoken on it, and I do not intend to deal with its many aspects. However, I must place on record my belief that many dedicated teachers are doing their utmost to educate our youth in spite of the many difficulties they encounter such as shortage of classrooms, teaching equipment and aids; large classes; and a poor salary range compared with salaries in other States and countries.

Let me say that I am pleased that at last some wage justice is to be given to women teachers as a result of a recent judgment of the Industrial Commission which raises their salaries, in yearly increments over four years, to those of male teachers. Equal pay will give women some encouragement to follow a profession to which they are particularly suited, and in which they can make an especial contribution to the moulding of future generations.

There are in my electorate many school-children who have to move from State to State. I refer in particular to the children of Air Force personnel stationed at Amberley. I find that there is much concern among these parents at the effect on their children of the differing education standards and curricula in the various States. Very many children are in this situation, as will be realised when we take into account not only all the Air Force bases throughout Australia but those of the other arms of the defence forces. In addition to servicemen who are subject to posting, civilians who work in banks, post offices, and other branches of commerce are required to move from State to State in their employment. One school alone in my electorate, namely, the Leichhardt State School, has more than 400 children of Air Force personnel. And then there are the children who attend the school at the Amberley Air Force base. Most of the children attending that school are children of Air Force personnel.

Because of the things I have mentioned, I think there is a need to attempt to achieve some uniformity between the States in standards and curricula. I realise that it would not be easy to do so, particularly as Queensland spends less per head of population on education than does any other Australian State; but, having in mind the principles involved, I ask the Minister for Education to give the matter some attention.

I turn next to the subject of opportunity schools. In answer to a question relative to my own district that I put to the Minister yesterday, I was told that there is a waiting

list of 36 at the Opportunity School at Ipswich. When one takes into consideration the waiting lists at other opportunity schools throughout Queensland, it is obvious that quite a number of children are waiting for this form of specialised education. Make no mistake about it, Mr. Hooper, the opportunity schools do a wonderful job for the children. When we see some of the work the children do, some of the articles they make, and the self-confidence that they gain as a result of this schooling, that becomes obvious. One Saturday afternoon I saw a mannequin parade at the Ipswich Opportunity School. Young girls modelled clothes that they had made themselves at the school, and it was very heartening to see the very able way in which they did the modelling and to see the pride on their faces.

I think it is a crying shame that children have to wait to go to opportunity schools. Some of them have to wait so long that they can never attend; they are too old. In my opinion, this is one aspect of education that should take precedence over all others. Bright children receive every encouragement and all sorts of things are done for them; but urgent consideration should be given to the plight of those who need the help of opportunity schools. Again I ask the Minister to try to expand the service so that children who need specialised teaching in opportunity schools can receive it.

I again wish to stress the need for increased technical education to be made available in more centres in this State. That need is fast snowballing as the State develops. That it has assumed extreme importance is highlighted by the increasing extent to which the Commonwealth Government is making available special assistance grants that do not have to be matched by the States.

Again I say that technical education should not be concentrated only in Brisbane and certain other centres. Yesterday I asked the Minister for Education a question relative to the establishment of an institute of technology in Ipswich in the foreseeable future. The answer was, "No", that Brisbane would serve Ipswich's needs for years to come—the old story for Ipswich in many things! Many students in Ipswich who would attend an institute of technology or of higher technical learning do not wish to travel to Brisbane—indeed, cannot travel to Brisbane—and, although they are interested, are being lost at a time when they are needed so much for the development of the State.

There has been much discussion in the local Press about the establishment of an institute of technology in Ipswich, and there has been quite a bit of support for its establishment. Indeed, it has been strongly supported by the headmaster of the Ipswich Boys' Grammar School, Mr. Heath, who said that there were solid reasons for creating an institute at Ipswich which could offer full-time courses leading to diplomas in such

fields as engineering and industrial chemistry. He said that because of the industrial strength of the district, and its population, there would be adequate numbers of students to warrant the establishment of an institute of technology in Ipswich. If Ipswich is not to get an institute for many years—apparently it will be many, many years—then there should be some expansion of the courses now available at the Ipswich Technical College. The Government should provide for and give greater encouragement to lads who desire to do something higher than a trade but who either do not want to or perhaps have not the ability to undergo a university or full-time diploma course. This could be done in centres such as Ipswich, Maryborough, Townsville, Cairns, Mackay, Mt. Isa, and perhaps other centres, and would offer greater opportunities to lads throughout the State.

I have spoken on this matter a number of times before, but because I come from an industrial city perhaps I am more conscious of the need for this than are some other members. Indeed, I feel that I must express appreciation of the action of the Minister for Labour and Tourism, Mr. Herbert, in calling a conference of representatives of employer and employee organisations, and Government departments, to discuss job opportunities and to encourage the provision of the maximum number of apprenticeship opportunities for school-leavers at the end of this year. It was a very good move and I hope that his efforts will be rewarded with good results. Such a campaign should be supported and I feel that the trade union movement will support it heartily.

Mr. Hanlon: I hope that the Government also supports it.

Mrs. JORDAN: I agree. In my Address-in-Reply speech I spoke on this matter of apprentices not being trained in sufficient numbers and of opportunities not being available to enough lads in private industry. I said that I felt that the position had reached crisis proportions already. I am very pleased, therefore, that the Minister has seen fit to call this conference and I hope that the Government will be right behind him in his efforts. I repeat that the trade union movement will be and I hope that private employers also will be.

I now turn to the question of housing, a contentious and worrying matter in Ipswich where there is some concern over the high allocation and provision of homes for Service personnel as against the small number made available for civilians. I have no cry against Service people getting homes. Provision must be made for them as for everyone else and at Amberley, on the outskirts of Ipswich, these people and their families must be housed. In such places extra homes are required for these reasons and I believe that more homes, pro rata, should be built by the Housing Commission for rental, to cater for this moving population and for the local people as well.

There are quite a number in our community who do not wish to buy their own homes—for whom, indeed, it would be foolish to attempt to buy a home of their own because they move about so much. That is the case particularly with Service personnel, so I feel that in such places the Government should provide extra Housing Commission rental homes.

Inala is the place suggested to private citizens when they apply for a Housing Commission home, because they do not often become available in Ipswich. But everyone does not want to go to Inala. The distance to travel to jobs, transport costs and a number of other factors are reasons for the reluctance of some Ipswich people to accept Housing Commission homes at Inala. With Ipswich's expanding population there is a need to increase the number of Commission rental homes to cope with the requirements of those who cannot, for one reason or another, buy a home of their own.

It seems now to be the thing to provide Housing Commission homes for the workers employed by companies in places where there is explosive development, to the detriment of those in areas which develop gradually. Funds go to build homes in these places of explosive development, which means that other places get less, because, as we all know, there is only so much money available. This seems most unfair. As my Leader said in this debate, the employees of favoured companies need no priority or deposit but get a Commission home as part of their job. This is extremely unfair to those other people in other parts of the State who are waiting for homes. The waiting lists for rental homes are growing longer every week, and a person must have a high priority even to get his name on a list let alone get a house. A long waiting time is involved.

On this matter of housing, particularly on behalf of old people who need some help and care, I make an appeal to the Government to set up a home for old people—a second "Eventide" as it were—on the Ipswich side of Brisbane to cater for the people from the south and south-west hinterland. "Eventide" has now grown to such a size that it has become a bit unwieldy and impersonal. Although it offers wonderful help and service I feel that smaller institutions give a more home-like environment. A second such home in the area I suggested would be more convenient to those in the West Moreton area, around Beaudesert, and all of the areas with access to the southern and western side of Brisbane. I have heard many people complain about having to travel through Brisbane and its heavy traffic to get to "Eventide". I think there are now good reasons for the establishment of a further home as I have suggested. I leave that thought with the Government in the hope that it will meet with its support, and that such a home will come to fruition in the not far distant future.

I will now deal with more general matters. First I shall refer to development. Certainly there has been some development in Queensland, especially with coal exports, minerals, natural gas, oil, and even explosive development with housing in some places. But it is well accepted that these are fortuitous circumstances which have not been peculiar to Queensland or, indeed, to Australia. As a result of these circumstances the Government has become smug and self-satisfied, and takes unto itself the full credit, although much of the ground work was done by a Labour Government.

Change is all around us, particularly in the countries to our north. World power blocs have seen great changes, and these will continue to emerge whether we like it or not. Australia must adapt herself to these changes and, of dire necessity, must hasten development and expansion, and must as quickly as she can become as self-sufficient as possible. Alterations in British policies, both in defence and trade, have affected this country and this State, and will do so more and more.

The growing impact of Asian development and of Asian politics is now of vital importance to many of our attitudes and our decisions. This area will more and more converge on our thinking and, indeed, the time has arrived when we will have to re-think many of our ingrained concepts and traditional attitudes and make adjustments to suit the needs of this era and its requirements as changes and new discoveries or new techniques occur.

Queensland cannot afford to be left behind; yet on all sides we have evidence that Queensland is lagging behind the other States. There can be little doubt about that; statistics support it.

In his Budget speech the Treasurer expressed dissatisfaction with the Federal Government's treatment in a number of instances. That was just two days before the Capricornia by-election which did not improve either the Federal Liberal-Country Party Government's image or the Queensland Government's image, as the results showed decisively. Indeed, I am sure that many of the Government supporters were very concerned about the Treasurer's castigation of the Federal Government at that time. Mr. Askin, the Premier of New South Wales, made a similar telling contribution at about the same time even though all three Governments were Liberal-Country Party Governments. It would seem to be a case of looking after your own hide first and letting the other fellow look after himself. It is certainly a very positive indication of Commonwealth-State relationships as Canberra's grip on the purse-strings tightens and the States get less and less pro rata.

No State is happy about the Commonwealth-States Financial Agreement, yet all the States continue to accept it even though

they put on quite an act of protest each year, saying that something should be done about the formula. Indeed, from all accounts, it would appear as if the Loan Council meetings have assumed the character of a Gilbertian performance with the Commonwealth trotting out the financial cake with recommended portions for each State, and the States protesting, some more volubly than others, and for diverse reasons. Then the Commonwealth alters the portions, or perhaps I should call them slices, and so the ritual proceeds, with no State happy about it. The same situation prevails each time, and each time all of the State Premiers return home flushed with victory after having forced more from the Commonwealth, or so they would have us believe. From time to time some adjustments are made in the formula but they are only new variations of the same theme—and not a very satisfactory theme.

Earlier this week we learned that the A.L.P. parliamentary leaders in all States, whether in Government or in opposition, had arranged a meeting in Adelaide on 4 and 5 November to discuss this very serious problem. That is concrete evidence of the A.L.P.'s concern at the financial impasse which it feels must be broken. Seemingly this action scared the Liberals into action on this question and now they, too, plan talks. Mr. Renshaw, the New South Wales Opposition Leader, said that the question was above party politics and if any worth-while change is to be made this must be so in every State.

Mr. Porter: The Liberal decision was taken early in September and announced in the Press throughout the State.

Mrs. JORDAN: The Labour Party decision was made quite some time ago but only hit the Press this week just as the Liberal Party decision hit the Press.

The A.L.P. parliamentary leaders in the States hope to come up with some proposition so that there may be complete understanding between the State and Federal Labour Parties on what financial assistance can be expected with Labour in government in both the Federal and State spheres. At least there will be a theme common to State and Federal Labour Parties and not a different theme as is now the case at each performance when the Loan Council meets. However, with both sides of the Parliaments throughout the Commonwealth now making moves on this matter we will see who is genuine about having a change and who is not, and I wait further developments.

Ever since the introduction of uniform taxation, a decision made necessary by the last war, and its retention by the Commonwealth Government after the battle for its continuance and its legality, the States have had to go along with the fact that the Commonwealth is dominant. They have had to rely for their chief source of finance

mainly on Commonwealth tax reimbursements or on special grants for special projects or for special reasons over and above the ordinary. And no matter how the formula is varied this State always seems to be the Cinderella.

The Premier is on record as saying recently that the 1965 variation of the formula, when Queensland was equated with South Australia, was too slow. He said that to bring Queensland's rate up to that of South Australia would have required an immediate increase of \$18,000,000 in Queensland's annual allocation. But, in fact, he continued, "We are only getting a progressive increase of \$2,000,000." I agree with him that that is not good enough for Queensland and that it is unjust.

The old tax reimbursement formula devised in 1946 quickly proved inadequate and, indeed, by the mid-1950's, many leading politicians, both Federal and State, felt the formula had outlived its usefulness. Queensland got harsh treatment under that formula and fared little better under the betterment factor which was included in 1959 and which applied for six years. This betterment factor was expressed as an amount per head of population for each State. The grant was increased, as those who were interested know, by 1.1 times the percentage increase in average wages during 1959-60 multiplied by the population as at 30 June, 1960, to determine the grant or reimbursement for the following year. This process was repeated in each year by the betterment factor. While it gave some increase it never quite caught up with the real requirements or factors involved.

This agreement was reviewed in 1965 and the betterment factor was increased to 1.2 per cent. because it did not give a big enough share to the States, and it was considered that the average increase in grants of 0.4 per cent., obtained previously was not enough. Then, latterly, the time-lag factor came into calculation. Previously there was always a time lag of nine months. But now the figure is adjusted according to the amount by which the wage level at 31 March, 1967, exceeded the level at 31 March, 1966, instead of from 30 June to 30 June. The variations in the formula become more and more complex and complicated, and it is little wonder that the scheme has become a morass and that even the theme is becoming lost. It could hardly be otherwise, whatever party was in Government.

That the States are dissatisfied and that the Treasurer finds he has to pass the buck and that he questions the action of the Commonwealth in allowing only a 5 per cent. increase in works and housing programmes for the States while the Commonwealth itself budgeted for a 9.3 per cent. increase in its own capital works apart from defence, is understandable. I see nothing wrong with uniform taxation. Indeed, it would be

ridiculous, even ludicrous, to reintroduce State taxation and so have one Federal and six State taxing authorities.

I think the time is overdue for a special conference between the Federal and State Governments to review completely, based on the needs of today and not those of British colonists a century ago, the whole reimbursement formula. Only when that is done will the State Government get justice in taxation reimbursement. It is time that the Loan Council ritual was altered, and the Queensland Government should take a strong lead in pressing for a complete reassessment.

I think it was the hon. member for Toowong who said the other day that it is the Federal Budget that has the major effect on the State and its economy, and that the State Budget is only a secondary consideration. I think all of us will agree with that statement. I go as far as to say that I think it must be obvious to every member of this Assembly, irrespective of the side on which he sits—and, indeed, to all responsible and thinking people—that in a country as vast and diverse as Australia the States should have more and more responsibility in their respective areas, not less and less, as the trend is now. Decentralisation needs to be a strong feature in planning, and the drift to the major cities has to be halted if we are to develop and make use of our natural assets.

Unless there is some reappraisal of the Commonwealth-States financial agreement, the cake will remain the same size and the States will continue to get too little of it. I am sure that every member of this Assembly, and every other thinking and responsible person, will now be hoping that at last some action will be more than merely contemplated and a new financial formula will be devised before the introduction of the next Budget.

I conclude by expressing the sincere hope that something worthwhile for Queensland, and indeed for the whole of Australia, will result before the end of this financial year.

Mr. **SHERRINGTON** (Salisbury) (7.58 p.m.): I would be praising the Budget if I said that it was bare, barren and bereft. The Financial Statement presented by the Treasurer is in keeping with all those presented by the Government during its ten years of office. Each of them has contained a sprinkling of Liberal pious political platitudes. In each Budget, including those in the days when Sir Thomas Hiley was Treasurer, one finds references to "record spending" in some sphere of Government activity. Surely it is only natural that each year there will be record spending by the Government when the gross national product is constantly rising.

Miserable though the hand-outs from Loan Council discussions have been, year after year more money has been available, and

if even one more dollar is spent in one year than in the preceding year the Treasurer says, "It will be a year of record spending." To me, that is nothing but a pious political platitude.

One would think that after 10 years of "record spending", at least the Government would have been able to keep pace with the demands of education in this State. That is why I say that the Budget is bare, barren and bereft. Hon. members have become used to meaningless phrases in Budgets; I think we would be disappointed if they did not contain phraseology similar to that which I have outlined.

The Treasurer's Financial Statement is a mass of contradictions. In it he refers to the unfair disadvantage that Queensland is under in comparison with the other States and draws attention to the difficulties that he and the Premier have at Loan Council discussions because of the reimbursement formula that is used in allocating moneys. If one looks at the Brisbane "Telegraph", of 16 August, 1967, one finds that the same Treasurer who came into this Chamber and complained about the financial arrangements had this to say when Mr. McMahon, the Federal Treasurer, introduced his Budget in the Federal Parliament—

"Mr. Chalk said that, appreciating the Federal Treasurer's problems, the Budget was 'a reasonably fair effort'.

"Mr. Chalk said he agreed with the efforts made by Mr. McMahon to cut back on departmental spending and direct more developmental work towards private enterprise."

Soon afterwards the Treasurer came into this Chamber and complained that one of the reasons why Queensland did not have the required number of teachers, adequate schools, and money for irrigation and water supply, was that the Federal Treasurer, whom he praised in one breath, had, by his miserable hand-out at the Loan Council, denied this State the right to obtain the loan money it so badly needed to push ahead with development.

I agree with the Treasurer when, in summing up on the Commonwealth-States financial arrangements, he said that the Commonwealth Government holds the purse-strings of government in Australia. These were his words—

"It is evident that any State desiring to improve its relative financial position faces the utmost difficulty. It is understandable that the States which do relatively better under the existing scheme are loath to surrender their present advantage. More and more the States are in the hands of the Commonwealth Government and are dependent on the good offices of that Government in improving their position."

I agree with that. If one is to accept the principle of federation, one must also accept the principle that the Government which has

the major responsibility for developing Australia as a whole is the Commonwealth Government. Anyone who is a good, loyal Australian and believes in federation must accept that.

Although I believe the Treasurer when he says that the States are more and more at the mercy of the Commonwealth Government, I would be more sympathetic towards him when he tried to explain away the shortcomings in his own Budget if he were to discourse on the wasteful expenditure and misuse of public money that is being indulged in by the present Commonwealth Government. We have already seen the costly process that the former Prime Minister, Sir Robert Menzies, went through to win the 1964 Federal election. As a pure political gimmick to win that election, he entered into a contract with the United States of America to buy F111 bombers, the cost of which has risen out of all proportion. He bought bombers that did not exist, that were only drawings on the drawing board, and already we have seen the tragic consequences with the cost rising steeply even before the plane has been proved in flight. It has already been found that this contract was undertaken merely as a gimmick to win the 1964 election.

Then, of course, we have the latest episode of the Holt Government in the scandalous waste of public money on the V.I.P. flight. With the Federal Government purchasing planes with a 60-passenger carrying capacity, is it any wonder that there is nothing left in the State Treasury for development when this sort of wasteful expenditure is going on.

Mr. Tooth: Are they the planes that are made available to the Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The Minister for Health is trying to come in on this, as he always does. If this is all fair and above board, why has it taken such a turning and twisting of arms before the Prime Minister is willing to disclose the actual cost to the public purse?

Let me sum it up in this way: I am reminded of that very old jingle that many of us used to recite when we were very young—

"Pat a cake, pat a cake, baker's man,
Bake me a cake as fast as you can."

With the Treasurer of Queensland in such difficulty, I could perhaps paraphrase that jingle as—

"Push ahead, push ahead, Gordon Chalk,
The State's economy slowed to a walk;
Haven't got a zack for a spending spree,
Harold Holt spent too much on the V.I.P."

That just about sums up the position from the point of view of this State relative to the wasteful spending by the Commonwealth Government on these planes. I believe there is a need for air transport for Commonwealth

Ministers, but I cannot see any necessity for any Commonwealth Minister or combination of Ministers to have a plane that will seat 60 passengers, taking into consideration their staff, close relatives and others who have enjoyed free flights on V.I.P. planes.

Is it any wonder there is no money for schools? Is it any wonder there is no money for irrigation and water supply? There is no doubt that the Federal Treasurer laid it down in no uncertain terms at the last Loan Council discussions that as far as he was concerned he was going to put a brake on public spending and leave it to the private sector to carry on developmental projects instead of allowing the Government to face up to its responsibility in supplying money for schools, and so on.

In the journal "Review" of the Institute of Public Affairs, this is said in discussing the Budget—

"1967-68 is likely to see an increasing upward pressure on the cost and prices structure which the Commonwealth Government will be fighting to contain. Its problems in this regard would certainly be intensified if some of the State Governments carried out their announced intentions of increasing their taxes and charges. If State Governments were to proceed too far in this direction it would contravene the Treasurer's desire that this year the expansion of the public section of the community should be restrained to leave more scope for the private sector."

In no uncertain terms the Treasurer, in his Financial Statement, lays down the same principle. It leaves me in no doubt that the Commonwealth Treasurer laid this very clearly on the line.

This Government would not want to increase taxation, because it is only about 17 months until the next State election. It would rather promote unemployment than try to raise additional money. Already various State departments have taken a pruning knife to their employees. The Government feels it is better to be unpopular with a few unemployed than to be unpopular with everyone by increasing taxation. If, by some unfortunate chance, we saw the return of this Government after the next election what would we see in the first Budget it produced after that?

Mr. Miller: What is the unemployment figure at the present moment?

Opposition Members: He doesn't know.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The last census showed that it was 1.8 per cent.

Mr. Miller: Do you think that is high?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The hon. member asks whether that is high. It might not be high to him, and it might not concern the other 98.2 per cent., but it is very high to the 1.8 per cent.

A Government Member: Jingle bells!

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Before I finish the next section of my speech there will not be too many jingle bells for hon. members opposite.

I have never seen such a transformation in the Country Party in all my life. From being a party of boundary-riders they have now emerged as a party of boundary-riggers. This is clearly demonstrated by the electoral rolls and the election results. Let us look at the Electoral Districts Bill covering the electoral redistribution in 1958. At that time the Premier advanced his reasons for the necessity to have a redistribution.

Mr. Wharton: Is this in the Budget?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The hon. member for Burnett wants to make sure that the effect of that electoral redistribution is maintained, because he is one Country Party member who got in here on the "grouter" as a result of the rigged boundaries.

During his discourse on why the redistribution was desirable at that time the Premier said—

"Eight of the metropolitan electorates are above the quota of 12,906 that was ascertained in accordance with the provisions of the Electoral Districts Act of 1949, some of them, notably Mt. Gravatt, to a very great and disproportionate extent in relation to other city electorates. In the metropolitan division there are 11 electorates below the quota."

I ask hon. members to bear those figures in mind. At that time there were eight electorates over the quota and 11 under the quota. The figures at 31 December, 1966, disclose that 19 seats in the metropolitan area are in excess of their quota and nine are under. If there was good reason for a redistribution in the metropolitan area in 1958, when that Bill was introduced, how much more need is there for a redistribution today on those figures?

I see that the "ginger group" are very silent on this. I know that in their own hearts they entirely agree with me, but they lack the guts to get up and say what I am saying. Under that legislation the provincial cities were included in a zone. Each of the 12 electorates in that zone now exceed their quota. Most notable are the electorates of Ipswich East, with 2,759, Toowoomba East, with 1,962, and Townsville South, with 2,845 over their quotas.

The really telling point comes out when we start delving into the Country Party seats. In the country zone, 27 seats exceed the quota and 11 seats are under the quota. Among the most notable of those exceeding the quota is Albert, with 3,979. This includes the Isle of Capri, which was thrown into the electorate in 1963 to ensure the return of the hon. member for Albert. This was virtually a cataclysm overnight. As if struck by a volcano, it disappeared from South Coast and reappeared in the electorate of Albert. Cook is 3,717 over, Cooroola 1,830 over,

Gympie 1,629 over, Logan 4,096 over, Landsborough, 1963 over, Murrumba, 5,419 over, Redcliffe 4,625 over, and South Coast 5,267 over, despite the unfortunate loss of the Isle of Capri.

Now let me turn to the country zoning. The most notable is Mulgrave, which is 1,428 under its quota. When talking in terms of 1,428 under quota, it is well to remember that the total enrolment is only 7,500. Hon. members will realise the magnitude in the deficiency in quota in that electorate. Condamine is 1,281 under. At this point I repeat from "Hansard" the Premier's statement that these electorates were designed to be fair to all parties.

Mr. Wharton: That is fair enough, too.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I ask the "Mayor of Bandy Wallop" this question: where is the fairness when an electorate such as Cook, our most northern electorate, embracing the Cape York Peninsula and the off-shore islands, has an enrolment of 12,184, 3,717 in excess of its quota, and there is the electorate of Bowen with 947 under, the electorate of Condamine with 1,281 under, and the electorate of Cunningham with 637 under?

To give a telling little comparison I refer to Ashgrove, Baroona, Chatsworth, Clayfield, Greenslopes, Hawthorne, Ithaca, Kurilpa, Merthyr, Norman, South Brisbane, Windsor and Yeronga—14 metropolitan seats—all of which have fewer voters than the electorate of Cook. Is that how the Government is distributing the electorates so that it is fair to all parties? Not only are there 14 electorates in the metropolitan area under quota, but Bulimba, Sandgate, Sherwood, Toowong and Wynnum are electorates with a few hundred voters over their quota. Despite all this, the "Mayor of Bandy Wallop" says that the electoral redistribution is fair.

All this is factual. It is not a flight of fancy from my imagination. It is taken from the State electoral rolls. While the Cook electorate has the tremendous number of more than 12,000 voters, Balonne has 6,967, Condamine 7,186, Cunningham 7,830, Lockyer 8,579 and Roma 8,751, just to mention a few of the small under-populated electorates, all of which, significantly, are held by Country Party members.

The truth of the matter is that taking all of this into consideration we find that the total voting for the major political parties in the 1966 State election was as follows: Labour, 350,245, successful in 26 seats, Liberal, 203,648, successful in 20 seats, and then come the boundary-riggers, the Country Party, 154,082, finishing up the major party in the House by winning 27 seats.

Each candidate, according to his political party, polled an average of 13,471 to be elected as an A.L.P. member, 10,182 to be elected as a Liberal member, and a lousy, miserable 5,707 to be sure of a seat as a Country Party member. Is it any wonder the Country Party is the major party in the House, and is it any wonder that in the

corridors and in the Liberal Party rooms there is this stirring discontent that Liberal members no longer want to be regarded as the junior partner and office boy in the Government coalition?

A Government Member interjected.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I am not worried. They can do what they like with my electorate and I will still win—and they know it. That is why they are frightened at this time. That is why there will not be any redistribution.

Let me put it really on the line. The Country Party will never agree to a redistribution because they know it would be political suicide. Only two parties in this Parliament can gain from a redistribution, namely, the A.L.P. and/or the Liberals. Make no mistake about that. I shall prove that later on and show just how cunningly the Act was "architected" to ensure that no matter how much the Liberals howl for a redistribution in this State, while the Country Party, with gerrymandered boundaries, retains the senior portfolios in this Government there will not be a redistribution unless the Opposition moves that it be carried out or the absolute sheer scandal of gerrymandered boundaries makes the people in this State rise up and do something about what is going on.

Mr. Row: Don't you think areas should come into it?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Of course they should, but there is a great difference between areas and "rorted" areas.

Let us have a look at some of the metropolitan seats and the number of electors over the quota in each. They are—

Aspley	6,860
Belmont	5,504
Bulimba	1,815
Kedron	2,104
Mt. Coot-tha	4,322
Mt. Gravatt	5,618
Nudgee	3,152
Nundah	1,014
Salisbury	7,150
Sherwood	2,455
Wavell	4,012
Wynnum	2,458

There are 12 seats in the metropolitan area with a total of 46,562 voters over the quota laid down in the 1958 Electoral Districts Act.

Mr. Row: You have only 12 square miles.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: As the Minister persists with his interjections, I record that the total area of my electorate is 46 square miles. I have four times as many voters as he has in his electorate and ten times as much mail, and I pay it out of my allowance. I do not book it up to departmental expenses.

There are 42,374 excess voters in the 26 country areas and 46,000 excess voters in the provincial city zones. When those figures are added it will be found that there are at least

120,000 voters in Queensland in excess of the quotas laid down in the Act. In spite of that, the Premier said in 1958—

"The alterations that the Government propose to make present a realistic approach to the rectification of anomalies which exist in the present distribution of electoral representation, and which have sprung from the manipulation of electoral boundaries by our predecessors."

That quotation is from "Hansard", Vol. 222, page 1616.

Let me say that if the Premier made today the statement that he made on that occasion in 1958, when he said that the Leader of the Opposition talked a great deal about South Australia but there was no need to go to that State for examples of gerrymandering as there were some excellent samples of it right here in Queensland, I would be the first to get up and support him. From what I have recounted so far in this speech, the extent to which boundaries have been manipulated is quite clear.

Let me drive home this point a little further. Indeed, throughout the Premier's speech on that occasion there are so many things that I could now quote to my advantage that if the subject were not so serious it would be laughable.

Mr. Wharton: What year was that?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I have already said that. If the hon. member does not clean the wax out of his ears, that is not my fault.

Mr. Wharton: We can't understand you; you aren't speaking up.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: On page 1827 of the same volume of "Hansard", the Premier had this to say—

"In the 1947 State elections Labour had a comfortable majority on a minority vote. Proof of this is furnished by the fact that Labour polled 272,103 votes, or 43.6 per cent. of the total, yet won 35 seats."

Let us look at what happened at the last election. I want hon. members to bear in mind that in 1947 the Labour Party polled 43.6 per cent. of the total votes, to win 35 seats. In the 1966 State election, the coalition Government parties secured 44.04 per cent. of the total vote, which was an improvement of 1 per cent. on the Labour Party's percentage in 1947, and gained 47 seats.

Mr. Richter: There were more seats.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Of course, but I am still allowing a pretty big margin of 12 seats for about the same percentage of votes.

Mr. Richter: Your reasoning is cock-eyed.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I ask the Minister to contain himself. I shall give him a pretty good "send off" over the national park at Teewah Sands before my time expires. There is no doubt that when one's chickens come home to roost, one has to look for a way out. The Minister, who is also in charge of forestry, seems to be lost in the bush; he is probably putting nicks in the trees to count the votes and seats. I cannot see that there is very much wrong with my reasoning when I claim that there is a vast difference between 43.6 per cent. of votes and 35 seats, and 44 per cent. of votes and the colossal number of 47 seats.

If the Minister wants me to rub the dirt in, I am not frightened of mixing it on this matter when I have figures to support me. The Country Party, the senior member of the coalition, received 18 per cent. of the votes in Queensland and has 27 seats in the House. In spite of that, the Minister for Local Government and Conservation tries to tell me that there is something wrong with my reasoning. I do not think there is too much wrong with it. The Country Party made sure that the Liberals would not become the senior partner in the coalition. I will say for the Liberals that they worked hard and gained 25 per cent. of the vote. At least they improved on the Country Party's share of the vote and finished up seven seats worse off, with only 20 seats in the coalition. The unkindest cut of all is that Labour received 43.12 per cent. of the vote but gained only 26 seats in the Parliament of Queensland. And the Minister for Local Government and Conservation tries to tell me that there is something wrong with my reasoning!

For the first time in many months in this Chamber, I have not been subjected to a barrage of interjections by the "ginger group". Every one of them is smiling a contented smile and saying, "Good on you! You are doing the job we should be doing." I should like to see the reaction at the next combined Caucus meeting when the Liberals take up the challenge that I have thrown out tonight.

I challenge the Government at this time to introduce a Bill to provide for the redistribution of electoral boundaries in the State of Queensland.

Mr. Houghton: You will get good Press on that.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I am not worried about the Press. If the Press prints anything that I say, it does so because of the sheer brilliance of my speech. I do not go out into the lobbies with prepared proofs and say, "Mr. Fryday, this is what I said. When I delivered my speech in the Chamber no doubt you could not understand it." Hon. members opposite go out into the

lobbies and say, "Will you put this in, Mr. Fryday?" I never go near the Press. As I said, they print things that I say because of their sheer brilliance. (Laughter.)

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Rae): Order! There is too much noise in the Chamber.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The Government has received a great deal of tuition in boundary-rigging from Sir Thomas Playford. The Press reported the Premier as saying that he and Sir Thomas Playford had discussed things of mutual interest, and the Premier rose in this Chamber and denied that Sir Thomas had offered him any advice on boundary-rigging.

Just let me read a few extracts relating to the system of boundaries operating in South Australia. Although the Labour Government in that State won the election on the vote of the people, it faces the fact that it cannot get a fairer distribution of boundaries because the legislation to provide for it will be blocked in the Upper House.

This is Sir Thomas Playford's idea of electoral distribution. In Glenelg, a metropolitan seat in Adelaide, there are 27,000 voters; there are 30,000 in Port Adelaide. Those are two classical examples, but most of the seats in the metropolitan area of Adelaide have at least 24,000 voters. If we go out into the country areas represented by the Country Party we find: Burra, 4,336; Frome, 3,660; Newcastle, 3,989; Rocky River, 4,719. I think it was there that the boundary-riders reached their destination as boundary-riggers.

Is there not great similarity between the electoral redistribution that was foisted on the people of South Australia, under which the Labour Party had to gain about 53 per cent. of the votes and then only scraped in by the skin of its teeth—

Mr. Chinchen: What percentage would you need here?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The hon. member was the person I was referring to who raced out to see Mr. Fryday.

Mr. Chinchen: The strange thing was that I was called out by Mr. Fryday. That has never happened to you.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I told the hon. member that the Press could not make sense out of what he was saying.

What a great similarity there is between the boundary-rigging in South Australia and that in Queensland. I do not want to be unkind to the Premier—I am trying to be charitable—but let me just read a few more things that he said in 1958. If we had some

pineapple juice here I would toast him for the things he said in those days. Referring to the Leader of the Opposition, he said—

"He belongs to a party which, in its unduly long occupancy of the Treasury Benches, became notorious throughout the Commonwealth for its manipulation of electoral boundaries to enable successive Labour Governments to dig themselves into what they fondly hoped would be an impregnable electoral fortress from which they could defy the rising wrath of a long-suffering people."

Then he went on to say—

"The ingenious twistings and turnings, the lopping of bits and pieces of previous electorates, and adding them to other electorates to make them safe Labour seats, make the Yankee authority of gerrymandering, quoted by the Leader of the Opposition, look like a small-time operator compared with hon. members opposite."

Get a "load" of the seats of Kurilpa and Merthyr as depicted in the Press cutting I have here, winding their way in a narrow path along the river like snakes, from Tory area to Tory area.

That is what the Premier had the audacity to say about one electorate. I have already referred to the disappearing Isle of Capri because the hon. member for Albert looked like losing his seat on that occasion.

As a matter of fact, when I read what is written in the Electoral Districts Act relative to distribution, I am astounded. The Liberal Party has always lauded itself as being astute, but the Country Party was able to pull the wool over its eyes by having inserted in the Act such an astounding section as section 13. It is headed "When subsequent redistributions may be made" and reads—

"If at any time—

(a) The number of electors for any electoral district or the numbers of electors respectively enrolled for any two or more electoral districts as constituted for the time being (and whether, in the case of two or more electoral districts, situated within the same Zone as prescribed by this Act or within different such Zones) is or are so much above or so much below the applicable quota or the respective applicable quotas as ascertained under sections ten and eleven of this Act (after taking into consideration the applicable margin of allowance or the respective applicable margins of allowance provided for in the said sections ten and eleven); or"

Mr. Smith: It is getting confusing now.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: It would possibly be the hon. member's legal mind that designed it. He would be drawing 120 guineas for such ridiculous jargon. I will pay tribute to the Country Party that it completely confused the Liberals on this one.

The section continues—

(b) The total number of electors within the State or within any locality or localities thereof, has increased or decreased to such extent,

that, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, it has become necessary to make—

(i) A complete redistribution—that is to say, a redistribution of all of the electoral districts for the State; or

(ii) A partial redistribution—that is to say, a redistribution of those electoral districts which are affected by the matters, or any of the matters, set out in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this subsection. . . .”

I am saying that the way that Act is worded, there need never be another redistribution in this State, irrespective of the boundary figures, because the Executive Council could say, “We do not think they are overloaded.” If the Liberals think they are astute they should have a look at that section of the Act. There is no obligation on the Government at present, in the terms of its own Act, to have a redistribution, although already it is breaching its own Act because of the excess in the number of electorates I have mentioned. However, there is no necessity for the Government to have a redistribution and there certainly will not be one before the 1969 election.

A Government Member: Hear, Hear!

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I hear a Country Party member supporting me; he knows what is going on. This provision was in the Act before I came into Parliament, otherwise I would have risen to it straight away. Unlike members of the Liberal Party, I would not have let it pass. The “ginger group” has never known such a sense of frustration, realising that there is no obligation on the Government to have a redistribution at any time except of its own choosing. Believe you me, I think we will be old men before hon. members opposite will want to relinquish these pocket-handkerchief-size electorates.

Having engaged in a friendly discourse on the rigging of electoral boundaries, I want to pass on to a subject which I feel is equally as important to the Budget, the people of Queensland and the Government of this State. At one time or another when it suited their political purposes I have heard all Government members rise and talk about how they believe in conservation. At the time great political play was made of the fact that the Government was creating a portfolio of Minister for Conservation. Great things were expected of the Minister for Conservation. Anyone who takes into consideration what is going on at the present time relative to what is known as the Cooloola Sand Mass would be greatly disturbed, and could come

only to the inescapable conclusion that this Government is merely paying lip service to the word “conservation”.

On Saturday next the Australian Conservation Foundation will be holding a seminar at the university. I am quite sure that the Government representative will go out there and say, “My Government believes in conservation”. When we see what is happening, or the lack of what is happening, in this area it makes you realise that the Government is only paying lip service to conservation. Before I go any further I pay tribute to the Minister in charge of forestry and conservation for having made some attempt. Since I questioned him in the House yesterday he has produced a map of a proposed national park which will include the Cooloola Sand Mass. I pay a full compliment to officers in the Forestry Department for wise planning. Here we have an area which is rich in timber and containing coloured sands which are unique in the world. Dedicated forestry officers have prepared a plan of a carefully designed national park, with the remainder of the area being set aside as a forestry reserve, so that the whole of the area can be preserved for posterity.

I have been over every section of this area. It is a source of amazement to all who visit it. Indeed, it would be one of the wonders of the world. If this coloured sand mass were in any country but Australia there would be no talk about mining leases. If it were in America it would be another Yosemite National Park.

Mr. Hodges interjected.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The only reason they are not touching it is that there are no roads into the place. Why is it that this application has been under the consideration of the Minister in charge of forestry for three years? At no time has he raised the matter with Cabinet. No proposal has been put to Cabinet, yet according to the Minister for Mines and Main Roads prospecting leases are being granted in respect of mineral deposits in the area.

Mr. Hodges: Not in the coloured sands.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I did not say it was in the coloured sands. I was talking about the Cooloola Sand Mass. The hon. member is misleading the people up there who have put so much faith in him. Will he deny that there is no prospecting going on in the Noosa plains?

Mr. Hodges: Not in the coloured sands.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I did not say it was going on in the coloured sands; I was speaking of the Cooloola Sand Mass. If the hon. member says it is not going on he does not know what is happening; evidently he has not been there.

This area is unique in the world, except perhaps that there is something similar in a small way on Fraser Island and also on

some of the islands in Moreton Bay. Not another place in the world can rival these coloured sands and their attractions.

Mr. Hodges interjected.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I am glad the hon. member agrees with me. Rather than trying to rubbish my argument he should be on side with me trying to have it declared as a national park.

Mr. Hodges: It has been declared. It is set up now.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The Minister told us yesterday that it has not even gone to Cabinet. If the hon. member wants to know why, I will tell him why it has not been declared.

For the record and for posterity, let me briefly describe the Cooloola Sand Mass. It is a triangular feature of forested giant dunes, coloured sand cliffs and wallum. It is approximately 60 square miles in extent and is situated just over 100 miles north of Brisbane. It is bounded on the west by the Noosa River and on the north and the east by the ocean. Although similar in many respects to the insular sand masses of Stradbroke, Moreton and Fraser Islands, Cooloola is unique in possessing the Teewah Coloured Sands and the Noosa River. Geologically it is an island, but being attached to the mainland it is accessible with little effort. Because of its scenic attractions and scientific interest, the conversion of those parts of it lying within the State forest into a national park has been sought.

Mr. Hodges: How did you get there to have a look at it?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I have been up there and tramped over it.

Mr. Hodges: How did you get there?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: If the hon. member wants to know, I went to Noosa and then across on an Army duck.

Mr. Hodges: Why didn't you go on the road that has been put through?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I will give the hon. member a Cook's tour of what I did. I went to Noosa and across the river by Army duck, up the coastline to Double Island Point, then via Rainbow Bay past Eight Mile Rocks, and up to Inskip Point. We returned overland by going inland, past the lake that reputedly supplies the "bubbler", to the headwaters of the Noosa River, and back via Lake Cootharaba to Noosa by boat.

Mr. Hodges: Why didn't you travel on the good bitumen road that the mining company has put in there?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The hon. member would be very interested in the mining company.

This area as a whole is the only relatively undisturbed example of an ecological complex of subtropical rain forest, eucalypt forest, and heath vegetation which survives on the Australian mainland, and which is of sufficient size for scientific and recreational purposes.

The coastal sand complex of the Noosa Plain is the only relatively intact example of wallum vegetation bearing showy flowers that is readily accessible by road from Brisbane and of sufficient size to guarantee its preservation in perpetuity. In spring-time these wildflower heaths and downs provide a spectacle of floral beauty equal to the ecologically related and justly famous wildflower heaths of south-western Australia. Furthermore, the area carries many unusual plants which are rare or are not represented in other areas.

Time is running out on me and I will not be able to include in the record everything that I wanted to. The Noosa Plain is a haven for many rare species of animals and birds, in particular, the ground parrot, which, although still relatively common in similar areas in south-eastern Queensland and northern New South Wales, is otherwise doomed on account of the transformation of the lowland flats that it inhabits into areas of real estate, pastoral development and mining. It is the only region on the coastal lowlands of south-eastern Queensland between Rockhampton and the border to receive regular rainfall of the order of 60 inches annually.

Judging by all the giggling coming from the Government benches, is it any wonder that the people who have tried so desperately to preserve this area are terribly disappointed.

Mr. Chinchen: I agree with you.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The hon. member for Mt. Gravatt is the type of person who could start an argument in an empty house. It is quite apparent that the people who are interested in seeing this unique area—

Government Members interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Rae): Order!

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Hon. members opposite sound to me like the ground parrots that I have been describing.

Is it any wonder that these people are dismayed at the fact that although for three years they have pressed to get something done in this matter and have made every endeavour in that direction, nothing is done? They have invited members of Parliament to go to the area. With the exception of the member for that area, I would be the only member to visit the area and go over it with them. Is it any wonder that these people are dismayed at the fact that this land is being threatened by the granting of prospecting, dredging, and mining leases? I claim that any Government that allows mining at the foot of the sand dunes is

guilty of criminal neglect and should be in gaol, and any Minister who says that the beach in front of the coloured sands can be developed as a mining lease should be treated as a common criminal and incarcerated, and I make no apology for saying that.

The Minister for Mines, in his usual petty way—I am sorry he is not in the Chamber because I do not like saying things behind a person's back—said that he was objecting to this area being declared a national park until the mineral content was known. He said it would provide employment. Look at it from the point of view of a tourist attraction. If it was declared a national park and was properly managed it would be an income-earner for the State. But because the Minister for Mines wants to be able to hand out these mining leases there is a dispute between the Department of Mines and the Department of Forestry.

One of the reasons this matter has not been before Cabinet is that the Minister for Conservation is frightened to take it to Cabinet. I pay him the compliment that at least he has done something, in that he has had the matter investigated and the area delineated on a map.

Mr. Richter: This is not the way to help.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I challenge the Minister now to put it before Cabinet. I can tell the Committee why it has not been done; it is because the decision on whether to create it a national park is not made by the Minister but by Cabinet, and although the Minister wants to beat me down on this, the reason he has not taken it to Cabinet is that once it gets there he will not be able to muster the strength that the Minister for Mines will.

Mr. Richter interjected.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Can the Minister deny that this will be decided by Cabinet?

Mr. Richter: You are not helping at all.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Why is it that after three years it still has not been before Cabinet? I have the plan that was prepared by the Department of Forestry. It is here in black and white. It was tabled yesterday morning. Why is it that after three years the Minister has not submitted it to Cabinet if what I am saying is not a fact, that is, that when the Minister takes it to Cabinet the Department of Forestry may lose control of it. There will be jockeying and lobbying going on in Cabinet to see whether the Minister for Mines can get jurisdiction to mine the area or whether the Minister for Conservation—

Mr. Richter: You are not helping the case one bit.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I am not worried about that. The Minister is doing nothing about it.

Mr. Richter: You are making a political attack.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: It is time somebody made a political attack. I claim that I have more enthusiasm for conservation than the Minister has. Nothing but lip service is given to these things.

Despite what the hon. member for Toowong said about conservation and, like the great Architect of the Universe, the reorganisation of the entire Cabinet, this case highlights the fact that until there is in Queensland a conservation authority that can make recommendations that no Minister would dare go against, this untenable situation will continue. These matters are considered not in the light of conservation but according to the number that the Minister can get to support him in Cabinet. As long as that situation continues there will be further whittling away of these wonderful and picturesque resources, which would have become national monuments long before this if they were anywhere in the world except Queensland under the domination of a Country Party Government.

Mr. Hodges: These leases were granted before we became the Government.

Mr. Houghton interjected.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I think you're a mug, anyway.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Rae): Order! I ask the hon. member for Salisbury to withdraw that remark.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: With all due deference to you, Mr. Rae, I have no intention of doing so. I think he is a mug.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member for Salisbury to withdraw that remark.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I will withdraw it because I want to finish my speech, but there is no way in the world to stop me thinking it.

As I say, if this area was anywhere else in the world it would be treasured as a national monument. There would not be inter-departmental bickering over whether it is more valuable for mineral production than as a national park. The Premier agreed with me when I said that not one beach along the entire coast of Queensland has been preserved as a national park. When I raised this matter, the Premier told me that it was a good idea. Now is the time for him to prove himself a statesman and support me.

(Time expired.)

Progress reported.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Premier): I move—

“That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until Tuesday, 17 October, 1967.”

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 8.59 p.m.