

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 17 OCTOBER 1967

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 17 OCTOBER, 1967

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

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

LOANS SINKING FUNDS

Mr. SPEAKER announced the receipt from the Auditor-General of his report on the operations of the various sinking funds of the State for the year 1966-67.

Ordered to be printed.

QUESTIONS

PROPOSED ANTI-EROSION BOULDER WALL ON SOUTH COAST BEACHES

Mr. Houston, pursuant to notice, asked Minister for Local Government,—

(1) Has his Department approved of plans and specifications for the proposed continuous boulder wall from Point Danger to Main Beach as erosion protection?

(2) Are Government funds being provided for this work? If so, how much?

(3) Was construction of the wall recommended by departmental officers to the Gold Coast City Council or did they suggest other means of combating the erosion?

(4) Are tenders to be called immediately for its construction?

(5) Was the decision to erect the wall based on the views of any overseas experts or reports? If not, what considerations commend the wall as the best proposition for the purpose and the cost involved?

(6) Has an approach been made to the Commonwealth Government for financial assistance and, if so, with what result?

(7) Has the Government approved of the proposed rating on private property, viz. ten per centum beach front and ninety per centum balance of the city, as proportional repayment to the Gold Coast City Council?

(8) Is a referendum necessary before a benefited area rate can be applied to this local government area?

Answers:—

(1) "No submission has been made to the Department of Local Government by the Council in regard to this matter."

(2 to 8) "See Answer to (1)."

APPLICATION BY LOLOMA MINING COMPANY FOR LEASES, RUNNING RIVER

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

(1) Has an application been made by Loloma Mining Company for mining and/or dredging leases along Running River, a tributary of the Burdekin?

(2) If so, before its final determination, will he thoroughly investigate the (a) destruction of platypuses and (b) pollution and siltage of the Burdekin River as a result of dredging operations, and, in order to assess their views on the application, will he confer with the Charters Towers City Council, the Dalrymple Shire Council, the Ayr Shire Council and any other representative bodies who hold riparian rights on the Burdekin or its tributaries downstream from Running River or are interested in the preservation of natural fauna on the Burdekin?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "The various local authorities and other parties concerned are entitled to appear at the hearing of the lease applications in the Warden's Court, Charters Towers, and raise their objections, if any, to the applications. Such objections are given full consideration prior to the granting of a lease. The matter of possible destruction of platypuses will be discussed with appropriate officers of the Primary Industries Department. Furthermore, stringent conditions, including anti-pollution measures, will be imposed on any lease applications granted."

UNIFORM SAFETY STANDARDS IN SALE OF PET FOODS

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

(1) As a large amount of money is spent in this State on pet foods, is there any move among State Health Ministers to introduce statutory standards for the whole of the Commonwealth?

(2) In view of the possible danger of contamination and disease should pet food be kept with human food, has any move been made or regulation introduced by his Department to offset it?

(3) Have any restaurants or eating establishments been prosecuted in the last two years for selling horse meat and other adulterated foods?

Answers:—

(1) "The need for a standard of safety in relation to food for animals and pets and the definition of this standard on a uniform basis throughout the Commonwealth was discussed at the meeting of the Health Ministers held in April of this year. The conference agreed that a standard was necessary; that there should be a uniform standard; and that the question be referred to the National Health and Medical Research Council for consideration. The Council has not as yet considered this, but the standard which would be set would be such that there could be no possible danger of pet food contaminating any other human food with which it was being stored. If it is necessary to store pet food in a refrigerator it should first be placed in an impervious covered container."

(2) "The storage of pet food in the home could not be controlled by regulation, but when the standard referred to above has been made there would be no danger of contamination of human food by pet food."

(3) "No restaurant or eating establishment has been prosecuted for selling horse meat. Five prosecutions resulting in fines and costs totalling \$172.40 in regard to adulterated milk in cafes and five prosecutions resulting in fines and costs totalling \$151.50 in regard to adulterated spirits in hotels have been taken."

DANGER OF DISEASE FROM IMPORTED CHEESES

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

As many imported cheeses, principally those made from unpasteurised milk, are risky to human and animal life because they contain organisms of a severe form of brucellosis, is there a legislative ban in this State on their entry? If so, are cheeses packed in animal tissues also banned as such cheeses contain foot and mouth disease virus?

Answer:—

"The Commonwealth Health Department is responsible for the quarantine of any product imported into Australia. The Department is very strict and would not allow any cheeses to be imported into the Commonwealth if there were any danger of disease. The National Health and Medical Research Council considered the question of imported cheeses at its last meeting and the Food Standards Committee of the

Council is now awaiting further technical advice before recommending a standard to the Council."

TEATS FOR BABY-FEED BOTTLES

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

(1) Is he aware that several companies are showing irresponsibility by supplying to pharmacy retail outlets inadequate and useless teats for baby-feed bottles?

(2) In view of the cost to parents and mothers trying to get satisfactory teats and recognising the severe discomfort to many infants, has his Department recommended any uniform brand or has it any advice to offer?

(3) Can action be taken under the Health Regulations against many of the so-called reputable manufacturers who thus fleece the people?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) "I am unaware that 'inadequate and useless "teats" for baby feed bottles' are being sold in Queensland. Enquiries have been directed to the sisters in charge of the various baby clinics in the metropolitan area and I have been advised that the only complaints received by them are that the apertures are sometimes too small and have to be enlarged. I should be grateful if the Honourable Member would supply me with detailed and comprehensive information regarding unsatisfactory teats so that the matter may be further pursued."

INCIDENCE OF ASBESTOSIS

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

(1) Has his Department investigated asbestosis, an industrial disease prevalent in the manufacture of asbestos products?

(2) If so, will he advise whether the report indicates that employees in continuous contact with asbestos dust over a number of years are subject to a permanent disease dangerously similar to miners' phthisis?

(3) If not, will he give the question of such an investigation urgent attention in conjunction with the Director of Tuberculosis, who has considerable data on the disease?

(4) Has his Department any information in relation to the premature death of employees and former employees as a result of the disease?

Answers:—

(1) "The premises where asbestos products are manufactured are under constant review by officers of the Division of Industrial Medicine. There are two large fibrous cement manufacturers and several small ones such as pipe lagging manufacturers and insulation firms. The small producers do not cause concern. The employees of the two large firms are X-rayed regularly and if anyone shows signs which would indicate asbestosis he is transferred from dust exposure to another position. The two large firms are most co-operative in regard to suggestions made to them."

(2) "It has been found a small number of men have developed asbestosis. This does not depend on the duration of contact, although the longer the period the greater is the likelihood of the condition developing."

(3) "See Answer to (1)."

(4) "I have been advised by the Director of Industrial Medicine that he knows of two men who died from asbestosis."

KANGAROO-SHOOTERS' LICENCES

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

(1) How many licences were issued for the taking and destruction of kangaroos in the year 1960-61 and in each succeeding financial year?

(2) In what areas were the licences issued and for what species of kangaroo?

(3) What was the value of (a) meat export and (b) skin trade export in those years?

(4) Are figures of the number of kangaroos killed annually available and, if so, what are they?

Answer:—

(1 to 4) "The following list shows— (a) the number of registered shooters in statistical divisions. The open season for kangaroos in Queensland relate to grey and red kangaroos; (b) a table showing the estimated annual income of the kangaroo industry at the level of prices to shooters; and (c) figures relating to the number of kangaroos killed per annum:—

(a)

DISTRIBUTION OF REGISTERED SHOOTERS IN STATISTICAL DIVISIONS, 1960-1966

Period Year	Peninsula	Cairns	Townsville	Mackay	Rockhampton	Maryborough	Moreton
1960	..	6	15	2	219	43	54
1961	..	3	3	2	140	85	22
1962	..	1	10	..	204	86	40
1963	..	1	14	4	227	99	143
1964	7	6	242	80	31
1965	6	1	168	59	26
1966	3	1	115	60	21
1967	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

Period Year	Downs	Roma	South Western	Far Western	Central Western	North Western	Yearly Total
1960	553	329	307	34	192	21	1,775
1961	444	279	284	13	175	20	1,470
1962	248	275	307	29	298	16	1,314
1963	398	289	218	14	264	40	1,711
1964	513	396	300	49	496	78	2,198
1965	525	500	407	38	350	73	2,153
1966	251	285	180	25	274	66	1,281
1967	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

* Permits issued from January to December, hence dissection not yet available—number issued from January 1, 1967 to October 16, 1967—1,374

(b)

Year	Kangaroo Meat	Kangaroo Skins
	\$	\$
1960	53,625	457,604
1961	55,250	259,023
1962	63,115	346,662
1963	53,755	483,514
1964	149,760	732,453
1965	264,420	753,177
1966	376,805	677,840
1967	*Not available	*Not available

* For collation of statistics the kangaroo meat and skin year is from January 1, 1967, to December 31, 1967.

(c)

Year	Number of Kangaroos Marketed
1960	738,072
1961	454,428
1962	533,343
1963	619,891
1964	1,093,214
1965	1,141,178
1966	785,861
1967	Not available

EXTENSION OF PRIMARY-SCHOOL CHRISTMAS VACATION

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

(1) Was an approach made two years ago by the Teachers' Union for the annual Christmas holiday period in primary schools to be extended to seven weeks to bring them into conformity with secondary schools?

(2) Was the request rejected and, if so, for what reason?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "Yes. It was considered that the present vacation period of six weeks at Christmas, two weeks in August and one week in May is adequate."

CONFERENCE OF PARLIAMENTARY LABOUR LEADERS ON COMMONWEALTH-STATE FINANCIAL RELATIONS

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to a statement in *The Courier-Mail* of October 12, headed "Holt yields over State Finance", that the Prime Minister would meet six Liberal Party leaders including

the Premiers of Victoria and New South Wales and that this decision followed a strong attack by the Deputy Premier of New South Wales on Commonwealth-State relations?

(2) As Parliamentary leaders of the Australian Labour Party had agreed to meet in Adelaide on the same subject before the Prime Minister had agreed to meet the Liberal Party leaders, including the Liberal Premiers, will he use his good graces to see that the same courtesy is extended to Labour leaders, including the two Labour Premiers?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "I am sure that the Parliamentary Labour leaders concerned are competent enough to make their own approach to the Prime Minister, should they wish to see him."

TEACHERS AT MITCHELL RIVER AND EDWARD RIVER SCHOOLS

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

(1) How many teachers are at present employed at the Mitchell River and Edward River schools?

(2) What are the educational qualifications of (a) the head teachers and (b) other teachers in the schools?

(3) Will the staff of qualified teachers be increased?

Answers:—

(1) "Mitchell River—teachers, 6; enrolments, 118. Edward River—teachers, 6; enrolments, 61."

(2) "(a) Mitchell River—Victorian Education Department sub and primary certificates, matriculation, three years Melbourne University, licentiate theology. Edward River—Certificate, special teachers' training course. (b) Certificates, special teachers' training course and experienced but otherwise academically unqualified teachers."

(3) "Yes."

ESTABLISHMENT OF STUDENTS' HOSTEL AT NORMANTON

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

Is the Carpentaria Shire Council no longer interested in the establishment of a students' hostel in Normanton? If so, does he intend to establish a students' hostel there as previously stated in his Answer to a Question?

Answer:—

"The Shire Clerk, Carpentaria Shire Council, has advised the Under Treasurer that his council, at a meeting held on Thursday, September 21, 1967, decided not to proceed further with the proposal for the construction of a war memorial hostel at Normanton. To correct any misconception which may be held by the Honourable Member, I remind him that in answer to his Question on October 13, 1965, he was informed, *inter alia*, 'This does not necessarily involve the provision of a students' hostel'. Other factors remain as then advised."

TIMBER PLANTINGS

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

(1) How many acres and what species of timber have been planted in Queensland in the years 1965, 1966 and 1967?

(2) In what timber districts were the plantings made?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "The acreage planted by the Department of Forestry in each of the past three years has been: 1964-65, 4,861.3 acres; 1965-66, 5,810 acres; 1966-67, 7,960.4 acres. For further details of the species planted and the districts in which plantings were made, the Honourable Member is referred to Appendix F in the annual reports of the Department of Forestry for the years 1964-65, 1965-66 and 1966-67, which latter report I propose to Table today."

GERIATRIC WARD, IPSWICH GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mrs. Jordan, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health,—

When will the geriatric ward, newly prepared at the Ipswich General Hospital, be put into use and how many patients will it accommodate?

Answer:—

"The Board's proposal for the accommodation of these patients in a separate ward at Ipswich General Hospital involving the provision of additional staff for the purpose is at present under consideration."

"SUNLANDER" TIME-TABLE

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

(1) Is there need for an extra weekly service of the "Sunlander" between Brisbane and Cairns?

(2) If so, will the extra train be of new construction or will the present "Sunlander" time-table be accelerated?

(3) If not, is any endeavour being made to cater for the comfort and convenience of the travelling public by allotting additional sleeping cars on the northern service, presently requiring two days and two nights to complete its run?

Answers:—

(1) "No."

(2 and 3) "See Answer to (1)."

PAPERS

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

Report of the Department of Forestry for the year 1966-67.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

The River Improvement Trust Acts, 1940 to 1965.

The Meat Industry Act of 1965.

The Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Acts, 1926 to 1966.

The Wheat Pool Acts, 1920 to 1957.

Regulations under—

The Fruit and Vegetables Acts, 1947 to 1959.

The Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Acts, 1926 to 1966.

The Wheat Pool Acts, 1920 to 1957.

FORM OF QUESTION

Mr. R. JONES (Cairns) having given notice of a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member's question appears to seek an expression of opinion. I shall have a look at it.

PETROLEUM (SUBMERGED LANDS) BILL

INITIATION

Hon. J. A. ROW (Hinchinbrook—Minister for Primary Industries), for Hon. R. E. CAMM (Whitsunday—Minister for Mines and Main Roads): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to make provision with respect to exploration for, and the exploitation of, the petroleum resources, and certain other resources of the certain submerged lands adjacent to the coasts of the State and for other purposes."

Motion agreed to.

GAS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon J. A. ROW (Hinchinbrook—Minister for Primary Industries), for **Hon. R. E. CAMM** (Whitsunday—Minister for Mines and Main Roads): I move—

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Gas Acts, 1965 to 1966, in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

PETROLEUM ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. J. A. ROW (Hinchinbrook—Minister for Primary Industries), for **Hon. R. E. CAMM** (Whitsunday—Minister for Mines and Main Roads): I move—

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Petroleum Acts, 1923 to 1962, in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT—
RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

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

Debate resumed from 12 October (see p. 874) 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. MURRAY (Clayfield) (11.24 a.m.): I do not think that any of us on this side of the Chamber needs any recourse to petty politics or melodramatics to agree that the Treasurer is doing a first-class job. I do not think we need any bolstering on that point. We are also conscious of the undeniable fact that not always in the past have Treasurers been aware of the dangers that lie ahead and the many obstacles that will be encountered. The dangers are considerable because the portfolio is so important. Although most hon. members accept that as a fact, only those who have occupied the position of Treasurer of a State would be able to tell the Committee of the extent of the frustrations and, I suggest, the loneliness of the role played by a Treasurer and of the difficulties and responsibilities inherent in it.

The Treasurer needs to be, and usually is, a very senior Minister. In most States, I understand, the Premier is also the Treasurer; but I think we have a very good arrangement in Queensland, one that I should not like to see altered. He also must be a strong Minister, which in this case he is.

However, it is not sufficiently appreciated by the public that the Treasurer in Queensland is only one of 13 Ministers in Cabinet and that, as Treasurer, he often carries the odium of public opinion connected with unpopular financial measures that are passed from time to time. As he is only one of 13, all the odium should not be attached to his particular position. He is not by any means the sole arbiter of the directions in which money shall flow in the State. Although he must bear heavy responsibility for it, he certainly should not bear the full responsibility.

Government policy is one matter; the decisions as to how it should be implemented are another matter. It is from this point, I should say, that the strength and guidance of a Treasurer become quite apparent. He has to gather together each year the rough pieces, form a total picture from them, and then endeavour to hold that picture in shape through the ensuing year. The role he plays and the responsibility he bears in holding the many pieces together in their correct shape is not sufficiently appreciated.

I venture to predict that hon. members opposite will have very little genuine cause for complaint 12 months from now. Indeed, I predict further that the actions taken by the Treasurer at this point of time will supply the foundations necessary to allow the State to again launch into a most exciting phase of development in the decade ahead. Hon. members on this side of the Chamber recognise that the Treasurer has done well, and we say so. In the realities of public life many stumbling blocks are thrown across the path of the Government, and the Treasurer could have chosen to walk many paths that would be much more comfortable than the one he has in fact chosen. It is difficult to walk a straight path in setting guidelines for the future.

The Treasurer has described the Budget now under discussion as a “push ahead” Budget. Up to date, hon. members opposite have poured scorn on that claim; no doubt they will continue to do so throughout the debate. That is their right—in fact, in a debate such as this, one would expect them to do that—and no doubt they will criticise the Budget publicly on every possible occasion. But I think they are very foolish to deny the Treasurer's claim that this is a “push ahead” Budget, because no-one believes them. The people of Queensland have evidence on every side that the State is pushing ahead. Sections here and there doubtless are affected by local problems; but if one looks into these local problems, one finds that the sections concerned fail to look at the over-all picture of the State.

We, as members of Parliament, must always cope with these particular regional and sectional problems. At the same time, we are members of Parliament in the Legislature of Queensland. I think we sometimes tend to forget this in our approaches

in this Chamber, because we should be deliberating and legislating for the whole of the State and not purely for small sectional interests. Note them, by all means; speak of them, by all means; and try to correct them, by all means; but let us take the broader view as often as we can.

I insist that up to this stage of the debate, with the exception of one or two points of interest, the Opposition has been merely mechanical in a particularly retrogressive and destructive way. This, of course, most of us on the Government side have come to expect from hon. members opposite. If they want to argue against the Treasurer's case they would be better employed—and they would gain far more respect—in arguing the amount or degree of push which the Treasurer claims he has given the State in his financial measures. Of course we are moving ahead! I think even the simplest idiot knows this, and in the course of this debate I think we can hope to convince even hon. members opposite that we are moving ahead.

Mr. Walsh: Now tell us how you arrive at that conclusion.

Mr. MURRAY: We might even coax hon. members opposite to have a look at pages 11 and 12 of the Treasurer's Financial Statement, on which is set out a summary. If they look at this summary surely they will agree that we are pushing ahead, not as excitingly, here and there, as one would want to, but the State is pushing ahead. If they read that summary they will realise once again that this State never stands still under this Government, that it never has stood still, and that it never will stand still. They may pit their judgment against that of the Treasurer. One would expect them to do that.

Mr. Tucker: Why does Mr. James praise you so much?

Mr. MURRAY: One might even allow that the hon. member for Townsville North might pit his judgment against that of the Cabinet and its advisers, and the Treasurer and his experts, as to whether or not the financial measures undertaken for this year are, in fact, in the best interests of the State. They may do so, and I hope we hear from them continually during the remainder of the debate. If they do this they will find that even "Blind Freddy" would know the answer, and I do not refer to the several rather "Blind Fredmys" opposite.

Personally, I look on this Budget as one that will ensure much greater strength and stability in the future. It is a strengthening and reinforcing Budget, strengthening the basis upon which we are working—and that is essential. We have widened out in many new fields of progress and development over the past decade, and, compared with the previous four decades of almost

continual socialist rule in this State, even the most biased critic would have to admit that great things have been achieved.

But there comes a time in any forward operation—and I believe that the Treasurer has judged that this is such a time—when it is desirable to reorganise, to consolidate, and to take stock. I believe that the Treasurer is effectively allowing this to happen now so that, in the next decade, we can more effectively move on towards our objective.

There are valid and compelling reasons, no doubt, to justify this course of action. Our major primary industries have suffered a crippling blow through drought. That is No. 1 reason. Large stock numbers have been reduced to alarmingly low levels. The great wool industry, which we have taken for granted for so long, is suffering severely from the effects of national apathy and complacency. I think we should recognise the opportunities that are available and the lessons to be learned, which have been ignored during and since the early 1950's, in any effort to stabilise this most vital part of our national income. This has resulted in a national failure to succour and support the very sheep on whose back Australia has been riding throughout the history of its development.

That the sheep is now too weak to carry us is perhaps the most serious indictment that one can direct at the Federal Government. No Government can ever hope to gain by complacently standing aside while the internal politics and dissension of its major income-earning industry tear it apart. It is very simple and very popular to flaunt the development of minerals and oil and industrial growth. We flaunt those things as the panacea for, and answer to, so many of our problems. We want these things in full measure, of course, but in my view it is national folly and stupidity to tarnish the golden fleece, this unique Australian merino product, by encompassing it in a cost squeeze from which it cannot escape, by land policies which reduce it to penny packets of licorice all-sorts, and by standing aside like Pontius Pilate when decisions on marketing and other matters related to its survival and the national welfare are clearly for Governments to make, however uncomfortable the political consequences.

Whatever the decision, it would be at least better in both the national and the wool-growers' interests than to maintain this declining state of suspension in which the wool industry finds itself. Certainly it could be no less popular than many of the decisions on taxation and other matters affecting our daily lives that Governments have to make.

The Treasurer knows full well that our wool income must hold a question mark. It is very difficult to forecast what the wool income will be. He knows that beef cattle numbers are slow to build up by natural increase, and that the cost and the availability of suitable cattle for re-stocking means a very significant inhibition on rapid expansion

of income from beef cattle. He knows that the wheat crop must also hold a question mark. He knows that there are serious seasonal problems in this regard at the moment. He is hopeful, perhaps—I think we all are—but he knows full well that the great sugar industry is depressed by world markets. He knows, and is encouraging, the painful process of transition in the dairy industry to reduce our reliance on butter production, and to seek out the best means of diversification and change.

I am sure that the Treasurer is well aware of the impact of the Government's policy to encourage industry into this State. The world already knows some of the major results of this policy throughout the State. The Treasurer has now had a reasonable opportunity to observe the results of the measures that he introduced a year ago. I repeat that on this side of the Chamber we are very satisfied that he has done a good job and that his predictions a year ago were justified.

All in all, the Treasurer is justified in taking the action that he takes at this time in the Budget he now presents to us. He is not yet clear on some decidedly inhibiting factors and it would be quite wrong for him—I suggest it would be irresponsible for him—to venture out too boldly at this stage before he has freed himself from some of these things.

There are some points in the Budget papers that we could question in detail. I ask the Treasurer if he can help us to understand the losses we shared with the Commonwealth Savings Bank in its trading last year, and the appropriation that is made for this year. The sum of \$220,000-odd is our share of the Commonwealth Savings Bank losses last year, and \$395,000 is the appropriation for our half share of those losses for the financial year. Those are large amounts. I know perfectly well that, through the 20-year deal we made, the Government received very great benefits, but, on the other hand, I think the people should have an understanding of the reasons for these contributions towards Commonwealth Savings Bank losses. It would be interesting for us to know how this bank incurs a loss. I have always been under the impression that savings banks conduct reasonably profitable operations, but perhaps the Commonwealth Bank, in its philanthropic attitude towards the State, is satisfied to run at quite a serious loss, half of which the State carries.

There are other minor points of detail on which, although they do not disturb me greatly, one could argue continually as to whether they are justified or otherwise. By and large, we have been presented with a good set of Budget papers. However, there is another factor of major importance that this Chamber must take into consideration at this time, although I do not suggest for one moment that it has had any effect on the preparation of the Budget. I refer to the pending retirement of the Premier. The knowledge that our Premier is to stand down, I think early in the New Year, must cause,

and has caused, an atmosphere of speculation throughout all levels of government and the community at large as to what changes there will be, both in policy and in administration. From the very moment it is known that there is to be a change of leadership this speculation is as natural as it is warranted and necessary.

Mr. Walsh interjected.

Mr. MURRAY: I ask the hon. member to bear with me.

During this inevitable period of speculation one finds a sort of open season for advice and criticism from the community at large. There is nothing wrong with that—in fact, I think it is very helpful—except that it reminds me at times of a class of schoolboys; they are well-mannered while the master is present, but, when he leaves the room for a short while, the game is on. One of them plucks up a bit of courage and throws something, and that is the signal for them all to be in it; it is on for young and old until somebody takes over the reins firmly again.

This becomes quite infectious and one sees it throughout the community. Indeed, advice and criticism of all sorts is starting to flow in from various bodies and individuals throughout the State. One thing that I am quite sure of is that the organisations and individuals who are coming forward with advice and criticism are not reflecting in any way whatever on the general regard and affection in which the Premier is held both in this State of Queensland and elsewhere.

No Government at all, in what remains of our form of democracy, can escape critical advice. In fact, after 10 years in office we should be disturbed if it is not forthcoming. But the form in which it is coming and the people from whom it is coming cause me to observe that whilst the numerous points of advice and criticism should be well noted by us all—noted carefully and certainly never brushed aside—they are in fact, I would say, the most severe insult to the Leader and all other members of Her Majesty's Opposition in this Parliament that I have witnessed since I have taken an interest in politics. They have been a deliberate and studied insult to the Leader of the Opposition and all his followers, I believe, directed by bodies and organisations outside that proffer this advice to the Government.

It is indeed an extraordinary state of affairs that it takes people from outside—this is a serious indictment—to help hon. members opposite to be even a semblance of an Opposition. These people outside are saying what members of the Opposition have failed to say. Time and time again organisations outside are setting out to become the Opposition in this State. It is an extraordinary indictment on members of the Opposition.

The hon. member for Toowong drew attention very pertinently to the 10-year danger period that confronts Governments of long standing. Historically this happens, but

in order to handle it and overcome it, as the hon. member for Toowong pointed out, this danger must be recognised and faced up to.

Mr. Houston: You started off by praising the Premier.

Mr. MURRAY: I am still doing so. It would be my understatement of the year to say that I have not always agreed privately or publicly with the hon. gentleman. We have had one or two disagreements in this Chamber. They have been the sort of disagreements that make members of the Opposition green with envy, because they can never understand how we on this side of the Chamber can insist on the right to differ with one another right to the final bell. We insist on that right, and we preserve it. Opposition members cannot understand that and they never will—true, dedicated, regimented Socialists that they are. They can never understand how we can differ, how we have the right to differ, and how we can differ healthily with a Minister and then bounce back and support him on either that or another measure. We will continue to do that. How hon. members opposite would love to do that! Because of their particular form of regimentation they cannot do it, nor will they ever be able to do it.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: Have you ever been carpeted by your State executive for adopting a contrary point of view?

Mr. MURRAY: That does not happen on this side of the Chamber. We are not Socialists who run to the top of the Hill, to the Trades Hall, to be carpeted when something goes astray.

Hon. members opposite cannot understand the fact that on no occasion when I have disagreed with the Premier has our disagreement been carried outside the Chamber, nor has there been any discourtesy; there has been only courtesy, help and guidance from the hon. gentleman. Herein lie the qualities that hon. members opposite, at the parliamentary level, cannot understand.

Above all—and I emphasise this—we must determine just what the Premier has done for Queensland. It would be impossible to measure it in precise terms. I feel that most people will carry one outstanding impression, among many others, of the role that the Honourable Frank Nicklin has played in Queensland since 1957. That is certainly the overriding image of him that I carry. I should say that he brought to government in Queensland, and continued to sustain, an image of administrative honesty and decency. He raised the standard of morality in public affairs in this State to a level which it should be the aim of every citizen to maintain. That can never be taken from him.

I doubt whether Queensland has ever had a period—or certainly a decade—in its political history which has been so free from corruption and dishonesty in public administration. I admit freely, of course, that there

have been other great Premiers who have served the State well, but none, I believe, succeeded in this regard to the extent that the present Premier has. It can be argued forever whether in some matters his policies were right or wrong. That is stuff for political analysts and academics to argue and historians to record. That is another matter altogether, and I believe that the Premier, in retrospect, would now possibly say that, if he had been able to foresee the events of today, he would have steered a slightly different course. That, of course, is only natural. The fact is that he has produced good, solid results on a firm basis, and, whatever the analysts may decide, they can never remove from him the high image of honesty and integrity that he has created in this State. He deserves many, many years of happy, healthy and contented retirement. He has thoroughly earned for himself in his own right a very noble place in the State's history.

I want to continue by saying that the Premier came to office at the very time when he was most needed, when the Government was in a shambles and torn with dissension, rackets and corruption. That is the inevitable fate of every socialist administration. I know that my friends on this side of the Chamber agree with me when I say that the very controls and restrictions which are inherent in the philosophy of hon. members opposite form the base from which corruption must grow. The Premier cleaned up the ship of State; he scrubbed the decks and set it sailing along on a very safe course.

The State now waits for the changes that a new personality must bring. I think all will agree that every man brings to leadership something new, and qualities that perhaps were not apparent before. Inevitably he changes course slightly when he takes the helm of government. If, as we expect, it is the Honourable Jack Pizzey who succeeds the Premier, we look forward to his leadership with keen anticipation.

Mr. Sherrington: Is he your choice?

Mr. MURRAY: He would certainly be my choice.

Mr. Sherrington: You are not supporting Gordon Chalk?

Mr. MURRAY: That is a very silly question.

My friend from Toowong made some interesting suggestions for changes in ministerial responsibility. I hope they will be studied and considered carefully.

In the light of all the circumstances and after a careful appreciation of the situation, the Treasurer has produced a Budget, and the Leader of the Opposition has replied. I believe that his reply was quite notable in that it hit a new low in the register of pathetic contributions by the hon. member to debates in this Chamber. It was by far the worst speech ever written for him that he has had to read in this Chamber. I read it very

carefully—very painfully, but very carefully—because I did not want to miss any of it. It is a gem, and I would honestly ask students of politics to look at it as a classic example of how a Leader of an Opposition should not deal with a Budget.

I can only come to the conclusion that privately the Leader of the Opposition endorses the Treasurers' submissions but that publicly he has to try to appear critical. There was no censure motion from him—nothing of that sort at all. Whenever he attempted to be constructive, he stated the obvious. He tried to climb on every existing band-wagon, but he fell off because the wagons were already overloaded with his socialist friends from the Trades Hall and from other States. He failed in that, too, and, as I said, it was a very pathetic contribution.

On the other hand, the hon. member for Baroona made the type of contribution that one expects from him—penetrating in places, and always worth attention—and I should say that when—if ever—the Opposition can deal with Egerton, Macdonald and company up on the Hill, the A.L.P. in this Parliament may have a leader of real quality.

The hon. member for Barcoo said—I certainly hope he realises that these were his words—that private enterprise can market produce successfully and in the interests of the growers—a remarkable, quite extraordinary, discovery for a socialist! That point occupied quite a deal of the hon. member's attention in his speech in the Budget debate, and it amazed me. I think the hon. member's findings will cause a little bit of disquiet in the socialist ranks.

The hon. member for Salisbury, on the other hand, got quite heated about the problems of redistribution and electoral boundaries. That is quite an important subject, and there is no doubt that it must, and will, be faced up to soon. However, I should say that it would be quite logical to wait and see what the new Federal boundaries are.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. MURRAY: Now that there is to be a Federal electoral redistribution, I think that would be the logical step. No doubt the Federal machinery has been set up for that, and the redistribution will be made before machinery could be set up for a redistribution of State electoral boundaries in Queensland.

My views on that subject are quite simple—as simple as A, B, C: I believe in one vote, one value. I agree with the way in which the Commonwealth, in an approved and tried manner, has applied the principle of 20 per cent. over and 20 per cent. under to provide for declining or growing electorates.

Mr. Walsh: In other words, you think that the country areas should have less representation in this Chamber?

Mr. MURRAY: I believe that if a member has a problem of distance or geographical problems in his electorate, this should be recognised by compensating him with additional facilities for travel and an allowance for travelling.

Mr. Walsh: Do you agree that there should be less representation in this Chamber for country areas? I want an admission from you.

Mr. MURRAY: The hon. member's interjection is extraordinary. I should say that there is not any doubt that one vote, one value is the only basis on which to look at the problem; no other course is justified. I believe that this is true throughout the—

Mr. Houston: Yet you are prepared to accept the present boundaries.

Mr. MURRAY: No, I am not.

Mr. Houston: You just said you were.

Mr. MURRAY: Hon. members on this side all want a redistribution; the whole of the Parliament and the whole of the State want it.

Mr. Sherrington: Except the Country Party.

Mr. MURRAY: Of course we all want a redistribution. The need for it has been recognised; it must be faced up to.

The Leader of the Opposition began his speech in an aggrieved tone, having found himself in a similar position relative to the Auditor-General's report and other reports as he and other Leaders of the Opposition have found themselves over the years. He then observes that there is an increasing tendency on the part of the Government—I noted what he said here—"to treat the Opposition and the public with contempt." What an interesting statement to hear from the hon. gentleman—this poor, wounded fellow complaining about this—particularly when one looks back a few years to the full and complete contempt with which the hon. gentleman and his colleagues treated all and sundry when they were in Government. No doubt there are accepted practices in the publication and distribution of certain documents which we receive—

Mr. Houston: Do you know that in 1956 we had documents prior to the presentation of the Budget?

Mr. MURRAY: This does not mean for one moment that practices do not need review. We should not hesitate to look at accepted practices and forms operating in this Chamber, but these are never changed lightly even when changes are necessary.

It is most amusing to me to listen to the Leader of the Opposition performing like a four-year-old child deprived of his comics when the very practices he complains of have been cemented into the customs of this Parliament by his own party. This is not a sound way of going about changing matters. If the

hon. gentleman wants to go about it in a rational and constructive manner, then let him forget playing politics; let him get away from petty party politics. If he does that he will be surprised, I think, at the support he will receive in his endeavours to change certain measures or practices. But he must remove his whole approach from politics.

Mr. Houston: Where should I do it?

Mr. MURRAY: The hon. member has been in this Chamber and in politics for much longer than I have, yet he asks me such a silly question. When others can be convinced of the hon. member's bona fides in this regard, I would say it would be a simple matter for us to get together as men of Parliament, not as members of political parties, and to effect some change, or at least to look at the matter.

We can take a hard look at practices if we are not sure that they are in the best interests of Parliament. As the hon. member complained, there are many practices that have to be carried out and that we must change. One, of course, is called "Hansard". I am one of the fortunate ones who got an early copy of the "Hansard" report so that I could study the hon. member's speech on the Budget. Not many hon. members can get hold of this advance copy in time to study it for half an hour, or even five minutes. What is said in one day takes a good deal of reading and studying if one wants to speak responsibly on the Budget. So, let us have a daily "Hansard" as is the practice in most other Parliaments, supplied to each member of Parliament each morning—at a little more cost, although I doubt it very much. The system works well in other places and it would work here.

Mr. Walsh: Some alteration of the present system is certainly required.

Mr. MURRAY: Certainly.

Mr. Houston interjected.

Mr. MURRAY: Do I hear the hon. member asking that further Estimates should be debated in this Chamber, other than half the Estimates each year? After all, he should forget the past. He should forget the fact that on one occasion the Opposition, when in office, debated nothing but the Health Estimates. He should forget this and get together with other hon. members and push for things that are required—things that we know are required—as men of Parliament, not as members of political parties.

Mr. Houston: Tell me whether you support my contention or not.

Mr. MURRAY: This sounds very reasonable indeed, but let us do this in the manner that the hon. member knows it should be done; there are many avenues for this to be investigated.

The Leader of the Opposition then went on to say something about Commonwealth-State financial relations. He supported the

Treasurer and then called for a review of the system of payment to the States. Then the hon. gentleman went on to make the most extraordinary statement, in my view, ever made by a socialist Labour leader, either Commonwealth or State, in making accusations against the Liberal Party. To see how cheap hon. members opposite can get, to see how low they can get, to see to what depths of hypocrisy and deceit they can sink, we need go no further than look at this gem from the Leader of the Opposition, the so-called leader of an alternative Government. In his speech he said—

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

We should keep before us all the time the real punch-line—

"It is a carefully laid plan of the Liberals to reduce the State Government to the status of a county assembly"

and then, added to that—

"This, to my mind, is wrong."

What does the hon. gentleman really stand for, and those with him on that side of the Chamber? What else did he and his colleagues swear to implement when they took the oath to their party to work faithfully and diligently for the socialisation of the means of production, industry and exchange? What else did they swear? Listen to this, which is a principal plank of their party's platform as an amendment to the Commonwealth Constitution—

"To clothe the Commonwealth Parliament with unlimited powers and with the duty and authority to create States possessing delegated constitutional powers."

What else have hon. members opposite sworn to uphold and sworn to work for? A few clauses later we read—

"Abolition of the State Legislative Councils."

We understand that. They succeeded in Queensland but nowhere else.

Listen to this gem, because it is not only the abolition of State Legislative Councils—

"and of the office of State Governor."

To make sure that I was not going too far wrong in this, I have checked their "blue book". I also have here "The Thoughts of Mao", another book they hold closely to

themselves. Compare "The Thoughts of Mao" with the decisions of the Adelaide conference—we heard all about how this great Labour Party was getting a new look and image—and what do we find? We find exactly the same principles and platform in this regard. What utter hypocrisy we hear from these people!

I was prepared to believe that there may have been a little change after the Adelaide conference, but not one ounce of change has there been. There it stands with all the other hogwash that has kept them out of Government for so long. Let us keep it in front of us at all times: nationalise banking, credit and insurance establishments, public health, monopolies, radio services, television, sugar refining, and so on. In one little document, "The Thoughts of Mao"—here it is—they are even going to control sex; they are going to abolish venereal disease. They are clever boys; they would control anything.

Let us consider the thoughts of the Leader of the Opposition. He is now showing himself in his absolutely true colours. This wicked Liberal Plot which he suddenly brought to light is nothing other than the socialist platform that he has taken an oath to implement. He is now obviously using the same technique as Whitlam. I call it the socialist-gloss technique. It is based on the belief that if you tell a lie often enough, using every trick in the bag—and they have plenty of tricks in the bag—someone will fall for it. We know that Whitlam stumps the country, getting around all over the place, making speeches on television, for the Press, on the radio, and in public addresses. Whitlam is a clever liar; he is a sophisticated, polished liar.

Mr. DONALD: I rise to a point of order. I ask the hon. member to withdraw that remark. It is offensive to me. The hon. member called our Federal Leader a liar. He is not a liar at all, and I ask that the remark be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Clayfield.

Mr. Melloy: I have never seen you so hysterical.

Mr. MURRAY: Let me say that Mr. Whitlam—

Mr. DONALD: I ask that the remark be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The gentleman mentioned is not a member of this Assembly. I call on the hon. member for Clayfield.

Mr. MURRAY: Thank you, Mr. Hooper.

I will say that not only is Mr. Whitlam a clever liar; he is also a sophisticated, polished liar and therefore far more dangerous. The hon. member for Bulimba, in doing deliberately what he did in his speech, by comparison with Mr. Whitlam proved himself to be inept and clumsy.

Mr. Houston: You say I didn't write that speech.

Mr. MURRAY: The hon. member assumed responsibility for it. If the hon. member for Bulimba wrote it, how much more interesting is it? I gave him the means of escape earlier by saying that it was the worst speech he has ever read that someone else has written for him.

Mr. Houston: You want it both ways.

Mr. MURRAY: A rather comforting, but disturbing aspect of all this is that from this point onwards everything the hon. gentleman says in this Chamber must be suspect.

Mr. Houston: Rats!

Mr. MURRAY: How can it be otherwise when he deliberately does what he did in his speech? It was not a slip; it was a deliberate copying of the Whitlam technique—of the socialist-gloss technique—but he failed. The Parliament and the State deserve a much higher standard than this.

I think it was John Douglas Pringle—somebody can correct me if I am wrong—who said in an interesting little document called "Australian Accent"—

"Every country gets the politicians that it deserves, but no country deserves the politicians that Australia has."

It is behaviour like that of the Leader of the Opposition that brings us into such disrepute. Worse still—and I say this seriously—his behaviour was recorded on film for a documentary made for the Department of Education and the Public Relations Bureau to coincide with the 100th anniversary next year of the first sitting of Parliament in this Chamber. Our noble political forebears and predecessors must squirm in their graves at this utter trash and cheap political rubbish put forward by the Leader of the Opposition.

The hon. member tries hard to climb onto the band wagon of the Commonwealth-State financial relations. He forgets or ignores what has been said on this side of the Chamber. We know that the Socialists are unificationists. Mr. Dunstan, of South Australia, reaffirmed this only the other day in clear terms. Quite apart from their being sworn to uphold their platform on this, they will go on with this nonsense, as the Leader of the Opposition does, in trying, by the socialist-gloss technique, to get onto the band wagon of Commonwealth-States financial relations. Evidently members of the Opposition did not listen to my maiden speech or to other comments I have made, which have had no impact on them. One would have thought that the remarks made on the first private member's motion last year, to which several hon. members opposite spoke (including the hon. member for Barooona, who addressed himself in a particularly responsible and non-political manner), would have had some impact on the other side of the

Chamber. But they had none at all, so we find hon. members opposite climbing onto the band wagon.

I wish to put the record straight. The truth is that it is only now that the States are getting together and facing up to and agreeing on this collective problem. Many attempts were made in the past. We remember well in the middle or early 1950's that the then Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, said to the predominantly Labour Premiers, as they were then, "Fair enough, you can have back your taxing powers if you want them." The result of that meeting of predominantly Labour members was the famous little rhyme put together for the occasion—

"We thank you for the offer of the cow,
But we can't milk and so we answer
now.

We answer with a loud, resounding
chorus:

Please keep the cow and do the milking
for us."

That has always been Labour's attitude. Only now, with predominantly Liberal Premiers, have the States an opportunity to face up to this problem in a responsible way.

Let me place on record that on the first Monday of September last, in Canberra, the Federal Council of the Liberal Party of Australia studied several resolutions from the States concerning the need for a council of Ministers of the States to meet with the Commonwealth Government. It was decided to do so. It is true to say, and place on record, that one of the principal initiators and behind-the-scenes negotiators for this, and a man who must take considerable responsibility and credit for having initiated the negotiations, was the Queensland State Treasurer. He has never sought headlines. He is not like the headline seekers opposite. The decision is no secret. It was published in the Press at that time. It was to meet the needs of the public through a meeting of non-socialist Governments of the States.

But what do we now find? Gough Whitlam and his socialist camp-followers are rushing in to get some cheap Press. They say, "We must change the basis of Commonwealth-State financial relations. We must strengthen the States." That is what the socialists are saying now. They say, "The wicked, wicked Liberal Party is eroding the powers and constitutional role of the sovereign States," when all the time, in an atmosphere of complete hypocrisy and fraud, each one of them is sworn to place unlimited power in the Commonwealth and abolish the sovereignty of the States. Lincoln knew a thing or two when he insisted, "You can't fool all the people all the time." That is a truism that the Labour Socialists will have to face up to.

I hope that in some way I have helped to destroy some of the phony, hypocritical image which hon. members opposite are determined to wrap around themselves for

political purposes. The great danger in continually telling lies is that eventually someone will believe them. There is in that possibility a great danger to our democracy. We expect more responsible statements from Opposition Leaders, and I sincerely hope that we never again hear in this Chamber such a deliberate distortion of the truth and such a deliberate attempt to deceive by a Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) (12.22 p.m.): The hon. member for Clayfield descended, in his usual egotistical way, to personalities (which is something that I deplore and something that we on this side of the Chamber do not do) and claimed that the Leader of the Opposition made a very poor contribution to the debate. I refute that statement. In fact, my Leader made a very great contribution, and for confirmation of that one has only to look at the way it was received by the State of Queensland the following day. The response to it is there for all to see, and the wide publicity that it received throughout the State is worrying the hon. member for Clayfield and other members of the "ginger group" on the Government benches.

I do not think the hon. member for Clayfield is a very good judge of contributions made in this Chamber. Indeed, I cannot see how he could be considered a judge at all, because my colleagues and I have at all times been sickened by his speeches. They never contain anything of any worth, and today he was even worse than usual. He resorted to craven crawling to the Premier, which is at complete variance with his conduct towards him on a number of occasions. I have seen him publicly embarrass the Premier, both inside and outside this Chamber, yet now he stands up and says piously, "We have the greatest Premier of all time." How hypocritical can he be! I would have thought more of him if he had stuck to his old line, as at least that would have shown that he was consistent. There is something wrong when we see him trying to get on side with the Premier, and one wonders what he is up to. I suppose it could be said that he is notorious for his vacillations in both this Parliament and the Federal House.

The Treasurer had much to say when presenting his Financial Statement a week or so ago, and the two points to which I want to draw the attention of the Committee are to be found at the conclusion of his speech. One part reads—

"This year I am able to present a further 'push ahead' budget—one for further progress and development—but, happily—this time—I have not had to increase local taxation."

The other reads—

"The continued development and expansion of the State are the keynotes of this budget and under this progressive Government, Queensland will continue on the march to a brighter and better future."

Those would be very noble words if they had any substance in them; but they do not have any substance in them as far as the State generally is concerned or as far as North Queensland particularly is concerned.

While the Treasurer indulged in this high-flown oratory and in these flights of fancy, one saw the spectacle in Townsville of the Commonwealth Development Bank moving into some of the city's industries. In one instance the bank placed a receiver in one of the steelworks in Townsville and, by so doing, virtually declared that it was preparing to sell it—to declare it bankrupt. While from the Treasurer there issued a cry of "push ahead", a steel industry in Townsville went into reverse because of the stupid political action of the Government and some members of Cabinet. That is typical of the attitude of this "Queen Street" Government. It cannot see beyond Brisbane; it is completely oblivious of what is happening in the western and northern parts of Queensland. It says, "We are pushing ahead", when in fact it is not doing so in the distant areas of the State.

Let me refer the Committee to what has been said in this Chamber by members of the Government parties. I listened to the speech made by the hon. member for Flinders, Mr. Lonergan, in the Address-in-Reply debate. He said in one breath, "This is a very good Government"; in the next breath he said, "But something has to be done about it, because in the western areas of my electorate I have lost 698 people from the roll in the last few years." In other words, they have left the West. Why have they left the West? Because there is no employment there and there is nothing doing there. So, from a member of the Government parties, there is that admission. I do not know whether the hon. member understood what he was saying, but the record in "Hansard" shows that what I am saying is true. Is that pushing ahead—698 people leaving the hon. member's electorate?

Mr. Pizzey: You had better use the same argument relative to the growth of Townsville.

Mr. TUCKER: I am glad that the Minister for Education has interjected. I am about to show the Committee what is happening in Townsville. When I have finished, the Minister will have his head pulled in, too, because it is not a good story from the Government's point of view.

About the same time I heard the hon. member for Gregory, Mr. Rae, make a similar statement relative to western areas. I know that he is a responsible member of this Assembly and that he is worried about what is happening in western Queensland, particularly in areas that he represents. It is no good the Treasurer trying to pull the wool over our eyes when we have information supplied by members of the Government parties.

Mr. Carey: You seem to be worried about your seat at the next election.

Mr. TUCKER: Perhaps I am always worried about it; that is probably correct. Because of that, I pay strict attention to it and have never been beaten in an election. If the hon. member for Albert likes to contest the seat at the next election, he is welcome to see if he can beat me.

About a year ago one heard statements such as these being made in the areas of which I am speaking: "If you return a member of the Government, everything will flow to the area next year. If you return a member of the Government around Townsville, everything must flow to Townsville." In due course, in went Mr. Katter for Kennedy. But did he bring anything out there? Not according to the hon. member for Flinders, Mr. Lonergan, and the hon. member for Gregory, Mr. Rae. Has Mr. Bonnett been able to do anything in Townsville? Was he able to stop the Commonwealth Development Bank moving in and declaring one of our steel fabricators bankrupt? I know they approached him, but he went to Canberra like a lamb and did nothing. It is a fact that these people blow out a lot of hot air. Katter and Bonnett may be able to go to Canberra and talk hot air, but when it comes to helping development there, and others like them, are not worth a cup of cold water to North Queensland.

When the Treasurer says that he is pushing forward, he is living in a day-dream. I ask him to return to reality and understand what is actually happening in this State. The Government has become smug, self-satisfied and complacent. It has become fat and lazy after 10 years on the Treasury benches, and its members believe that this will go on forever.

The hon. member for Toowong, Mr. Porter, sounded a note of warning the other day and everyone on the other side laughed—I hope they continue to laugh—when he said that they had better have a good look at themselves. Those are not my words only, but the words of apparently responsible supporters of the Government in this State. I wish to quote from some newspaper articles in this regard. I quote first of all from "The Courier-Mail" of 6 October, 1967, in these words—

"Government lacking in leadership.

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

Mr. Carey: Who is the author?

Mr. TUCKER: The article continues—
"This charge is made in the Queensland Chamber of Manufactures journal, "Queensland Industry", issued yesterday.

"It was the second attack on the State Government by an employer organisation in two days."

That was the author. One could not say that these people belong to the Labour Party, but they made that statement relative to the present leadership in this Government.

I refer also to "The Courier-Mail" of 5 October, 1967, which says—

"State needs to 'Get with it'—Employers.

"Queensland does need 'to get with it', and some Queenslanders do need shaking. This is the view of the Queensland Employers' Federation.

"The federation's current Industrial News Report states:—

"'Apart from possible political implications or repercussions, it doesn't really matter much whether Mrs. Holt did or didn't say Queensland needed "to get with it" or that she "could shake Queenslanders."

"What does matter is that some Queenslanders apparently still suffer from a form of hypersensitivity which makes them resentful of any criticism, justified or otherwise.'"

I could go on reading in that strain, but I do not want to bore the Committee. However, there again is a criticism of the present Government.

In "Sunday Truth" of last Sunday, 15 October, hon. members will remember the article headed "Attacks Sting Coalition Government," followed by a report of what Mr. James said relative to the ineptitude of the present Government. When such people come out and attack the Government there must be some substance for the attack.

Mr. Chalk: They take place for the same reason that some of the unions sometimes attack your party when they do not get all their own way.

Mr. TUCKER: Let the Treasurer say that; he is entitled to his own opinion. Hon. members opposite do not like this sort of medicine. The Treasurer always talks about giving medicine in small doses. That medicine was not given in small doses but by the whole bottle.

There is no doubt that this Government is lacking in leadership. In 1957 it was elated with its victory. I will grant that at that stage the Government played a very close team for a start. Hon. members opposite understood that it was very necessary that they play as a team. To me it is very necessary that a Government should always play as a team. Gradually the warring factions in the coalition Government have come to the fore and have grown. Again I refer to a speech made in this Chamber not very long ago when the hon. member for Gregory suggested taking off the gloves and getting stuck into it. That is how much the faction wars within the coalition parties have grown. There is a perfect example on record of the type of statement that is made by some members of the coalition.

Although the Government played as a team at the start, it has now slipped down into individual effort. There is no cohesion, no team work, and no leadership in the Government at this time. Each Cabinet Minister is preoccupied with his own department. He does not understand that there should be a

certain amount of team work. What I am going to say today is the result of that pre-occupation and in forgetting that each department is part of a team that should be properly governing the State. Hon. gentlemen opposite are too concerned about their own aggrandisement and are careless about how their reactions affect others. As a result of this attitude the people of Queensland are suffering, particularly the people of North Queensland and especially the people of Townsville.

I am about to cite one example to prove that what I am saying is correct. I alluded to it a few moments ago—the steel industry in Townsville. I mentioned the fact that one of our industries there has been, or is about to be, declared bankrupt. Let me refer initially to the \$24,000,000 army base project in Townsville. Before this was started we had some 12 months' notice that a base was to be built in Townsville. We had no argument about that. All of us in North Queensland had been urging for it, and everyone of us welcomed the fact that it was to be built in Townsville. I remind the Committee that the amount of \$24,000,000 exceeded the building approvals in Townsville for the three years 1963, 1964 and 1965. In those three years we approved building works only to the tune of \$23,422,000.

I mention those figures to show that indeed this was a big project for the City of Townsville. Indeed, it was big business for the whole of North Queensland. It offered our North Queensland industries a golden opportunity to expand and develop; it offered them stability. If they had been able to take part in this contract a large volume of production would have been moving through their works. Over a given period of time they would have been able to calculate what was needed. They would have been able to plan for further development in their plants on the basis of an assured volume of production.

These are very important matters. The volume of work would have necessitated the installation within the steel firms of some very costly and sophisticated equipment. This would certainly have helped the industry. The cost would have been partly amortised by the millions of dollars that it was hoped would flow through the industry from the Army contract. It would have helped the steel industry in the North to become more efficient.

The steel industry in the North may be described as being in its infancy. It is slow in growth because it cannot win large contracts. If we had won these contracts we would have been able to compete more favourably with southern firms and, most certainly, if we had obtained them our firms would not have looked back. The increased labour requirements would have brought skilled labour to Townsville and North Queensland, and with the increase in skilled

labour we would have employed more apprentices. That is another important point; being able to offer apprenticeships to young men is something that is very dear to our hearts. Those are the points I wish to make when referring to the northern steel industry and the importance of its obtaining the Army contract. If the successful tenderers had been our local steel fabricators those benefits must have flowed to us.

We hoped to obtain through the Army contract a strong, skilled, well-equipped steel fabrication industry in the North, which is extremely important. I repeat that it would have enabled us to compete in our own right with large southern firms. If we are to stand on our own feet we must ultimately be able to do that. With more skilled workers in the community there would have been greater spending power.

Lastly, and most importantly—and this is very dear to the heart of every North Queenslander—work for North Queensland would have been done in North Queensland. I cannot advance too forcefully the need for this. The steel fabrication industry was one of the largest basic industries in Townsville at that time, and we believed that by winning this Army contract it could have expanded to a greater degree, thus making a strong contribution to northern development.

I should like to explain the position with regard to fabricated steel. We had 12 months to prepare for this. Two months before tenders closed for the Army contract a Brisbane fabricator would have paid the following costs:—

Landed cost of structural steel	\$125.00 a ton
Fabricating, painting, etc.	\$146.00 a ton
Rail freight, Brisbane to Townsville	\$54.82 a ton
Total cost f.o.r. Townsville	\$325.82 a ton

A Townsville fabricator at that time would have paid the following costs—

Landed cost of structural steel	\$133.50 a ton
Fabricating, painting, etc. in Townsville	\$174.50 a ton
Rail freight	nil
Total cost ex Townsville fabricator's works	\$308.00 a ton

It can be ascertained readily from that comparison that the price of fabricated steel favoured the Townsville fabricator by \$17.82 a ton when the normal freight rate applied. Two months before the Army contracts were let, Townsville fabricators were in that happy position and we felt that we were poised ready to get the contract.

A moment ago the Minister for Education interjected and asked to be told what the Government has not done. I will tell hon. members what the Government did one month before the tenders were due to close. Without prior notice to anybody in North Queensland, and without any consultation with any northern firm, the Minister quietly lowered the freight rate. It was not made public so that we in North Queensland did not know about it immediately. It came to us along the grape-vine; that is how we found out about it. The freight rate on steel fabricated in the South and hauled to the Army base in Townsville was lowered to \$28 a ton, one month before tenders closed. By the time we found out about it there was no time for opposition. There was, however, just sufficient time to allow the contractors in the South to amend their tenders.

The North Queensland manufacturers protested, and I protested to the Minister and to the Premier when Cabinet met in Ayr. All I got was an implied accusation that because I was protesting on behalf of the people of Queensland and industry in North Queensland I was a Communist or a Communist-follower. It seems that anyone who is prepared to protest in Queensland today is immediately smeared or slandered in this way. But time proved me correct. What we said would happen has happened in Townsville today. In one fell swoop, without any statement at all to northern manufacturers, but in a quiet statement to southern manufacturers, the Minister, by lowering the freight rates took away the capacity of North Queensland manufacturers to compete for this contract.

Who benefited by this action? Primarily the Commonwealth Government benefited, through its contractors and subcontractors. If it was possible to take fabricated steel north for \$28 a ton, that benefit must flow back through contractors and subcontractors to the Commonwealth Government. Yet the State Treasurer says, "We are not getting enough money from the Commonwealth Government." I agree with that, but at the same time, by the Minister's action, money that could have been made available to North Queensland is flowing back to the Commonwealth.

Admittedly the Railway Department may have obtained some benefit from this concession. The point I make is that instead of discussing with his colleagues what effect such a concession would have, the Minister went ahead and introduced this rate irrespective of its result on North Queensland. I can understand that he was endeavouring to undercut shipping rates from Sydney and Melbourne to Townsville, which perhaps would have been commendable in some circumstances if no-one else was going to be hurt. When he took this action, however, he sounded the death-knell of the steel industry in the North. Although protests were made, it appears that he could not care less because he did nothing about them. Although we told him what would

happen, he went ahead and virtually "murdered" the business of steel fabrication in the North.

The Minister later offered a freight concession rate on 2-ton lots of unprocessed steel for northern manufacturers, but that meant nothing. Northern manufacturers and fabricators have to buy from B.H.P., and everyone knows what a tremendous monopoly that organisation is. I have here letters which show that immediately any quantity of steel is sent forward, this company sends a numbered sight draft relating to each shipment of steel and asks for payment immediately. There is no question of giving a month's, two months' or three months' grace. Immediately B.H.P. sends steel, a bank draft is placed with the consignee's bank and paid immediately in cash. There is no question of any benefit flowing to northern manufacturers from the Minister's concession, and, by his action, he virtually "murdered" our steel-fabricating industry.

A moment ago I referred to an industry in the North going broke. I propose to mention its name, because doing so will not hurt anybody now. I wrote to the Minister for Industrial Development about it. Most certainly I am not attacking his department because, by the time the matter came to me after Mr. Bonnett had made a mess of it, it was too late for the Minister to do anything about it. I admit that he sent an accountant there, but it was much too late at that stage because things had gone too far. I appreciate that the Minister for Industrial Development certainly was not "in the race" at that time, and I am not launching this attack on him today.

The Townsville firm of Steelwrights is to be sold holus-bolus. It has been calculated that the business is worth \$150,000 as it stands.

Of course, it is running down fast, but that is the calculated worth of the business at present. At its peak it employed 72 men, and it employed 30 men in its general running. Last year its turn-over was \$750,000, and it paid wages amounting to \$183,000. After it had completed a tiny portion of the Army contract, it was unable to meet a mortgage of \$46,600 held by the Commonwealth Development Bank, and the bank immediately moved in, put in a receiver, and virtually declared the business bankrupt and prepared it for sale.

I think it is tragic that that has happened, and I can see that, in order to avoid bankruptcy, other businesses will close their doors. There are two others—I shall not mention their names because it has not happened to them yet—

Mr. Campbell: Have you had a look at the capital city prices for steel?

Mr. TUCKER: Yes. I shall deal with that in a moment. I propose to discuss it.

Although the industry to which I referred was virtually declared bankrupt, it had unsecured creditors in North Queensland who were owed many thousands of dollars but who were prepared to wait another 12 months to allow the business to get going. The peculiar thing was that, during the Army contract, the Commonwealth Development Bank was prepared to give the business another \$10,000; but then, in no time at all, it moved in and declared the business bankrupt.

There are really four big steel firms in Townsville—I have mentioned one; there are three others—and I intend to put on record some statistics that relate to their operations. The total employment over-all in the steel fabricating plants in Townsville initially was 510. I shall number the points that I wish to make from 1 to 5.

1. The highest number of employees engaged at any one time was 389. In a city the size of Townsville, that is a very important industry.

2. The total number of boilermakers in No. 1 (that is, the highest number of employees engaged at any one time) was 157.

3. The current total number of employees in the industry has dropped to 185—a decrease of 200.

4. The current total number of boilermakers has decreased from 157 to 63.

5. The percentage of capacity currently utilised in Townsville by the firms is not 100 but 48.5. That shows without a shadow of a doubt what has happened to the industry.

One of the firms concerned gave me statistics that I shall read out. If any hon. member wants to see them later and read the name of the engineering firm, he is at liberty to take the information away and look at it. I do not wish to mention the name of the firms; it may do them some harm if I do so.

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

Mr. TUCKER: Before the luncheon recess I had given certain statistics relative to the whole of the steel industry in Townsville and I had mentioned that I would give statistics pertaining to one particular firm. I will not mention its name, but if any hon. member should like to see the statistics he may do so afterwards. I numbered the statistics that I gave before lunch 1 to 5. On this occasion I will number them 1 to 6. The first is that the highest number of employees engaged at any one time with this firm was 57; No. 2 is that the total number of boilermakers listed in answer to question 1 was 27; No. 3 is that the current total of employees is 30 as against the previous 57; No. 4 is that the current number of boilermakers employed is 11 as against the 27; No. 5 is that the estimated monthly through-put of fabricated steel from the shop at full capacity was 250 tons and No. 6 is that the current actual through-put of fabricated steel per month is 60 tons. In other words, the firm is now working

at only 25 per cent. capacity, it has lost some 16 boilermakers, and is down some 30 employees over all—and that is only one firm. It is a perfect example of what is happening at the present time in the steel-fabrication industry in Townsville.

Over all, we can say that there is a 50 per cent. reduction in the work-force in this industry and also a 50 per cent. loss of production. It might be worse than that, but I find that sufficiently frightening and alarming because this is a basic industry in the North and particularly in Townsville; it is an industry that not only imports skilled labour but trains skilled labour as well as employing a labouring force.

By interjection a little while ago it was mentioned that Townsville is moving ahead, that firms are coming up there and erecting big shops. That is right, but at the present time there is a mushrooming of service industries. I have no argument against that, but our basic industries are languishing and when this happens it is not good for the economy of North Queensland and particularly for the economy of Townsville. We must keep our foundation industries. If we do not have the foundation, if these industries languish and become sick, the whole of our economy must, in fact, be sick.

When I say that our industries are losing skilled men to the South it should be remembered that not only do they lose these skilled tradesmen but they lose many of their offsidars as well. They leave, never to return, because they are not able to find employment. They head for the South. That alone is not good, but it must be remembered also that in the great majority of cases these skilled tradesmen have been trained by industry in the North and they are therefore a loss to North Queensland industry, which really has an investment in them.

The loss is two fold. Firstly, we cannot afford to lose people from North Queensland at all, and secondly, industry cannot afford to lose men it has trained. Yet, in fact, that position has been forced upon some industries. It has been forced upon them first and foremost by the unrealistic approach of the Minister for Transport to freight rates. He has not been concerned at all whether industry would be hurt; all he could see in front of him was increased revenue. When a deputation tried to point this out to him he said, "All I am concerned about is trying to increase the revenue of the Railway Department." What a short-sighted policy! This is what I mean when I say there is an individual approach and that the Government does not work as a team. If one member of Cabinet acts in this manner, what can we expect throughout Queensland? This is the sort of thing that is happening.

The steel industry in North Queensland is presently faced with a cessation of developmental projects in the sugar industry. Those projects have been considerable, but now

they have stopped. The sugar mills have expanded as far as they care to go, so there is no work coming from that source. The steel industry faces an encroachment from the pre-stressed concrete field. Previously the steel industry virtually had a prerogative in bridge and similar construction work. There can be no argument against pre-stressed concrete—this must come—but it does embarrass the steel industry. In addition, there is a cessation of major development at Mt. Isa. Mount Isa Mines Ltd. feels that its development has expanded far enough. When the K57 shaft is finished there will not be much work there.

The end result of all this has been the sorry spectacle of a price war between the fabricators themselves in the last few months. It has been almost a matter of dog eat dog in an attempt to secure work to try to keep the businesses alive. That is not good. It has all been brought about by what I have instanced.

The concessional freight rate is still operating, which means that southern firms are still able to tender successfully for major projects in Central and North Queensland, thus denying this work to northern firms.

What of the future? How can we help this industry? I do not intend to be entirely destructive in my criticism; I want to be constructive, too. I make a suggestion to the Treasurer because he is in charge of the debate and, through him, I make the suggestion to the Ministers concerned. I ask first that this unrealistic concessional freight rate from Brisbane to Townsville for pre-fabricated steel be revoked so that northern firms will not have this disadvantage operating against them.

Mr. Chalk: I have sympathy with you, but tell me how we could then prevent that business going over to shipping?

Mr. TUCKER: I have not finished; I will add something else, too. If, in fact, it was realistic to grant a concessional freight rate from Brisbane to Townsville—I assert that it was not—why could not a similar concession be granted from Townsville to Mt. Isa so that northern fabricators could gain some advantage in that direction? I ask that every consideration be extended to giving a similar concessional freight rate to our northern fabricators for the transport of fabricated steel from Townsville to Mt. Isa and, perhaps, to other places. That is one way in which we could gain some advantage.

Secondly, it has been claimed on many occasions that this Government has the ear of the Federal Government; that it is of the same political colour; that Mr. Chalk can go down to Canberra and talk to his counterpart in the Federal sphere. If he can bring pressure to bear and show that a burden is being placed on one part of Queensland, he should speak up on behalf of our northern

people. I ask him to approach the Commonwealth Government and get the port of Townsville declared a capital-city port by B.H.P. for steel pricing. This would allow steel to be landed in Townsville at the same price as in Brisbane and other capital cities. I know that is a fairly tall order, but it should not be beyond the Government. I understand that the tremendous monopoly of B.H.P. has—

Mr. Campbell: You want direction of industry in this matter.

Mr. TUCKER: Brisbane is protected by the freight rates. Surely Townsville can be protected to some extent. If the Government cannot protect us in this way it should try to ensure that steel is in fact landed in our port at the same price.

I have certain figures here to show what would happen. I believe that B.H.P. could very easily absorb the freight differential. I cannot visualise that there would be any great argument if it was asked to do so. It would amount to only 3.5c or 4c a ton on the price of steel throughout Australia if that were done. The sum of 3.5c or 4c represents as much steel per ton for B.H.P. as the steel I hold in my hand. This tiny piece of steel represents virtually nothing on B.H.P.'s output. B.H.P. could well absorb that very small amount per ton. Last year B.H.P. produced 5,548,842 tons of steel, and last year, through the port of Townsville, the total tonnage of all types of steel amounted to 31,467. If we were able to gain this concession, production in Townsville would be encouraged, as would production throughout North Queensland. New businesses would be established and possibly we could produce refrigerators and many other types of equipment in the North.

Mr. Campbell: What happens if, having asked B.H.P., the request is refused?

Mr. TUCKER: I am putting forward what I believe is the cure for this, and I am advancing it in all responsibility. I believe it is the Government's responsibility to try to protect the people wherever they may be, whether in business here or in North Queensland. It is useless granting a concession in Brisbane if, 800 or 1,400 miles away, we are getting nothing. Townsville is strategically situated in North Queensland. If it were to get capital-city port prices from B.H.P., Cairns would offer no argument, as it would benefit, too. The people of Cairns would be in complete agreement. If the Government is really interested in northern development it will use every pressure—every good office—to try to get the capital-city port price for steel in Townsville.

I ask the Premier and the Treasurer, when they are next in Canberra, to discuss with the Minister for Shipping and Transport the establishment of a Government-controlled shipping line in the North. It would enable fabricators and manufacturers in Townsville to tender for contracts in New Guinea and the Islands. Over 50 per cent. of those contracts

are presently let to Japanese firms. With a shipping line, manufacturers in Townsville could tender for and win those contracts. In addition, they would be able to tender for southern contracts.

If the Government is genuinely interested in northern development this is the way to achieve it, and businesses in Townsville would be able to stand on their own feet. Northern manufacturers should not be priced out by tremendous freight rates. Any Government worth its salt would see that that was done. I put that suggestion forward in a responsible way and ask the Government to assist.

Mr. HOUGHTON (Redcliffe) (2.32 p.m.): After hearing the remarks of the hon. member for Townsville North relative to the problems confronting the Treasurer and the State, we must all agree that the Treasurer has a very important job that must cause him many headaches. I offer my heartiest congratulations to him on the presentation of his Budget. As he said, it is a "push ahead" Budget, enabling the State of Queensland to march to a brighter and better future. The Treasurer said—and Opposition members have also said it—that there are many difficulties confronting him in this task.

We are all heartily in agreement that we do not get a large enough slice of the financial cake from the Federal Government. I have said that before, and I still say it. I do not need to run around corners or duck down corridors. The moment a Government loses its taxing powers it becomes subservient to the taxing authority, which in this instance is the Federal Government, and, no matter how good or bad a Treasurer is, if he does not get a large enough slice of the cake he cannot meet the demands made on the Government for the development of the State. This calls for the close scrutiny of the Federal Government so that the Treasurer can overcome the difficulties and problems that confront him.

It is gratifying to see members of the Opposition in the Federal sphere and in other places trying to jump on the band wagon to assist the Treasurer in his dilemma. I offer my heartiest congratulations to the Treasurer for bringing this matter to the notice of the Federal authorities. It is the creaking wheel that gets the oil in the finish, and the development of this State calls for the attention of the Federal Government.

The hon. member for Townsville North, who has just resumed his seat, gave some illustrations of the things that must influence the minds of all. Surely there is enough flexibility in the minds of those in the Federal Government who control the public purse to make more funds available to plug the financial gaps and assist development in this State. Let party politics be forgotten and money made available for development; that is what everybody in our democratic community wants to see. Although we may disagree on many things, I think we all see the basic principle, and the most important

aspect, of government as the development of our constitutional rights and the plugging of gaps by the provision of funds wherever that is necessary.

I sympathise with the Treasurer, and congratulate both him and the Premier on their wisdom and fortitude in presenting a claim for a larger slice of the financial cake. I hope their representations will be fruitful, as success will benefit not only small sections of the State but all of it. I think all Queenslanders readily agree that extra finance is most essential. After all, if the Treasurer obtains only a small slice of the cake, he becomes merely a puppet dancing at the hands of the Federal Government. That is completely wrong. Last year the Treasurer was castigated over the Budget that he had to present. This year I am very glad to see no evidence of additional taxation demands or imposts. I hope that that situation continues. After all, the State's economy is very good; it lacks only the co-operation of unions and extra finance to plug the financial gaps. I am quite sure that Queensland will continue to march on towards its rightful place in the nation.

The Treasurer's allocation of available funds runs right down the line to local authorities. As one who has had experience in this field of government, I sympathise with local authorities. I also sympathise with the Treasurer in his problems. I am quite sure, from what has already been done under the stewardship of the Government, that if it can obtain sufficient funds the State will continue to progress. However, if there are no additional avenues of taxation open to the Treasurer, where does he go for extra finance? The Loan Council is, in my view, responsible for restricting development in some forms, because I am firmly of the opinion that it is not aware of the magnitude of the demands made upon the States. I think it is evident from the development that has taken place in this State over the last 10 years that all demands made on the Treasurer cannot be met without greater assistance from the Commonwealth Government.

On looking back over the years, I think all will agree that people worked harder in the old days. When one thinks of the railway construction work that was then carried out, and the buildings that were then erected, including Parliament House and others in George Street, one must come to the conclusion that there is something radically wrong with the present financial structure or with the contributions that we are making today. In the old days either people worked harder or more funds were made available through the taxing authority.

There are probably faults on both sides; but after looking at the development that took place in earlier days and comparing it with what is happening today, I am firmly of the opinion that we have become either complacent about the development of the

State or lazy in our approach to the problems that confront us. This aspect of the problem must be studied very closely, and I am very glad to see that the Federal Government has paid attention to the demands made by the Treasurer in this Chamber. I hope that his suggestions will bear fruit.

Hon. members opposite have said that in some instances State funds should not be made available. I point out to them that no businessman worth his salt will put money into a project if he does not think it has a chance of developing and producing a good return on the capital that he invests. We should all keep in mind that man is virtually living on borrowed time. He has only three score years and ten, and I believe that he is entitled to enjoy the best possible living conditions and to share in the wealth, development and progress of the State. The ordinary citizen will be able to do that only if there is a change of heart on the part of the Federal Government when it cuts up the financial cake and hands it out to the States.

Mr. Newton: Unfortunately, man has not received any return over the last 10 years.

Mr. HOUGHTON: I should say very definitely that the man who has been prepared to work has received a return in Queensland. One can see evidence of this throughout the State. A man is much better off today—most men will admit this—than he was in earlier years. And why shouldn't he be? I do not deny him the right to have a car, a washing machine for his wife, and the amenities of life for his children. Good luck to him. It is the responsibility of the hon. member for Belmont and myself to see that the people of this State have the best possible living conditions.

However, I absolutely abhor the situation that has arisen in the development of the State as a result of the efforts of some trade unions. Trade unions are necessary, and I do not want hon. members opposite to make any mistake about the fact that I support them. But I cannot support trade unions that are not prepared to abide by arbitration and by the system that our fathers fought so hard for. They are the ones who are absolutely crucifying the development of Queensland at present. In effect, it is just a dogfight between certain elements in the trade-union movement. They are at each other's throats and poor old John Citizen becomes the meat in the sandwich.

I do not make any concessions on this issue. In fact, I go a little further and say that I blame the Government for some of the problems confronting the State in this direction. I agree with the submissions made by some hon. members that it is about time the Government faced up to its responsibilities and stopped allowing some of the people at the Trades Hall to put their feet on its neck and showed them who is

running the country. The Government should tell Egerton, Dawson, and the others who try to run the State, just where their authority begins and ends.

Mr. Davies: You are spoiling it now.

Mr. HOUGHTON: These are the cold, hard facts. Every good trade unionist will agree quite readily with what I am saying. Unfortunately, the wheel has turned a full circle. Instead of the workers instructing the executives of their unions what they want to do, the position has been reversed and the executives are telling the workers what they must do.

Mr. Sherrington: Tell us what union you ever belonged to.

Mr. HOUGHTON: I would not want to be associated with any union that the hon. member is associated with. He and his fellow-travellers are the ones who are trying to kill this country at the present time. I would not want to be associated with anyone at the Trades Hall that the hon. member associates with because, as I say, they are the ones who are destroying this country today. And, make no mistake about it, good trade-union men today will not go along with the fellow-travellers, the Hanoi group and the Trades Hall mob. That is the situation that confronts us all today. There must be unity.

I do not deny that there should be trade unions and I do not deny the trade unions or anybody else the right to look for the best conditions they can obtain. But what do we find happening today? They are not prepared to accept arbitration, which has done so much for the worker. The yokels at the Trades Hall are allowed to dictate what is to be done.

Mr. Thackeray: Are you talking about "scab" unions?

Mr. HOUGHTON: It is a shocking state of affairs to hear hon. members opposite talking about "scabs" in reference to members of the A.W.U., particularly when such hon. members condoned the bludgeoning and blackmailing of men, women and children at Collinsville. Having condoned such things, they have the audacity to stand up here and say they believe in trade-unionism.

Mr. Newton: You ought to talk about Collinsville and Mt. Isa!

Mr. HOUGHTON: I heard Mt. Isa mentioned; I was up there last week and I would say that Mt. Isa is a typical example of co-operation between management and union in the welfare and development of the district. Mount Isa Mines Ltd. is to be congratulated on the conditions, amenities and other facilities it provides for workers. As a matter of fact, I give the company full marks.

Mr. Newton interjected.

Mr. HOUGHTON: They won't have anything to do with the hon. member's "Commo mob" now. The hon. member can't take it. Like O'Reilly's dog, he wants to dish it out but he can't take it.

As I said before, Mount Isa Mines Ltd. is to be congratulated, and I congratulate those who reached agreement there. I sincerely hope that there is no further industrial strife in that centre. I am satisfied that the wisdom of both the union and the mine management is a clear indication of what can take place, and should take place, provided everyone is allowed to do the right thing. Mount Isa Mines Ltd., in its approach to this problem, obviously fully realised the needs, requirements and demands for the welfare of everybody concerned—and rightly so. As I said before, I firmly believe that until such time as hon. members opposite get rid of a few of the hardheads and those pursuing the antagonistic line, and prevent them from representing the workers, there will always be these undercurrents.

Mr. Davies: What part does management play in it?

Mr. HOUGHTON: I am satisfied that there is no problem, big or small, that cannot be solved around the table.

It concerns me that all elected representatives do not pay due respect to some of the things we have all worked so hard for. I would be remiss if I did not say that there are many good union leaders and many good men in unions today. At the same time, I am vitally concerned about the future welfare and development of this State. What was achieved in the past is being trodden into the ground by a few rabble-rousers whom nobody is prepared to pull into gear. The time is ripe for the Government to take firm action against them.

I have heard all sorts of submissions about the responsibilities of both Government parties. Until such time as it is realised that a champion team is better than a team of champions, and we get a co-operative spirit, we will never get anywhere. We must realise that the time is fast approaching when we will have to compete to an increased extent. God only knows what is going to be the future role of this State. Through her mouth-piece, the Prime Minister, Great Britain has already said that she cannot look after Australia. It is obvious that we will have to stand on our own feet. In the past we have been a primary-producing nation, but more and more now are we becoming an industrial nation. However, I am firmly of the opinion that we will have to maintain our primary production as well as engage in increased industrial development. This will require the closest co-operation of all concerned—unions, Governments, and business management.

Mr. Newton interjected.

Mr. HOUGHTON: As the hon. member is a responsible member of the Opposition, I would expect him to challenge those on the Hill when they step out of line and tell them that they are wrong. Let the hon. member pull up his socks. When he does that, I will commend him and congratulate him on taking such a stand.

Mr. Newton: Why didn't you make a speech like this when Black and Bulcock were down at Redcliffe? They've got you rattled.

Mr. HOUGHTON: That will be the day when Egerton, Black, Bulcock or any other "bull" around the place can intimidate me. The hon. member's old friend, Mr. Bulcock, has already left the Redcliffe peninsula. He is up in the mountains somewhere. My old friend, Harry Dean, will tell the hon. member how much he wanted Bulcock to assist him in his campaign. In that capacity he would have been the best campaign director I could ever have. You could beat him with your hat. I suppose he had been through the mill. When he came to Redcliffe I think he had a reputation, but unfortunately for him that is behind him now. This is one thing I cannot understand about the organisation of hon. members opposite. The Labour movement was once something that they could be proud of. Today hon. members opposite sit idly by and allow a few rabble-rousers to drag Labour's name into the dust and annihilate all the good things it did for mankind and unionism.

There are a few points I should like to touch on relative to the Budget.

Mr. P. Wood interjected.

Mr. HOUGHTON: When you grow whiskers,—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Smith): Order! Will the hon. member please address the Chair.

Mr. HOUGHTON: There are a couple of items in the Budget that concern me. The first one is the matter of transport, which we all know is a very important activity of government. It is tremendously important to those who use public transport, or any other method of transport, to get to their places of employment. I am concerned about the Government's attitude to the transport problem. From the way we are approaching road transport, I can never visualise that roads will be constructed so that individuals in their own motor-cars will be able to travel from Redcliffe to Rocklea in a reasonable time.

I believe that the Government should look closely at a ring-road, monorail transport system, or some other railway system. No-one has yet convinced me that the great mass of people can be lifted quickly by a system other than the railways. The time is fast approaching when there must be a new approach to this problem, particularly by the Government. It is all very well for the Government to say that it has no funds to do this or that, but I suggest that it should adopt the same approach to this problem as is intended to be adopted in the implementation of the Bligh Plan for Roma Street. If the Government is not prepared to construct a monorail system itself, it should call world-wide tenders.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. HOUGHTON: I give Clem Jones full marks for some of his thinking; make no mistake about that. No-one can say that I am not willing to give credit where it is due. I am prepared to castigate people for things that I believe are wrong, and I think that is the responsibility of every hon. member in this Assembly. However, I make no bones about the fact that I give credit to Clem Jones for some excellent work he has done. Anybody who has had an opportunity of being associated with him must agree with that. There are some things I do not agree with, but anybody who has to do anything in this world makes mistakes. The most important matter is not to continue making the same mistake. It is important to learn from past mistakes.

A report on Brisbane's smog problem was furnished last week by responsible people. Mr. Gilpin, and Mr. Shield of the Meteorological Bureau, both said that Brisbane's smog problem is the worst in the Commonwealth. That is alarming, and the Government must be ever mindful of the danger. I firmly believe that factories must follow the river to take advantage of shipping facilities, and that they must also take advantage of the interstate railway line, interstate road transport, and the availability of industrial land. The availability of water and many other things must also be taken into account. Furthermore, I think it is the responsibility of businesses to decide where they want to put their factories and develop. However, in the light of the report submitted. I am firmly of the opinion that immediate consideration should be given by the Government to what will happen in the next 10 to 20 years.

I visualise that the northern side of the Brisbane River will become much more densely populated. It will be found that the area represented by the hon. member for Sandgate will want to become a suburb of Redcliffe. I am firmly of the opinion that there will be more and more residential development on the northern side of the Brisbane River. Therefore, there should be a fast transport system by monorail or something similar, and if the Government is not prepared to undertake that project it should call world-wide tenders. Such a system could run from Sandgate to Kallangur, Petrie, Brisbane, Ipswich, Inala, Wynnum and Pinkenba, with road-transport feeder services to it. That would be a cheap, fast method of transportation. I realise that in many instances it is difficult to get a local authority to put in a trench for sewerage purposes, but this transportation system would be advantageous and beneficial. In addition, it would alleviate the smog problem. We cannot cast aside the report that I mentioned. As the city grows and the population increases, so too will this problem become greater, and it must be faced up to quickly. Now is the time to lay plans for future projects.

There has been no development of magnitude of our waterways. The Government should purchase a couple of hydrofoils

or a similar means of transportation. One could be used in North Queensland and one in Moreton Bay on a trial basis. It is evident that we must adopt a different approach to our transportation problems.

Mr. Davies: Is there any chance of repairs being made to the Hornibrook Highway?

Mr. HOUGHTON: Yes. A few of the wooden blocks are being replaced. All hon. members will agree that there must be a limit on how long a wooden structure can be kept in good condition. It will be interesting to see what happens in 1975, when Hornibrook Highway Ltd. says to the Lord Mayor of Brisbane or the Mayor of Redcliffe, "There it is." As a ratepayer, I hope I will not have to dig into my own pocket to maintain this structure, whose life will already be behind it. Probably the best approach to Redcliffe will be through Redcliffe West, where there is no great stretch of water to cross. I have no objection to another toll bridge being constructed by a large organisation. If it is prepared to put money into it, it is entitled to some return. The Hornibrook Highway has been of paramount importance in the development of Redcliffe. People do not have to pay the toll because there is an alternative route along Anzac Avenue, and anybody can work out the economics of driving his car an extra 5 or 6 miles or paying 10c toll.

Mr. Davies: Haven't they made a big profit of it?

Mr. HOUGHTON: I suppose so. I should like to be a shareholder.

Mr. Davies: They have not ploughed much back into it.

Mr. HOUGHTON: My word they have. They did not for a start, when Mr. Hornibrook nearly went broke. If the civic fathers of Redcliffe had had the vision and foresight of M. R. Hornibrook and had invested a few pounds in the project, nobody on the Redcliffe Peninsula would be paying rates today. The Hornibrook Highway is the best cash register in the State. However, Hornibrook had the foresight to put money into the venture, and I do not deny to those who display such initiative one penny in return.

There are another couple of points with which I should like to deal. The hon. member for Clayfield dealt with an attack made on the Premier, and the statement that he is the highest-paid pensioner in the country. That attack was regrettable, because personalities should be avoided at all times. This State should be very happy with, and indeed proud of, the development that has taken place under the stewardship of Frank Nicklin. If the gentlemen who attacked him in that way leave behind in the development of this State the monuments that have been erected by Frank Nicklin in the ten years

that he has been Premier, they will have done very well indeed. I think all decent and fair-minded Queenslanders will readily agree with that assertion. The attitude of his critics is rather hard to follow. However, there are those who resort to such tactics when they do not get their own way. I think it behoves all of us to keep "plugging" for the things that we believe in, as it is the creaking wheel that gets the oil.

I firmly believe that the development of this State under the stewardship of Frank Nicklin has been unparalleled, and it is regrettable that personal attacks should be made on one who has done so much for Queensland. However, I feel that, with the respect and high esteem in which he is held in the State, he will not be very worried about such attacks.

Another scathing attack was the one made by a Mr. Nolan on the Minister for Transport. I do not know Mr. Nolan. He said on one occasion that the Minister was absolutely devoid of all intelligence. It comes back to the state of mind of those who wield the big stick and say, "You will come to the party, or else." That is where the system breaks down. I do not know Mr. Nolan; apparently he is some sort of executive officer in the Australian Railways Union and the Trades Hall. The redundancy issue is, I suppose, a result of automation. Although I can readily understand concern for the welfare of employees, I am firmly of the opinion that nobody will want to say, "You can't do this", or, "You can't do that." It is all a matter of co-operation, and I compliment and congratulate the Minister on the stand that he took.

The attitude of the unions cannot be tolerated. The Minister was told, "You will come to the party, or else. This is what you will do." How could anybody sit round a table knowing that that threat was uppermost in the minds of those with whom he was supposed to negotiate? A problem such as this has to be approached with an open mind and heart so that the best can be done for the individual and the State. After all, is that not democracy?

Many hon. members in this Chamber have taken up arms to protect the democracy in which we live, and this matter is of vital importance to all of us. The sooner we get straight thinking and straight talking about the problems that confront the State in this field, the sooner the State will march to progress. Queensland will never progress as it should while individuals hold up a big stick and adopt a threatening attitude.

If one wished to examine Mr. Nolan's background and besmirch his character, one could point the finger at the fact that he has visited Russia three or four times in the last 15 years. As I say, I do not know the gentleman personally; I am not interested

in him. However, I think things such as that should be considered by every decent citizen.

Mr. Davies: That is a silly thing to say. What about the men in England and the United States?

Mr. HOUGHTON: I know that you were not born in a fish-and-chip shop, so you could not be a fish or a chip.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Smith): Order! The hon. member will please address the Chair. I have already spoken to him about that.

Mr. Davies: If the Communists have afternoon tea with the Queen, the Queen is a Communist.

Mr. HOUGHTON: If the hon. member wishes to carry on with the argument, I am prepared to do so. These matters are very important; they should be brought out into the open. Let us be frank not only about Frank Nolan but also about all the other matters. As I said earlier, I am not interested in Mr. Nolan personally; what I am interested in is that he is prepared to upset the whole economy of the country and that some hon. members opposite are fellow-travellers of his.

I do not deny the worker the right to strike. I think he is entitled to strike if he does not get justice. However, I believe that every decent and fair-minded Queenslander should be concerned about the people who carefully create a situation that is of absolutely no benefit to the worker in this State.

If the Government is to provide the State with good government and succeed in developing it, there are two very important things that it must do. Firstly, it must get a larger slice of the financial cake from the Federal Government; secondly, it must give serious consideration to calling world-wide tenders for projects designed to improve the present system of transport.

I think, too, that the Government should immediately consider means of arresting the exodus from western areas represented by the hon. member for Flinders, Bill Lonergan, the hon. member for Gregory, Wally Rae, and the hon. member for Barcoo. Those who have been out to the West and have mixed with the people who live there will readily agree that they are the true Australians, the true Queenslanders, who have done so much to develop the State. A few weeks ago I was in Jundah. A council meeting was held in the evening, and at 10 past 11, at the conclusion of the meeting, some of the councillors travelled as far as 120 miles down the old Birdsville Track. That is the sort of thing that makes one proud to be associated with men of that calibre.

In western areas there is a crying need to air-condition buildings under the authority of the Government for the benefit of people who live there. The other matter, of course, is beyond the jurisdiction of this State Government. It is the installation of television in these areas to bring some entertainment into the lives of these people.

I feel, too, that many wool-growers at the present time are facing great hardship and privation because of the imposition of increased living costs, freight charges, and other things of that nature, which make heavy demands on them today. Hon. members should not forget that levies were made at a time when the wool industry was at its peak; today it is at low ebb and I think sympathetic and favourable consideration must be given to the matter of extending relief to people who are prepared to live in and develop the western parts of this State. I think this can only be done by co-operation among everyone concerned—the unions, business management, and the Government.

I hope the time will arrive when we will be able to build this great State into something even greater than it is today, and to improve democracy into something better than it is today.

Mr. HARRIS (Wynnum) (3.17 p.m.): I do not propose to elaborate on the Budget, especially as the hon. member for Toowoong, Mr. Porter, has clearly voiced his disapproval of the Government's handling of the Treasury benches. I fully realise that this Budget is one of the most defeatist Budgets ever brought down in this Parliament. It offers the people nothing but promises, while blaming every possible element such as drought, wage increases, industrial disputes, and even the Commonwealth Government.

It has been said by some previous speakers that the Budget debate is of such national importance that they would rather not punish the parish pump but would deal with matters of much more importance and value. However, in my opinion, the problems of my electorate and its people are problems of national importance. On their behalf, I propose to bring to the notice of this Committee not only the problems that exist in my own electorate but some things which this Government appears to be over-looking. Whether this is because of its own inability to see where trouble exists or because the heads of certain establishments that are producing goods for and on behalf of the Government are incompetent, I do not know. But, later in my speech, I will endeavour to prove to the Committee where, in my opinion, one or two factions are completely incorrect.

In my Address-in-Reply speech on 29 August I mentioned a certain matter. I am a little disappointed that the Minister for Housing and the Commissioner for Housing have just walked out through the

lobby because, rather than castigating them it is my intention to compliment them. I am sorry they are not here.

Mr. Bromley: Get stuck into them.

Mr. HARRIS: It is not the usual practice of Labour parliamentarians to attack people in their absence. They much prefer to tell the truth on all occasions, irrespective of whom it may affect.

It has been mentioned that I propose once again to drive nails into a certain matter, but I merely want to tell the Committee what actually happened about a contract that was signed on 6 February, 1967. The keys of the house in question were handed over to a very satisfied young couple on 6 October, 1967, exactly 35 weeks after the contract was signed, and 11 weeks overdue.

Mr. Newton: Was that private enterprise?

Mr. HARRIS: It was private enterprise. I will get on to the day-labour side later on.

I admit that there was quite a delay. I admit, too, that I may appear to be a little unfair in what I am saying, because after I spoke to the Minister he left no stone unturned to rectify the position.

Mr. Sherrington: That was good representation by you.

Mr. HARRIS: Granted. The inspectors from the Queensland Housing Commission, under the supervision of the Commissioner—I give him full credit for this—came down to the dwelling and caused quite a stir. Very briefly, I will tell the Committee what they found to be incorrect and what they have remedied on behalf of the two young people concerned. Some of the roof tiles had to be replaced; the concrete around the pylons that hold up the patio had to be renewed; the exterior paint had to be scraped off and the building repainted; the interior of the dwelling had to be repainted; the hinges on the stable door in the kitchen were replaced with the proper type of hinge—a stronger type that should have been used in the first place; the catches on the windows were replaced because the inspectors, who are fully qualified tradesmen, realised in their wisdom that those used were inadequate. The young people wanted a certain type of garage door. A different type of door was erected. It was taken down and replaced by the type of door of their choosing. The inspectors realised that if this couple wanted to go into the garage at night-time they would be in a ton of bother because the light switch was inside the garage in such a position that when the Tilt-a-Door was opened it covered the pull-switch. It meant that they would have had to come in the door, close it behind them, switch on the light, reopen the door, drive the car in, close the door, switch off the light and then reopen the door to leave the garage. That difficulty was eventually overcome. At the same time, the old type of pull-switch, which went out of use long ago, was replaced.

I am not familiar with the materials used, but what I will refer to as the concrete septic tank that had been placed on the job for use on this land was rejected by the inspectors and subsequently replaced with an obviously first-class one. All these faults were found only because of the alertness of the Housing Commission inspectors, who came down to the dwelling under instructions. I pay them a full compliment for this.

While the house was taking so long to be completed, the hot-water system was left underneath it. When the electrician arrived back on the job there was no hot-water system. The inspector saw to it that another very good, high-quality hot-water system was provided in place of the stolen one.

It was suggested earlier that I may have appeared to have been unfair, and it was also suggested that if I continued to pursue this line there was a possibility that I would be victimised. I do not suggest for a moment that this would happen—and let us sincerely hope that it does not happen, because, if it does, it will be right up my alley. I make that perfectly clear.

I should now like to draw attention to a question that was asked concerning the tailoring of uniforms for prison officers. It was directed by the hon. member for Chatsworth to the Minister for Health, as follows—

“(1) Has his attention been drawn to a report in ‘The Courier-Mail’ of August 17, headed ‘Jail Suits—Last Word’, which stated that prison officers complained that uniforms made by prisoners in the Prison’s tailor’s shop were so bad that they were made to look like clowns?”

“(2) Are these claims well founded and, if so, what steps are being taken to correct the situation?”

The Minister’s answer was—

“I read the article referred to by the hon. member with some amusement . . .”

It amazed me that a Minister would doubt the word of one of his own Government members, who said that the work these people were doing was so bad that it made the people wearing the uniforms look like clowns. I would be permitted to say that because I am a member of the Opposition. I would also be permitted to say it because I have had the privilege, and the opportunity, of seeing some of these garments. The hon. member was wrong when he said the uniforms made the prison officers look like clowns, and I think he may have been wrong when he suggested they were made at the prison’s tailor shop. I think the officers looked like circus employees and that the garments were made at George Pickers’s canvas factory.

The Minister’s reply was—

“I read the article referred to by the hon. member with some amusement, and can only assume that the journalist responsible was the victim of a certain amount of leg-pulling.”

Mr. Tucker interjected.

Mr. HARRIS: I will come to that later on.

I should not like to suggest that any qualified journalist would be doing any leg-pulling. Journalists are very responsible people. They would certainly print the truth concerning a subject like this.

The Minister's answer continued—

"I can assure the hon. member, from my own personal observations . . ."

The Minister referred to his own personal observations. Let it be said that the Minister is one of the most immaculate dressers in this Chamber; he would most certainly know good clothing when he saw it. He must have taken someone's advice on this; he is much too astute to make a statement such as this without personally investigating the matter—

" . . . I have been impressed by the smartness both of their bearing and of their appearance."

Of course the Minister would be impressed. That is why Ted Harris and a dozen other Ted Harrises have for a number of years, been making a particularly good living from making alterations not only to prison uniforms but also to railway and police uniforms, and various uniforms for other departments which, through their incompetence, are making these suits so shockingly badly that the people for whom they are made cannot wear them. They take them along to private enterprise and are exploited.

The Minister's answer continued—

"Prison officers at H.M. Prison, Brisbane, have their uniforms made to measure."

I do not doubt for one moment that they are made to measure. I do not know whether they are measured with a tape, a foot rule, or a piece of string with a knot in it. But I suggest that the people who do the measuring are not qualified to do so, because they turn out such shocking work. It has been claimed that they are under the supervision and direction of a tailoring instructor. If that is so, there must be other reasons why this work is turned out as it is.

A moment ago I was asked by an interjector what qualifications I have to make the statement I have made. I have here my signed indentures from the Queensland Government Apprenticeship Board. It would be interesting to know how many Government members are in the privileged position of being able to display apprenticeship indentures.

I followed the question that I have referred to with a series of questions on the tailoring of uniforms of Government employees. But first let me deal more with the prison uniforms. I have with me a uniform that was made for a prison officer.

A Government Member: Put it on.

Mr. HARRIS: I have every intention of putting it on.

Mr. Murray: How can this be put into "Hansard"?

Mr. HARRIS: I should like to put it over the hon. member's head.

This uniform that I have here was made for a normal stock-size 5. I realise that that language may be foreign to the farmers on the other side of the Chamber, so for their information a size 5 would fit a man like the hon. member for Barooka. I shall put this coat on. Have a look at the back. Look at the breast pocket. It would be logical to assume that it would be on straight. Have a look at the flap. If that line was continued hon. members can see what would happen.

Mr. Lee interjected.

Mr. HARRIS: I do not expect criticism from the hon. member for Yeronga; he did not have a coat until he was 19. I now produce a pair of trousers.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Smith): I hope that the hon. member does not propose to demonstrate that article of clothing. (Laughter.)

Mr. HARRIS: I mentioned earlier that it was alleged that these clothes could have been made in a circus, so I appreciate the fun that hon. members opposite are having. This is indeed a circus.

I now produce the trousers, which match the coat. Although the name of the owner has been removed, the measurements are shown if anybody cares to examine them. I was told in answer to my question that clothing was tailored to measure. I am not complaining about the measurements of these trousers, except that they are too long. Just look at them! And we are told that these fellows are well dressed! From the information that I have received, the tailoring department has not even a steam press—it is in the laundry—and these garments are pressed by hand and sent out in similar condition to the ones I have here.

With regard to workmanship, there before me is the product untouched and unsullied. This is the way trousers are turned out. I invite hon. members to look at them for themselves. This part is sewn up with needle and thread.

A Government Member: You are destroying Government property.

Mr. HARRIS: I will put it back in better condition than it is now. It is not even sewn by machine, and there are machines available that sew on the inside only. It is the pressing and the workmanship on the bottom of the trousers that I am complaining bitterly about. These are the garments that prison officers are complaining about. Make no bones about it—these garments are not free gifts. They represent part of the salaries of prison officers, and for that reason they are entitled to the best.

The garment that I now produce was made for a different person altogether. These trousers measure five inches in the back seam.

They were measured by a trade instructor and cut by a tradesman, yet work of this type is turned out. The fly is not even made correctly; it is not even pressed on the inside; there is no crutch piece; yet prison officers are expected to be reasonably well dressed to represent the State Government among the public.

It may be argued, "What would happen if the State Government, like the Brisbane City Council, turned its employees out in nice terylene olive-green uniforms?" The only point of similarity between the uniforms of prison officers and those of Brisbane City Council tramwaymen is that they are both olive-green in colour. There is no other relationship whatever. It could be asked, "What would happen to those who work in the tailoring department at the gaol if they no longer made these uniforms?" It would not make a scrap of difference, because no prisoner spends long enough in the tailoring shop to learn anything about tailoring.

I now leave tailoring to deal with shirts. Only a giraffe would fit into the shirt that I now have in my hand. It has a neck of 1½ inches and a body to fit Marty Hanson. To prove that what I am saying is not a complete fabrication, in the course of making further inquiries I got in touch with the Railway Department.

I know that the Minister for Transport is very interested in this. I have here three pairs of trousers belonging to the one man. Some hon. members may ask, "Why does he need three pairs of trousers?" This man has about six pairs of trousers and six vests, simply because those that are provided do not fit him. Tickets are attached to the garments that I have here. They show the man's name and the station to which he is attached. Each pair of trousers is completely different in size, and the measurements vary not by half an inch but, in one instance, by two inches. They would not really be too bad if the seams were opened and oversewn to prevent them falling apart. The workmanship would be fairly good if good material had been used to sew them; but, as hon. members can see, the sewing is of a poor standard and inferior material has been used in the pockets and other places.

I am pointing this out for the benefit of the Committee generally. The Treasurer, with his wide experience in the Railway Department, is aware of it, I am sure.

Mr. Sherrington: He was responsible for it.

Mr. HARRIS: No, he was not responsible for it. I believe that the people in private enterprise who are responsible for making these garments are taking advantage of the State Government, and I think that the Minister for Transport and the Treasurer are aware of what is going on.

I will give the Committee another instance relative to the same pair of trousers. It is logical to assume that waist measurements will fluctuate, and I suppose that alterations

have been made to the waist of every pair of trousers in this Chamber, including the pair worn by the Treasurer. On the pair that I have in my hand there is a back seam of one inch; on this other pair there is a back seam of two inches. That is the reason why so many railway garments are being used by fishermen and many people other than railway men. They simply do not fit the person for whom they are meant.

The garment that I have in my hand now is the classic of them all. It is a railway uniform coat. I know that costs play an important part in the State Government's thinking at present, and I am sure that if it could get the uniforms made more cheaply, it would. But it should realise that men have to wear these uniforms and "front" the public in them. How can they do their job decently and respectably when they are asked to wear uniforms such as these? It is just as bad as putting a clerical worker in a pair of blue overalls. He would be as humiliated as the unfortunate people who have to wear these uniforms. As I said, not even a seam is pressed or oversewn, and one has only to touch the garments to imagine what happens when they are washed.

They are made out of navy serge, a material that went out with the bullock wagon. Every other Government in the Commonwealth is using the type of material that should be used in 1967. This material is similar to the railway serge that was used in 1914. Railwaymen in northern and western Queensland have to wear uniforms of this type, no matter whether it is the middle of summer or the middle of winter. The Government's attitude is, "They are only railway workers. Why give them anything better?" That is the opinion of Government members; it is not ours.

I now draw the Committee's attention to two better-class garments. These are the quality garments for workers in the railways. They are supplied to railway employees who prefer not to wear this shocking garment. Instead, they go for a lumber-jacket. I fitted this garment on several people, including myself. At one stage I was under the impression that it could have been a fractional-fitting garment. For the information of the unwary, fractional fittings are made so that it is possible to get a garment to fit big, small, thin or stout fellows, but I have not yet found any person whom this one will fit. I can get it to fit in the sleeves but then the body is too short, or I can get it to fit in the body but not in the sleeves—yet these garments are made to measure. There is no question about that.

For those hon. members who are wondering—and they are wondering—why I am not telling who makes these garments, I might mention that I have never worked for these people and I do not suppose that after today I would ever get a job with them. People who turn out garments like this, one would think, would not want anyone to know anything about it. However, I have discovered in the pockets of one of these jackets

an advertising gimmick. The people who turn out these garments have the cheek and audacity to put an advertising card in the pocket stating that they will give a union discount. Any union member who is game to go to the city or into any other town where Woulfe & Sons are trading—anyone who is game to go out on Saturday morning or at any time in daylight and can produce his current financial union ticket—can get a discount of 10 per cent. This is the only time I have every known private enterprise to be interested in unions—and you can bet your bottom dollar that if a unionist produced his union ticket the price would go up 10 per cent.

However, my intention was to bring to the attention of this Committee, and the Ministers concerned, the shocking state of prison and railway uniforms. I did intend to include police uniforms but I found on inspection that, for some unknown reason, they are all right. If it was not for the tailors in the districts where these people are working there would not be one well-dressed railwayman or prison employee in Queensland.

Mr. Carey: You can overcome this. You can resign your seat and be head tailor at the gaol.

Mr. HARRIS: If I should happen to do that, it would not be very long before I had the hon. member working for me.

I have already spoken about housing. I think that unbeknown to the Minister for Works and Housing these things existed. He did a particularly good job in remedying the faults. They are now a very happy young couple. It was because of the interest that the Minister and the Commissioner took in this particular case that the faults have been remedied. I have no further complaint there.

As to my exhibition of tailoring, I suggest that the State Government should look very carefully at the goods it is receiving to ensure that it is getting quality as well as quantity in the uniforms it is paying for. In my opinion it is being taken for a ride.

I know that the next subject I intend to mention will be a matter of great interest to the Committee. It will be something that hon. members have never heard about before! I wish to discuss the possibility of the erection of a hospital to serve Wynnum, Manly and the surrounding district. I realise that this is something that the Government would rather I did not speak about. I draw attention to a letter from the establishment committee to the local Press in which gratitude is expressed to the 250 people who attended the last hospital committee meeting, thus giving a clear indication that the people of Wynnum were not going to sit down and accept this Government's argument against providing a hospital in the area. I could talk for another hour about why we should have this hospital.

If the Government intends to try to overcome some of the present unemployment this is one method that could be used.

On television the night before last it was suggested that there was a drop of 1,500 in the number of unemployed. Such a statement is made only to hoodwink the people because these figures are taken over a period. In the Wynnum district alone imagine the amount of employment that could be created by the establishment of a hospital.

Recently the hon. member for Ithaca asked the Minister for Health the following question about extensions to the Ipswich Hospital—

“(1) Will he supply details of extensions or additions to hospital buildings at Ipswich in recent years?”

“(2) When were these works commenced and/or when are they likely to be completed?”

“(3) What is the cost of work completed to date, work under construction and work in the planning stages?”

I have no complaint about extensions being made to the Ipswich Hospital. I am glad that they are getting these facilities. But when one realises that the population of Wynnum and the surrounding district is almost equivalent to the population of the Ipswich district—and I heard the hon. member for Ipswich East gasp when I said that—it makes one wonder why the same consideration cannot be given to my area. There is no question of the need for a hospital and I feel sure that within the next two or three years we will get one there. I respectfully suggest that in the meantime some further consideration be given to clinics. There is a clinic at Wynnum and from the viewpoint of the hospital board it would appear to be a very good and successful clinic. On many occasions I have asked that the visiting hours be revised and altered to suit conditions at Wynnum. Two doctors, on two visiting days or 7 hours a week, have to look after the needs of approximately 40,000 people. Hon. members will note how inadequately we are catered for in Wynnum from a medical point of view.

I have another complaint—and again, I am prepared to be blasted—from a lady in my electorate who has a son and a daughter aged 8 and 10 respectively. She had the children registered at the clinic, but because the clinic took so long to get around to them she took them to the clinic. The child was duly taken into the surgery. Continuous screaming by the lad could be heard in the waiting room, as could the yelling of the dentist, and finally in desperation the parent asked if she could see the lad. Her request was refused on the ground that parents are not permitted in the surgery under any circumstances. I think that is justified; I have no complaint against that. The sister came out to the parent and told her that the dentist had

tried to fill a tooth and that the tooth had broken down. There could be no complaint about that. When such a thing occurs it is just unfortunate. But I am complaining about the fact that the dentist then removed two teeth from this child of eight years, who was by then in a state of complete exhaustion and terror. I remind hon. members that the parent was not permitted to see the child. When the dentist came out with him he told the parent to take the child away and added, "Don't bring him back; we don't want him here; he is too hard to handle and we will not give him any service." If it is suggested that this is a fabrication, why did this same dentist, the very next morning, send a letter in the post to the parent with a complete explanation? He said—

"With regard to our conversation this afternoon, regarding treatment of Christopher, I am prepared to make a trial of two visits to the surgery with you present in the surgery."

I remind hon. members that 24 hours earlier he had hunted the child out of the surgery and had told the mother he would not treat him under any circumstances.

The letter continues—

"You must realise, however, that this is not the usual treatment and if not successful we must revert to the normal procedure.

"As you left without making further appointments . . ."

Can hon. members imagine that a woman would want to stand round a surgery after having been treated like that! Hon. members can imagine her suffering and humiliation. The child's mouth was bleeding. How could she in those circumstances go to the desk and appeal for further treatment?

The letter continues—

"As you left without making further appointments and it is not my intention to deny you treatment here, . . ."

Hon. members should not have any doubt about the fact that he refused treatment, but he said in the letter that she could have it. He said that he was enclosing new appointments for her son and, if she did not want him to do the work, she could have another dentist to do it.

That is an indication of what is going on in my electorate. The next day there appeared in "The Courier-Mail" the statement that dental health is at a very low ebb in Queensland. That statement was made not by a ratbag, like some parliamentarians, trying to gain publicity, but by Mr. Hooper, Chairman of the Committee of Dental Health Education. While he makes a statement like that, these people are subject to this humiliation.

Why does the doctor at the clinic refuse flatly to allow children or shopping bags in the waiting-room, regardless of whether it is

raining or the sun is shining when on dental days children and shopping bags are permitted in the waiting-room. I claim there is an urgent need for supervision at the Wynnum Clinic and for the hours and visiting days to be revised to the satisfaction of people in the district. A person who becomes ill on Monday must wait until Wednesday or else go to a Brisbane general hospital. Earnest and urgent consideration should be given to this matter.

There is a new court-house at Wynnum. According to "Hansard" the new court-house was mooted more than 10 years ago. I give credit to the Government for having built it. But it was built only because the Government was afraid the old court-house would fall down and it would have to pay compensation, or because it thought the steps would collapse and an innocent child or mother would be injured. The court-house appears to be complete, but it has been standing vacant for some considerable time and the people in Wynnum are interested to know when it will be opened. They are proud of this building.

When it is opened I hope that the Government will give urgent consideration to building a new police station next to it. Portion of the police station was demolished so that the court-house could be built and members of the Police Force in the Wynnum district have insufficient working space. We now have more police in Wynnum than formerly as a result of representations to the Minister for Education to have extra police sent to the district. He co-operated with us, fully realising that the request was reasonable.

For some time we have been hearing about Austral-Pacific Fertilizers Limited. We know that the legislation recently introduced by the Government will ensure that the right thing is done by the people in this district. Among other things the company must landscape and beautify the island. That goes further than cleaning it up and then planting grass and a few trees. History shows that this island has an old burial ground, where victims of the plague were buried in 1889. Somewhere in Australia or England there may be descendants of those people, and in carrying out beautification of the island let us not overlook humane considerations. Thought should be given to making a reserve of the area where these poor unfortunate people were buried.

It has been suggested that the Government was responsible for the establishment by Austral-Pacific Fertilizers Limited of its plant on the present site. That is completely incorrect. The company came to that area because it was the only available site that suited its purpose. That had nothing to do with the Government at all. It is very pleasing, of course, to see the establishment of this industry, because through its recognition of the potential of the south bank of the river other industries will be encouraged to the area. It has the waterways, highways, railway, and all other things that industrialists require. If the south bank of the Brisbane

River can attract more industries, it will develop into one of the finest and most highly developed areas in the Commonwealth.

Mr. Newton: Only a Labour Government developed the south bank.

Mr. HARRIS: I realise that. Before beautification of the island starts, let the Department of Harbours and Marine give some consideration to the problem of flooding at Hemmant. Irrespective of what anybody says, the filling of Brophy Island or Gibson Island (it is officially known as Brophy Island after the old hermit who had a cattle property and dairy farm there in the old days) will aggravate flooding problems. When the causeway was constructed from the mainland to Brophy Island, the Hemmant district became subject to flooding. Until a canal is made, as it once was made by the residents 75 years ago, there will continue to be flooding in the Hemmant area. That is one thing that will have to be considered in the beautification of Brophy Island.

Let some thought be given, too, to the old Aquarium Passage. Although a person can pick up a local map and see "Aquarium Passage" on it, I wonder how many people are familiar with it? How many realise that this was once one of the finest pleasure spots for the people of Brisbane? How many know that prior to the 1893 flood there were recreation facilities and cafes there, and two motor launches used to ply down the Brisbane River to the Aquarium Passage, carrying up to 100 and 150 people at a time? During the 1893 flood everything there was completely demolished. Let some consideration be given to the fine old Aquarium Passage.

Whilst on the subject of the south bank of the river, the Aquarium Passage, and Brophy or Gibson Island, let me draw attention to the lack of interest that the Government has shown in this area. There has been no development at all on the south bank for ages, and it is obvious that the Government has no intention at this stage of doing anything there. Unless the Government realises the importance of this area and develops it, it will go backwards instead of making the progress that we in Queensland expect today.

Furthermore, I know that the Government has made provision for feeder lines when the natural-gas pipeline comes into operation. But has it realised what potential the south bank of the river has if the reclamation work is put in hand immediately? Many people in Queensland are crying out for land in this area, but the Government is not making any attempt to improve it.

The suggestion has been made at different times that the Government intends to close the railway line to Wynnum. What will happen if the Government carries out its intention to close that line when a vast industrial area is established within 2 or 3 miles of the city? It is obvious that the

railway line will have to be broken at Cannon Hill and then re-routed along the south bank of the river to the oil refineries and, eventually, to the fertiliser works. All hon. members are aware of the chaos in the Salad Bowl area.

Mr. E. G. W. Wood: There is no chaos in the Salad Bowl area.

Mr. HARRIS: The hon. member for Logan is well aware of the trouble that has been caused by the Government's closure of the railway line to the Salad Bowl. Approaches have been made to the Government for it to provide one-third of the cost of a bridge from Wynnum to the Salad Bowl, but they have been rejected.

Mr. Newton: Shocking!

Mr. HARRIS: Of course it is shocking, and it will be even more shocking if the railway line from Cannon Hill to Wynnum is closed. If that happens, the Government can kiss goodbye to the establishment of industry in the Wynnum district in the next 10 years.

Mr. Newton: The hon. member for Logan is not supporting you.

Mr. HARRIS: I will give the hon. member for Logan credit for asking that a bridge be constructed. The Government of which he is a member has seen fit to reject his request. It has asked, "What would be the good of having a railway line down there? Most of the people are strawberry-growers. There would not be sufficient freight carried on the line to pay a driver's wages to South Brisbane."

I again appeal to the Government to give serious and urgent consideration to the railway lines in my electorate and at all costs to avoid closing them.

Mr. E. G. W. WOOD (Logan) (4.14 p.m.): I always believe in giving honour where honour is due, and, before dealing specifically with the Budget, I will take a little of the time of the Committee in offering my congratulations to its able architect.

The State in general, and the coalition Government in particular, is indeed fortunate in having a Minister of the calibre of the Treasurer to guide the State financially towards its destiny and take full advantage of the nation-wide buoyancy of the economy. His able administration and lucid explanations must retain the confidence of all members of the Government and at the same time silence adverse criticism. I, for one, welcome a Treasurer of this stature from among my Liberal friends, and I say to him on behalf of the people of Logan, "Congratulations on a successful year of stewardship. Your efforts well deserve the reward of a reduction in the accumulated deficit from about \$7,000,000 to about \$4,000,000." That is a very clear demonstration of a successful year.

Yesterday there was an announcement that the unemployment figures had fallen and were lower than they were at this period in the previous year. This, too, is a barometer of the financial atmosphere, and I say to the Treasurer that he is obviously to be congratulated on the work he has done for this State in guiding its financial activities.

It would be very timely if I were to deal with a particular matter at this stage. Certain members of the Opposition, particularly one, the hon. member for Salisbury, recently tried to drive a wedge between the two coalition parties. Other members have tried to do the same thing on various contentious matters such as redistribution and other things, and I would say that this is an age-old tactic; it is old and lost in time. I should say that their tactics are worn out; they are very obvious and not in any way subtle.

This has been a tactic used throughout history. If hon. members cast their minds back they will remember that Pizarro conquered the great Inca Empire with a handful of Spaniards by using the same method. Napoleon knew it well. These tactics are quite obvious, and I assure hon. members opposite that the unity of the coalition offers them no hope of success in this direction.

This Budget affords very real proof that we of the coalition are quite capable of adjusting our understandably different political approaches to various contentious problems by mutual understanding and respect, just as, by this very unity, we are capable of holding the reins of government for decades to come. Our very unity will see to that.

If the Opposition is depending on improving its political position by trying to take advantage of some mythical rift within the coalition, then their political plight is sad indeed. It is well realised by all members of the coalition, especially those in both parties holding blue-ribbon seats, that they owe a very sacred trust to the great anti-socialist forces in this State, a trust which they realise only too well they owe to the great army of willing supporters and able and strenuous workers within their electorates who would be loath to see the coalition continually jeopardised by individual displays of boat-rocking and brinksmanship in the search for self-aggrandisement and cheap political advertisement at the expense of their coalition colleagues who are attempting to keep the coalition together.

We are quite sound, and the Opposition has no chance of driving a wedge between the coalition; but I make an appeal to supporters of the coalition Government throughout the State that no representative in this Chamber be allowed to continue to carry their banner unless he is prepared to place the welfare of the coalition above personal prejudices and unilateral action. I appeal to the organisations of both parties of the coalition to select only those who are prepared to make the

preservation of the coalition their first consideration, particularly in those solid blue-ribbon electorates which, after all, are the life-blood of the coalition.

I will now deal particularly with the Budget. From this stage on I will accept most interjections. When we have regard to the allocations from the various funds we can say that the Budget is a well-balanced one.

I will deal very briefly with education. The Minister for Education has said that the Queensland Government this year would assign one-fifth of its Consolidated Revenue to education; that the remaining four-fifths would be shared among the many other Government activities; and that education expenditure from Consolidated Revenue would rise by 12½ per cent. compared with 1966-67 expenditure. He said that education expenditure from Consolidated Revenue in 1967-68 would total \$72,000,000, and pointed out that, in all, \$98,000,000 from all sources would be spent on education this financial year.

But that is not the whole story. The responsibility rests with the Treasurer. What use is there in raising the standard of education and taking more and more students through to tertiary education if the development of the State is not such that we can absorb the greater proportion of them? If we cannot do that, we simply become a seat of learning for the whole of the Commonwealth. When pressures are brought to bear for more and more money for education, let us be very sure that our development keeps pace with it so that we can take full advantage of the extraordinary effort we have made, having regard to the fact that only 11 per cent. of the total revenue of the State was devoted to education by the Labour Government in 1957 compared with 26 per cent. today. Regardless of what figures are cited, those percentages are very difficult to get over.

In dealing with the Budget I should like to refer to local authorities. I should say that we have been treated well this year. My shire is quite happy. A total of \$15,000,000 has been allocated from loans, supplemented by \$3,325,000 from the Commonwealth Aid, Local Authority Roads, Fund and \$365,000 from the Commonwealth Aid, Marine Works, Fund. I have already mentioned loans and subsidies. There is the subsidy on ordinary council revenue, and then there is the section 19 money under the Main Roads Act.

At this stage I pay tribute to the Minister for Mines and Main Roads for the manner in which he has treated my electorate. I thank him very much for his effort in relation to Compton Road, which services Acacia Ridge from the work pool at Woodridge. Previously it was a completely unusable road. The Brisbane City Council and the Albert Shire Council will together be putting in half the money, with the other half, \$25,000, being allocated by the Main Roads Department through the Co-ordinator-General of

Public Works, through the Treasurer. The completion of this road will revolutionise Woodridge's accessibility to the Acacia Ridge industrial complex.

In the Redland Shire the allocation of section 19 money for the development of Stradbroke Island and the improvement of the mainland is very timely. I assure the Treasurer that my shire appreciates it.

While on this subject, I refer particularly to the effort to expand the industrial area of Acacia Ridge into the Beaudesert Shire. Hon. members should understand that at Greenbank and Park Ridge there are large areas of land eminently suitable for industrial purposes within easy reach of the Acacia Ridge industrial complex. The whole area is composed of high, well-drained ridges and it has good, all-weather access via the Mt. Lindesay Highway. It fronts the interstate railway, which makes it particularly suitable for industrial purposes. I thank the Minister for Industrial Development for the effort he has made, through his officers, to develop the Beaudesert Shire in this way. In this instance his efforts will be crowned with success as it is quite obvious that industrial Brisbane, with all its facilities, must expand down the interstate highway.

I was particularly pleased to note at the Local Government Conference in Bundaberg that conference, in its wisdom, decided to reject the investigation into shire boundaries.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: You have not yet thanked the Minister for Local Government.

Mr. E. G. W. WOOD: I thought the hon. member had something sensible to say.

Shire boundaries are not a matter for State-wide investigation; they are matters of mutual arrangement. This applies also to Greater Brisbane. They open up a much wider field, which I will deal with more specifically.

In the past, some moves have been made towards breaking up Greater Brisbane. I oppose strenuously any such move. It is quite impossible to unscramble an egg. It is useless to say, "We will divide it up; let us spend \$2,000,000 or \$3,000,000 and undertake all the necessary expenditure on administration and investigation costs. We will establish the new boundaries for our capital, and if that does not suit we will have another go." That is only trial and error, and town planning is no place for amateurs.

I do not profess to know anything about town planning, but I have been connected with subdivision for a good many years. I have had dealings with really good town planners, men with world-wide experience. It is a particularly complex problem. No man can say exactly where the ramifications of Greater Brisbane development will extend to.

Development in the fringe areas will greatly exceed that in the Greater Brisbane area. The statistics from 1961 to 1967,

between censuses, show that at compound interest per annum on average increase, Queensland has increased by 1.8 per cent., Brisbane by 2.1 per cent., Redland by 4.7 per cent., Albert, extending from Brisbane to Southport, by 5.3 per cent., Beaudesert, which is further remote, by 2.5 per cent., Ipswich by 2.3 per cent., and Pine Rivers, which had the advantage of water from the Petrie mill some years before the contiguous shires, by 8.6 per cent. That is why I say that it is impossible to forecast how Brisbane or the contiguous shires will develop. The figures from planners show that by 1986 the population of the Redland Shire will be five times the present figure. Therefore, it would be quite stupid to attempt to re-design a city when in a few years' time the surrounding areas will look after themselves.

From time to time hon. members have spoken on regional planning. The contiguous shires have considered this for a long time and have had some of the best brains, including Professor Greenwood and Dr. Karl Langer, investigate the matter. We have evolved the idea that the Moreton region should be the spearhead of regional planning in the State. But local authorities and the Government think of regional planning in different ways. In the contiguous shires we are prepared to accept regional planning only if the authority of the local authorities is not eroded in any way. Various advisory committees are being formed. Where the water supply is concerned, the local authority has had considerable difficulty getting representation on the board. If that is to be the keynote in regional planning I, and the local authority, want none of it. We want our voice heard in the councils of the State.

The Department of Industrial Development has attempted to do something in a small way. It set up regional committees in the local authorities, and furnished reports for industrial purposes throughout our areas. The local authorities have contributed. But this is only scratching at the surface. An investigation or industrial report for a big industry is a very complex matter and is well beyond the ability of a regional board to produce. My idea always was that we should have a co-ordinated planner similar to the Co-ordinator-General.

I agree with the Minister that such a planner should be under the control of a body on which the local authority is strongly represented. I say that if there is to be regional planning without local-authority representation, it would be better to carry on as at present.

I have some of the latest comments of Professor Greenwood on this matter, dealing with contiguous shires. It is a long document, and I do not propose to deal in full with it. It says, *inter alia*—

"There is an urgent need for the creation of an authority to determine the optimum design for both urban and rural development for the Moreton Region—that is, for

the area immediately adjacent to the City of Brisbane and extending as far south as the State border, as far north as the Maroochy River basin, and as far west as the Main Range between Cunningham's Gap and the Bunya Mountains (excluding the City of Toowoomba and its environs)."

He further goes on to say—

"The need is urgent because the rapid extension of the built-up areas of Brisbane, Ipswich, Redcliffe and the Gold Coast, the accelerating increase of their population, the multiplication and increasing scale of their manufacturing industries and the alarming growth of their road traffic are generating problems, the solution of which is demanding ever-increasing amounts of capital expenditure, and ever-increasing range of statutory powers and consultation with an ever-widening range of interests—private, commercial, local governmental and governmental. The speed and diversification of urban growth is such that delay in promoting a more orderly and efficient design for urban growth and the operation of urban services becomes much more costly and complex with the passing of each year. Moreover, the urban units in the region are still at a stage in which planning can achieve effective results. This is not true in the case of larger cities."

In some aspects of this matter, time is running out.

I notice that in the Financial Statement the Treasurer dealt with allocations for water conservation. I am particularly interested in proposed dams on the Logan and Albert Rivers, and in conjunction with my colleagues the hon. members for South Coast, Fassifern and Albert, I have made strong representations for their construction. It was pleasing the other day to receive a letter from the Minister for Local Government and Conservation in which he stated—

"A tentative programme of works was prepared by the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission recently and submitted to Cabinet indicating the proposed priorities to be given to construction of water conservation schemes over the next 10 years. A dam on Burnett Creek, a tributary of the Logan River, is included in the list, construction of which is scheduled to be commenced in the 1968-69 financial year.

"The dam, to be known probably as the Toowoona Dam, will have a storage capacity of 31,000 ac. ft. from which an assured annual supply of 21,750 ac. ft. will be available. This will allow expansion of the present irrigated area along Burnett Creek and the Logan River to some 9,900 acres. The presented estimated capital cost is in the vicinity of \$3,600,000.

My colleague from Fassifern had discussions with the Beaudesert Shire Council on this matter, and I agree with him that the Albert River dam, which would cost only \$1,620,000 and make available another 10,000 acres, should be constructed at the same time. I say to the Minister that as the sites for the proposed dams are situated close together and the areas concerned are in the premier agricultural district of the State, these dams should receive priority and both should be constructed at the same time.

Mr. Chalk: Do you think it would be a good idea to have one in the Lockyer district at the same time?

Mr. E. G. W. WOOD: I realise that I am speaking to the Treasurer, and I rely on him to implement the Albert and Logan Rivers projects.

A sum of \$750,000 has been set aside for the dairy subsidy scheme, and it is quite obvious that the schemes to improve land by the use of fertilisers cannot succeed unless adequate water is available. The fresh land in this area offers the best opportunity for a scheme of this type, the water being provided by the two dams that I have suggested. As I said earlier, they are 100 years overdue. There has been settlement in the area for over a century, but nothing has been done in the field of water conservation.

I thank the Minister for his consideration of this matter. We have been waiting for so many years that one year more does not make any difference. Next year will do. I hope that the Albert project will be included then.

At this stage I take the opportunity to speak in defence of the C.O.D. I realise that the matter was raised in the debate on a Bill that was discussed in the Chamber recently, but I doubt very much whether I would be allowed to say on the second reading of that Bill what I wish to say now. Therefore, I propose to deal fully, and perhaps in a somewhat tedious manner, with the ramifications of the C.O.D. and answer the criticism that was directed in this Chamber at some aspects of its operations.

From my experience—and I have had long experience—the C.O.D. is the life-blood of the small-crop growers in this State. As regards the constitution of the C.O.D., the Fruit Marketing Organisation Act very effectively provides for complete control of the organisation to be in the hands of the Queensland fruit and vegetable growers.

In 1944 a royal commission was appointed by the Queensland Government to report on fruit and vegetable distribution in this State. That decision was made following bitter criticism from both consumers and growers that the margins between what growers received and what consumers paid were far too great, and that quality fruit and vegetables were not available, especially in country districts.

At the time, there was a well-held opinion amongst the public that the C.O.D. was responsible for this state of affairs. Mr. Justice (later Sir Roslyn) Philp was chairman of the commission, and another of the three was the late Mr. Harry Harvey, who subsequently became a member of the Industrial Court. In its report, the commission, after setting out the constitution of the C.O.D., commented—

“The full ultimate control of the C.O.D. then rests with the growers.

“The primary intention behind the Act is to give the C.O.D. full control of marketing, subject to this: that the C.O.D. must obey the directions of the particular Sectional Group Committees as to policy in respect of the marketing of its particular fruit.”

Whilst praising the C.O.D. for effectively preventing Brisbane agents from increasing their commission charges from 10 per cent. to 12½ per cent., some hon. members in this Chamber have been critical of the C.O.D. for engaging in trading. They have advocated that the C.O.D. should be a growers' union, fighting market agents in the growers' interests, which they claim it cannot do when it is a market operator. This is the very question that was examined by the royal commission, which had this to say—

“Some growers strongly object to the C.O.D. acting as an agent and think it should confine itself to other activities. Agents of course object to it and assert that its activity as an agent is an unfair competition with private enterprise, particularly as it pays no income tax.

“It is clear to us that if the C.O.D. did not act as an agent it would be powerless to assist growers—it would have little funds for other activities and its absence from the market would leave the grower at the mercy of the ordinary agent. The very fact that agent influence in Melbourne has been able to keep the C.O.D. out of the markets there has had a detrimental effect on the marketing of Queensland commodities in Victoria, which suffers by not receiving a proper share of the best Queensland tropical fruit at reasonable prices. The facilitation of the entry of the C.O.D. into the Melbourne markets is a matter which should be discussed by the Queensland and Victorian Governments.”

.....

“Representation—Perhaps the greatest service given to growers by the C.O.D. is its representation of them particularly when some governmental or other action is proposed to be or has been taken. The C.O.D. is a ready mouthpiece for the presentation of the growers' views and claims. The C.O.D. has been particularly clamant and from a consumer's point of view perhaps too successfully so.”

.....

“Some growers were critical of its conduct, the criticism mostly centering around

its business as an agent which some thought it should not undertake. We think this view is held by only a small minority.”

.....

“In our view the C.O.D. is the champion upon which the growers should rely to fight their battles in the strenuous days to come, and the C.O.D. should be now mustering all its strength by getting all the grower-support it can.”

In the whole of the report, the only criticism of the C.O.D. was as follows—

“Our criticism of the C.O.D. is that it has not ‘propagandised’ itself and its activities sufficiently with growers and the public.”

For many years the C.O.D., with the full approval of the Sectional Group members, all of whom are elected every three years by Queensland growers, has pursued a vigorous policy of itself engaging in distribution of fruit and vegetables. Its objective has been to give Queensland growers an opportunity to have their fruit sold in each of the major markets of Australia, either by private agents or merchants, or by the C.O.D.

The C.O.D. has succeeded to the extent that it now operates wholesale floors in the following centres: Cairns, Townsville, Mackay, Rockhampton, Gympie, Brisbane, Newcastle, Sydney, Albury, and Melbourne.

Statutory powers of the C.O.D. are never used to strengthen its distribution activities. Like individual agents, it is entirely dependent on its own efficiency to attract grower consignments to it. In Sydney it is by far the biggest agent, and Sydney is easily the largest market in Australia and an extremely difficult one. In Brisbane its wholesale fruit and vegetable floor is the largest single wholesale fruit and vegetable unit in Australia, whilst a similar position is held by the C.O.D. Ripe Banana Department, which, additionally, operates the largest banana-packing house in Australia, and one which for efficiency would compare with any in the world.

The C.O.D. has shown the way with banana marketing, and, following visits of its executive to America, it succeeded in the introduction of the hand pack of bananas in cartons, which is rapidly revolutionising banana distribution throughout Australia. Hon. members would be very well advised to become personally acquainted with this and other C.O.D. operations in the Brisbane market before seeking to pull this very reliable and able organisation down from its pedestal.

Hon. members should be interested in the experience of the C.O.D. in Melbourne. It was the C.O.D. which financed C.S.I.R.O. in research into banana ripening, following a visit of its then manager to the United States. The old system of the application of heat and gas gave very little life to the banana once it was ripened. When the C.S.I.R.O. recommendations were made available they were ignored by the trade in Australia, and the C.O.D. itself was forced to establish a chain

of banana-ripening plants. This it did in Rockhampton, Brisbane, Sydney, and, finally, in Melbourne.

Unfortunately for the Queensland industry, the Victorian trade was bitterly opposed to the entry of the C.O.D. to the Melbourne markets. However, the Banana Sectional Group of the C.O.D. was determined to provide ripening facilities for Melbourne, and a plant was finally established at the then huge cost of £8,700—this was in the early 1930's. The agreement, however, provided that the C.O.D. could not sell the bananas that it had ripened. This was probably a trap, which was effectively used by the trade when it virtually boycotted the plant. After a five-year lease expired, the plant was sold for a mere song.

For years the C.O.D. continued its efforts to get into the Melbourne market with the right to trade, but the wholesalers had a very strong organisation which had its members tied to the extent that if a business was available for sale, the buyer had to be approved by the merchants' organisation. The general manager of the C.O.D. was told on numerous occasions by members of the trade, privately in their offices, that the trade would do everything within its power to keep the C.O.D. out of Melbourne.

Finally, a royal commission was appointed to investigate allegations of graft in the Melbourne markets. The royal commissioner, Mr. Smithers, Q.C., now a judge, thoroughly investigated the operations of the C.O.D., both in Sydney and in Brisbane. He recommended to the Victorian Government that encouragement be given to the C.O.D. to extend its distribution activities to Melbourne. It was then, and only then, that the C.O.D. was able to purchase a stand in the Melbourne markets, where it commenced in 1961.

Strange that this recommendation was so similar to that in the Queensland royal commission report of 1944—

"The facilitation of the entry of the C.O.D. into Melbourne markets is a matter which should be discussed by the Queensland and Victorian Governments."

Incidentally, it had been discussed by Ministers of the two Governments, but the Melbourne trade proved too strong for the Queensland Government.

Strangely enough, Queensland growers in the early stages gave the branch very little support, but the C.O.D.'s entry into the Melbourne market was enthusiastically received by South Australian tomato and celery growers and by Western Australian tomato growers. It quickly developed as the largest handler in the Melbourne markets of each of these lines.

Gradually support was forthcoming from Queensland, and now the C.O.D. operates the largest merchant business in the Melbourne markets. This, coupled with the

C.O.D.'s achievements in Sydney, Brisbane and other markets, is no mean triumph for organised Queensland fruit and vegetable growers.

Again, it should be stressed that C.O.D. in its trading activities has no advantage whatsoever from its statutory powers. That is the big issue at stake.

Mr. Merrett's observations on the C.O.D., coming as they do from a highly placed Victorian public servant, confirmed in 1967 the assessment of the C.O.D. made by the Queensland royal commission in 1944. This was the opinion of the royal commission in Victoria—

"Reference has been made to the Committee of Direction of Fruit Marketing (C.O.D.) and I don't think that any comparison could accurately be made between the Brisbane, Sydney and Melbourne Markets without a knowledge of what role this organization plays."

A statement has been made in the Chamber to the effect that the C.O.D., which has access to certain levies, openly boasted that it did more advertising than private agents. That, of course, on the facts, is not sound. None of the levies collected by the C.O.D. on the instructions of the Sectional Group Committees are used to assist the trading activities of the organisation.

This can be substantiated by reference to the Auditor-General, who conducts a continuous audit of the accounts of the C.O.D. The organisation's wholesale activities stand on their own feet. Relatively little advertising is done by the C.O.D. of its own wholesale activities, but very substantial sums are spent in sales promotion for the whole of the trade. There is, for instance, a small levy on all fruit and vegetables sold in Queensland south of Bundaberg, and the funds so raised have been used to extraordinarily good purpose.

Many people would know about the classes conducted by the sales promotion unit of the C.O.D. through the Adult Education Department. Each course consists of 150 women and two classes are conducted at the same time, each of six lectures. Many people will have seen this unit functioning in the fruit pavilion at the last Royal National Association show, when every session was hopelessly crowded.

In Sydney the C.O.D. has joined with the New South Wales Chamber of Fruit and Vegetable Industries in a publicity campaign to push Queensland beans, each making a contribution of 1c per package.

In Melbourne and Adelaide the C.O.D. is currently engaged in promoting the sale of pineapples, with equal contributions from the trade and the C.O.D. Similarly, the Banana Growers' Federation of New South Wales and the C.O.D. have for years co-operated with the trade in each of the southern markets in the sales promotion of

bananas. In Sydney the C.O.D. has been substantially successful, first of all, in publicising the use of avocados and papaws, and, more recently, in promoting the sale of both of these fruits, Queensland tomatoes, strawberries, and, for a short time, Bowen mangoes.

Levies have been used very extensively to assist the Queensland Department of Primary Industries in research. The total contributed to 30 June, 1967, was \$268,262, and definite promises have been made for further contributions over the years of \$62,000, making a grand total of actual promises or contributions of \$330,262 to the Department of Primary Industries for research. That is substantially the C.O.D.'s case when it says that it is the very life-blood of the fruit and vegetable growers in this State.

Before resuming my seat, I should like to deal with the Rickertt Road bridge in the Wynnum-Logan area which was recently referred to by the hon. member for Wynnum. The Redland Shire made application to the Premier for control of this bridge, but it was not successful. The Premier said that if the shire council and the Brisbane City Council could produce further evidence the matter would be considered. I point out at this juncture that the shire has provided further evidence and that the matter is now before the Premier. Far from my leader having shelved this matter, he has it under review and I am quite happy with the present situation.

Mr. HANSON (Port Curtis) (4.47 p.m.): The Treasurer's presentation of the Budget on this occasion did not differ greatly from the manner of its presentation on previous occasions, especially the references to the financial documents that I have in my hand. It was indeed a drab presentation. I do not desire to be in any way uncharitable or personal but, since I have been in this Chamber, I have noticed that the presentation of this important document seems to be reminiscent of the 19th century. As a whole it is colourless and enigmatic and, to many of us, confusing. In industry today—nay, for many years past—the annual performance of a company is given in an intelligible way so that the more salient features can be easily grasped, and consequently readily appreciated. If we look at the balance sheets of large corporations—very fortunately there are few in this country—we find in them a very simple presentation indeed. They list quite accurately the operations of the enterprise, in simple language and with greater illustration than we find in drab governmental documents.

While there are hon. members in this Chamber who can make an intimate assessment of governmental financial responsibility and quite a number are on the Opposition benches, many Government members are prepared to follow the very few on that side

who have the ability to do so. Many hon. members would like a clearer and more precise presentation, in keeping with modern trends. I do not think that this submission is out of character. It is not intended in any way to be personal or uncharitable. We have within the framework of the Government a department, namely the Government Printing Office, that could quite easily be geared to present the Financial Statement and Budget—and many other Government papers of account for that matter—in accordance with the practice in modern business where use is made of a considerable number of colour graphs showing company performance so that people can quite easily grasp the situation. They are not confused by microscopic print such as is used in the Financial Statement, which incidentally is much smaller than the typescript the Treasurer reads when he presents his Financial Statement to the Committee. In their references to the Consolidated Revenue Fund, the Loan Fund, and the Trust and Special Funds, many Treasurers delight in trying to confuse the issue so that the real facts are hidden from people unless they spend many laborious hours pouring over the form of presentation. This is quite impossible for a considerable number of hon. members. There are some hon. members in the Chamber who accept limited responsibility and do not realise the gravity of their position, and consequently they do not work as hard as many Opposition members. Therefore at times it is difficult to make a good assessment of the system of accounts.

Mr. Sullivan interjected.

Mr. HANSON: I did give some very good advice quite recently to my friend the hon. member for Condamine and I have noticed that since I gave him that advice his attitude has changed considerably and he stands high in favouritism for the next Cabinet vacancy.

The Treasurer's Financial Statement is an important document. It has a profound influence on the economic and commercial life of our country. Drought, a fall in the export price of marketable products, and just increases in wage rates, won in many instances only after laborious, tireless, and exhaustive representation, are eventualities that have a great effect on the Budget and the determination of what lies ahead in the financial year under consideration.

The Treasurer sets out, in the introductory stage of his Budget, the result of his previous year's crystal-ball gazing. He has to weigh up the political pros and cons so that the picture he presents to the people will lead them to believe that everything in the garden is rosy and will prove that he has exhaustively carried out his duties and functions and has displayed wise husbandry of the State's revenues and resources.

As mentioned by the hon. member for Baroona during his Budget speech, and accurately and eruditely canvassed by him,

the Treasurer has done some slick book-keeping to reduce, to the tune of \$3,000,000, the accumulated deficits since this administration took office. The Treasurer apparently desires to set aside some of this \$3,000,000 for a political rainy day, and certainly for the heavy going that he will experience prior to his Government's political vale in 1969.

The Treasurer referred to what he calls the "unforeseen assistance" won at the Premiers' Conference. I doubt very much the unforeseen nature of things. It was certainly not, as mentioned by the Treasurer, unforeseen prior to the Budget of 1966. I tell him, as he knows quite well, that he is not pulling the wool over my eyes or those of anybody else in this Chamber.

The change in the formula was exactly the same as was offered to the States in 1965 when the formula was renegotiated. What happened then is now a matter of history. Had the States accepted the change then they would have been \$15,000,000 worse off, and the Treasurer would certainly know something of what I am talking about. In the year ended June, 1965, the wage rate increase, which is a very important part of the formula component was 7.3 per cent., and under the old formula the amount paid was increased by the percentage increase of the previous financial year.

At the 1965 meeting the Commonwealth proposed that the lag in adjustment be brought forward to three months instead of 12 months to March, 1966, where the increase in wage rates was only 5.3 per cent. The States naturally spurned that offer because under it they would have been considerably worse off financially. It is a matter of history that in the year ended March, 1967, the States, naturally hungry for money, quickly accepted an offer based on the rise in the wage component under the new negotiated formula, which I think was 5.3 per cent. Queensland's share was approximately \$900,000, and the Treasurer, in claiming this to be unforeseen assistance, subtly wants people to think of him in terms of a punter who was driving along in a taxi and someone threw this money to him through the window.

What a lot of rot! All the State Premiers and Treasurers knew what was doing beforehand, because no-one as politically conscious as the Treasurer would otherwise have cared to take the "punt" in the Budget of last year and give a first-class kick in the guts to motorists, farmers, and many other people in the State by the increases in State taxation which were so abhorrent. Strong representations were made concerning them from many quarters, particularly the primary-producer section of the coalition Government.

Proof also that this hand-out was actually known and not unforeseen lies in the fact that the conference of State Premiers this year

concluded its business in half the scheduled time; in other words, they had full and complete knowledge of this matter long before they went to the conference. The Treasurer had this knowledge, and he tested the feelings of other States on this matter prior to the introduction of last year's Budget. He would otherwise not have made such savage increases in State taxation.

I agree with the hon. member on this side of the Chamber who said that the Treasurer could have made a conscientious attempt to spend the \$900,000, or part of it. He may possibly have had difficulty in spending it all in the short time available before the end of the financial year. A Government so lacking in administrative enterprise and capacity as this one is certainly would have had considerable difficulty in doing so. In its early, formative years, it well knew how to raid and plunder the various developmental funds that Labour Governments had put away for a rainy day. Since it has been in office, it has got its hands on every conceivable type of fund and plundered it for every cent and every penny so it could continue its political operations and preserve its status quo in the Government in this State.

One has only to look at the plundering of the Stamp Duties Suspense Account to see how the Government sharpened its knives on it; one has only to look at its performance in managing the assets and the affairs of the State to see how sadly it has been found wanting.

Last year, when speaking in the Budget debate, I mentioned the Golden Casket office. That enterprise, which has had a significant bearing on Crown revenues, was forced to leave the State Government Insurance Office building and go across the road to Jackman House and pay a large rental to private enterprise. The Golden Casket office now is even paying so much a foot for the corridors along which members of the public walk to get to the office. At the same time, the premises that it vacated lay vacant for six months, bringing no revenue to the Crown. The four walls stood there until, after many months, workmen employed by the Department of Works began bringing accommodation into being for another Government department. In spite of this, the Government tells us that it is a great exponent of the free-enterprise system, that it, and it alone, is blessed with the ideas that are needed in a Government enterprise. Certainly its performance in that respect falls very short of the mark.

To further expound my views on the subject of the Government's stewardship of the State's resources, capital, and assets, let me remind hon. members of what happened in Sydney, where a building known as Culwulla Chambers, owned by the Government of Queensland was sold two or three years ago by the Country-Liberal Government for £310,000, or \$620,000, or a little less than it is paying for the Bellevue

Hotel, across the road from this building. I am not concerned about the price that is being paid for the Bellevue Hotel, because it will not have to be paid for five years. But the building sold in Sydney is on one of the busiest corners in the largest metropolis in Australia, and the ground floor has since been rented to the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau for \$500 a week, with rent reviews in five, 10 and 15 years.

At the end of the 21-year term the Government will have paid to the present owners of the building more than it received when the building was sold. The building in question has entrances from both King and Castlereagh Streets, and property in the vicinity, some of which was owned by banks, was sold many years ago for almost £1,000,000. In spite of this, the Government decided to waste the assets of the State by handing this building over to its present owners on the payment of a paltry sum. There was a requisition by the Sydney County Council to the extent of about £90,000, but that could have been met out of the State's own resources. If that had been done, Queensland would have had an asset of far greater value than the price the Government received.

Is this the Government that claims to be the watchful guardian of the State's assets? Are its members so blessed that they are the great proponents of free enterprise, the great businessmen, who will steer the State to prosperity in the future? It is a shocking sham!

When we look further into the business aspect of things, I should say that if we are renting premises for the Crown, as we are in the case of Jackman House, and if we are selling an enterprise such as Culwulla Chambers in Sydney, one of the first things those charged with the responsibility of government would do, would be to have written into the contract that the buildings should be insured with the State Government Insurance Office. I should like to know if Jackman House and Culwulla Chambers in Sydney are insured with the State Government Insurance Office.

These things should not escape the attention of people so blessed with great business acumen—or so they would have us believe. They are very pertinent questions because, after all, the administration today is charged with the responsibility of looking after the State's resources and assets. They should not have failed to do this, and if there is some form of business acumen amongst members of the Cabinet, then the insurance of those two buildings should have been won for this State.

I should like an explanation of the whys and wherefores associated with the sale of Culwulla Chambers. It is very difficult to get to the seat of things and find out why, all of a sudden, this building was disposed of. I have been there on several occasions and there are always aggregations of people

in the area. It is one of the busiest corners in Sydney. Obviously it must have been considered by somebody in the Government to be a very valuable site, because the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau decided to continue operations in that building.

One must agree with the hon. member for Barooka that the gyrations and mumbo jumbo surrounding the Treasurer's performance in this matter are designed—I am referring particularly to the taking of \$900,000 allocated to him under the new formula and placing it in a position whereby he can reduce the accumulated deficit of his weak administration—purely to preserve the political future of this wobbly coalition. We often hear of the great development in this State and what is occurring all round us, but are the Treasurer and the members of his Government concerned with the little people of this State and their ability to sustain themselves and enjoy the ordinary necessities of life?

Is the Treasurer awake to the fact that retail food prices in this State have risen by 15 per cent. to 20 per cent. in the last five years, and that in many towns in Queensland there have been increases of 6 to 7 per cent. in one 12-monthly period? Surely that is an alarming state of affairs, and in many families, in order to maintain themselves in a fair degree of comfort and to obtain the ordinary necessities of life, both parents have to work. It is not that I am opposed to that. Let anybody who wants to work do so, but I believe that many mothers of small children, through sheer necessity, have had to seek employment in order to give their kith and kin the ordinary, simple, economic necessities of life.

I ask hon. members to contrast this state of affairs with the total of depositors' balances in all savings banks within the State. I quote from "Banking and Currency" 1965-66, Bulletin No. 4, starting with 1957, which was a shocking year in this State's history. Page 56 of that publication shows the total of depositors' balances per head of population in savings banks in Queensland at the end of the various years, and the national average for those years, as follows:—

" Year	Depositors' Balances in Queensland	National Average
	\$	\$
1957	204.67	254.65
1958	212.96	263.52
1959	227.01	276.70
1960	244.11	296.39
1961	246.41	300.23
1962	265.84	324.30
1963	297.80	361.29
1964	337.06	402.61
1965	362.18	431.06
1966	383.84	455.07 "

At the end of every year since this Government has been in office depositors' balances per head of population in this State have been considerably lower than the national average. Certainly this is cause for alarm. It does not reflect the great development we have been told about for the last 10 years.

Despite the low wages paid in this State and the high prices people have to pay for various commodities, the average person carefully nurtures his finances so that he can place a little in a savings account. But we find that the performance of this Government is such that people are able to put considerably less into their savings accounts than the national average. Every year since this Government took office we have been the second lowest of any State in Australia. The lowest has been Western Australia, which has half the population of this State. Is this not a shocking performance? Certainly it is not in keeping with the glowing, rosy reports we receive at all times from hon. members opposite, who sickeningly praise and laud the Government and grovel at the foot of the ministerial bench in the hope that one day they will receive the accolade for their political performances or laudatory speeches in this Chamber. What a disgraceful state of affairs!

In this country, in contrast with other countries in the Western world, we deny ourselves many of the attractions of consumer goods. On this subject we have a very interesting report from the heir apparent to the political throne of this State, the Minister for Education, Hon. J. C. A. Pizzey. He wants to go a little further. Apparently he wants to deny us some of the necessities of life. Before I read this editorial in the "Bundaberg News-Mail" of 4 October, which castigates the Minister for Local Government and the next Premier, I want to emphasise to the Committee that the reliance by the public on the popular consumer goods has been encouraged by the Canberra counterparts of the Minister for Education. I suggest that the hon. gentleman have a look at this editorial, which says—

"Mr. Pizzey, who is likely to be Queensland's Premier next year, expressed an opinion on economics which must have startled acknowledged experts in this sphere. He apparently believes that Australians should spend less on consumer goods—"(despite the fact, as I have already said, that we deny ourselves more than any other country in the Western world) "so that a greater proportion of the national income can be devoted to national development—water conservation schemes, for example. 'Development comes from savings,' said Mr. Pizzey. It does not, of course. If any country's national government had to rely on the people's savings for development programmes that country would stagnate, just as Australia's

national development has stagnated in the past because national governments—abetted by some State governments—have refused to face up to the task of directing and planning development. As for cutting back on consumer goods spending; the one certain result would be an economic depression.

"There can be a divergence of opinion about the extent of government control over development, but few people will claim that it is not the government's task to plan it. The future is not bright if governments will not accept this job."

Mr. Muller: What paper is that in?

Mr. HANSON: The "Bundaberg News-Mail".

When considering this castigation of the State Government relative to the development of the State, I should point out that the editorial, in referring to the opening of the local government conference at Bundaberg, contains the following statement:—

"The Minister for Local Government, Mr. Richter, claimed for the State Government considerable credit for a professed policy of allowing substantial autonomy to local government. Addressing delegates at the annual Local Government Association conference, he said, 'I know of no better way of developing the State than through the efforts of local authorities'."

That is all very well in opening such a conference.

The Minister is then reported in the article as saying—

"You should be the planners and controllers of your own particular area."

The article continues—

"The only inference to be drawn is that the State should be developed on a district basis, under local control, with no real forward planning by the State authorities. Few people would regard this as a tenable proposition, because of the chaotic conditions which could occur. Development means much more than swimming pools, sewerage and civic centres in country areas. Government must accept the responsibility of leadership in this vital field."

The ideas on development of these two Ministers are noteworthy and, whilst there are considerable difficulties, they obviously abrogate their rights to plan and develop to the local authorities and the consuming public. As leaders in the community they deserve every censure that the editorial directs at them.

I heartily agree with the person who wrote that editorial in the censure that he directed at the Government. For many years in this State there has been a lack of planned development. There is nothing in the Budget that would excite anyone. Reference is

made to certain projects that are under consideration, but when we consider some of these developments we realise they are in no way the result of Government planning.

Before the hon. member for Wynnum resumed his seat he was referring to the new fertiliser plant at Gibson Island. The State Government was not directly concerned in the selection of Queensland by this company as the State in which to establish its factory. Like the few industrial enterprises that have been established in Queensland, it was created because of lengthy feasibility tests conducted by the company itself. I am sure that at times it met with a good deal of frustration when trying to deal with members of the administration, much more than would have been the case if Labour had been sitting on the Government benches.

Mr. Muller: The fact remains that the fertiliser plant was built in Queensland.

Mr. HANSON: That is all very well, but I am greatly interested in the construction of a fertiliser works in my electorate, which at present is not receiving the same treatment as is being meted out to these vast enterprises which are financed largely by foreign capital. In the matter of electricity charges and other benefits, the Government is very prone to neglect aid to industries that are financed largely by Queensland shareholders. The Government wishes to close the door on them. The expansion of fertiliser facilities owned by companies with a large Australian shareholding should be encouraged. I am very happy that these overseas companies are coming here, but at the same time I want a fair and equal chance given to Australian companies. The Government should give to Australian companies what it is prepared to hand out to overseas companies that commence operations here.

Mr. Muller: Can you give us an instance of an Australian company being frustrated?

Mr. HANSON: A.C.F. & Shirleys Fertilizers Ltd., which is desirous of establishing itself in Gladstone, is one. Let the Minister tell us the charges he is going to impose on that company for electricity, compared with those paid by other enterprises. Is the Minister prepared to tell us the electricity charge he wanted to impose on an enterprise not far away that has a 22½ per cent. Australian equity?

Mr. Chalk: You would rather chase them away.

Mr. HANSON: No.

Mr. Chalk: Yes, you would.

Mr. HANSON: I am all for seeing that Australian companies are given at least equal rights and equal concessions with those from overseas. I would not lower myself

to grovel and crawl at the feet of foreigners and give them concessions that I am not prepared to give to an Australian company.

Mr. Chalk interjected.

Mr. HANSON: The Treasurer knows what I am talking about. I am sure that for many months he has been incensed at a couple of statements I have made.

It was quite refreshing to read in the Financial Statement that the Treasurer was prepared to comment quite openly on matters pertaining to Commonwealth-State relations. That shows he has finally decided to espouse some of the thoughts raised by Opposition members on many occasions. What is happening in that field is against the spirit of Federation and is certainly not in keeping with what was intended by the founders of Federation. I commented last year on the shocking sham and farce that surrounds the mistique of Premiers' Conferences—the same roles, the same character acting. The Commonwealth gives out no more than it desires to give, and the regional Press acclaims the leaders as they return to their respective States and says that the Premier and the Treasurer of each State were happy to get so many more millions of dollars this year.

I endorse the view of many speakers on both sides of the Chamber that there should be a complete revision and overhaul of the present financial relationship. Political chicanery should not be indulged in. Surely as Australians we should be able to arrive at the satisfactory answers, solutions, and conclusions, without the likelihood of bitter recriminations between the opposing forces of Commonwealth centralisationists and State rightists. The spirit of Federation was laid down years ago. Let the Commonwealth live up to its responsibilities and accept the mandate given to it by the various referendums to carry out the functions of central Government.

I think these words are very pertinent and very true. The States have sovereign rights. When the Commonwealth was formed in 1901 the States in effect gave some powers to the Commonwealth in return for what the people thought they were getting, that is, the benefit of a national Parliament. Let us hope that the future development or the national security of this country is not placed in jeopardy by avaricious centralisationists, whose counterparts in 1778 caused Madison to write—

“The accumulation of all power in the same hands, whether of one or of many, whether of hereditary, self-appointed or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny.”

In the early years, under sections 89, 93, and 94 of the Constitution, every State in the Commonwealth was able to participate in surplus revenues held by the Commonwealth, and they were paid to the various States. There was the introduction of the

Surplus Revenue Act of 1910, under which for the first time per-capita payments were made. This was eventually re-negotiated by a financial agreement in 1927, when the sum of £15,170,000 was given to the States to pay interest on State debts.

We then unfortunately saw the misery of the depression and World War II. Then came the introduction of uniform taxation. I think it is pertinent to note that the Queensland Premier, in making a case for the State's allocation under the States Grants (Tax Reimbursement) Act of 1946, insisted that school-children be included in the density-of-population figures. This gave Queensland 16.5 per cent. of the allocation, which has not been bettered since. It has dropped considerably during the days of the Nicklin administration.

I repeat that the present financial situation existing between the State and the Commonwealth is certainly cause for alarm, and I support the many speakers who have expressed similar thoughts. I support very much the conference to be held shortly of A.L.P. leaders, both State and Federal, at which I am sure that solutions will be found to many problems. After all, the conference will be imbued with the idea that, in the interests of the people, future financial relationships should be ironed out so that the development of each State shall proceed smoothly and not in the present haphazard, "stop-go" fashion. The present pattern is to impose virtually no increased State taxation in a pre-election year, whilst in the year after an election the abhorrent claws of the Treasurer dig into the people's skin. Twelve months ago many who were so affected had already suffered greatly from drought conditions.

The Treasurer noted in the Budget that the State had \$109,287,122 of debts maturing in the financial year ended 30 June, 1967, \$35,419,449 being domiciled, at mint par rates, overseas. It is noted that the National Debt Commission redeemed \$3,572,688, the remainder being redeemed by the Commonwealth from cash raisings. This appears to be satisfactory, as in this modern world of ours money borrowed from overseas is at present really "tough" money, for the one obvious reason that it has to be serviced in foreign exchange, which does not depreciate to any degree unless there is considerable devaluation in the country of the lender.

Other reasons can be mentioned. One is the high level of interest rates on loans negotiated in overseas countries. Rates that once were 5 per cent. and 6 per cent. are now 7 per cent. and 8 per cent. In West Germany, to the end of this financial year, the rate was 9 per cent. The debt servicing of foreign exchange is certainly something that merits the attention of the Government. It is related to the very unpredictable cash inflow to the country which, in the largely important field of primary exports, is influenced by seasons and fluctuates according to market

prices. This has particular importance to this country, which is mainly an exporter of primary products.

Capital acquired from overseas at very high interest rates and depressed maturities can therefore set up an outflow of the country's cash, which, in times of an export slump, can have very serious consequences on the economy. In his speech the other day the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt referred to Government procedures in India. I was very interested in what he said, because it had application to government in this country.

Overseas borrowings have caused India considerable concern and have been responsible for many economic pangs. That country's external debt servicing takes 25 per cent. of its annual export income, and it is finding that it is beyond its capacity to keep its exports at the required level. As a result, it has to rely on assistance from any country that is prepared to help it.

I hope that the overseas loans maturing in 1969 and 1970 mentioned by the Treasurer in his Financial Statement can again be attended to satisfactorily by the National Debt Commission or by Commonwealth loan raisings. The Treasurer probably is not particularly worried about that, because in that year an A.L.P. Government will again be occupying the Treasury benches, and I am sure that a master stroke of financial genius will be made by the occupant of the Treasury portfolio, who will uphold the high traditions of the Labour Party by ensuring that the State's financial problems are settled satisfactorily.

I believe in a "do it yourself" policy, and if we exercise our natural talents and become self reliant, we are less likely to become involved in the complex flows of international capital and more likely to progress rapidly. This country's most valuable capital flow is a productive investment from a rising rate of local savings and out of our own resources, skilfully achieved by a sane level in the Consumer Price Index and full employment.

Mr. Chalk: What about the price of beer?

Mr. HANSON: I could say something about that, too. The Government should be arrested and sent for trial because of the big increases in fees it has inflicted upon the State. The poor man who likes two or three beers in the afternoon is bearing the burden of these increases, which have been introduced by an administration that does not care two hoots for him.

I shall now refer to other sections of the Budget that have a bearing on matters in my electorate. The Treasurer mentioned the Gladstone-Moura railway project, which is to be completed during this financial year. As Senate elections are to be held in the next five or six weeks, I think it is pertinent to note at this stage that not one cent of Commonwealth money has been used in the construction of that railway line. During the

recent Capricornia by-election there were many glowing reports of what the Commonwealth Government was doing for Queensland. One saw photographs of the huge machines on the Moura coalfield and a chart showing the route of the railway line to the port of Gladstone. They were a subtle attempt to sell to the public the idea that those projects were the result of the munificence of the Commonwealth Government.

A few days before the Capricornia by-election was held, I asked the Treasurer a question. He replied emphatically, "No", that not one cent of Commonwealth money was involved, and that not one cent will come from the Commonwealth for the project being undertaken at Blackwater by the Utah Construction Co. and its co-lessees. On the other hand, if we look at the performance of the Federal administration in South Australia, we find that when coal was being brought from Leigh Creek to the coast and to other centres, its participation was considerable. Not all of the money was provided by way of repayable loan; a considerable amount of it was provided by way of grant. In addition, the loan repayments were on a very attractive basis—much more attractive than those that this Government received when it obtained the money for the Mt. Isa railway project.

These matters naturally cause considerable concern to the present occupant of the Treasury portfolio. I fully realise that, with regard to political matters, he cannot get out on the hustings and sell his own party down the drain in these matters, but he knows in his own heart and soul the utter neglect that he has suffered at the hands of his Federal confreres since his coalition Government came to office. Otherwise, he would not have been so subtly critical of them in this Financial Statement.

Whilst on the matter of railways, if we consider the negotiations for the financing of the reconstruction of the Mount Isa railway line and compare them with the South Australian Standardisation Agreement Act we will find a considerable disparity. We will find who was faring the best, the State of South Australia or this beloved State of Queensland.

Returning to the matter of Moura coal, I very much regret recent statements by the hon. member for Fassifern when he made very derogatory references to the Mt. Morgan railwaymen. I thought his remarks were very much out of character. They were obviously made by one who certainly did not examine the position to find out what was the real cause of the upset in that town.

Mr. Chalk: What was it?

Mr. HANSON: The Treasurer asks, "What was it?" He certainly knew many years ago what would occur in the Mt. Morgan railway depot. That is one reason why I am complaining. His Government and the department have made no conscientious effort to

see that the transfer of these men was effected without undue injury. Everybody knows the real estate position in Mt. Morgan and the hardship and suffering that any railwayman would have if he was transferred to another depot. It must have been realised that these men would suffer a considerable financial loss.

Some hon. members would come into this Chamber—I should say the hon. member for Fassifern would—and say that this is all in the cause of automation. After all, automation and planned development, and all such things, are not worth a tinker's curse unless we can look after the people, the inheritors of the earth. It is the people who make our State; they are the units that we, in this Legislative Assembly, should so very carefully guard to see that no upset or suffering is caused them or their children. It does not matter at all how fast a train can go from the Moura field to the port to get the coal to Japan. What matters most is that the employment and the livelihood of those who work the trains, of the miners who mine the coal, and of the men who load the coal on to the ships, are in no way endangered and that they enjoy the prosperity that is rightly theirs.

Those are the things that are necessary and it ill-behoves the hon. member, after a cursory glance at the problem, and obviously briefed by people who have a detestation of the workers, to come into this Chamber and abuse them in such a fashion. It certainly does not reflect very well upon him. He should be ashamed of himself for bringing this important matter up in the unreasonable manner he did.

The magic of money still persists. In my Budget speech last year I referred to what is known in our economy as the "invisibles". I particularly mentioned the matter of our trade in this country under c.i.f. conditions. I drew attention to marine premiums and imports into Australia under c.i.f. arrangements. If we examine practices that have continued for years we find that they have had a very detrimental effect upon our economy. I put forward the proposition that we should seal the leak in foreign exchange. The profits of local firms would then increase. I suggested that this could be brought about by ensuring that insurance was negotiated in this country and not in the country from which the various goods were imported.

I go even further this year. As this Government cannot personally direct or create this type of facility in this country I suggest to the Ministers, particularly those who go frequently to Canberra on very serious matters, that they instil into the minds of the Federal Government the idea that we should have a Commonwealth shipping line. This is a long overdue necessity.

In this country we have an air service of our own. We have an overseas airline and an airline operating both interstate and intrastate. They are very successful enterprises, ably staffed by Australians. The three arms of the defence forces, the Navy, the Army and the Air Force, are all quite adequately managed at times by Australians. Although some years ago we were told that it was impossible to make a motor-car in this country we now have large assembly works. We are engaging in aircraft production and many other diverse activities.

Although we are doing all these things we are strangling our economy by not having a shipping line of our own. Attempts were made to obtain one some years ago. Everybody knows the unfortunate circumstances surrounding the loss of the Commonwealth shipping line on that occasion. A scandal occurred; certain people in the United Kingdom had to go before the courts, one person even being committed to gaol. For many years afterwards the self-same ships came to the various Australian ports and virtually thumbed their noses at us.

There are countries smaller than Australia that have very efficient shipping lines of their own. It is not very difficult to obtain the services of many fine people in this field who, I am sure, could place such a service in Australia on a very sound basis. If we do not live up to our responsibilities and ensure that we have facilities of a national character in every field we will attract people who are far out in their thinking and who are satisfied with a lower standard of living than we enjoy.

We are aware that very shortly a new port is likely to be created in this State for the handling of many of the products that will come from coal leases that probably will be opened up in the future. I should like the Treasurer to take cognisance of the fact that the existing ports, which have spent many laborious years trying to prepare themselves for a great volume of trade, should not be jeopardised in any way by the Government's desire to bring another port into operation. There is a huge Government involvement in the port at Weipa. It is an excellent port, but it has been financed mainly from State resources. If we are to develop another port I hope that it will not mean another serious encroachment upon State finances but that the private enterprise concerned will live up to its responsibilities and pay its way.

A year before the former Treasurer went out of office he said that the time had come for us to look more to the private sector than the public sector to provide these facilities. After all, these people have a responsibility, and the Government has a very clear, concise responsibility to ensure that the arrangements concerning present ports are not in any way endangered by a proliferation of other ports that may be in the Government's mind.

I might mention that in many ports a serious injustice is being inflicted through Commonwealth legislation on certain members of the Waterside Workers' Federation. This relates to the waterside workers' pension scheme, which has been introduced by the Commonwealth Government. It is affecting the development of the port that I represent because a lot of waterside labour is leaving it. Under the pension scheme, owing to appearance payments and so on, for waterside workers' payments it has been declared a seasonal A port instead of an A-class port. This concerns the people greatly because in many ports, not only the port where I live, waterside workers have their own homes. They have lived there for years with their wives and families. They are part and parcel of the town but many have had to go to ports farther afield and run two homes in order to obtain employment to keep the family pot boiling.

This matter deserves the Government's attention. I hope that representations made to it are closely investigated and that a full case is made to the Federal authorities so that justice may be extended to these people. Only today I made representations to the Federal Minister for Labour to see if a just solution could be found to this problem so that these people may not be seriously inconvenienced and so that the port of Gladstone shall not have its export trade jeopardised.

(Time expired.)

[*Sitting suspended from 5.57 to 7.15 p.m.*]

Mr. LICKISS (Mt. Coot-tha) (7.15 p.m.): There are two important occasions in Parliament in each year from the point of view of a back-bench member: the first is the unrestricted opportunity afforded during the Address-in-Reply debate, and the second is the opportunity of addressing oneself to the Budget.

I have reflected on the theme which I adopted for my speech on the occasion of the Address-in-Reply debate in which I dealt with the general economic trends in this State; the problems facing both the public and private sectors; the vital need for regional planning and the concept of regional development; and concluded with some general and specific recommendations which I trust were of a constructive nature. Indeed, I endeavoured to the best of my ability, to indicate the vital and urgent need to carefully analyse Queensland's situation in the year 1967. It is my intention to consider the Budget for 1967-68 in the light of what in fact I indicated in my Address-in-Reply speech, and therefore, before proceeding, I shall repeat the concluding four points which I stressed. They are—

(1) We can no longer afford the luxury of trying to develop this State without adequate planning on a State, regional, and town basis;

(2) That if increasing population and improved living standards together are to be our goal, economic development of this State must emphasise industrial development;

(3) That our limited resources of capital and labour must become engaged in optimum economic industrial pursuits; and

(4) That well-documented plans, based on regional concepts, should enable an aggressive State Government to forcibly convince the Federal Government of the vital necessity for developmental finance for our needs, at least on an equal basis with successful approaches by other States.

Before attempting to be critical or expansive on a Budget, I believe that it is the obligation of a member to obtain a clear picture of the objects of the Budget, and thus to analyse the contents thereof in some detail. I now wish that I had so analysed previous Budgets in years gone by. My reason for making a detailed analysis was to endeavour to place my findings within the bracket of being one year's programme in a pre-determined policy for future Queensland.

The first question therefore that I posed myself was—

(1) What is the purpose and aim of a Budget—certainly an elementary question. However the answer poses some thought.

(a) Is it purely a system of accounting to record expenditure and receipts and to "balance the books", or,

(b) Should a Budget and what it entails go considerably further and take into account the prevailing economic prospects ahead, whilst at the same time providing the necessary stimuli in those sections of the economic framework for development as will enhance the long-term growth activities vital to this State's proper development?

It might be argued that the foregoing is the province of the national Government. However, is this true? Surely under a federation the Commonwealth and State activity in growth must be complementary. The State Government's financial resources and sovereign powers are considerable and the direction of the State's resources, together with the use of such powers, can and will have a marked influence on this State's future.

Modern capitalism is a mixed economic system. The larger part of the national output is purchased by private consumers and investors, and the larger part of the product is produced and supplied by private firms. The distribution of income is determined largely by the ownership of factors of production and their earnings in the market. At the same time, a substantial share of the nation's product goes to satisfy public wants; a substantial part of private income originates in the public budget; and public tax and transfer payments significantly influence the state of private distribution. Moreover,

budget policy affects the level of employment and prices in the private sector. Thus ours is indeed a mixed system, including a sizeable and vitally important sphere of public economy along with the market sector.

Modern government is very big business; its financial operations are so significant to economic well-being as to merit the maximum of penetrating analysis and understanding. One of the most significant developments in the Australian economy over recent decades has been the rise of Government to a position of impressive influence upon nearly all economic activity. The channelling of so significant a share of the income stream through government cannot but have effects of great magnitude on the whole community.

For a State Treasurer, the raising and disbursement of government funds by no means constitutes a narrow field of problems. Determination of appropriate measures for raising funds involves an understanding of the flow of production from, and income through, the private economy, and therefore of the way in which the whole economy works.

Determination of an appropriate expenditure programme implies insight into such vast fields as the effects of public spending upon the income stream of the whole economy; the relative social utilities of governmental services and private spendings; and the impact of change of governments' expenditures upon the structure and philosophy of government.

In other words, a treasurer of a modern government is—or should be—aware that the operations of the public budget have a marked impact on resources allocation, the distribution of income, full employment, price stability and growth. The field is thus both broad and deep. The solution of fiscal problems requires co-ordination of the efforts of many specialists.

The complexity of modern budgetary operations is a far cry from that arising from the principles of public expenditure pursued in the old days when every particle of expenditure beyond that which necessity absolutely dictated for the preservation of social order and protection against foreign attack was adjudged to be waste and an unjust and oppressive imposition on the public. This latter barren and negative view of the proper economic activities of the State still finds some support even today.

In fiscal administration the budget is the master financial plan of the government. It brings together estimates of expected revenues and proposed expenditure for the budget period, and from these estimates the activities to be undertaken and the means of financing them can be inferred. Only in the budget can a unified view of the scope and character of governmental activity be

seen, and only here can the financial direction which the Government is planning to take be discerned.

Ideally, the budget is a statement of careful estimates and honest intentions. In practice, it is too often less than that.

Ideally, also, the Budget documents permit the average citizen to see fiscal policy in integrated form. In practice, the picture is only too frequently excessively complex for Parliament, whose business it is to legislate budgetary plans.

Later I propose to comment further on the economic implications of the budgetary programme and the purely technical or accounting procedure followed in the documents. At this stage, from general observation of the budgetary documents presented by the State Treasurer, there is no doubt that his efforts are most commendable, bearing in mind the restrictive character of the existing financial environment in which he must operate in framing the State's budgetary programme.

Until recently, such limitations have not been widely recognised, and it is very encouraging to observe that the positive approach adopted by the Treasurer in outlining both the need for and means of improving Commonwealth-State financial relationships already shows signs of ultimately reaching a fruitful conclusion. Undoubtedly the pursuit of national objectives such as fast population growth, rising living standards, and rapid economic growth, requires a strong central Government. Again, the responsibility for the compensatory financing associated with the maintenance of full employment and the stability of domestic price levels necessarily must be borne largely by the Commonwealth Government. Evidence of such stabilisation measures is, of course, reflected in the Federal Budget for the current financial year, in which the rate of increase in public expenditure was retarded in favour of stimulating the private sector of the economy. This course was adopted in order to absorb idle labour and plant resources that have existed, to some degree, for some time in most States, including Queensland.

Under these conditions, this was the correct fiscal policy to pursue. However, at the same time, the steps taken to slow down the rate of growth in public expenditure have highlighted the critical financial problems confronting States in meeting budgetary requirements, and in his Financial Statement the Treasurer has rightly drawn attention to this in so far as it affects Queensland.

Obviously, in a growing economy, the increasing demand for routine services and other functions provided by the State calls for commensurate growth in current expenditure. Again, the State Government is responsible for undertaking much of the social and developmental capital expenditures,

and thus funds for such purposes also must rise to maintain an acceptable rate of economic growth. If this State is to perform these functions more efficiently, then a more favourable financial relationship between the State and the Commonwealth than that currently prevailing must be devised.

It is important to note that, whilst there are justifiable grounds for improving the State's financial position relative to that of the Commonwealth, it should be borne in mind that the public and private sectors compete for scarce resources under conditions of full employment. It is essential, therefore, that these resources utilised by the public sector as a whole flow into channels most consistent with maintaining the optimum rate of growth and other economic, social and similar objectives pursued in a private-enterprise economy.

At the moment, Parliament is engaged in the annual financial routine of providing the Treasurer and his Cabinet colleagues with the legal authority needed to carry out the programmes on which they have decided, and, incidentally, of providing the Treasury with the legal backing needed to keep the expenditure of the departments within the limits of the agreed programmes.

Although all hon. members of this Committee may not be aware of it, it is evident to me that the public in general and the business community in particular are convinced that these annual financial proceedings have long since degenerated into nothing more than a ritual and that the important Parliamentary function of scrutiny has become wholly ineffective.

This may be largely attributed to the system of reporting embodied in the documents such as these currently tabled in Parliament.

I would, therefore, urge the Treasurer, now that he has presented his second annual Budget along the lines of his predecessors, to endeavour to adopt a new mode of presentation when reporting to Parliament on the financial activities of the Government.

It is most apparent that the financial procedure should be shorn of the superfluous and misleading forms oozing from the antiquated accountancy practices still followed.

These documents do not answer immediately or unambiguously some of the simple and obvious questions that can and ought to be put by a member of Parliament embarking on the task of scrutiny.

Primarily, such a member, or for that matter a member of the public, wants to know how much the Government is spending and raising in total, how much it is spending on different kinds of services, and how much it is raising in different ways and from different sources.

At best the information about particular expenditures or kinds of receipts may be scattered through the separate accounts of the funds. Total receipts and expenditures both realised and anticipated are not shown at all.

Members of Parliament or the public are justified in thinking that the State Government has budgeted for a total expenditure of \$811,499,573 in 1967-68 as shown in the table "Estimates of Expenditure for 1967-68" on page 110 of the document entitled "Estimates of the Probable Ways and Means and Expenditure of the Government of Queensland for the year ending 30th June, 1968" and tabled by the Treasurer. This, of course, is far from being the case, as it is just another meaningless aggregate derived from the State Government's peculiar book-keeping system.

In fact, one would have to be a financial wizard to derive even an approximate figure of aggregate expenditure from these documents let alone determine with any certainty the directions in which the sum has been or is proposed to be spent.

This is a most disconcerting situation in view of the marked impact that the Government expenditure has on the distribution of incomes, the allocation of resources and the over-all level of economic activity—as I outlined earlier.

If Parliamentary scrutiny is to be effective it needs to concentrate on what in fact the Government is doing and on what its activities and policies really are. In relation to finance surely this means that Parliament must direct its attention to the raising and spending of money by the Government, its payments to other institutions and to members of the public, and its receipts from them.

The documents often appear to divert attention away from these vital points to certain technical details of the Government's book-keeping. At the same time they fail to make clear the real meaning of the figures and the other information they provide.

The basis on which the documents are drawn up does not require them to report directly on the Government's payments and receipts, and the terminology used in the documents is often misleading and cloaks the significance of the figures provided and the concepts employed.

The Consolidated Revenue Fund, the Trust Fund and the Loan Fund are accounting entities, records kept in the Treasury's books of particular kinds of transactions.

When the Government receives money which it pays in to the "Public Account" it has to credit the amount to one of the funds, according to the rules of the Audit Acts. When the Government makes a payment out of the "Public Account" the amount is normally debited to one of the funds.

Indeed authority to spend normally takes the form of authority to debit one of the funds. However, it is not true that every credit or debit to one of the funds implies a payment to or by the Government.

The system permits "inter-fund" transactions in which a credit is transferred from one fund to another whilst the Public Account is left undisturbed.

I propose to refer to one or two examples of these "inter-fund" transactions to make my point clear. Let us look at the estimate of expenditure for 1967-68 for the Department of Health, as shown on page 110 of the document to which I have previously referred. The estimated total expenditure of the Department of Health for 1967-68 is \$96,993,997, comprised of expenditures of \$46,509,389 from Consolidated Revenue Fund, \$49,684,608 from Trust and Special Funds and \$800,000 from the Loan Fund Account.

Now, \$26,049,729 of total estimated expenditure from Consolidated Revenue Fund is simply a transfer to Hospital Administration Fund as shown on page 33 of the document. There is also a noting about this at page 29 of the document. Although not separately recorded, the amount so transferred reappears in the receipts of \$44,853,804 of Hospital Administration Trust Fund on page 79, and is destined to be "re-spent" from that fund, along with its other receipts stemming from Commonwealth payments, patients' payments, manufacturing dispensary recoveries and yet another transfer, this time from another Trust Fund.

It will be noted on page 90 (see also page 79) that the Hospital, Motherhood and Child Welfare Fund, which receives proceeds from Golden Casket Art Unions, is to be debited with \$2,600,000, which becomes a contribution to the Hospital Administration Trust Fund, and is ultimately "spent" once more.

As another example of "inter-fund" transactions—on this occasion, between the Loan Fund and Trust Fund—consider the estimated expenditure for 1967-68 of the next department listed in the summary on page 110, the Department of Industrial Development.

According to the summary, that department will "spend" \$13,527,022 of which \$5,430,000 will emanate from the Loan Fund Account. On page 105, it will be seen that this loan sum will be "spent" by crediting \$1,000,000 to Industrial Estates Construction Fund and \$4,430,000 to the Electricity Development Fund. The proceeds so credited will, of course, be "re-spent" by medium of the Trust Funds, expenditure from which, as shown in the table, is estimated to be \$7,386,800 in 1967-68.

When delving into the Estimates for the Railway Department I gained the impression that the interpretation of a pakapu ticket would be an easier exercise.

Clearly then, the documents are not records or forecasts of the Government's spending or revenues. They do not report directly on the financial operations, or revenues, or the payment and receipt of money by the Government, that Parliament is supposed to be scrutinising. Nor do they provide a satisfactory indirect measure of these operations except for possibly a few persons highly skilled in the interpretation of financial documents, who can arrive at approximations of these figures by the elimination of irrelevant items such as inter-fund transactions.

Hon. members, if they wish, may engage in this financial exercise of endeavouring to determine the actual level of Government expenditure. From the documents presented they will not get very far with the estimates for 1967-68, let me assure them. However, they might get closer to the mark for 1966-67 once yet another of these Government documents becomes available, namely, the Annual Report of the Auditor-General. This, too, is a joy to behold in its present form.

I submit that the deficiencies in the documents are sufficiently serious and provide a sufficiently effective barrier to scrutiny of the Government's financial activities to justify the Treasurer in calling for substantial reforms.

Mr. Mann: Why don't you make your representations in the right place?

Mr. LICKISS: I thought the hon. member might be a little interested in hearing some facts regarding this issue.

Mr. Mann: We can't hear you.

Mr. LICKISS: I am not responsible for the P.A. system in the Chamber.

Mr. Bennett: You should do some deep-breathing exercises.

Mr. LICKISS: I will give the hon. gentleman all the exercise he likes any time he likes.

As a starting point, perhaps the Treasurer could eliminate the irrelevant "inter-fund" transactions and express figures on a net basis. He would then be in a position to avoid making, what I consider to be, with respect, somewhat meaningless statements such as those dealing with the Trust and Special Funds on page 10 of the Financial Statement: "The total expenditure for the Trust and Special Fund is expected to increase from \$315,191,140 in 1966-67 to \$381,873,203 in the present year for expenditure in these funds". Quite obviously, under the present accountability procedure, you can furnish whatever increase you care to nominate.

The next point, I would suggest, after deriving net figures, is to design a classification of the accounts to show the economic and social effects of the financial transactions of the State Government. In relation to

expenditure in particular, these amounts should disclose details of net current expenditure, net capital expenditure and total net outlay for each financial year. It is also essential that the receipts and outlays of local and semi-governmental authorities be similarly classified.

The financial transactions, of course, of the Commonwealth Government are already completed on this basis. However, for obvious reasons these are not computed or, if they are, certainly not published to show Commonwealth expenditure in each State. It is inevitable that this must eventuate and that the Commonwealth Government be requested to face up to its responsibilities in the development of this State.

A classification on this basis would provide meaningful aggregates of expenditure by all public authorities in this State on current goods and services, on capital expenditure, and total outlays. Thus the essential basic framework would be provided for making intelligent policy decisions. Budgeting for the year ahead would thereby possess the sophistication that I believe it currently lacks. It would become the means of implementing the plans for an integrated and well-conceived programme of economic development.

Unfortunately, the ad hoc, unsophisticated approach to development heavily weighted, and often unnecessarily so, in favour of rural activities, is again clearly reflected in this Budget.

I cannot stress too much the urgency for the Government to devise an integrated programme for the development of this State. I feel that the Treasurer has done an excellent job in relation to the problems associated with education in this Budget, but we must not overlook one very vital fact. During the Address-in-Reply debate I emphasised that unless the economic growth of this State was hastened with a resultant increase in employment opportunities befitting the rising standards of education then the "brain-drain" of the more highly-educated Queenslanders from this State would continue. This, of course, does not mean that we should in any way depart from the obligation that we owe to our children to provide the best possible facilities in education. I merely make the point that as a State we can ill afford this loss.

Obviously there is little to be gained in net value as far as this State is concerned until appropriate opportunities are available to absorb and retain all new entrants to the work-force.

I previously mentioned that in a fully-employed economy, the private and public sectors must necessarily compete for scarce capital resources. I have endeavoured to draw attention to the means of ensuring that capital available to the public sector can be used more effectively.

In our economic system, growth depends largely on private capital expenditure. It is vital therefore that every means be adopted to attract private capital to this State.

It could be well worth while then exploring the possibilities of extending the activities of the Agricultural Bank in order that it may become a Resources and Development Bank for this purpose.

It is possible that that institution already has the power to raise money from private sources. If not, then surely only minor variations would be necessary to enable it to fill this role. Such funds could be made available where necessary to worthy developmental projects based on resource development study. After all it does this now in a fashion for those engaged in agricultural activities.

There is one further point that I should like to raise in relation to the presentation of the Budget. Current economic conditions and prospects naturally have a vital bearing on consumer and business expectations and behaviour. These are most inadequately dealt with in the present Financial Statement. In fact, there is little reference to this aspect at all. It must be remembered that rural activities, whilst of vital importance to this State, are declining in relative importance, and those engaged in non-farm activities (in excess of 85 per cent. of the work-force) also are entitled to know where they are heading.

They certainly find it difficult to derive much of an indication from the continual references made to seasonal conditions, trends in cattle and sheep slaughtered, and the world movements in prices of some rural commodities. This information, important as it is to the general economic welfare of the State, is only part of the story essentially required by the community in general. The rural factors obviously have a significant influence on the over-all level of activity in this State and will continue to do so, but, I repeat, there are certainly numerous other factors of at least equal importance in the other fields of activity which must be taken into account in analysing economic trends.

I submit that it is the responsibility of the State Treasurer to undertake this role. It is of course done by the Federal Treasurer, but that applies to Australia as a whole.

Mr. Davies: Have you talked this over with the Treasurer?

Mr. LICKISS: I do not talk my speeches over with anyone. I do not get my instructions from the Trades Hall.

Conditions in the States vary and an authoritative and comprehensive analysis of economic conditions and prospects incorporated in the budget documents by the Treasurer would be of invaluable assistance to industry, commerce, and the public generally of Queensland.

In concluding my remarks on the Budget, I congratulate the Treasurer on the manner in which he has managed the financial affairs of this State during the 1966-67 period. In his present Budget he has taken positive steps towards the financial assistance required for education. He has drawn attention to and taken positive steps in the matter of Commonwealth-State financial relationships.

Under his management the State appears to have emerged in a sound financial position after a number of difficult years. The Treasurer is mindful of the capital needs of the State, and I wish him well in his efforts to attract the necessary capital sources to this State.

In my speech on the Budget I have endeavoured to point out that the actual presentation of the Budget in the present form is most unsatisfactory from the point of view of parliamentary scrutiny and as an economic guide for the community. I suggested certain improvements in the formulation of the Budget papers to improve the presentation. I also mentioned the role of budgetary measures in assessing economic trends in the public and private sectors.

I reiterated the need for integrated regional planning flowing over from a speech on a previous occasion, and the urgent need in Queensland for this provision. I have suggested that the Agricultural Bank be redesignated the "Resources and Development Bank", to attract private development capital to Queensland. The Agricultural Bank acts as an intermediary bank, and it would fill the role admirably.

Finally, in relation to the Budget and the other factors mentioned, I suggest that such inter-related matters, if properly dealt with, would enable the Government to formulate a soundly based, co-ordinated plan on which to provide better for the accelerated development of this State. The Budget session of this Parliament should be one in which it is conveniently possible to review in simple prospect the guide lines of economic activity for the 12 months ahead. The Budget should provide a strong lead in a well-defined path of development leading to the optimum economic prosperity with growth in our State.

I should now like to deal with another matter that I believe to be of great importance. I think we should all note with concern that petty crime is on the increase in Queensland.

Mr. Bennett: There are not enough police.

Mr. LICKISS: If the hon. member for South Brisbane would bide his time and listen, he might learn something. That information was supplied by the Minister (Honourable J. Bjelke-Petersen) acting for the Minister in charge of the Police Force in an item in "The Courier-Mail" of Friday, 13 October. If it stemmed from a question

asked by an hon. member opposite, I give him full credit for asking it and am pleased that this information has been made public.

I think it should also be recognised that law-breaking remains conspicuously a pre-occupation of the young. In Great Britain figures quoted by Barbara Wootton show that in that country criminals over 30 number a quarter of those in the 8 to 14-years-old group, and less than one-sixth of those in the 14 to 17-years-old group.

Mr. Bennett: They get more skilful as they get older.

Mr. LICKISS: That is the type of utterance one would expect from hon. members opposite.

I again say we should recognise that the adolescent must have some participation in group life to help him develop in due course to mature adulthood. He needs to participate in group life to learn the socially acceptable limit to his behaviour. He learns how important it is to belong and to feel accepted. He learns that the nonconformist is punished and the conformist is rewarded. In the light of those statements, it must also be recognised that the delinquent uses the delinquent gang for the same reasons, and that therefore strong police action to break up gang life may remove a source of social fear but may not in the long run free society of the anti-social personality.

Mr. Mann: Who do you think you're kidding?

Mr. LICKISS: In answer to the interjection of the hon. member for Brisbane, I am advised by experts that we are a product of heredity and environment. I should say that the hon. member demonstrates clearly that he is a product of environment.

I think it should be recognised that there are emerging in some cities professional social workers trained to work as detached workers within the framework of the delinquent's gang structure. It should be recognised, too, that an authoritative figure such as a policeman, important as he surely is in setting firm limits of socially acceptable behaviour for youth, is nevertheless hindered by his authoritative role in working closely with delinquent youth gangs. Therefore, any increase in numbers in the Police Force will not solve all the problems of anti-social youth.

Again, I think it should be recognised that prevention is always better than cure, and that it is of economic and social benefit to the State to support not only work for the rehabilitation of criminals but also work in the field of the prevention of crime. I want this problem approached from the point of view of prevention.

In this light, it is important to note similar trends in such fields as programmes of mental hygiene in the community. It

is fast being recognised that the most effective way to combat mental sickness is to promote programmes of mental health. To this end, there is a development within the community of what is known as "community psychiatry", which, amongst other things, promotes mental health from a preventative point of view, whereas for so very long the emphasis has been placed on rehabilitation of mentally sick persons.

I suggest that, in view of what I have said, there is strong argument to support the idea that finances could be well spent in supporting skilled workers who can do much to prevent crime by working as detached workers in those areas, such as milk bars, in which delinquent gangs congregate. It would be little drain on the economy for the Government to appoint one such specialist youth worker for every 50 additional policemen added to the Police Force.

I strongly commend this idea to the Committee, because I believe that every person has a place in the sun. As I said earlier, people are products of heredity and environment, and steering these young people along the right track is not only the correct thing to do, having in mind the economy of the State, but is the acceptable and proper Christian approach to this serious problem. If someone can be directed onto the correct path before he becomes branded as a criminal, it will be of advantage both to the State and to the young person concerned. As my colleague from Toowong says, it is good economics. It certainly is. How often does one find that, once a person has gone over the edge, if a petty crime is committed in the district in which he lives, he is pestered by the police to explain where he was on a certain night and what he was doing. In other words, the police are saying, "You are free, but we are not going to trust you." If they say that often enough to a person, he will say, "If the social world does not require me, if people in it think I am bad, then I will be bad." Unfortunately, that is often the end product of an otherwise decent young citizen.

Mr. Mann: That is a lot of baloney.

Mr. LICKISS: Again I say that we are products of heredity and environment. The hon. member's environment has been rather limited and probably unkind to him.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. LICKISS: As hon. members opposite seem to be quite vocal, I shall now deal with the statements made by the hon. member for Port Curtis, who preceded me in the debate.

I give the hon. member credit for being rather honest and forthright, but I am afraid that this benevolent feeling does not extend much further on that side of the Committee. Let me say that the hon. member has drawn attention to the dangers of centralisation. If I did not know him better I would

immediately accuse him of political chicanery, or political hypocrisy. If hon. members opposite feel that this is a rather harsh statement to make I refer them back to their platform, which was again approved at the Adelaide conference. Of course, the hon. member expressed his great concern that too much power was moving into the Commonwealth field, that too much power was being vested in the central Government and that the States were taking second place.

I think it would be wise to again quote the A.L.P. platform—

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

It is worth mentioning again—

“To clothe the States . . . with delegated constitutional power.”

Of course, we know that the socialist policy is one of centralisation and unification and that it is diametrically opposed to the establishment and maintenance of sovereign States. But hon. members opposite, now following the line of their Federal Leader, Mr. Whitlam, parroted by the Leader of the Opposition in this Parliament, try to cast this veneer of respectability over what Labour, in fact, stands for. But Labour stands for its platform, its rules and constitution, and if anyone cared to examine in detail the result of the Adelaide conference he would see that whilst Mr. Whitlam appears to go around covered with this veneer of respectability, the official Labour Party has moved further to the left, perhaps, than it ever was before.

Mr. Tucker: Labour policy is giving you fellows a lot of worry lately.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind hon. members on both sides of the Chamber that persistent interjections will not be tolerated.

Mr. LICKISS: The truth hurts, and it is really stinging them tonight. If the hon. member for Townsville North wants to mix it, just let him nominate the time. I will have a few words to say about his activities in his own electorate of Townsville North.

We have also heard this morning, as was mentioned by my colleague the hon. member for Clayfield, that part of Labour's platform is the abolition of State Legislative Councils and the office of State Governor. What they are saying, in effect, is that they want an all-powerful centralised Government with mere administrative centres set up around Australia, doing precisely what the central Government desires them to do.

Mr. Porter: That is the very essence of Socialism.

Mr. LICKISS: As my colleague the hon. member for Toowong says, that is the very essence of Socialism—to centralise power and to set up administrative centres. It is sheer

political hypocrisy, therefore, for hon. members opposite to come in here and shed tears over the deal the State Government is receiving from the Commonwealth. They do not believe in the system. If they had their way in both the Federal and State spheres they would be forced to carry out the provisions of their platform, and these are diametrically opposed to what they are advocating here today. We want a strong national Government and that is what we have in Australia. We want a Federal system with a national Government of the type we have in Canberra at the moment.

I did intend to comment on some of the matters raised by my colleague the hon. member for Logan. Many of the matters he mentioned he touched on only briefly, and I should like to take them a step further. First of all, I refer to the necessity for the appointment of a boundaries commission to deal with local-government boundaries.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. LICKISS: If hon. members opposite want my advice on State boundaries I am prepared to give them my views on that subject too. At the moment I am dealing with the need for a boundaries commission to determine local-authority boundaries. It has been said by my colleague that he would be prepared to go along with regional planning as long as the local authorities were not disregarded. I would again state that if we had town and regional planning in this State it would have to be in co-operation with local government and not in opposition to it. This is the very substance of partnership, but hon. members opposite would not understand that sort of thinking. They believe in dictatorship at the top, passing down through administrative arrangements, and finally being a form of instruction in a particular area. We believe that any action we take at any level—Commonwealth, State or local authority—should be by way of co-operation, and certainly not in opposition to the various forms of government.

Of course, I do not share my colleague's feelings about Greater Brisbane. Immediately the Bennett Report was made public I said that I believed we should accept what we could from that report and then immediately institute a wider committee of inquiry to investigate all the ramifications and responsibilities of Greater Brisbane. I do not make this a political issue. I believe that irrespective of the type of administration at the City Hall, no administration as properly constituted could satisfactorily administer this huge area.

What I want to see is the Brisbane City Council reduced to the status of a local authority in terms of what a local authority is meant to be. I do not think, for instance, that it should be responsible for water supply when Greater Brisbane is situated, as it is, within the South-east Queensland complex. Greater Brisbane has only paper boundaries. It is the result of telescoping 19 local authorities into what was called Brisbane away back in 1923. At

that stage Brisbane had an area of some five and a-half square miles, whereas Greater Brisbane now covers 385 square miles. It has merely paper boundaries and is part of the South-east Queensland complex, which we see rapidly developing every day.

I believe that there is room to look at the present concept of Greater Brisbane, and we should take away from the Brisbane City Council the responsibility for such things as transport, water, electricity, and the various other activities that are beyond the ordinary scope of a local authority. At that stage, having looked at it from that point of view, I believe everyone would agree with the wisdom of breaking it up into more workable and more personal areas. The Brisbane, as we know it, would continue to develop, not as Brisbane, but as an integral part of the South-east Queensland complex.

I should like to reiterate, not for any party-political purposes, my request for the constitution of a royal commission to investigate the functions and administration of Greater Brisbane in relation to the type of administration which, of necessity, it must have to carry out this type of work.

Mr. Melloy: The Bennett Report was a washout.

Mr. LICKISS: Hon. gentlemen opposite and others would have liked the Bennett Report to be a washout, but it rebounded because the little people came forward to air their grievances. Statements made by the little people, when investigated by Commissioner Bennett, were responsible for a damnable indictment, not only of the Lord Mayor, but also of the Town Clerk, for the dictatorial way that they meted out unequal justice to the citizens of Brisbane. One does not have to go very far to realise why the big subdividers did not come forward.

Mr. Lloyd interjected.

Mr. LICKISS: The hon. member has never been a lover of Clem Jones, so he should not talk about that.

The big subdividers were not prepared to come forward, for obvious reasons. It was left to the little people to come forward and air their grievances and it was on these matters that there was a drastic indictment of the activities of the administration at the City Hall in relation to the present Lord Mayor and the Town Clerk.

Mr. DEAN (Sandgate) (8.12 p.m.): At this stage of the parliamentary session it is customary for us to make a reply to the Financial Statement presented by the Treasurer. On this occasion, however, I believe that if I were to do that I would be engaging in superfluous debate because my leader, Mr. Houston, gave a full and complete exposition of the Financial Statement as introduced by the Treasurer, and for me to continue in that vein would be to indulge in tedious repetition, as I fully agree with my leader's remarks. One of the front-bench

members of our party fully supported my leader on most of the telling points he made in his speech in reply to the Treasurer, and I repeat that it is unnecessary for me to engage in tedious repetition.

The Budget debate affords hon. members a very wide scope to introduce matters of importance, matters that may not be discussed during formal debates on legislation or within the narrow confines of other matters that come before the Assembly. There are many subjects I wish to mention but there is a certain amount of confusion in my mind concerning just what subject I should like to discuss this evening. After listening to the speech by the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha, I am afraid that my confusion has been added to, so I have decided to confine my remarks to subjects that may have a vital effect on the community at large—particularly on certain sections.

I will refer first to the plight of deserted wives—or deserted women generally—and their children. As hon. members know, for some time we have been told repeatedly by the Children's Services Department that the State law is very limited in its ability to give aid to these women quickly and urgently. The plight of some of these unfortunate wives and mothers is such that they want immediate assistance, and but for the quick, prompt action of the service organisations in the community, goodness only knows what privation and suffering many of them would suffer before receiving the necessary State or Commonwealth assistance.

Like many of my colleagues on this side of the Chamber, I have always laid full blame for this at the door of the Commonwealth Government. I do not want to lift the responsibility from the Commonwealth Government, but to a certain extent we have been wrong in placing full responsibility on it. In reading the remarks of the Federal Treasurer when introducing the Appropriation Bill (No. 1) into the Federal House on 15 August, I found a reference to relief for deserted wives and wives of prisoners that changed the whole tenor of my thought on the State's responsibility and the Commonwealth's responsibility in this regard. The Federal Treasurer said—

"We intend to open discussions with the States with the object of working out mutually acceptable arrangements for the assistance of deserted wives and wives of prisoners. At present these women are, subject to a means test and other conditions, eligible for a widow's pension if they have been deserted or, if the husband has been in prison, for not less than six months. Meanwhile, they can approach the State authorities in most States for assistance, with assistance varying considerably from State to State."

That is the great weakness. Each State has legislation and its own way of helping deserted wives. That is the point that brought to my mind the full significance of the fact

that the States are falling down on the job compared with what the Federal authorities are doing.

The Federal Treasurer continued—

“If the States can reach agreement on the principles to be followed we will offer to meet half the cost of State assistance where the wives concerned have children.”

In other words, the Commonwealth is waiting for the States to get together.

I make a strong appeal to our Treasurer, when he goes south to the Loan Council or to the meeting of State Treasurers, to bring this vital matter forward. Hon. members, and many authorities and organisations, will surely agree with me that the time is overdue when prompt assistance should be given to these women. The Treasurer, when he goes south, should try to get some agreement among all State Treasurers in the Commonwealth so that they can present a case to the Commonwealth Government for assistance for these women and children. I have touched only briefly on this subject, although it could be debated widely. It is sufficient at this stage to raise it and place it on record in the hope that assistance will be given to these unfortunate women some time this year, either through Commonwealth legislation or as a result of an agreement between the States and the Commonwealth.

My next subject emanates from a question I asked a fortnight ago for the sole purpose of getting information on the use of detergents. From time to time members of the medical fraternity have discussed many common complaints, some more common than others. One specialist, discussing the prevalence of stomach complaints and complaints of the digestive system, said they were on the increase. He was not a specialist in that field but he said that in his opinion, and in the opinion of many other doctors, although no specific research was being undertaken, it seemed that detergents were being used in the home in an unrestricted way and that they could be having an effect on the incidence of stomach complaints, especially in children.

The point was made that contamination is caused by the residue of detergent left on dishes, cups and other cooking and eating utensils after they have been washed following their use. In other words, the washing of dishes after a meal is not sufficiently effective to remove the residue of detergent.

When this was first mentioned to me, I thought it could have been merely a fad of a particular doctor, because doctors, like many others, including politicians, have their leanings and weaknesses. I frequently come into contact with quite a few medical men in various organisations, and I made a point of discussing this matter with them. Quite naturally, many were not prepared to make definite statements on contamination arising from the use of detergents in

the home, although they had a strong suspicion that some of the fears expressed by me and some of their colleagues were well founded.

The Minister's answer to my question was non-committal and of the “yes-and-no” type. I quite understand that, as the medical men of whom I spoke were not prepared to take a definite stand because, as they said, no specific research had been carried out into this matter. Someone recommended to me the reading of a book entitled “Silent Spring”, by Rachel Carson. It deals not so much with domestic contamination by the use of detergents but with the wider field of the use of insecticides in gardening and rural activities. I recommend it to anyone who wishes to know something of the danger to the community arising from the widespread use of insecticides.

Frequently one sees evidence of skin complaints in the community. Dermatitis is familiar to us all, and there is clear evidence that one type of it is caused by immersion of the hands in water containing detergents. Some forms of dermatitis are virtually incurable, and in those cases it is almost impossible to restore the skin to its original healthy state or even to arrest the spread of the disease along the arms and to the body. When one sees the effect on the skin, it needs little imagination to appreciate what the use of detergents in water must do to the membranes of the stomach.

One authority told me that some detergents—he did not mention which ones—are cumulative in their effect; the concentration builds up within the system till it reaches a dangerous level. It is not hard to realise what detergents must do to the delicate membranes of the stomach if taken internally. They are certainly very powerful irritants. Many hon. members have read articles dealing with the origins of cancers and other growths. They make it clear that cancer can be caused by irritation, and the irritants to which I am referring could be the cause of many serious stomach disorders.

As I said, there is a relationship between what Rachel Carson says in her book and what I am saying, because she draws attention to the connection between the indiscriminate use of insecticides and the sprays used in the campaign to eradicate mosquitoes and other insects. She points out that, although we may destroy one particular type of insect, the soils in which vegetation and crops are grown may be contaminated. Certain plants and vegetables absorb poisonous sprays into their structure, and we do not know what damage is being done to persons in the community who eat vegetables that are affected in that way.

My purpose in raising the matter tonight is to try to get the Minister for Health to have officers of his department carry out research over a period and find out

whether dangers are being created to members of the community as a result of the unrestricted use of detergents.

Some contamination takes place when many agricultural insecticides are used on farms or in suburban gardens. It has been said by some biologists that the long-lasting residues of synthetic pesticides are a greater menace to life and health than is nuclear fall-out. That is rather a sweeping statement to make, and I remind the Committee that it is not my statement, that I am only repeating what has been said by some biologists of note.

I mentioned the book "Silent Spring" to my colleague the hon. member for Salisbury, and I found that he had already studied it and was very conversant with its contents. When I spoke to him about it recently, he said that the book had had a tremendous impact on the community when it was released in America.

Mr. Bromley: How much were you paid to say that?

Mr. DEAN: I was not paid anything to say it. I have the courage of my convictions, and I always say what I think I should say. I believe that I should say what I am saying tonight. It seems that I always say things at the right time.

The reaction to Miss Carson's book in the United States of America was so strong that the late President Kennedy asked his scientific advisory committee for a special report on it. After carrying out a thorough investigation, the committee brought in a shock report in May, 1963. It found that many of Miss Carson's basic allegations were justified, and it recommended an intensive long-term study of the subject by the Government. Scientists went very thoroughly into the effect of insecticides and pesticides on both animal and human health.

The picture painted in that book is not a pretty one; it shocks most readers; but it makes one realise the danger to which one is exposed in using poisons to kill pests of particular types in one's own garden. In fact, one runs a risk in even opening a tin of poison in a careless manner.

Queensland could learn from the experience of other countries relative to this very important problem. The unrestricted use of toxic pesticides in the United States of America alone wiped out whole fields of wild-life communities. That is shown very strongly and clearly in the book to which I referred earlier. The use of these pesticides to destroy certain pests, without any thought of the side effects, long-term or otherwise, or the breaking of the ecological chains that are so apparent in all things belonging to nature is a very dangerous thing indeed, and, as I said earlier, it is something the full impact of which on the community most of us here do not realise. We have to admit, of course, that these detergents

do the job. They clean the things we want them to clean, such as heavy grease deposits on receptacles, but they have after effects.

Perhaps if people were educated in their proper use the danger would be considerably minimised if not eliminated altogether. We must realise, of course, that one of the greatest dangers relative to insecticides today comes from aerial spraying and the unrestricted laying of poison baits to destroy dingoes and such pests. This is another thing which could be having a very serious impact on the community. We have been told—and I have read various publications on the subject—that many of these baits find their way into the watercourses in this country.

A Government Member: Careful of that water, Marty!

Mr. DEAN: The water that is reticulated by the Brisbane City Council is clear of all poisons and toxic substances, so the hon. member need have no fear on that score.

I regret to state, Mr. Hooper, that only one State in Australia appears to be aware of this danger; it is Victoria. The Director of Fisheries and Wild Life Department in that State, Mr. A. Dunbowin Butcher, has been most outspoken about the indiscriminate use of chemical pesticides on our wild-life. In August, 1964, the Victorian Government considered the use of chemical pesticides and decided that it was both opportune and desirable that an immediate appraisal be made to determine whether any significant problems were being created and if so what action should be taken. A select committee was appointed by the Premier under the chairmanship of Mr. R. G. Downes and its report was tabled in February, 1966. The 78-page report covers all aspects of chemical pesticides and various classes of chemicals, their toxic effects, their persistence in plants, animals, soil and water, examination of existing packaging, sales, and the general use of these chemicals.

The committee recommended to the Premier that a pesticide review committee be appointed to give effect to its findings on matters which appeared to be relevant to the terms of inquiry. I stress that this is something of which we should take cognisance and that we should set up a similar committee of inquiry composed of people who would know what they are doing and who would let us know what is happening in the State of Queensland.

Victorian people have a very good foundation on which to work and I do not see why we should not learn from some of the mistakes they made in the early part of their investigations.

The committee came to a number of conclusions of which a very powerful and significant one had the effect of bringing to the community by way of education a realisation of the dangers inherent in the use of these substances and information on the correct use of them. That is one of the main points in my address tonight, namely, that

we should be educating our people not only in the dangers of these things but also in their proper use.

Mr. Sherrington: I think we will have to educate the Minister for Primary Industries, too.

Mr. DEAN: I think the Minister for Primary Industries is well educated and is listening intently to what I am saying tonight. I hope that he will give some lead in this direction.

The Committee examined the matter under two headings. It came to the conclusion that as pesticides were toxic materials it was important to know what materials were being used in Victoria. That was the first question the Committee had to deal with; how they were used and their characteristics. The second consideration was in 1966. It found that there were no means of determining the quantities of pesticides being used. At that time it could get no lead so started right from scratch to find out the type and the quantities being used in the State of Victoria. I imagine it would be much the same as in Queensland. I do not think any of us here would know the quantities on the market at the moment. I do not know whether we would know their constituents.

The Committee found that 25 of the pesticides being used in Victoria were toxic to wild-life and bird-life generally. I refer again to Rachel Carson's book, "Silent Spring". The Duke of Edinburgh once said that he recommended the reading of that book to anyone who wished to know what was happening to wild-life generally. He said that miners used canaries to warn them of deadly gasses, and that therefore it might not be a bad idea if we took warning from the dead birds lying around the countryside, and by that he meant, of course, that there was evidence before our eyes of the destruction of our bird-life by the use of insecticides for agricultural purposes. He pointed out that biologists working with the Antarctic research team had been shocked to find pesticide residue in the fat of seals and penguins. That shows how this dangerous substance can be transmitted, and how it can accumulate within the body. Pesticide spray used in Canada was later recorded in Scotland, having crossed the Atlantic on the prevailing winds. Somebody suggested that it was in Scotch whisky. Judging by some people who drink whisky here I think it must be in our local whisky.

It has been said that many scientists believe enough is known already about pesticides to warrant their removal from the market. Charles F. Wuster of the State University, New York, once said that DDT is more than a pesticide. He said, "A pesticide just kills pests and insects but DDT is a biocide. Spraying it over a forest or swamps in the name of mosquito control is almost like dropping an atom bomb on the city of New York to eliminate its

criminals." That expression of opinion comes from a very eminent scientist who should know what he is talking about. As I said earlier, these pesticides are toxic and can be accumulated in the human system, and are usually found in the body fat.

Without becoming too gloomy on this subject I feel that we must admit that in advancing towards his announced goal of the conquest of nature, man has written a very depressing record of destruction, directed not only against the earth he inhabits, but against the life that shares it with him. The direct killing of birds, mammals, fish, and indeed almost every form of wild-life by chemical insecticides indiscriminately sprayed on the land, has certainly written a tragic chapter of havoc down through the years.

Of course, there are many ways of destroying wild-life. We have learned that more sea-life was killed by the detergent that was used to fight the oil from the tanker wrecked off the English coast than by the oil itself. The authorities in Great Britain now realise that they should have left the oil alone, or tried to assist the prevailing tides to take it away instead of using thousands and thousands of tons of detergent in an attempt to break it up. They now realise that they did more damage than the oil did—and goodness knows, it did a great deal of damage to the English coast—by the use of detergents to break it up. The detergent wrought greater havoc with the coastline than did the oil.

I share with many people strong feelings about the aerial distribution of chemicals. I know that many of my agricultural friends and people engaged in the pastoral industry will react strongly to my remarks: nevertheless, the damage is there to be seen. Only last week-end the hon. member for Salisbury and I attended a symposium at the University on the preservation of wild-life. Apart from the Premier who opened the symposium we were the only two members of Parliament in attendance. The Premier left very early, which is understandable, as he is very busy. Insecticides were touched on lightly on this occasion because primarily it was a research symposium to decide what policy should be followed. I am sure my colleague will agree with me that the sessions we attended on Saturday and Sunday on the conservation of wild-life, particularly in Queensland, were very interesting and educational. We learnt much about many things concerning which we laboured under misapprehensions.

The symposium was attended by many eminent men who were fully qualified and knowledgeable in their subjects. They were not talking from the viewpoint of a crank and advocating the conservation of everything even if it meant letting the human race starve to death for want of killing a rabbit or some other pest. They did not wish to be regarded as a lot of cranks, but pointed out in a clear and conscientious

way that a fine balance was required between Nature and the needs of the people. I thought I should point that out in case it was felt that those attending the symposium had extreme views and considered these matters in an extreme way without taking into consideration the important matters of feeding the people and producing food generally.

A mass campaign, with unrestricted aerial spreading of baits, to kill dingoes has been carried out in Queensland. There has also been mass spraying of dangerous insecticides throughout the country. Who can deny that much of the illness in the community today is attributable to the indiscriminate use of aerial spray?

I believe that many insecticides used for agricultural purposes eventually find their way into our streams and waterways. No doubt some hon. members will recall that some time ago I spoke on pollution generally in the city of Brisbane and emphasised the importance of having a purification plant on the river to stem the rapid increase in river pollution that must come from the constant increase in population. New suburbs spring up—and many have in the last few years—and their drainage finds its way into the river. Some day we will pay a heavy price, as has happened in some parts of America. Some beaches in the United States were closed because of the foam caused by detergents. The outlets flowed into the waterways and the detergent ended up on the beaches as foam. The authorities had to decide whether to clean the beaches and keep them for recreation purposes or to close them and let the detergent foam take over. They decided that cleansing services were important from the health aspect and they closed some of the beaches because of this foam menace.

I realise that I could open up the subject of water pollution caused by the discharge of industrial effluent into the river. Hon. members will no doubt agree with me that we could devote a considerable period to a discussion on water pollution, but time is limited and I shall not pursue the matter at this stage as I have certain other matters to deal with tonight.

Many industrial concerns, especially in Brisbane, are not doing the right and proper thing by the State or in the interests of the health of the people. A person has only to go to the rear of some of these premises on the river to learn that the effluent is not being properly treated. I have spoken to some of the directors of these companies and they have been disinclined to install treatment plant to take care of their waste products. This problem and our weak laws that can be circumvented so easily are matters for the Government. These companies can get around our State laws easily and therefore will not install the treatment plant to handle their waste products.

Mr. Herbert: That is a local authority matter.

Mr. DEAN: We have a Minister for Local Government, and local authorities work under an Act of this Parliament. I have always been of the opinion that our legislation is inadequate in this regard, and that the means of enforcing it are even more inadequate; they are just too weak.

Too little is known of the consequences of water pollution particularly by effluent emanating from some of the modern processing techniques. I do not suggest this, but I read in an article that companies might sit up and listen and accept their responsibilities and realise the seriousness of this matter if they were taxed on their effluent load. That might assist some of these concerns to make up their minds to do the right thing. The first and most urgent requirement is that all States should work together on this matter because it can affect each and every State and every individual in each State. We should have a pollution committee co-ordinating all the departments concerned and having on it representatives from industry.

Finally, I appeal to the Government to appoint a special committee of inquiry to consider ways and means of stopping the present insidious slaughter of our wild-life. I make my final appeal on this subject. I ask the Government to do something about the unrestricted use of pesticides and sprays. Although I speak only as a layman, I feel that there is great danger to the community from the use of poisons known as insecticides. It has to be remembered that the science of ecology teaches us that we have to understand the interaction of all living things in the environment in which we live. I leave it to hon. members on that note.

I have referred to deserted wives and the plight of widows in the community. I hope that the Government will take cognisance of what I have said and move for some agreement between the States so that the Federal Government will be able to give the assistance that the Federal Treasurer has offered if such a basic agreement can be reached.

My other request is that the Government do something about preserving the wild-life of the State whilst there is some left to preserve. I include in that plea the fauna that is at present unprotected and under attack by people, sometimes deliberately but often, I feel, in ignorance. We have been told recently that sections of the Great Barrier Reef are now protected and set aside for posterity, and so that research scientists can give attention to protecting something of great value not only from a scenic but also from a natural point of view.

Mr. Davies: And also preserve the fertility of the soil.

Mr. DEAN: Yes, as mentioned by interjection by the hon. member for Maryborough, to preserve the fertility of the soil. In the main, however, we should preserve what wild-life we have left to preserve.

Mr. CORY (Warwick) (8.53 p.m.): I should like to comment at the outset on the reference by the previous speaker to the problems associated with the widespread use of insecticides and sprays. I think we are all concerned about the possible effects of the unlimited use of many of them. It is appreciated that much of the useful bird-life has been destroyed, together with living organisms in the soil, by the indiscriminate use of sprays. Let me also say that much has been done, and much more discussed with the Government, with a view to controlling such indiscriminate use. But it must also be kept in mind that many people have to make a living from the land in spite of the pests and other problems with which they are confronted. It is difficult indeed to carry on year by year and produce, as we have to do under the present economic system, without resorting at some stage to the use of sprays.

Mr. Sherrington: Do you agree with the use of octatoma in ridding the State of lantana?

Mr. CORY: I have not had any experience in dealing with lantana; but I have had experience in dealing with the tap-root weeds and the types of burr that grow amongst the cereal crops on the Darling Downs. It would be virtually impossible to cope with them at this stage without the use of sprays.

I raise that point in passing because I was very interested in what the hon. member for Sandgate said. The problem is of great magnitude, but I think it is being tackled in as practical a way as is possible in the circumstances.

In dealing with the Budget, I congratulate the Treasurer on the presentation of his second Financial Statement. In my opinion, it is the best Budget that he could have framed having in mind the financial resources available to him.

Mr. Sherrington: In other words, you say it is not much but it is the best he could do?

Mr. CORY: No-one can do better than is possible. If hon. members did the best they possibly could, they would do quite well.

There will never be a perfect Budget. One person might think that he has received fair treatment under a budget; others might feel that they have not been treated as fairly as they could have been. The cloth has to be cut according to the resources available to the Treasurer, and in fact it boils down to the amount of taxation collected from the community by either the State Government or the Commonwealth Government. The present limit of taxation of the community is quite marked. If taxation is raised to an excessive level, initiative and development are immediately crippled, and they are the very things that the Government is endeavouring to encourage. Therefore, I say that, with the present structure of

development, the level of taxation must be limited and budgets must always be framed with that somewhat tight financial structure in mind.

Having said that, I say that I believe there are certain items in the Financial Statement that are a little disappointing. I stress that this is not the fault of the Treasurer, who, as I said, has framed a very fair Budget and has spread the resources very evenly over the State of Queensland. The Financial Statement shows that the works programme in this State has been increased by about 8.4 per cent. compared with the all-States average of 8.2 per cent. I think the Treasurer would fairly admit that that increase is perhaps not as great as he would like it to be, because it is obvious that a certain amount of increased expenditure has been swallowed up by the inflation that has occurred during the last 12 months.

However, it is only fair and reasonable that a State such as Queensland should progressively spend more on providing services for the people over the length and breadth of the State. I say that because Queensland has particular problems associated with its comparatively small population, its comparatively large area and long distances, and its comparatively small production. Hence, there is a smaller ton-mileage of freight and goods, which is costing more for transport when compared with the other States. Therefore I say that we should keep, and are keeping, ahead of the southern States in this regard but, as I have said before, the Treasurer would be the first to realise this and admit that this is a problem for Queensland which we have to face and which I think we must admit, to be quite fair, that the Treasurer is facing in the best possible way.

Before proceeding further in this debate, I should like to say a word of appreciation to the Treasurer for the inclusion of a new Wheatvale school building and stage 2 of the new Government building block at Warwick in this year's State Budget. Stage 2 of the Government building has been looked forward to for some time, especially since the opening of stage 1 some months ago. The advantages gained by the facilities, amenities and conveniences of the stage 1 building have more than ever shown that it is vital that we continue until stage 2 is completed so that the large staff will be able to work in the best possible conditions and hence to the best advantage of everyone in the district.

Mr. Sullivan: That is the result of very good representation.

Mr. CORY: That is true.

There are many disturbing features, however, in the financial problems of our State. I feel that we are caught up in a structure that was framed many years ago and that we are probably still caught up in many of the problems that date back to the days

of World War II, when obviously things were not normal and when rather extreme measures were resorted to to finance the immediate task of that moment. As the years have progressed we have found that we are getting into a completely different economic climate in which the needs of every section of our community are far greater because every amenity and every assistance we have and need today costs so much more money.

Firstly, we must look at the depth of the resources of our finances—and I mean our State finances. Basically, they are from the collection channels of taxation and otherwise in our State, and the taxation fields of the Commonwealth. I will admit that much has been said about State-Commonwealth relationships in the last few days and I know that, both inside and outside this Chamber, much has been said and many discussions have taken place, and are taking place, on the matter. However, I think it is a matter of such magnitude that I cannot allow it to pass without mentioning something about it, together with my feelings on it.

We must realise, first of all, that all our State and Commonwealth finances must work in co-operation with private and, if necessary, overseas capital to bring to fruition much of the planned development that is demanded at the present time. True Federation, as it was framed in the very early part of this century, is based on co-operation and mutual respect for sovereign powers. I sometimes think that much of the sincere feelings of that time has been lost, possibly through prejudices that have been created between the Commonwealth and the States. The sooner we get down to creating a modern formula suitable for modern conditions and the necessities of all States—perhaps I can speak authoritatively only on Queensland's needs—the better.

I noted with interest the words of the hon. member for Toowong the other day when he expressed his thoughts about the weakness and possible breakdown of the present system if we could not arrive at a suitable arrangement between the Commonwealth and the States in the near future. I do not want to take up time in reiterating his remarks, but I do agree with much that he said in that direction.

We have to forget prejudices and jealousies in order to arrive at a fair and just formula.

Mr. O'Donnell: You had better tell your own coalition about that.

Mr. CORY: That is all right; they are listening.

I congratulate the Treasurer on his very practical attitude in setting out to the people of Queensland in his Financial Statement, firstly, Queensland's position with costs, and secondly, the need for more recognition of this State, based on the facts as we see them today, not on the facts that would have been present when the current formula was first worked out.

I think the basic problem is that we do not have enough depth to our finances to be able to look far enough ahead with our programmes. We need to adopt a more mature attitude when arriving at our financial needs. Year after year we seem to be battling for funds to cope with the year's programme. We never seem to get far enough ahead, and to have sufficient depth in our finances to be able to look ahead 10 or 20 years to many of the projects that we hope to bring to fruition.

While this attitude remains we will have a feeling of strangulation about development and expansion. I instance electricity supply in this State. With our comparatively small population and vast area the supply of electricity is not an easy matter, yet it is the type of service that we must strive to supply to as many people as possible. Not so many years ago—possibly only about four—it was necessary to have in the vicinity of 15 per cent. of the capital cost available before there was any possibility of electricity extension into an area. That percentage has been reduced. I think 11 or 12 per cent. is now considered adequate by the State Electricity Commission for the extension of electricity into an area. In many instances individuals are being asked to make capital payments to the Commission to assist it to provide this service in their area.

An Opposition Member: That is the only way they will get it.

Mr. CORY: I agree that that is the only way they will get it at the present time. We have not enough long-term capital to cope with the extensions that are necessary and that are expected and looked for by so many people.

I will mention very briefly an almost similar position in respect of many local authorities where ownership tax is the basis of revenue. Ownership tax has reached the limit; it cannot be increased. Considerable assistance is given to local authorities by way of subsidies and grants, but as time progresses and the costs of their works programmes increase, we must look for another source of capital investment for local-authority work to overcome what will be an increasing shortage of finance. I say that because I believe it is now physically impossible to increase ownership taxes, such as rates.

It is a fact that we do not have sufficient depth of finance to think far enough ahead to provide a volume of finance for our present expansion needs and to assist the people to produce what is needed to pay for increased employment and profit on capital, which are necessary so that each person in Queensland may continue to benefit from a rising standard of living and also increase the income of the Government so that it may provide better and still better services. It all comes back to the problem of marshalling available funds to the best advantage.

I have been referring only to Government funds. I think that perhaps their prime duty is to provide services within the community, although they also have a very vital duty to assist in creating a climate—much of it is provided because of these services and perhaps in other individual ways—that is suitable for the investment of other than Government capital. In this regard, we must admit that Queensland is in very much the same position, in relation to Australia as a whole, as is the Queensland country area in relation to the metropolitan area. Here again, I stress that we in Queensland are controlled because we do not have sufficient long-term capital. The basis of our finance is short-term capital, and that is the essential problem in our rural areas. Insufficient capital is invested in many of our areas to give them the benefit of the expansion that is taking place in some restricted areas.

Queensland is not in a position as a State to provide this capital. We must go further afield where we can get a greater depth of capital over a longer term. While this is happening we find that our concentrations of activity are getting larger and larger and the smaller areas are just not receiving their benefits. In the main, this is because there has not been a fund available to make use of the potential and make active the potential in these areas.

I listened with interest to the words of the hon. member for Chatsworth. Again he made a very considered and sincere contribution to the debate. He mentioned the future establishment of possible satellite areas and towns in Queensland and referred to what is happening overseas, where there are very large intensified areas of population to the extent that it has become uneconomic to provide services to them. A large amount of money has been put into setting up those satellite towns.

We are approaching this type of problem, but with the services and the potential we have in now-established areas within quite reasonable proximity of our large concentrations of population, we will never have the need to establish satellite towns in Queensland. However, because we do have the existing established areas with all the services, such as water, power, and in many cases sewerage, available, ready and waiting for something like this to happen, we will have to give some assistance to industry or enterprise to establish itself in those areas.

While we have those places ready and waiting and willing to go ahead, there is no need to spend a large amount of money creating something new. Do not let us have a policy or thought of killing many of our existing areas and so having to create satellite areas in the not too distant future. Let us keep alive the areas we have now, because they are the ones that will save us not only a good deal of embarrassment but also expenditure in the years to come.

To provide the basis of capital requirements in the future we must look to Commonwealth sources, and, I believe, overseas sources. Much has been said about overseas finance coming into Australia in recent years, and it is only right and proper that conditions should be imposed on finance coming into the country.

I also say that unless overseas capital is invested here, this country will be retarded and battling for urgently needed funds for a long, long time. This capital is needed because, in the first place, I do not believe that there is sufficient capital available within Australia. In the second place, it must always be remembered that until a project has been completed and brought into production, it remains a burden. A developmental programme is either perfect or useless. I believe that is why, when there is a restriction on the amount of capital available within Australia, outside capital must be obtained to bring programmes that have been started to quick fruition. If we are not in a position to bring them to the productivity stage, I do not think we should start them.

I know that members of the Opposition and those at the Trades Hall do not want to see the introduction of capital from outside this country. I cannot understand why. It is fairly obvious that not only do they not want to see capital coming in, but they do not want to see Australians spending their own capital. For evidence of that one has only to look at places such as Mt. Isa, where there was industrial trouble a few years ago; Collinsville, where there was trouble only a few weeks ago at the site of the new powerhouse; Swanbank, where there was industrial trouble; Gladstone, where there was industrial trouble; and Rockhampton, where there were industrial problems over the barrage only the other day. In each of those cases, someone has capital and is prepared to spend it, but, for some unknown reason, some people seem to want to prevent its use and deprive the people of Queensland of the employment that they not only need but deserve.

Mr. Sullivan: Pretty woolly thinking, don't you think?

Mr. CORY: Very woolly thinking. In addition to providing employment, such projects create jobs that will be permanent as long as we hold Queensland. We must also be very very fair and say that anyone who invests capital in any project deserves a reward for so doing, and, if people are not to be allowed to invest capital, who is to pay for the employment of all the Queenslanders who not only want but deserve jobs at present?

In the first place, Queensland needs people, and industrial expansion is the only way to create jobs and give to additional workers a standard of living that gives them the buying power to provide for the home consumption of all our primary products except wool. We must start from the very bottom

and ensure that capital is soundly invested so that permanent jobs can be created for everyone in Queensland.

I cannot understand why hon. members opposite, and particularly the people at the Trades Hall, seem to think that Queenslanders do not deserve permanent employment of a high standard. It is obvious that their policies live on discontent, and they completely disregard the personal feelings and sufferings of people who are embroiled in discontent of the type that they create.

Added to the Government finance to which I referred is the finance provided by banks. In the past, banks provided the financial backbone for virtually all operations in Queensland, but I think that recently they have lost a considerable amount of their significance in this field. Money is also made available by private lenders; but, irrespective of what they say in their reports, they appear to be looking constantly for high-interest, short-term loan opportunities. Because of that it continues to be difficult to get long-term finance either from them or from the banks. It is obvious that the capital that is available is eaten up in short-term finance of that type. Business institutions make their profit much more quickly on lending of that type, so it is a much more attractive proposition to them. However, I believe that that is the principal weakness in the planning for future expansion.

I do not think the Government of Queensland can increase taxes to any great extent because of the very nature of the field of taxation that it has left to it. I say that because so much of its taxation is based on ownership and capital. There are already rents and survey fees, land tax, stamp duties, and succession duties. There are transport taxes, which are based on activity and movement. There are taxes on the registration of business names, the registration of titles, and the registration of companies, all of which are based on ownership or capital. I am not saying that these taxes should not be imposed if they are kept in their proper perspective; but I do say that there is a limit beyond which ownership cannot be taxed. Ownership does not mean profit; it means that someone is risking something.

In my opinion, the biggest problem facing the State is where to find finance. There will have to be completely new thinking on this question, and a completely new formula will have to be devised to obtain revenue from the community by means of taxation.

We admit that we have to pay taxes if we expect to have services provided, but we have reached the limit in the field where capital as such can be taxed any further. Firstly, if we tax capital before it is allowed to earn anything, before it is allowed to produce activity and employment, it will kill incentive, restrict employment, and hence automatically restrict income to the Government. Land is the most obvious and extreme example of this, because it is the one that possibly attracts the greatest taxation throughout the year regardless of

whether it produces or makes a profit. Land, I suppose, is the worst in this regard, because capital is invested in the land but, in the main, it produces somewhere between two per cent. and five per cent. interest on that investment, whereas most other businesses are not even considered reasonable if they cannot produce interest of 12 per cent. to 20 per cent. on the initial capital invested.

Mr. Hanlon: That is disregarding over-capitalisation, which does take place.

Mr. CORY: Admittedly there is over-capitalisation. A matter I will mention, in all fairness, is that there is capital appreciation in land, which most of these other investments do not have, but if we look at it fairly and squarely in regard to someone who has invested money in the land as a business and lives all his life on a very small profit, all that is happening to him with land appreciation is that he dies quite a wealthy man but has never had any money to spend. That is something in respect of which I say we cannot tax capital any further.

Mr. Hanlon: Perhaps we should tax the fellow who leaves the land and has the money rather than the fellow who is coming in.

Mr. CORY: The point I am trying to make is that we should restrict our capital tax but apply the tax to profits. I do not think any of us can complain about paying tax on profits, provided the tax is reasonable. But if we are to be taxed before we even have a chance to put our enterprise into operation, or even have a shot at making a profit, we will lose any incentive we have. That is what we want, and I think particularly in our country areas there are people who are making profit; but when a man makes a profit he employs well, pays good wages, provides good conditions, spends well and is a good citizen in his community. If so, he will assist in the community, but if he is not allowed to make a profit the community goes down with him. It is the easiest thing in the world to drag a community down if the man with enterprise, whether rural or otherwise, in that area starts to fold up. However, if we have people in the community who are making a profit, employing well and spending well, they are the ones who fairly should be paying the taxes.

This is where we come back to Commonwealth-State relationships. The State Government is basically living on capital taxes; the Commonwealth Government is living on profit taxes. Until we come up with a more suitable, acceptable and honest formula for distributing these taxation collections, we will have very real problems in the State. The Commonwealth Government, as the collector of profit taxes, must be made to realise that these taxes are the result of the increased production to which the States have contributed by providing finance to

assist the development of various industries, and that the States are not in a position to collect their full share of the money they have advanced. Therefore the system of reimbursement should be based not only on the collections from the States but also on their need to assist further development and thus again increase production which will in turn provide increased taxes. It is a vicious circle, but it must be faced up to.

It is the profit tax, not capital tax, that we have to look to for future funds to further develop the State. I think that is the only fair tax that we can look to if we want to continue employment at the rate we should all like to see.

Landholders furnish a prime example of capital returning very little money in comparison with capital investment in other fields. We must remember that the land industries not only feed the population—and they will continue to feed the expanding population we will get with the development of secondary industries—but they have also been the basis of all our export earnings, much of which has been used up to develop secondary industries, particularly in Queensland. Admittedly secondary industries have improved and are earning much more now, and they will continue to expand. But we must remember where the funds become available from to set in motion the industrial expansion that we are witnessing at the present time.

I congratulate the Government on the work and discussion that took place prior to the establishment of the Austral-Pacific Fertilizer Ltd. plant at Gibson Island. It represents one of the major steps forward in Queensland's industrial development. No commodity will be of greater value to the economic development of this State than fertiliser. That will be proved more and more in the years ahead. I think we will see the establishment of a further plant in the future. I offer my congratulations to the Government that this plant has been established in Queensland, particularly when we take into account the enormous demand for fertilisers in the southern States. Admittedly phosphate fertilisers are used mainly in the southern States, but that we have been able to establish this plant in Queensland is something from which we must reap a benefit in the future. I think it must surely have an effect on the price paid by primary producers for fertiliser. Cost is the biggest obstacle to the mass use of fertiliser in Queensland today.

Mr. Sherrington: Do you really believe that?

Mr. CORY: Indeed. We are using more fertiliser on the Darling Downs than many of us will admit—and we can use a lot more.

Mr. Sherrington: I am referring to cheaper fertiliser.

Mr. CORY: We will get cheaper fertiliser—mainly nitrogenous fertiliser.

Mr. Sherrington: How is it that we did not get cheaper petrol?

Mr. CORY: No-one ever suggested that we would get cheaper petrol. The hon. member must admit that we are on the threshold of large-scale expansion in the use of fertiliser in Queensland and, for that matter, in Australia.

Queensland is the largest user of nitrogenous fertiliser in the Commonwealth, and we are on the threshold of a huge expansion provided we can get nitrogenous fertiliser more cheaply. The retarding influence at present is the price that has to be paid for it. Unless we support the use of fertilisers in a major way in our agricultural and pastoral improved areas, the future security of the areas and their production will be in doubt.

Mr. Sullivan: Over recent years farmers have become very much aware of that.

Mr. CORY: They are very much aware of the need. Higher protein and higher yields, and the acceptability of the grains, are the big factors.

Mr. Sherrington: There is a danger in the over-use of fertiliser.

Mr. CORY: There is a lot of difference between over-use and regular use. The hon. member must realise that.

Mr. Bennett: It kills all the earth-worms.

Mr. CORY: What rubbish!

With increased use of fertiliser we will immediately put pressure on our marketing system. This is a challenge not only to the industry but also to the Government of the day. Let us never have a policy by which we will try to control production. We must accept the challenge to provide markets for everything we can produce.

We must always keep in mind one reservation, namely that the full benefits from the use of fertilisers will not be reaped without complementary moisture. Fertiliser without moisture is valueless. This is especially so in the doubtful rainfall areas, where the use of fertiliser presents greater risks. With the other extreme, where irrigation is possible—

Mr. Bennett: What about the Burdekin River scheme? Don't you think we should bring the Snowy River engineers up here to do something about it?

Mr. CORY: They are coming up; they are around all the time.

We must always remember that fertiliser without moisture is useless; the use of fertiliser is very risky where moisture cannot be assured, but where moisture can be provided the use of fertiliser is becoming a "must". In our irrigation areas the biggest problem from the primary industry or agricultural point of view is the inability to provide water

for a sufficiently large area. We have the land potential and we can supply the fertilisers, but it is not always possible to supply the water for a sufficiently large area. That is because there is insufficient water in Australia to cope with the land potential at our disposal.

One reason for this is that we have only one snow-fed river system in Australia and that is the only regular supply. While we depend on rainfall we will have large variations from year to year, and this limits the amount of use and the volume of water that can be supplied. We must provide storages to tide us over several years, not storages with an assured new feed every 12 months. With this water problem we have to make sure—and here the Government will have to be effective—that as little water as possible flows out of Queensland, because we have more potential here than our water can supply.

The Darling Basin Association has been formed recently by getting together all local authorities in the Darling Basin. This basin covers a large area of Queensland and New South Wales. I agree with the formation of this association. It is good that all these bodies are getting together to discuss the right, proper and practical use of this water. Queensland, however, has a big responsibility to protect the people who live in Queensland, and agreements must be made between the Queensland and New South Wales Governments on how to make use of this water to best advantage. Admittedly the association can only evolve schemes and make recommendations. We will need the protection of the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission to safeguard Queensland's interests. No scheme over a large area in New South Wales will help us if it is developed on the basis that it will use Queensland water.

One problem is that the strength on this association consists largely of New South Wales personnel. Every local authority in this area of Queensland should become a member of the association and try to safeguard the use of the water caught in their areas for the individual and the potential that is there. I am in an area such as this that provides water for many areas farther down. If we continue on a large scale we will provide a good deal of the water that will make those other areas productive, although we have better country than they have. We have established landholders and other people who are prepared to pay for this water. They are not able to get the water at present because we have been unable to conserve it far enough up the watershed to make it available to them. I appeal to the Minister for Local Government and Conservation, who is in the Chamber, and the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission to protect the water supplies in Queensland so that our potential can be used.

As I said before, not only have we not enough water in Australia to meet our needs;

we have not enough in Queensland, so that Queenslanders are not in a position to give any of it away to anybody else.

Mr. Davies: Is the Minister doing everything possible?

Mr. CORY: He is.

Also, every step must be taken to develop underground supplies of water, as many areas will have to depend on them for water to make use of the potential of the soil. We depend largely on the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission to help in this matter. My final appeal is this: do not let any water from Queensland flow down to New South Wales when it is so urgently needed in this State.

Mr. INCH (Burke) (9.51 p.m.): I note in the Treasurer's Financial Statement, under the heading "Financial Results 1966-67," that mining receipts of \$2,883,269 showed an improvement of \$1,176,957 on the 1965-66 level, although revenues from oil fell short of the higher estimate for them.

Whilst I realise that these receipts are obtained from all mining sources throughout the State, I am firmly of the opinion that the largest percentage of this revenue would flow from the Mt. Isa-Cloncurry mineral field, from which large tonnages of ore are produced each year. These tonnages will continue to increase as more modern equipment and methods of mining and treatment of ores are introduced to the industry.

As a natural consequence, revenues from this area will also continue to increase not only to the Department of Mines by way of royalties, lease rentals and other charges associated with the mining industry, but also to the Railway Department as a result of the transport of increasing tonnages of metals to the coast for shipment overseas or to the refinery at Townsville. The return flow of materials and goods necessary to satisfy the demands of this industry, and the requirements of other business interests and the community at large, would also contribute handsomely to these revenues.

The fact that these interests, and the people who are playing a magnificent part in the development of the far-western regions, are continuing to pay a heavy price for the doubtful privilege of assisting the State in the development of industries and towns throughout this area receives scant consideration from either the State or the Federal Government as far as efforts to alleviate hardship are concerned. If anything, their whole position is aggravated because of the insatiable and greedy desire of both the State and Federal Governments to extract the last possible cent from them.

The efforts of these people to develop and aid the closer settlement of these regions are being stifled and to some extent nullified by ever-increasing forms of taxation, which include increased rail fares and freights, increased air fares and freight charges, and road transport charges.

Whilst it is recognised that these charges are not confined to this section of the State alone, their effect has a greater impact upon the living standards of the people in these areas than of those who reside in coastal areas, where freight concession rates are applied and the cost of living is thereby reduced. Immediately goods are railed from the nearest port, which is Townsville, to inland centres, they attract full freight-rate charges. It will therefore be readily seen that freight charges to western centres impose an added burden on the people through increased costs of foodstuffs, building materials and essential supplies.

To add still further to the burden of the people living in the remote areas of the Gulf country hundreds of miles from the nearest railhead, there is the additional cost of increased road transport charges resulting from the higher registration and transport fees imposed upon road hauliers.

Although Governments of the day repeatedly profess their interest in and desire for the development of the sparsely populated areas of this State, and, indeed, of the country as a whole, their interest appears to lie mainly in what can be extracted financially from the areas concerned and from the people who have done so much for, and given such a great deal of their lives and efforts to, the development of the areas in which they live. Little thought or consideration is given to the ways and means by which the lot of these people can be eased and their general living standards improved.

In the electorate that I represent, millions of dollars are earned each year through the production of minerals, beef cattle, and wool. Both the State Government and the Federal Government reap a rich harvest through the various measures of taxation imposed upon both the producer and the employee engaged in these industries. In addition, they obtain revenues from other sources that are associated with these industries in some measure or that rely to a large extent upon the earnings of the industries and the employees in them. Although it is appreciated that the Government of the day must necessarily take cognisance of the problems affecting the State as a whole and allocate financial assistance accordingly, and that all revenue received from a particular area cannot be returned in full to overcome its disabilities, it must be realised also that no one area of the State should be regarded as being the milking cow to overcome losses sustained in other areas of the State.

No doubt hon. members will sense that I am referring to the north-western area, which produces a large portion of the State's wealth and through which the Townsville-Mt. Isa railway passes. This section of the railways is one of the most profitable lines in Queensland; but, unfortunately for the residents of the North-west, people living in the area do not enjoy any concessions by way of reduced fares or freight rates that should flow to them as a result of

the profitable operations of this line over the years. For years they have consistently had to pay high freight charges and rail fares while the profits earned on the line have been utilised to offset the losses sustained in other parts of the State, particularly in southern areas, where concession fares and freights apparently are considered by the Government to be the privilege of the many, not the few who, by their efforts and sacrifice over the years, have made it possible for this line to be a paying and profitable instrumentality. It is about time that some form of appreciation other than lip service was shown for the splendid contribution that the residents of this region have made to the progress and development throughout the area, and I urge the Treasurer, and the Minister for Transport, to show a more concrete form of appreciation of the efforts of these people by granting substantial reductions in freight rates and fares.

The Government can further assist these people and encourage them to remain in these areas and carry on with their endeavours to achieve the desired development and closer settlement by making available free grants of finance to shire councils to assist them to supply the necessary reticulated services and, consequently, to reduce developmental costs that must otherwise be imposed upon communities already overburdened with various forms of taxation and high costs of living.

The Federal Government, which professes to be so greatly interested in the development of North Australia and other parts of the Commonwealth, should also come to the party, so to speak, and play a more practical role in aiding the development of this State through the allocation to the State of more free financial grants and loan moneys at lower interest rates and over longer repayment periods than in the past.

It could also assist those people resident in the north-western and Gulf areas of the State who have done so much to bring these areas to their present stage of development, and encourage them to further their efforts in this direction by allowing them a higher level of income before taxation and also by increasing their zonal allowance. The setting up of other industries within this region, which would bring about decentralisation and closer settlement could also be encouraged through tax concessions or exemption from tax until they become firmly established.

It seems, however, that the Federal Government has adopted the policy of taking all and giving little in return until it is absolutely forced to do so; and, so far as the people in the Far West are concerned, a policy of discouragement instead of encouragement is being implemented by this Federal body. This is exemplified by the action of the Federal authorities in taxing the two-yearly air-fare incentive granted by Mount Isa Mines Ltd. to its employees.

In this regard, because these fares are received by the employees at the end of their second year of employment, the fares are classed by the taxing authority as being part of the second year's earnings as a whole and are taxed accordingly, with the result that the air-fare concession will largely be lost because a tax loading of up to one-third or more of the equivalent air fares is imposed. In effect, the Federal Government is "copping it sweet" in two ways: firstly through the initial tax on air fares, and secondly by levying a further heavy tax on the concession granted by the company to its employees. If the Federal Government is sincere in its desire to assist decentralisation throughout remote areas (and this is doubtful, considering its recent action) it should have allowed this concession to be free of tax or at least made allowance for the tax to be spread over the employee's earnings during the two-year period so that the employee would not be brought into a higher tax bracket prior to taking his annual leave. These employees must be allowed to enjoy the benefit of concessions granted to them by their employer. They should not be deprived of them through any rapacious action on the part of the Federal authorities.

If isolated parts of the State such as exist throughout the Burke electorate are to have their undoubted potential developed to the fullest extent, more consideration must be given by the powers that be to making more amenable the working, living and social conditions of the people residing in and developing the resources of such areas.

The development of these resources to date has been of great benefit to the whole of this State and, indeed, to the Commonwealth of Australia, and some compensation should be forthcoming for the lack of amenities and great inconvenience suffered by the people living in these communities. They are inspired by the spirit of the pioneers who blazed the trail that resulted in the discovery of our mineral wealth, an untapped source of energy, and the production of other commodities which have played a big part in the economic development of our State and nation. These people have more than earned any concessions or privileges that may have been granted to them in the past, but further means could, and should, be found to alleviate the discomfort and handicaps which they have suffered and are enduring in providing more than their share of the State's production of essential metals, produce and wealth.

In conclusion, I earnestly appeal to the Premier, the Treasurer, and other members of the Cabinet, to take the necessary steps to compensate the people in this far western region for the excellent service they are rendering to the State under adverse conditions.

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 10.6 p.m.