

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 24 OCTOBER 1967

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 24 OCTOBER, 1967

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

QUESTIONS

**REFLECTIVE NUMBER PLATES FOR
MOTOR VEHICLES**

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

(1) As the introduction of reflective registered motor vehicle number plates has been announced for the Australian Capital Territory in 1968, has any action been taken to provide similar plates in this State? If not, why not?

(2) Have any discussions taken place towards making reflective number plates uniform throughout Australia?

(3) Will any amendment to the Traffic Regulations be required to legalise the A.C.T. reflective plates for visitors to this State?

Answers:—

(1) "No. At present it is not considered that the results would justify the added cost which motor-vehicle owners would have to bear. The reflectors required to be fitted under the Traffic Regulations appear to be adequate."

(2) "At an Australian Motor Vehicle Standards Committee meeting in March 1962, it was decided not to recommend the mandatory fitting of reflectorised plates. However, at the 1967 meeting a sub-committee was formed to report on the matter."

(3) "No."

AUTHORITIES TO PROSPECT FOR PETROLEUM IN OFFSHORE QUEENSLAND

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

(1) What companies at present have any rights or authority to prospect for, or recover petroleum off, the immediate Queensland coastline?

(2) What is (a) the coastline area covered by each of these permits, (b) the commencing and expiry dates of the permits and (c) the progress made in each case?

Answers:—

(1) "The current operators prospecting for petroleum in Offshore Queensland are:—Authority to Prospect No. 58P, Marathon Petroleum Australia Ltd.; 70P, Phillips Australian Oil Company; 71P, Shell Development (Australia) Pty. Ltd.; 88P, Tenneco Australia Inc.; 90P, Australian Gulf Oil Pty. Ltd.; 111P, Tenneco Australia Inc.; and 127P, Corbett Reef Ltd."

(2) "(a) The total offshore areas covered by these authorities are approximately 140,025 square miles and the mainland coastline of the same is 1,440 miles. In regard to (2) (b) and (2) (c), I would point out that a detailed reply would take some pages of typing. I would direct the attention of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition to pages 49 to 54 of the Annual Report of the Under Secretary for Mines for the year 1966, where he will find details of all offshore titles held in Queensland's adjacent area as at December 31, 1966. The only changes in title since that time have been reductions in area of Authorities to Prospect, 70P, 71P and 88P, the surrender of 114P and the taking up of 127P."

LAND FOR SHOWGROUND PURPOSES, ROMA

Mr. Donald for **Mr. Bennett**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Lands,—

With regard to a parcel of land at Roma proposed to be vested in a joint Local Authority as trustees for showground and other purposes—

(1) Is this land the most suitable in Roma for sporting activities such as racing, rodeos, shows and football?

(2) Why is it necessary to transfer from the present recreational areas in Roma?

Answers:—

(1) "It is considered that the land to be vested in the joint local authority represents the only available area of any size adjacent to Roma containing an appreciable extent of sandy-loam soils. In these circumstances it is considered well suited for development for racecourse and showground purposes as proposed by the Roma Town Council and the Shire of Bungil who have constituted the joint local authority which is to implement such development."

(2) "The transfer from the present venues of the activities mentioned is being made at the request of the local authorities mentioned in the Answer to Question (1), the main reasons for the request being that the existing reserves are situated on areas which possess heavy clay soils rendering them incapable of use in wet weather. The proposed action meets with the approval of the trustees of the existing reserves who are already or will be faced in the near future with heavy re-building or repair costs which would be better incurred on land more capable of use in periods of wet weather."

PAINTING OF CAIRNS COURT HOUSE

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

(1) Will he consider the early repainting of the interior of the Cairns Court House?

(2) If not, will he arrange for such repainting when the new court house accommodation is under construction?

Answers:—

(1) "A report and estimate of cost concerning the internal repainting of the Cairns Court House will be obtained. The carrying out of the work, if necessary, will be considered with necessary internal painting of other buildings in the light of available funds."

(2) "Expenditure for the construction of additional accommodation at the Cairns Court House has not yet been approved. Provision has been made in the work specifications for the painting of new and disturbed work. It is not proposed to arrange for the repainting of the existing Court House to be carried out when the new accommodation is being constructed."

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. Donald for **Mr. Bennett**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health,—

(1) What office facilities have been made available for the new smog expert, Mr. David Wilson?

(2) As Mr. Wilson has become an assistant to the Air Pollution Control Director, Mr. Gilpin, has any extra staff been allocated to the office?

(3) What work has been planned for Mr. Wilson?

(4) What is being done to combat the pollution alley referred to by the Chief of the Brisbane Weather Bureau as reported in *The Courier-Mail* on October 12?

(5) Is the inner city area of Brisbane being subjected to a gradual increase from year to year of harmful atmospheric pollution?

(6) What has been done to control this dangerous development?

(7) In particular, has anything been done, except for the removal of some steam engines, in the area where smog is most concentrated, i.e. the Woolloongabba area?

Answers:—

(1) "Pending the early occupancy of the Air Pollution Control premises in Macrossan Street, suitable office accommodation for Mr. Wilson has been made available in the Health and Welfare Building."

(2) "Additional staff will be appointed when the Division moves into its permanent accommodation."

(3) "Mr. Wilson will be assisting the Director of Air Pollution Control in the work of the Division of Air Pollution Control and will be undertaking a survey of industry in relation to the Clean Air Regulations which are expected to be gazetted shortly."

(4) "Several large undertakings in Brisbane have carried out or are planning to carry out major plant alterations and additions to enable them to meet requirements of the Clean Air Act. It should be pointed out that existing scheduled industries have a period of seven years to comply with the requirements of the Act."

(5) "The Director of Air Pollution Control has been in Queensland for only two years and this period is not sufficient to draw firm conclusions."

(6) "See (4) above."

(7) "The Woolloongabba Depot was closed in the week-end beginning September 23, 1967. This action has reduced the number of steam locomotives operating from this depot from 31 to nil. Only 5 steam locomotives a day will pass through this depot in future."

POWERS OF INSPECTORS UNDER WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT

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

In view of the controversy during the debate on the amendment of the Weights and Measures Act concerning clause 2, which dealt with an amendment to Section 23 in regard to the rights of entry of inspectors, and his statement as reported on page 2053 "Hansard," vol. 244, when he said, *inter alia*, "As it is the policy of the Opposition to support the amendment the Government will examine it," what consideration has he given to the submissions raised by me and other Opposition Members?

Answer:—

"The matter referred to by the Honourable Member is still under examination."

ASSISTANCE GRANTED UNDER FARM WATER SUPPLIES ASSISTANCE ACT

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

(1) How many farmers and graziers have received assistance under "The Farm Water Supplies Assistance Act of 1958"?

(2) What was the expenditure in each financial year since its inception?

Answers:—

(1) "Technical and financial assistance has been provided to 1,296 farmers and graziers under "The Farm Water Supplies Assistance Acts" to October 20, 1967."

(2) "Actual advances made each year since inception are—

	\$
1958-59	10,041.25
1959-60	153,930.02
1960-61	331,002.35
1961-62	490,140.52
1962-63	398,252.22
1963-64	623,355.47
1964-65	783,612.10
1965-66	919,631.11
1966-67	799,664.09
1967-68 to October 20,	
1967	214,020.99
	\$4,723,650.12"

"Many other landholders have received technical assistance only. In 1966-67 alone this was provided to 864 landholders in addition to those who received both technical and financial assistance."

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee): I ask mutilated question No. 8.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! In view of the hon. member's remark, I now disallow the question.

CAIRNS-KURANDA RAIL-MOTOR SERVICE

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

(1) How many passengers were carried on 38RM, 66RM and other services from Cairns to Kuranda during 1966-67 and what are the figures available to the most recent date?

(2) In view of the increasing demand for travel along the Kuranda Range, will he consider the reintroduction of a train similar in type to the pre-war grandstand train in order to allow passengers a complete scenic view of the Barron Gorge and other panoramic views?

Answers:—

(1)—

	Passenger journeys
"July 1, 1966, to June 30, 1967	37,489
July 1, 1967, to September 30, 1967	14,900"

(2) "The re-introduction of the pre-war grandstand train to the Cairns Range would involve the costly conversion of carriages which, when fitted, would be suitable only for that particular service."

PAPERS

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

Reports—

Health and Medical Services of the State of Queensland, for the year 1966-67.

Operations of the Sub-Departments of Comptroller-General of Prisons, "Eventide" (Sandgate), "Eventide" (Charters Towers), "Eventide" (Rockhampton), Rehabilitation Clinic (Wacol), and Queensland Industrial Institution for the Blind (South Brisbane), for the year 1966-67.

The following paper was laid on the table:—

Regulation under the Factories and Shops Acts, 1960 to 1964.

FORM OF QUESTION

Mr. BYRNE (Mourilyan) having given notice of a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member's question is out of order in its present form. He is asking whether a newspaper report is true. I ask him to have another look at it.

TRUSTEES (HOUSING LOANS) BILL

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Dr. Delamothe, read a third time.

QUEENSLAND LAW SOCIETY ACTS
AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Dr. Delamothe, read a third time.

OBJECTIONABLE LITERATURE ACT
AMENDMENT BILL

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Dr. Delamothe, read a third time.

STOCK ROUTES AND RURAL LANDS
PROTECTION ACTS AMENDMENT
BILL

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Mr. Fletcher, read a third time.

ABORIGINAL RELICS PRESERVATION
BILL

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Mr. Pizzey, read a third time.

SUPPLY

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT—
RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

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

Debate resumed from 19 October (see p. 1032) 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. HODGES (Gympie) (11.30 a.m.): I should like to extend my sympathy to the Treasurer on his having to bring down the Budget after Queensland has passed through a period of drought and other adverse conditions, which have seriously reduced revenue during the past year. It is gratifying that the Treasurer has been able to avoid further impositions on the public, particularly when one considers that not only has the State's income been considerably reduced but funds have had to be made available to primary producers for drought relief and to local authorities to provide jobs for those who were seeking employment as a result of drought conditions.

In the light of restricted income and increasing financial demands, it is almost impossible to provide all the services required throughout the State. There has been in recent months an agitation for the allocation of more money to education. If one examines the Budget and sees the percentage of the State's money directed to education and appreciates all the other services that require capital to maintain the necessary rate of growth, one will see that the Treasurer could not have done any more for education than he has. Nevertheless, I

feel that he now has the opportunity to accept the offer of the public of Queensland to contribute more for education.

I should like to express my alarm at the paucity of funds made available in the Budget this year for primary industries, which have contributed, and are continuing to contribute, more to this State and the Commonwealth than have any other activities. According to the latest figures available to me, the value of primary industries to the State has been \$750,000,000 a year. It is well recognised that this State was established, and has been developed, on primary industries, and I feel a little alarmed when I see in the Budget the comparatively small amount of State funds made available for their encouragement and development.

There is no greater example of self-help than what has been done by the Department of Primary Industries, and primary industries themselves, in this State. Without that self-help, and the contribution from the Commonwealth Government, the Treasurer would have found it very difficult indeed to produce a balanced budget on this occasion.

Mr. Bromley: Why?

Mr. HODGES: If the hon. member will control himself a little, I shall explain why.

The Estimates for the Department of Primary Industries are divided into three sections—Consolidated Revenue, Trust and Special Funds, and a Special Standing Fund. The Budget shows a total from all three funds of \$14,081,807, to which Consolidated Revenue Fund contributes \$5,574,000 and Trust and Special Funds \$9,394,000, which includes a Special Standing Fund of \$650,000. To that Special Standing Fund, other States contribute \$30,000, the State Government \$173,000, the Commonwealth Government \$255,000, and industry \$191,000—a total of \$650,000.

A close examination of the figures reveals that \$5,500,000 has been allocated for expenditure from Consolidated Revenue on this occasion. The State is contributing grants to the extent of \$390,800, made up as follows: a grant to the Queensland Agricultural Journal, \$65,020; Stock Diseases Compensation and Stock Improvement Fund, \$47,000; Poultry Industry Fund, \$56,500; Sugar Experiment Stations Board, \$14,000; Cattle Pasture Research, \$35,000; Tobacco Research, \$11,000; Pasture Subsidy Scheme, \$140,000; and (this is the one that intrigues me) the Development of Agricultural, Horticultural, Dairying and Pastoral Industries, \$22,000.

If one examines the position a little more closely, one finds that transport costs, salaries, wages, long service leave, travelling and postage account for \$4,960,000 of the \$5,358,000, which leaves a balance of \$398,000 for the grants to which I have referred; so quite a large amount of that has been contributed to the Consolidated Revenue Fund by industry.

In addition to that, hon. members will see that the Department of Primary Industries has contributed—this figure is a guess, because I have not available to me the Auditor-General's Report to substantiate it—through various taxes and collections, such as those received from the sale of the Queensland Agricultural Journal, the sale of hand-books, from commodity boards, requirements for seed testing, milk and margarine taxes, butter and cheese taxes, cold-store depot taxes, milk licences, grants from the Dairying Industry Commodity Board, slaughtering fees and licences, and registrations, about \$400,000 to Consolidated Revenue. It is obvious, therefore, that the \$300,000 remaining for the development of the various funds by means of revenue has more than been contributed by the industries themselves.

If one takes the Trust and Special Funds for the Department of Primary Industries, one sees that there is an estimated expenditure there of \$9,300,000, which in my opinion is not quite correct, because it includes an amount of \$671,000 that has nothing to do with the Department of Primary Industries. It is for sugar bulk handling, a matter that is controlled and administered by the Treasurer. So that leaves \$8,700,000 as the estimated expenditure from Trust and Special Funds. In this instance, too, one sees that primary industries have displayed a considerable amount of self-help in providing the bulk of the finance available to enable the Treasurer to bring down the Budget that he has, particularly as it relates to the Department of Primary Industries.

Out of a total of \$8,700,000 the Commonwealth of Australia contributes \$3,258,000, industries themselves contribute \$3,697,000 and the State \$1,559,000. Out of a grand total of \$8,700,000 we have on the expenditure side for travelling, long service leave and salaries a total amount of \$4,500,000, leaving \$4,100,000 for services.

When one considers the amount that has been contributed by industries themselves and by the Commonwealth—and keeping in mind the value of these industries to the State and the Commonwealth—I feel that a paucity of funds is made available by the State for the encouragement, development and promotion of primary industries within the State. At the same time, one must congratulate the various primary industries that contributed so heavily towards their own existence and development. For instance, we find, in the Meat Inspection Account, \$368,000 contributed by the industry; in the Meat Research Trust Fund, \$139,000 contributed by the industry; in the Poultry Industry Fund, \$76,700 contributed by the industry; in the Stock Diseases Compensation and Stock Improvement Fund \$100,000 contributed by the industry; in the Stock Fund, \$1,200,000 contributed by the industry; in the Sugar Cane Prices Fund, \$435,000 contributed by the industry; in the

Swine Compensation Fund, \$47,000 contributed by the industry, and, in the Tobacco Research Fund, \$129,000 contributed by the industry.

As I mentioned earlier, in the Special Standing Fund \$30,000 was contributed by other States, \$173,000 by the State Government, \$255,000 by the Commonwealth Government and \$191,000 by the industry. I also mentioned the Buffalo Fly Fund, which contains an amount of \$165,100 contributed by the industry.

The cry that we hear about inefficiency in primary industries is all bally-hoo. When one considers that these industries can contribute in self-help to the extent they have done in this State, they must be congratulated on their efficiency. They must be efficient to be able to contribute to the extent that they have to the various funds for their own development and self-help.

No doubt the Treasurer would be hard put to present a Budget without this assistance. I am not saying that it should not be required, but when industry is prepared to contribute to this extent to Consolidated Revenue and Trust and Special Funds, we as a Government must recognise the effort of those concerned to a far greater extent than we have in the past and contribute more to enable them to develop their industries to a greater extent and to carry out further research. We must assist them in every possible way, keeping in mind particularly the return from production that I have mentioned of over \$750,000,000 a year.

That is one reason for my opening remark that I sympathise with the Treasurer in having to bring down a Budget, knowing that he finds it very difficult to make funds available for the development of the various services within the State. No doubt it could be asked, "Where can we obtain extra funds?" An examination of the Budget indicates that every cent available has been allocated. It is therefore very difficult to give further assistance to the Department of Primary Industries or any other department.

Without being antagonistic towards any department, I feel that there could be a reduction in the Vote for tourism. Even though tourism does bring some benefit, it directly benefits individuals more than the State as a whole and therefore cannot be compared with the activities of the Department of Primary Industries. I believe that the provision of facilities for tourism should be the responsibility of free enterprise, which receives the benefits and profits from this industry. If the State concentrated on one major tourist office in the capital city and allowed the district offices throughout the State to be run by private enterprise, we would probably have a better coverage at less cost to the State. The money thereby saved could be made available to those industries that are of greater revenue-producing value to the State than is tourism.

Mr. Hughes: Don't you recognise the tremendous value of this industry to the State?

Mr. HODGES: I recognise the tremendous value of this industry to the State.

When we look at agriculture in general, we realise that there is a change in the structure of agriculture in Queensland. This change has gone on ever since farming started on the long road from subsistence to a market basis. Not only has agriculture been commercialised but it is rapidly assuming an industrial complex within which the process of farming constitutes one stage only. In consequence, the capital-intensive agriculture we now have, is so closely integrated with the general economy of this State, and of the nation as a whole, that continuing change in its structure is vital to productivity and the growth of the whole economy.

Today the promotion of productivity and economic growth is becoming the main aim of policy all over the world. All countries have their planning departments charged with the pursuit of a faster rate of growth and development; therefore, it must follow that agricultural policy—ours in particular—is becoming more and more a part of an overall economic plan. Agriculturally we are witnessing in Australia, in particular in Queensland, rising output and, even more so, rising productivity, that is, the amount produced per man. With this trend there is a rising rate of investment but a continuing fall in manpower on farms. However, even if we do manage to sustain a substantial yearly increase in productivity and output, we will have to encourage consumer expenditure to the same extent to keep pace with this increase.

I feel that consumer expenditure has not kept pace with the productivity of this State, especially in relation to primary products. At present primary producers are not receiving the total benefits of their production. For that matter, neither is the housewife in this State. From my observation, I believe that far too much of the consumer expenditure is going, not to the farmers or the housewives, but to the processing and distributing interests in this State. I will illustrate that point. A primary producer rearing beasts produces from a beast a hide of an average weight of about 35 to 40 lb. He obtains a price of about 7c a lb., or approximately \$3, for the hide. By the time the hide is processed in to secondary goods—remembering that in the first place the producer gets \$3—it is retailed to the consumers of this State, not for \$3, or even \$5, but for \$196. That is iniquitous; it is just one instance of how the businesses that process primary industries are obtaining far too much from the work and labour of primary industry.

To give another illustration, I refer to the average baconer produced on a farm, weighing about 124 lb., for which the primary producer obtains about 30c a lb. By the time the processed product is

retailed to the housewife—remembering that the farmer receives about \$37 for the baconer—she has to pay about \$86 or \$87 for it.

As I have said, we must urge the Government to encourage every department to keep pace with increased production. We are now facing a period in which technical advances are tending to raise the level of output faster than the growth in the demand for food, thus limiting the scope for producers to increase their incomes by producing more in bulk. The work of our research officers is advancing so rapidly that the prospects of increasing farm output are so great as to make the possibility of improving farm incomes far from promising. It is all very well to increase farm productivity, but little benefit will be obtained if we have not another department following it through and encouraging increased consumption of the articles produced. We must find ways and means of keeping up with the bewildering pace at which the findings of science and technology are now being applied on farms.

Rural production, of course, has not the advantage of secondary production. The rural producer must produce his article and put it on the free, open market and obtain the best price he can on that market. I am sure all hon. members will fully appreciate that on a free, open market a very little excess in supply is capable of depressing prices of farm produce. I have read reports by several farm economists on this subject, and their studies show that today, on a free market, an excess of 1 per cent. in supply over effective demand can cause prices to fall by as much as 3 per cent.

Whatever steps may be taken to improve this situation, however, one thing is certain, and that is that it would be as defeatist as it would be disastrous to make this an excuse for halting the march of technical development by our research officers. Though we find that there has been tremendous advancement in research work within this State in recent years, as I have just pointed out, so much of the productivity of the State is exceeding the demand within the State. But there is a change: today the market for farm products is passing through a spectacular revolution. Already direct contact between the farmer and the consumer of food is on the wane. Producers are rapidly altering their status from that of sellers of consumer goods to sellers of producer goods. This, I feel, is a move in the right direction. It could be the way by which producers could apply the results of research to a more economic method of production without the fear of over-production and the depressing of markets. This could lead to producers adopting more and more the practice of producing to contract. This is another way in which they could ensure against the danger of producing unwanted produce.

However, it should be remembered that producers now reap many of the technical benefits of research, not by increasing the size of their farms or properties, but by increasing the size of their enterprises. Producers today are managing bigger acreages of crops, bigger herds, and bigger flocks. To achieve this, they are becoming more and more specialised in their own fields.

With all of these advances through research and the changing pattern brought about through the application of the findings of research officers, agriculture will continue to be dominated by the small and medium farm and by the family business. I am strongly of the opinion that we are not likely to see any radical alteration in this position for a long time to come. I am of this opinion because I am impressed by the complex of factors which explain the astonishing powers of survival of the small and medium farms and farmers.

This is not to say, and I am not saying, that there is no cause for modernisation. On the contrary, our farm structure, like all of our social and economic institutions, must be continually modified to keep abreast of a dynamic technical situation. This is a pattern by which we are developing in this State and it will be the pattern that will be continued for many years to come. It is because of the energies and efforts of those men and women in the various primary industries in this State, who have contributed so much and will continue to contribute so much to the welfare of this State, and through their own self-help within their own industry, that much more recognition must be extended to them by the Government and they must be assisted even further, if not in research, at least in marketing and the use of the products that they produce.

Over the past 20 years much has been achieved through research, and we can claim that land users now successfully have launched on the ultimate phase, that is, the era of the broad-acre pastures. In the past we have seen pasture development on a very small scale indeed. But through the technological development by research officers we have seen a vast improvement in this field in recent years. It is this progress and the promise for the future, not only in pasture improvement but in other aspects of land use in this State, that I freely acknowledge.

I pay a tribute, first of all, to the many scientists and research officers who have unleashed this new force in Queensland. In the main, these are officers of the Department of Primary Industries and of the C.S.I.R.O., other officers and scientists in various other avenues connected with the primary industries of this State, and those attached to fertiliser companies, to seed-producing companies, and to merchandising companies. All of these have made very handsome contributions to the welfare and development of pastures in this State.

The C.S.I.R.O. has made a contribution to dairy pasture research in many ways. From its plant introduction and breeding work have evolved such useful legumes as siratro, lotononis and Cooper glycine, and grasses such as Nandi setaria. The Division of Tropical Pastures has more recently gone into the matter of soil fertility and evaluation of pastures for dairy cattle in South-east Queensland.

The practical application of the dairy pasture work carried out over the past 15 years can best be spelt out in terms of production achievement. In my area of Wide Bay alone, there are dozens of examples of how new knowledge has been applied for the benefit of production. One farmer who put down 80 acres of improved pasture increased his production of butter fat by 75 per cent. over four years, and another with 132 acres more than doubled his production in three years. In many cases the extent of improvement ranges from 50 to 100 per cent.

In the Cooroy district there are farms on which production has been increased by up to 128 lb. of butter fat per acre. Wide Bay dairy factories lost 410 suppliers between 1961 and 1967, a decrease of 20 per cent., yet production rose, not fell, by 30 per cent. The chairman of the Dairy Pasture Subsidy Scheme Central Committee (Mr. Stan Marriott) has estimated that, if pasture improvement continues at its present pace, the Wide Bay district could double its 1960 production by 1975.

It will therefore be seen that consideration and assistance must be given to the officers and organisations engaged in this work, and I commend the Government for giving, for the first time in the history of this State, tangible assistance to the dairying industry by means of the Dairy Pasture Subsidy Scheme. Although it may be seen by some as a handout to this industry, a reflection on the figures that I have quoted will show that it is no more than a little compensation for what the industry has contributed to this State in cash and kind over the years.

However, all forms of primary industry require more and still more men, materials, regional research workers, and research facilities, as well as a more effective system of giving personal advice to producers on production and marketing matters. New information should be disseminated as soon as possible. At present the findings of scientists and research officers are far too often left lying idle for too long. That may be the result of a shortage of funds to employ sufficient staff to distribute the information to primary producers, and I should like to stress that a better service means more money and more men. Whilst no doubt technical personnel to undertake an expansion of regional research and extension work are not readily available, the major limiting factor is undoubtedly the availability of finance.

Again I refer to the contribution made by the industry itself, and there can be no thought of requesting it to provide more. It is therefore up to the State or the Commonwealth—or both—to find the necessary funds to permit this very important work to be carried out. Valuable as they are, funds made available by the Commonwealth Government are by no means the complete answer to the financial difficulties of the Department of Primary Industries. I should therefore like to see the Treasurer and the various departments get together in an attempt to find ways and means of relieving the situation. Even if more money is obtained from the Commonwealth, I do not wish to see the State using that as an excuse to withdraw additional financial assistance to this department. No doubt the Commonwealth Government does benefit more from primary production in Queensland than in other States because the rural industries in this State contribute so much to Australia's balance of payments and overseas credit. As it obtains more revenue from Queensland's primary production, I think it should contribute more to assist the State in this field.

However, at the same time, such industries are so valuable to the State and have contributed so much to the development of the State in the past—in fact, primary industries have been the basis for the State's development—that we, as a Government, must show them every consideration and at all times assist them in every possible way to enable them to achieve the best results and to show the skill they have always shown in carrying out their tasks.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (12.6 p.m.): Before adding my sympathy to that already extended to the Treasurer by the hon. member for Gympie, I wish to mention briefly a matter that was raised in this Chamber last week and which led to the creation of an atmosphere of crude drama surrounding happenings at the Ashgrove Police Station some time ago. Because of that, I think it is necessary for me to speak on behalf of the policeman whose character has, I think, been placed under a shadow to some extent, the former officer in charge of the Ashgrove Police Station, Sergeant Tapsall.

Sergeant Tapsall has given many years of service to the Police Force, and his public relations work in the Ashgrove area was of such a high standard that his reputation and good standing in the community reflected credit on the Police Force as a whole. A suburban policeman must concentrate a good deal on public relations work, and Sergeant Tapsall did this to good effect during the many years that he was in charge of the Ashgrove Police Station. For that reason, I think I have some responsibility to protect his name, and I undertake that duty quite willingly.

Many of the matters mentioned have reached their present stage only because of the action of the Police Department in transferring the whole of the staff of the Ashgrove Police Station to other areas of the State. That gave the public the erroneous idea that something was seriously wrong with the administration of that police station. In addition, a number of the matters have been raised on wrong premises. For example, a question was raised relative to the removal of some bricks. The bricks were in fact reject bricks and were utilised for some work that perhaps should have been carried out by the Department of Works—the residence was a public building, not a privately owned building—to enable the family of the policeman occupying the premises to live more comfortably in them. It may be true that a police car was used to move the bricks; but the work done saved the department a considerable amount of money and was approved by the Department of Works. Matters such as that relative to the running of the police station have been allowed to go out to the general public, and I do not think they should.

Mr. Walsh: What about the poker school?

Mr. LLOYD. The poker school is a joke. To my knowledge, and to the knowledge of all the officers of that police station, there have been no poker schools at any time in the police station or the police residence for about 11 years.

Stories often have a cumulative effect when they are repeated, and it is not right that things of this sort should be allowed to cast a shadow on the reputation of police officers. I place some responsibility in this regard on the shoulders of the Commissioner of Police, because the respect in which the Police Force and its officers are held is of great importance to the State of Queensland as a whole. In earlier years the Queensland Police Force had the reputation of being the finest Police Force in the Southern Hemisphere, and that reputation was created by the ministerial heads of the department. The Ministers in charge of the Police Department were prepared to accept responsibility for anything that occurred within the department, and that is once again essential if the reputation of the Police Force is to be regained. There is obviously quite an amount of discontent among many officers in the Police Department, and that is too important a matter to be ignored.

Mr. Hughes: The hon. member for South Brisbane is on a heresy hunt.

Mr. LLOYD: I am not speaking about the hon. member for South Brisbane: I am suggesting that the Commissioner himself, by the sudden transferring of officers from the Ashgrove Police Station, gave the public the impression that something was seriously wrong. That impression should never have been created. I am sure the Commissioner would agree that the robbery that occurred at the Ashgrove Police Station was occasioned

principally by the construction of the police house. It is a house converted to a police station and, although it is quite unsuitable for the purpose, it has been allowed by this Government to remain in that condition for many years. The original house was built probably 60 or 70 years ago and has been used as a police station, without improvement, in an area that has grown very considerably. When it was originally converted to this use the suburb of Ashgrove and its surrounding districts were very thinly populated, but it has remained in the same condition over the years even though Brisbane, and particularly the suburb of Ashgrove, have developed out of all recognition.

Some comments were made in relation to the Newmarket Bowling Club. This club is in the Ashgrove police area and it is necessary for officers of the Ashgrove Police Station to supervise its security just as they do the security of any business activity in the area. It is probably more essential to supervise sporting club premises. As a result, I have no doubt that officers from the Ashgrove Police Station have on many occasions visited the Newmarket Bowling Club. However, as a result of the comments that have been made, the reputation that Sergeant Tapsall created over many years has been destroyed and I feel it is necessary for me to make a short statement on the matter. In my opinion, and in the opinion of virtually all residents in the district, Sergeant Tapsall's reputation is among the finest in the State. As a result of this unfortunate propaganda it may be too late to save it, but I thought it was necessary for someone to speak on his behalf and on behalf of the police officers under his control.

I can now move on to the Budget and the financial affairs of the State. I will mention one or two points that have already been raised. The first relates to the complication of the public accounts and the difficulty experienced by many hon. members of this Chamber and by the public generally in making a clear analysis of the figures. I have studied this matter for many years and I feel I still do not understand completely much of the financial figuring in the Tables and Estimates issued by the State Government. Some simplification was promised in 1958 by the then Treasurer, Sir Thomas Hiley, and I believe there should be concentration on the Trust and Special Funds. The cross-transfer of many sums from Loan Funds and Consolidated Revenue received from the Commonwealth Government directly to Consolidated Revenue on some occasions, and at other times to Trust and Special Funds, causes complications and difficulty in completely understanding the financial ramifications of the State.

If any simplification can be obtained it might be done by having one set of the Tables indicating receipts and expenditure from Trust and Special Funds instead of having two separate sets of Tables. At the moment in the Estimates detailed expenditure

for last year is shown with an estimation of expenditure for the following year, but there is no indication at all where the revenue for Trust and Special Funds is to be derived. The only means of securing this information is to examine the Loan Fund Account to see what transfers are being made to specific Trust and Special Funds from the Loan Fund Account. There is no real indication every 12 months of exactly what is the revenue of each fund, or counterbalancing details of expenditure from each fund. If this information were available it would be very simple to understand the whole of the accounts of the State.

The hon. member for Gympie seemed to indicate that because of the drought and other difficulties we should be sympathetic towards the Treasurer. Since 1961 the State Government has secured more money from the Commonwealth Government than at any previous time since the end of the last war. I mention 1961 particularly because that was the year of the Federal election which was contested on the failure of the Commonwealth Government—the Menzies Government at that time—to provide Queensland with amounts of money for specific purposes similar to those received by the other States. The people of Queensland believed this propaganda and overwhelmingly rejected the Commonwealth Government at that time and supported the Australian Labour Party. As a result there was a reawakening of interest in the North on the part of the Commonwealth Government; there was a resurgence of assistance to this State for some of the required purposes. However, since then there has been a backsliding in the amount of assistance granted to Queensland.

Criticism of the State Government can be made on two main points. These would be obvious to any person who makes a study of and understands Commonwealth-State financial relationships. The first point is the weakness of the negotiations between the present State Government and the Commonwealth Government, with the resultant inadequate amount of financial assistance received for specific purposes. The second point of criticism is one that has been made by me on previous occasions, and repeated again on this occasion by the Leader of the Opposition, namely, the way in which the money made available to the State Government has been spent.

I will take the second point first. Government members have been most indignant about this feature of the Opposition's criticism of the Government. They say that if the Government had not made provision for the expenditure of \$8,000,000 on harbour and housing facilities and water supply for the alumina development at Gladstone, another \$11,000,000 for similar works at Weipa, and another \$16,000,000 or more on the construction of the Moura-Gladstone railway line, these works would not proceed. That is erroneous thinking on the part of hon. members opposite.

Despite the many protests we have heard from the Premier, the Treasurer and other Cabinet Ministers, I believe that it is necessary to look closely at what is occurring in other States of the Commonwealth, particularly Western Australia, with its iron-ore and pellets export trade to Japan. When we do, we see that the Western Australian Government is not being forced to make a contribution to company expenditure and development, as the Queensland Government has agreed to do in this State. We know that the Commonwealth Government has insisted on a hard line towards these companies in Western Australia that are engaged in the export of iron-ore and pellets. It revoked the export licence of one large company in Western Australia because it believed the price offered by Japan for pellets was far below the normal world price for that commodity. That company was refused permission to export.

There is a new Commonwealth insistence—a new hard line—in dealings with these companies. It can be found in the bauxite development on the Gove Peninsula, in the Northern Territory. We were told by the Commonwealth Government that before Pechiney received mining rights to the bauxite deposits in the Northern Territory it would have to undertake to build an alumina refinery within a certain period. The Commonwealth Government also insisted that this company pay double royalty to enable the Aboriginal population displaced by the development to be rehoused and resettled in other parts of the Northern Territory.

This hard-line approach has been imposed on most of the overseas companies yet, at the same time, we find an easy line adopted by the Queensland State Government in all the years it has been in office since 1957. We can recall the publicity that the late Ernie Evans received as Minister for Mines when he was highlighted as "hard, tough-hitting Ernie" because of his insistence that the company developing the bauxite at Weipa should make its own arrangements for the construction of a township, the development of harbour facilities, and the construction of a new town for the Aboriginal population in the area.

We can recall the attitude adopted by the Government in 1958, when that agreement (which was originally hammered into shape by the previous Labour Government) was introduced into this Parliament. We were told that the Government would not allow the company to enjoy the immense profit from this industry unless it did these things, but within a few years the hard line was lost and the Government, by an Order in Council, enabled the company to recoup all of the costs incurred on the construction of the town at Weipa and the harbour facilities. In other words, it will cost the Queensland people \$11,000,000 to reimburse the company for the full cost of the township—its original commitment—and the cost of the harbour facilities.

The Commonwealth Government's contribution in this matter is only \$2,300,000, towards the harbour facilities at Weipa.

Contrasting that with what happened in Western Australia with the Broome Jetty, the Derby Jetty, and the Exmouth township, we find that the basis there was a 50 per cent. grant by the Commonwealth Government to Western Australia, and a loan, repayable over 15 years, for the other 50 per cent. of the cost. I again ask hon. members to contrast that with the \$2,300,000 Commonwealth contribution to the harbour at Weipa—a loan fully repayable by the Queensland people. The Government has been increasing the debt charges to the State of Queensland, year after year, compared with other States. The Government's weaknesses are being exposed.

I will now outline—I have done so previously—what happened relative to the Moura-Gladstone railway line. I should not like to see that company owning this railway line, even if it did build it. If it had constructed the railway line, as was originally intended, and after a period the line became the property of the State, I would have been in complete agreement. I am not at present criticising the fact that the State Government is constructing and paying for the railway line, but I am criticising the Government for not securing from the Commonwealth Government, or the Australian Loan Council, the same terms and conditions for this project as the South Australian Government received, in the last few months, for the construction of a natural-gas pipeline in South Australia, as announced at the last meeting of the Australian Loan Council.

If these things are of immense importance to Queensland's development and the nation's development, as we are led to believe by hon. members on the Government benches, why has the Commonwealth Government not agreed to assist Queensland in the construction of these works, which will benefit the Commonwealth Government to a greater extent than the Queensland Government consequent upon the export wealth that will flow as a result of these developments? We should not forget that the Commonwealth Government reaps the greatest benefit from such developments, whether it be the construction of a railway line to carry annually 5,000,000 tons of coal to Gladstone for shipment to Japan, or the construction of an alumina refinery at Gladstone. The advantages of having a trade balance much more beneficial than it would have been by the creation of secondary industries following this development enhance the Commonwealth's chance of balancing its budget more than it does the Queensland Government's chance of doing so.

Here is the debit side relative to State revenue and expenditure. Every year the \$8,000,000 to \$10,000,000 taken from the Loan Fund Account to finance these works necessitated by the development of these

large companies is lost to the construction of hospitals, water-supply schemes, and other necessary capital works.

If Government members claim that it is necessary for the Government to spend this money, why is it not necessary for the Western Australian Government to do the same? On page 44 of "Australian Facts and Figures," No. 89, under the heading "Raw Materials and Exploration", there appears the following:—

"An agreement has been reached between the company's subsidiary, Dampier Mining Co. Ltd., and Cliffs Western Australian Mining Co. Pty. Ltd., a subsidiary of Cleveland Cliffs Iron Co. of the United States, for the sharing of facilities for the production and shipment of iron-ore and pellets from adjoining deposits at Deepdale, Western Australia (for previous reference see Facts and Figures No. 86, page 44). The joint project will include a township adjacent to the iron-ore deposits of both companies, a standard-gauge railway line to Cape Preston, a port township and deep-water port facilities at Cape Preston where Cliffs Western Australian Mining Co. Pty. Ltd. will also establish a pelletising plant with an initial capacity of at least 3,600,000 tons of pellets a year. Dampier Mining Co. Ltd. has the right to have the pelletising plant extended, within limits, to meet its needs for pellets elsewhere in the organisation or for export. Quarrying and marketing will be carried out independently by the two companies."

That is only one case in point. The company exploiting the Hamersley Range iron-ore deposits is involved in tremendous expenditure to construct the railway line, harbours and towns. If it is possible for other States to negotiate such agreements with overseas companies, why can't we?

Mr. Chalk: Are you in favour of privately owned ports and railway lines?

Mr. LLOYD: Certainly not! While the Treasurer was absent from the Chamber, I said that in relation to the Moura-Gladstone railway line—and do not forget that the Government introduced the idea of its being privately owned, and later changed its mind—I would not be against this principle if it were on a turn-key basis, that is, bringing to this State companies with the technologists and technical know-how to build the railway line and allowing them a licence for, say, 10 years during which they could reap the profits, and then, after amortisation, the project's reverting to the control and ownership of the State. More turn-key arrangements like that should be operating with many of the overseas companies that come here to exploit our resources.

Mr. Walsh: Like the City Square arrangements?

Mr. LLOYD: Something like that. This is nothing new. We are amazed at the development that has taken place in Japan's secondary industries since the war. The Japanese have purchased, and pay royalties on, patents from England, the United States, France, perhaps Germany, and other countries. They purchase the patents and import the capital, but the basis of the large industrial expansion in Japan is Japanese ownership, with very little owned by private capital from outside that country. The Japanese have a very strict policy in regard to capital entering that country to exploit their resources.

Why has it not been possible for the Government to negotiate more strongly with overseas companies so that they, at least temporarily, pay the full cost of the facilities they require? If it is necessary for the State Government to bear the full cost of such things, as has been done in Queensland, why has it not been possible to receive from the Commonwealth Government recognition of the national importance of these projects? Queensland is suffering as a result of the high interest and amortisation payments it has had to make, particularly in recent years.

A detailed examination of railway projects, in particular, between 1952 and 1966, indicates the inequities that exist between Queensland and other States. There are involved in this factors that I have no doubt the Treasurer will mention, such as the standardisation of railway plant. During the period 1952-66 total specific-purposes payments of a capital nature from the Commonwealth Government to the various States were—

New South Wales	\$411,979,000
Victoria	\$298,943,000
Queensland	\$305,360,000
South Australia	\$173,491,000
Western Australia	\$302,527,000
Tasmania	\$68,573,000

Interest payments alone on those advances in the year 1966-67 were—

New South Wales	\$911,000
Victoria	\$220,000
Queensland	\$2,177,000
South Australia	\$253,000
Western Australia	\$1,488,000

Western Australia, which received during that period only \$3,000,000 less than did Queensland, paid interest of only \$1,488,000, and it is doubtful whether Tasmania paid even a cent of interest.

In estimated debt charges during that year for the total amounts made available by the Commonwealth to the States, Queensland had to pay \$3,255,000 whereas Western Australia had to pay no more than \$1,778,000, or approximately \$1,500,000 less than Queensland had to pay. If the full interest payments and debt charges met by Queensland during that period are ascertained, it will be found that they are far in excess of the comparable figures for the

other States. These are matters, I believe, on which criticism of the Government may be based.

I suggest that the Government must have shown weakness in its negotiations with the Commonwealth Government if it has not been able to gain for Queensland from the Commonwealth Government treatment similar to that being given to other Australian States. It may be said that the legislation introduced by the Commonwealth and the States to implement the railway standardisation plan showed an intention to adopt a very realistic approach on the basis of the loan moneys available. But if it was possible for the Commonwealth Government to introduce special legislation in the Commonwealth Parliament every time a new stabilisation plan between, say, South Australia and Western Australia or New South Wales and Victoria was agreed upon, surely it would have been equally easy for it to introduce a special grants Act to enable the Government of Queensland to receive similar treatment relative to the reconstruction of the Townsville-Mt. Isa railway line. Instead, the State is committed to interest payments of \$1,680,000 annually until the loan is paid in full.

In his Financial Statement, the Treasurer has made several statements with which I agree and which I shall mention later. On the other hand, he made what I thought was the rather ludicrous statement that he had been very fortunate in receiving more than \$1,700,000 in February of this year in a special payment that was agreed upon at the Premiers' Conference, and that it was as a result of that unexpected payment that he was able to balance the Budget.

Mr. Walsh: The Budget would have been in a bit of a mess but for that.

Mr. LLOYD: The Budget may have been in a bit of a mess, but I think the Treasurer probably would have followed the precedent established by Sir Thomas Hiley and found some method of taking money from Trust and Special Funds to pay off the tiresome accumulated deficit. In fact, the Treasurer mentioned in his Financial Statement that it had been possible to reduce the deficit from the previous year without funding the reduction from the Loan Fund, and a study of the Estimates for the year 1961-62 indicates how he did that.

In that year, Sir Thomas Hiley did something similar. He said, "We will take from the Queensland Housing Commission Fund, the Harbour Boards Fund and the Queensland Agricultural Bank Fund something in excess of \$1,000,000"—I will give the Committee the correct figure later—"to pay off some of the tiresome accumulated deficit." What he did not mention, and what the Treasurer did not mention on this occasion, is that money from the Loan Fund is put into Trust and Special Funds. It then becomes part of an over-all Treasury Loan indebtedness that an attempt must be made to balance. In the

same year as money is taken from the Loan Fund and transferred to Trust and Special Funds, it is used to reduce the tiresome accumulated deficit. Instead of funding it through the Loan Fund itself, the Treasurer is indirectly funding it without paying the additional 4 per cent. imposition over the long-term bond rate, upon which the other States insist within the organisation of the Loan Council. If he were to do it that way, he would have to pay 4 per cent. over and above the bond rate—in other words, about 10 per cent.—on that amount. So, instead of doing that, he simply transfers, as Sir Thomas Hiley did in 1961-62, an amount to, say, the Agricultural Bank Fund and the Queensland Housing Commission Fund and then, during the course of the financial year, transfers the amount necessary to offset the accumulated deficit in the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

What is the difference? It is a Trust Fund or a Special Fund created for a special purpose. The Queensland Housing Commission Fund is created for the construction of houses and the financing of workers' dwellings, and, if it has been necessary to take the money from the Loan Fund Account, that has been normal budgeting procedure in past years; but it was not the normal procedure of past Governments to take funds from the special accounts which have been established from Loan Fund moneys in order to pay off the deficit. That happened in 1962, and something similar is happening again this year. I mention it because there may be some explanation for it, but I doubt it.

This year the Treasurer said he will have a small surplus of \$26,000-odd, but on page 85 of the Estimates we find under the Mt. Isa Railway Project Fund \$872,000 transferred to Consolidated Revenue. By transferring the amount of \$872,000 from the Mt. Isa Railway Project Fund to Consolidated Revenue the Treasurer was able to show a small surplus. But on page 104 of the Estimates he is shown as transferring from Loan Fund to the Mt. Isa Railway Project Fund the sum of \$266,700. Whilst transferring that amount to the fund, at the same time the Treasurer transfers from that fund, which was established by loan allocations from the Commonwealth Government and its own Loan Account a figure of \$872,000. If that is not funding a deficit, what is it? If this money is necessary to build up the net expenditure from the Loan Account on essential capital works, why is the Loan Account being used as a vehicle for the transfer of funds to enable the funding of the deficit? The Budget does not disclose that the deficit is being funded by the transfer of Special Funds to Consolidated Revenue.

There are other references in the Budget that could be regarded as a very desperate attempt by the Treasurer to indicate that expenditure from Consolidated Revenue by the Government this year was wisely carried out and that there would, in fact, be record

expenditure on education. That is one of the points he made. Undoubtedly there will be record expenditure this year, particularly in view of the re-thinking by the Commonwealth Government about the necessity for improved education facilities and the money that is now flowing from that source for universities, colleges of advanced education, institutes of technology, science laboratories in high schools, and so on. These things were neglected by the Government in the past but now that the Commonwealth Government is making grants to the States, provided they are matched by the States, this expenditure is now being made. I have no doubt that expenditure this year will be an increase on that of last year, but I think the Treasurer should have been completely honest and indicated the exact expenditure from the Loan Fund Accounts on primary schools, secondary schools, and other buildings this year as compared with last year.

Let us examine this. If, as we are led to believe, the Government is spending more this year on education facilities, then we should no longer hear of primary schools with temporary classrooms underneath them—noisy rooms that in many cases are unfit for the teaching of children; we should no longer hear of primary schools lacking septic facilities and other necessities for proper hygiene; we should no longer hear of the lack of fencing and other important works because the Government has not sufficient money to carry them out. But these things continue. Page 109 of the Estimates reveals that expenditure from the Loan Fund Account on State school buildings in 1966-67 was \$3,790,688, whereas the amount provided from this source for this year is \$3,463,500. That means that \$330,000 less has been appropriated for this purpose for 1967-68. The Minister for Works and Housing would no doubt be a little concerned about this. Because of the shortage of money for capital expenditure in the Loan Fund Account, he no longer is able to continue a very vigorous programme of public works and public buildings.

The same remarks apply to technical colleges and high schools. Last year the Government spent \$4,888,605 in this direction whereas this year it will spend only \$4,782,500, or \$100,000 less. I have no doubt at all that the work on State schools, technical colleges and high schools will be carried out this year at a much slower tempo than it was last year, despite the neglect in the last two or three years of State school buildings and facilities for children and teachers. These are important enough matters to expose. In past years the Government has come forward and said, "We have done this," and to some extent people have been obliged to believe it. The Government cannot make this boast when we can point to such things.

I agree with the hon. member for Baroona that the level of university construction work should be parallel to the level in the other

spheres of education. If it is necessary to increase the expenditure on universities, it should be possible to increase correspondingly the expenditure on primary-school buildings, high-school buildings and technical colleges. However, the figures disclose a great discrepancy in Queensland's programme of work for universities, compared with what is being done in the other States. The tables in the Commonwealth publication, "Commonwealth Payments to or for the States", list the grants for universities for recurrent expenditure, which is the basis on which the Queensland University has had to increase students' fees. It has had to increase fees on two occasions. The Queensland Government could not have been getting the matching Commonwealth grant for a period of time if it is necessary for the University to increase students' fees to enable it to receive the maximum in matching grants from the Commonwealth Government.

Over the years 1959 to 1967 university grants for recurrent expenditure in the various States have been—

State	Amount of Grant	Percentage of Total
	\$	%
New South Wales ..	72,257,000	42.8
Victoria ..	41,371,000	23.8
Queensland ..	21,595,000	12.5
South Australia ..	19,593,000	11.3
Western Australia ..	12,576,000	7.2
Tasmania ..	5,589,000	3.2

Of all financial assistance grants, Queensland receives under the formula 14 to 15 per cent. year after year of the total allocation by the Commonwealth Government to the States. If the grants for recurrent expenditure for universities were to follow the same pattern—as I should imagine they would—Queensland has lost 2 per cent. of its allocation over the full period of eight or nine years since these grants were first made.

The same picture is disclosed when we compare the matching grants from the Commonwealth Government for recurrent expenditure of colleges of advanced education. Queensland received only 11.8 per cent. of the total allocation for 1966-67. Are we receiving the total amount of money available to us each year? If not, is it because the State Government is refusing to match the Commonwealth grants? The day before yesterday a good deal of publicity was devoted to the Commonwealth Government's reversal of policy on grants for research projects. In future, instead of matching grants, they are to be direct grants to each State. This is probably just as well so far as the University of Queensland is concerned, because during the time the grants for research were made by the Commonwealth Government we did not receive our total allocation.

We have pointed out previously that the amount of research undertaken at the Queensland University over the years has

been far below the standard and the amount of work undertaken on research in other universities in the Commonwealth. An examination of the figures reveals that, for 1965-66, Queensland received only \$105,000, or 7.6 per cent., of the total allocated by the Commonwealth to the States because the Commonwealth granted to each State only an amount equal to the matching allocation that the States were prepared to provide. New South Wales received 36.3 per cent. Victoria 24 per cent., South Australian 16.2 per cent., Western Australian 10.2 per cent. and Tasmania 5.6 per cent. Tasmania was the only State in the Commonwealth to receive a smaller percentage than Queensland for this important work. Here, again, the weakness of our attitude to the Commonwealth Government is demonstrated.

The hon. member for Gympie reminded me of one instance in which we are not receiving assistance from the Commonwealth (which we should be receiving) when he spoke of the buffalo fly and the damage it is doing to the cattle industry in Queensland. Let me compare cattle numbers in New South Wales and Queensland and state exactly what assistance is given by the Commonwealth Government to Queensland and New South Wales for tick control and the dipping of cattle. In 1965 the number of cattle in Queensland was 7,393,000 and in New South Wales there were 4,619,000—there were almost 3,000,000 more cattle in Queensland than in New South Wales—yet page 63 of the tables called "Commonwealth Payments to or for the States, 1966-67," issued by the Commonwealth Government, discloses that in 1962-63 special payments of \$96,000 were made to New South Wales and \$10,000 to Queensland by the Commonwealth towards the costs of changing the chemicals in cattle dips. On a previous page this statement appears—

"Cattle tick control and research.

"Since the 1920's the Commonwealth has been contributing towards the cost of cattle tick control and research in New South Wales. From 1st July, 1951 to 30th June, 1966, an amount of \$10,013,000 has been made available for this purpose."

For cattle tick control and research during that period, New South Wales received over \$10,000,000 but Queensland received nothing and, I repeat, for changing the chemicals in cattle dips New South Wales received \$96,000 compared with Queensland's \$10,000. Once again that demonstrates the failure of the State Government to insist that the Commonwealth Government treat each State fairly.

This brings me to the final point relative to this, namely, Commonwealth-State financial relationships. I agree with the Treasurer's comments. I believe that the Commonwealth Grants Commission should be a permanent body and that it should study not only the extra allocations that are to be made available by the Commonwealth

to the claimant States of Western Australia and Tasmania, based on the States' non-income taxation, but also the level of benefits in those States. The Commonwealth Grants Commission should also be made a permanent commission to enable it examine the accounting systems of all States, as well as that of the Commonwealth Government, to see whether it is necessary for the Commonwealth to reserve for its own purposes some 67 per cent. or more of the total taxation revenue that it receives and allocate to the States the balance, or whether it is possible for the States, within the area of their geographical boundaries, to secure from the Commonwealth sufficient finance to enable them to provide the necessary level of social services.

The most recent formula arrived at at the Premiers' Conference does not accurately assess the needs of all States and the Commonwealth. Because of its previous history as a claimant State, South Australia receives, per capita, a greater amount of money than we do. Possibly the formula principle relative to sparsity of population has some bearing on this. I have no doubt that with the high degree of centralisation in Adelaide, South Australia would have greater sparsity of population in its country areas than Queensland has. But it is obvious that in Queensland, with our greater number of larger cities and towns and with greater decentralisation of population, it costs far more to run our railways, to provide educational services and hospital services, to maintain the Police Force, and to maintain law, order, and justice, than would be the case in South Australia. But gross density of population has not been introduced into the formula based on population, which is a feature of the formula covering the present allocation under the tax reimbursement system.

Mr. Aikens: Isn't this formula something that the present Government inherited from Labour?

Mr. LLOYD: No. That claim is false. Until 1958 the formula contained an allocation for children in country areas attending school. The loss of that allocation was one of the reasons for much of the financial difficulty that devolved upon the State from 1958 to 1961 and that ultimately brought the State to the stage where it had to go to the Commonwealth Government for additional grants to enable it to balance its budget and to provide the necessary and essential social services. That feature of the formula, retained by Labour Governments, was more advantageous to Queensland than to Western Australia, Victoria or South Australia.

The Treasurer did not mention one very important feature of Commonwealth-State financial relations dealing with the Australian Loan Council and the inability to secure unanimity or, in the event of disagreement within the Loan Council, the continuance of a formula that will never be

put into operation by the Premiers or Treasurers of the States and the Commonwealth. It is quite obvious that the time is past when we can expect the Australian Loan Council to come to any agreement outside its own political and border jealousies, which from time to time have prevented the implementation or construction of many major national works in Australia.

Take, for instance, the Burdekin River scheme, which will cost a tremendous amount of money. We would approach the Loan Council for a special purpose loan to undertake this project under the ordinary arrangement for repayment over 53 years by way of sinking fund contributions to the Commonwealth Government. We would not be able to obtain such a loan because, if we did, New South Wales would want similar treatment.

There should be, in accordance with the Vernon Report, a special projects commission established alongside the Commonwealth Grants Commission. There should be two permanent commissions, one to examine all accounting systems of the States and the other to investigate special projects.

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

Mr. LLOYD: This question revolves mainly round the distribution of surplus Commonwealth revenue, which has been a particularly contentious matter ever since Federation. The intention of the Commonwealth Constitution was that surplus Commonwealth revenue should be distributed among the States, the residue remaining to the Commonwealth. This contentious issue has grown over the years as a result of the Financial Agreement of 1927 and the introduction of uniform taxation in 1942, and has reached the stage at which it has become almost impossible for the States to give to the people the services that they need. This is one of the most important trends in recent history. Education in Australia has lagged far behind the standards applying in other major countries, simply because, for financial reasons, it has not been possible for State Governments to exercise their sovereign powers in accordance with the Commonwealth Constitution.

This is a situation that must be resolved quickly. Where it is not possible to get agreement between the States, where one State refuses to pass its own legislative enactment granting the Commonwealth additional powers, and where States will not set aside their own political rivalries and jealousies, some other solution must be found. It is quite obvious that the States are not at present receiving sufficient of the Commonwealth's surplus revenue.

There are three ways in which the Commonwealth Government has distributed some of its surplus revenue. The first is by financing from revenue its own capital works for defence purposes and for Postal Department and other capital projects. The second way is by financing short-falls in loan raisings

for the States' works and housing requirements. That amounts to millions and millions of dollars. The third method is in the financing of special capital grants and loans to the States for specific purposes determined by the Federal Government.

There is a weakness in each method. In the financing of capital works of the Federal Government, from 1949 to 1960 the sum of \$2,270 million was allocated from Commonwealth revenue. That is a tremendous sum. In the same period, \$1,200 million was used from surplus Commonwealth revenue to finance short-falls in loan raisings for the States' capital works and housing requirements. The amount made available by the Commonwealth in specific purpose grants is also a huge figure. All of that money came from surplus revenue of the Commonwealth which, under the original intention of the Commonwealth Constitution, should have been distributed among the States to allow them to maintain their own sovereignty.

Since then the Commonwealth has continued, by obtaining taxation revenue both directly and indirectly, to spend money in those three ways and to charge the States interest on money used to finance their own works and housing requirements, money which, in the first place, was provided by the taxpayers of the States themselves.

(Time expired).

Mr. PILBEAM (Rockhampton South) (2.20 p.m.): I accept the opportunity to take part in the Budget debate, firstly to congratulate the Treasurer on bringing down a Budget that will allow a continuation of the accelerated development of Queensland that has been brought into being by the Government in recent years. Even if the State is not progressing to the extent that everybody would like to see it progress, it is still making continuous forward steps.

I accept the fact, although I appear to be one of a small minority, that Queensland is still in the pioneering stage of development and that patience must be displayed by all if we are to reach the goals under all departmental headings that we can see before us. In the first stage of pioneering—that is, in the early days of Australia—the main requirements were courage and muscles. Now, in the second pioneering stage, a third ingredient has been added—finance.

Unfortunately, development cannot take place in this modern day and age without finance. The Government of Queensland is to some extent hoist by its own petard in this respect, because the accelerated development of the State, for which it has been responsible, increasingly requires more and more finance, which is becoming difficult to obtain. The position is aggravated somewhat because, egged on by Press and radio, we are fast turning into a race of impatient complainers. I do not exactly blame the Press and the radio for this, because the

people generally will not read words of praise or commendation. They like to read a complaint about some existing situation, and therefore the Press and the radio cater for this.

I recognise this pattern in the State of Queensland only too well, Mr. Hooper, because an exactly similar situation met me when I first went into public life in Rockhampton. No place in Queensland was more retarded than that city, because for half a century progress was bogged down by the old catchcry, "Why should we do anything? Let the Government do it, or let the council do it." We cannot see much evidence of that mental outlook in Central Queensland now; but wherever we look in the State of Queensland generally, we see some pressure group complaining about one situation or another—if it is not the teachers, it is the railway employees or the pensioners—and calling out to the Government—usually the Commonwealth Government—to do something more for it.

Before I deal with any of those specific complaints I am entitled to ask myself this question: What have they really got to complain about, especially when they criticise the Commonwealth Government, which, because it is the controller of the purse-strings of the nation, usually is the target for the main bodies of criticism? I ask myself: Is the Commonwealth Government really entitled to all this adverse criticism, and is Australia generally in a bad way? In reply to that question, let me refer to a remark made recently by the hon. member for Toowoomba West, Mr. Duggan, who said that Australia had the second highest growth-rate in the world today and was second only to Japan. He said, too, that the growth-rate in Japan was rather chimerical and could possibly terminate. I repeat: Australia's growth rate of 5½ per cent. is surpassed only by that of Japan, and it has outstripped the growth-rate of countries such as the United States of America, West Germany, and Italy—in fact, all countries except Japan. Surely people should be happy about that and not be continually complaining.

I will give some statistical figures, for which I am indebted to the Commonwealth Statistician, to prove that Australia is now progressing well and does not merit this continued cacophony of wails. In giving figures that set out the growth of the nation I will make a comparison between the year 1948-49—for obvious reasons—and the year 1966-67, which is the last year for which I have figures.

Australia's population increased from 7,900,000 in 1948-49 to 11,760,000 in 1966-67. In the former year the work-force numbered 3,300,000; it is now 4,700,000. In 1948-49 dwelling units totalled 1,970,578, whereas in 1966-67 they totalled 3,580,000. The national income in the year 1948-49 amounted to \$3,740 million; in 1966-67 it was \$18,124 million. That is a tremendous

improvement. The gross national product in 1948-49 was \$4,034 million; it is now \$22,729 million. That is another tremendous improvement. Private investment in 1948-49 was \$666 million; it is now \$3,670 million. Public authority investment in 1948-49 was \$284 million, as against \$2,143 million in 1966-67.

These figures convey only one message, namely, that people are now much more prosperous than before. This is borne out by the fact that savings bank accounts in 1948-49 totalled \$1,534 million and, in 1966-67, \$5,795 million. In 1948-49 the total trading bank deposits, on the weekly average, were \$2,060,000,000, as against \$5,264,800,000 in 1966-67.

As far as payments to the States are concerned—I think this is of particular consequence to this Parliament because we take a turn in complaining about the Commonwealth Government, and I will admit that in some respects we have the right to criticise them, mostly on financial assistance grants—taxation reimbursements in 1949-50 were \$141,000,000 whereas they are now \$900,000,000. Grants to universities were not in existence in 1949-50, whereas this year they amount to \$65,852,000. Aid to roads in the year 1949-50 amounted to \$17,704,000, in 1967-68 they total \$160,000,000—another tremendous improvement. Allocation of loan funds for housing in 1949-50 totalled \$34,430,000; the figure for 1967-68 is \$122,840,000. The total of works and housing borrowing in 1949-50 was \$184,000,000, as against \$677,000,000 in 1967-68. Total payments to or for the States by the Commonwealth in 1949-50 amounted to just over \$202,000,000, and in 1967-68 to \$1,347,500,000.

Those figures speak for themselves, and I say that they are a fairly complete answer to those people who are accusing the Commonwealth of doing a bad job. We certainly have some arguments with them but, by and large, those figures prove that Australia is now in the most prosperous condition it has ever been in and that the people who live in Australia are enjoying a higher standard of living than they ever had before.

I could produce figures showing the number of television licences in force now and how they have increased year by year, proving that more people now enjoy the benefit of television. I could also give figures showing the increase in car-ownership and home-ownership. In 1957 retail sales totalled \$1,262,800,000 compared with \$2,241,100,000 in 1966. These figures cannot be gainsaid. They tell only one story: we are in the most prosperous situation we have ever been in.

Ironically enough, it is at a time when people are the most prosperous that they are making most complaints. I suppose that is human nature. If you do no work for the public they do not criticise you, but once you start doing work for them everybody wants you to do something. It is

my experience that it is when you start doing something worth while for the people that you get the complaints.

One of the groups that has complained most about the Government are the teachers. Have they really very much to complain about? The Minister for Education has given us figures which indicate a substantial increase in expenditure on education in Queensland this financial year. The Queensland Government this year has assigned one-fifth of its Consolidated Revenue to education, and education expenditure from Consolidated Revenue will rise by 12½ per cent. compared with 1966-67 expenditure. Expenditure on education from Consolidated Revenue will total \$72,000,000 in 1967-68, representing 21.23 per cent. of the total Government expenditure from Consolidated Revenue, as against 19.1 per cent. in the previous year. Education expenditure from the State Loan Fund this year will total \$12,500,000, which is an increase of 9.74 per cent. on the previous year's expenditure.

Education this year will receive 14.8 per cent. of the total State Government Loan Fund expenditure, and the Government will assign 52.28 per cent. of its total tax reimbursement to education. The total expenditure on education from all sources in 1967-68, including Commonwealth expenditure, will be \$98,000,000. This will be 15.17 per cent. more than the expenditure from all sources in 1966-67.

I cannot help but think that the main reason for complaint by a small minority of teachers is that they see people in other parts of the world receiving higher salaries than they do. However, I cannot exactly agree with the argument that teachers are forced to leave Australia because better salaries are paid elsewhere. I agree that they are paid higher salaries in one of the local authority areas in Canada, but it leaves me rather cold when I hear it suggested that a teacher and his wife who are both employed at the North Rockhampton High School, receiving between them almost \$7,000 a year, are forced to leave Australia because they cannot live on the money they are earning. Probably they are guilty of covetousness which, according to the Bible, is one of the cardinal sins. I think it is the subject of one of the Ten Commandments, if I can remember as far back as that.

What is the real position of pensioners in this country? The pensioners of this country constitute one of the main groups that rail against the Commonwealth Government. Have they been treated worse under the present Government than under the Labour Government? Those who criticise the treatment of pensioners are obviously people who never try to work very hard in their cause because in no other direction is there a greater opportunity for community self-help than in the field of old people's housing. Both the State Budget

and the Commonwealth Budget allow ample financial subsidies to assist with the housing of the aged.

Before I deal with this aspect of geriatrics, I think we should again ask ourselves whether the old people of Australia have been really badly treated by the present Commonwealth Government in comparison with their treatment by the previous Commonwealth Labour Government? I think we should all be fair enough to concede that political parties should be judged by what they do when in office and not by what they say when in Opposition. The group that is now screaming about the treatment of old people has been particularly vociferous in recent years and, although I am one who has worked hard in the interests of old people and should very much like to see them get an increase in their pensions, I am prepared to be fair and make the comparison that I have suggested between the treatment meted out to them by the present Liberal-Country Party Commonwealth Government and the Labour Party Commonwealth Government that was last in power in 1948-49.

In that year, 1948-49, the total amount provided for aged and invalid pensions by the Labour Party was \$88,708,000. In the current year, 1967-68, the present Liberal-Country Party Commonwealth Government allocated \$509,500,000. That is very close to six times as much. In the intervening period there was an increase in population of 27½ per cent. and the difference in the dollar value represents approximately 30 per cent., which would account for only a fraction of the colossal improvement. Hon. members opposite can work it out for themselves.

An Opposition Member: What was the basic wage in 1949?

Mr. PILBEAM: I have the Consumer Price Index figures, which reflect the difference in the cost of living over the years. In 1954-55 the index figure was 102.6; in 1965-66 it was 131.9. That is a difference of about 30 per cent., which would not account for the sixfold increase in the amount paid to old people in the form of pensions.

In addition, the Labour Commonwealth Government of 1948-49 provided nothing in the way of pharmaceutical benefits for pensioners—it had not even thought of it—whereas this year the Commonwealth Government has allocated \$31,830,000. Similarly, the 1948-49 Labour Commonwealth Government provided nothing for medical services for pensioners, as against \$16,530,000 provided by the present Liberal-Country Party Government this year.

Reverting again to the subject of self-help, which is a favourite subject of mine, I refer to the very wonderful development that has occurred in old people's housing in recent years by reason of the very wonderful subsidy provided by the Commonwealth Government towards the cost of housing old

people. This was not even thought of by Labour Governments of the past, regardless of how hon. members opposite may harp about their concern for old people now. Under legislation brought down by the present Liberal-Country Party Commonwealth Government, namely, the Aged Persons Housing Act, the Government provided a subsidy of 30s. for every £1 collected towards the cost of housing old people. It later increased that subsidy to \$2 for every \$1 collected. The present Commonwealth Government has already allocated \$9,000,000 under this heading. This is an outstanding avenue for those who give only lip-service to the cause of old people to actually work to alleviate their lot. What community, or what person professing to have any regard for old people, would neglect to take advantage of this wonderful subsidy? The scheme can be administered by a public body specially constituted for the purpose or, in accordance with the legislation that this Government introduced last year, a local authority can do it. It is open to everybody to do this work in the interests of old people.

As if this were not enough, the State Government is assisting with the housing of old people by providing the total cost of furnishing these cottages. That is an even further incentive to people to work for old people because, over all, it means that for approximately a quarter of the actual cost of a furnished house an aged person can be provided with a fully furnished dwelling, with hot and cold water, sewerage, and all the other amenities that go with modern living.

On many occasions in this Chamber I have heard hon. members, particularly those on the Opposition side, express concern for old people. In my book nobody who has not made an effort to house old people by taking advantage of the wonderful subsidies offered by both State and Federal Governments can honestly chide either the Federal Government or the State Government for neglecting the aged.

I have been president of a society that has already erected 54 units in Rockhampton for old people. I have been instrumental in assisting 37 similar societies in Queensland, New South Wales, Western Australia, and Victoria, and I am happy to say that only a few days ago the Rockhampton R.S.L. decided to assist in this field. I warmly congratulate it on this step.

An Opposition Member: The hon. member for Rockhampton North is interested in this.

Mr. PILBEAM: The only time the hon. member for Rockhampton North will take an interest in this field is when he occupies one of these houses in the future.

The housing of old people is not a difficult job, because old people can trigger off the construction of their own dwellings. Many aged people have an amount equal to one-quarter of the cost of a furnished dwelling and are prepared to make a donation to obtain life-ownership of a cottage. There are

many aged people—anybody interested in local authority work knows who they are—who live in old houses against which a demolition order is issued. Probably much more money would have to be spent on renovating the house than would represent a quarter of the cost of a new dwelling. They have not got the ready money and have to sell the old house. They obtain enough to pay a deposit in the housing scheme because of the value of the land on which the old house is located. In most cases it is no more than an administrative detail to house old people. I cannot imagine why anybody who is interested in the welfare of old people would not do something about this.

It is no use claiming that the housing of old people is only one aspect of geriatrics; in my book it is by far the most important. It is my experience, gained from a survey of every pensioner in Rockhampton—I have gone into every pensioner's home—that there is not in any community a pensioner who has reached pensionable age, with a house in reasonable order, who cannot live reasonably comfortably on the pension. The trouble occurs when a person reaches pensionable age not owning his own house, because he then has only two courses open to him: firstly, to go into sub-standard accommodation; or secondly, to pay such a high rental that he has not sufficient money left on which to live.

I can assure hon. members that we have 60 people living in the Talbot old people's estate, in which I am interested, and not one of them is in other than reasonably comfortable circumstances. They certainly live much the same life as anybody else. They have to be careful, of course. They have television, they are fairly frequent users of taxis, and they even go to the races occasionally and have a "flutter"—I hope with more success than I have. This completely proves my point that if accommodation is provided for old people at a reasonable figure, they can live a reasonably comfortable life on the pension.

Mr. Chinchin: How much represents a quarter of the cost of a house referred to by you and provided by the pensioner?

Mr. PILBEAM: In the case of Talbot Estate in Rockhampton, it amounts to \$1,000. They pay a weekly rental of \$2 if they do not make a donation, and \$1 if they have no money at all. I will not be convinced that, with the avenues that are open, all communities should not have one of these housing settlements. I say to my shame that I took a little convincing before I came into it.

Mr. Chinchin: What is the usual area of land?

Mr. PILBEAM: We usually give them an area 60 ft. by 50 ft. We get eight cottages to the acre.

Nothing should be taken from my references to indicate that I would not be happy to see an increase in pensions for old

people. But the main point that I wish to emphasise again and again is that nobody who is not prepared to help old people under such favourable circumstances is in a position to lift up his voice and scream about the lack of effort by another section of the community, referring particularly to the present Commonwealth Liberal-Country Party Government. I cannot stress that point often enough.

Accommodation is the most important requirement of old people. Many hon. members no doubt watch the television programme "Four Corners". On all occasions on which pensioners are shown in documentaries as having a rather hard life, the programme invariably starts by showing old people living in substandard and near-substandard accommodation. Once that occurs, they cannot exist on the pension. It is most important that they have satisfactory and reasonably-priced accommodation.

I should now like to say a few words about local government, because this is another section of the community that lifts its voice from time to time and expresses discontent at the state of its finances. All that one hears these days from local authorities are requests for more money or financial aid from either the State or the Commonwealth Government. Very rarely does one find a local authority that is prepared to look at the other side of the budget. Very rarely does one find a local authority making an examination of its expenditure or a genuine attempt to carry out its work on an economic basis. The cry is always for more money.

Recently I heard the completely inane argument that the Commonwealth Government should pay for the sewerage of a provincial township. What a completely unrealistic argument that is! What sort of haywire financing would that be? Everyone knows that a local authority is a body that is formed to do certain work in the interests of the community. In the case of sewerage, for example, a local authority should set out how much it will cost to sewer its area on the basis of repayment of interest and redemption over a term of 40 years, and on that figure determine what the cost per tenement will be to the people. It is the obligation of the local people to pay for a local job such as that. If they cannot, or are not prepared to, pay for it, they should not embark upon the scheme. To say that the Commonwealth Government should pay for the sewerage of one community and not for the sewerage of others is completely wrong. If it is a Commonwealth responsibility, let the Commonwealth Government sewer the whole of Australia and the cost per person will work out at exactly the same figure. But I cannot be convinced that there is any merit in saying that the Commonwealth Government should sewer one city merely because for years it has resisted any attempt to do the job itself, and has perhaps become caught up in some explosive developmental work.

Mr. Walsh: The city does not assume the whole of the cost.

Mr. PILBEAM: No. A reasonable subsidy is received. I am glad that that matter has been brought up by the hon. member for Bundaberg, because recently the Government has allowed local authorities to extract from subdividers much more than they previously could towards sewerage works. I can tell the Committee now that that is one reason why local authorities should be able to balance their budgets, because they now get a much better deal from subdividers than they used to. In fact, they get a double effect, because they obtain immediately the rates applying on the inflated value provided by the provision of amenities. I cannot see any reason why local authorities should be complaining as they are.

I have even heard it argued that the Commonwealth Government should pay for the barrage to provide water at Rockhampton. Where is the sense in that argument? Either the Commonwealth Government provides this assistance for all local authorities throughout Australia, or for none. Why should the Commonwealth Government pay for the improvement of the water supply in Rockhampton whilst Toowoomba should have to pay its own way? If it is done for one, it must be done for all. When I hear people say that the Commonwealth Government should provide more money for education and more money for water conservation, and then say in the same breath that the Commonwealth Government should assume responsibilities of local authority enterprises, such as the provision of sewerage and town water supplies, I wonder how far that sort of argument can be taken.

As for asking for special sources of income, why should they need this? The costs to the citizens will be the same whether they are met from rates only or from rates plus some other charges. It is ridiculous to say that all people in the community do not pay rates. Try telling that to the tenant of a house who pays \$14, \$16 or \$20 a week rent, when 10 years ago he was paying \$3, \$4 or \$5 a week rent! A portion of the increased rental he pays covers the rates on the property. Try telling it to a boarder in a boarding-house who pays board of up to \$20 a week, when 10 years ago he paid only \$3! Of course all people share in the rate burden, whether they actually are property owners or not.

The cost of providing sewerage and all the other amenities has increased. It must be admitted, as I said to the hon. member for Bundaberg, that costs have increased greatly. But land values are very much inflated. Whereas, before World War II, developers paid only the cost of gravel streets in subdivisions, they now have to meet the cost of kerb-to-kerb bitumen, concrete kerbing and channelling, water reticulation, drainage costs, an allocation towards the cost of sewerage, and also an increment towards the cost of setting up a

park in the area. And it should not be forgotten that local authorities, by reason of the increased value that the property assumes as a result of being loaded with all those charges, get an increased income because they rate on the value of the properties.

There is no excuse for local authorities failing to draw up and adhere to reasonable budgets. If the Commonwealth Government had to pay for sewerage and city water supplies, there would be less money available for education and for irrigation projects, and these are the things that the Commonwealth should be pressed to do something about.

I can honestly say that the city of Rockhampton has no difficulty in balancing its budget on the lowest rates in this State, and the Rockhampton City Council does not ask for any other source of income or for anything other than the ordinary subsidies from the State and Commonwealth Governments. In my opinion, that is what a local authority is for—to do local jobs. It knows what those jobs are going to cost and imposes charges on the community accordingly. If people, having formed a council, are not prepared to pay for streets, footpaths, and drainage, what the dickens do they want a local authority for?

I cannot understand the complaints coming from local authorities. I believe that they have a real obligation to study the economics of their operations and balance their budgets. They have ample means available to them to compare their costs with those of other cities. In the case of the Rockhampton City Council, tenders are called before any project is undertaken. All the work is done by day labour, but the people doing it know that they have a target to achieve—keeping below the lowest private tender—and invariably they do better than they are required to do.

Mr. Hughes: Do you think that local authorities should run transport?

Mr. PILBEAM: In some cases they have an obligation to do so. I do not support the view that a local authority should provide a system of public transport, because almost invariably it involves the city in a loss. Again I cite the city of Rockhampton as an example of what can be done. The Rockhampton City Council has the only system of public transport in the State that very nearly broke even last year. That is a remarkable achievement.

I am pleased that the Budget makes provision for continued co-operation with private enterprise in the development of the large mineral deposits in Central Queensland and the continued development at Gladstone. I was a little bit disturbed when I heard the hon. member for Toowoomba East say earlier in this debate that the royalty on minerals was fairly poor, and he

cited the royalties on coal and bauxite. I think he should appreciate that that is only a very small part of the picture. What the State derives from mineral development goes much farther than the collection of royalties. I invite him to look at Gladstone and see the excellent development there and the development at Rockhampton, and to look, also, at places such as Emerald, Moura, and Blackwater. Look at the assistance given to the Railway Department, and, as the hon. member in question spoke about decentralisation, no area has shown a greater rate of decentralisation than Central Queensland. The collection of royalties is only a very small side of this great developmental picture.

I am pleased that provision is made for the expansion of electric power. A tremendous amount of capital is required in this direction, and the regional boards are experiencing difficulty in getting it.

What does not appear in the Budget, however, except in a very indirect way, is the avenues for people in all walks of life to help both themselves and their fellow citizens in many ways. I cite particularly the magnificent subsidies paid by both the Commonwealth and the State Governments in the housing of old people. Wonderful subsidies are already provided by the Commonwealth and State Governments in all aspects of education. The 50 per cent. subsidy that applies to most amenities at schools is a very great help. I venture to say that very few members would not have an interest in some school or another. This wonderful subsidy allows parents and citizens' associations to provide libraries and luxuries such as swimming pools, of which most towns already have one or two. It is a very generous subsidy and is much appreciated by all.

Particularly in the case of the institutes of technology that are now being set up, both State and Federal Governments offer a remarkable subsidy. We are foist with the responsibility of providing student accommodation at the institute of technology in Rockhampton, and we know that it will cost us approximately \$350,000 to house 100 students. To do that our target figure—the one we have to collect ourselves—is only \$87,500, because the State adds a \$1-for-\$1 subsidy, making it \$175,000, and the Commonwealth gives a matching grant of \$1-for-\$1. This means that we have to collect only one quarter of the actual cost to provide a handsome amenity that will house all the country students we can foresee in the next few years at the Capricornia Institute of Technology. No-one can tell me that in criticising a Budget one should not add on the other side of the balance sheet—particularly for the benefit of those who are prone to complain about budgets—something about these things. All these self-help efforts are reflected in more money being made available for other aspects of development, such as roads, water reticulation and education.

Reverting again to the subject of self-help—I cannot help reverting to it—I would say that the most outstanding example of self-help in the history of this country has been the development of Port Alma by the city of Rockhampton. I think this deserves a special chapter in the history of the day because, when the city assumed this responsibility at a time when nobody supported Port Alma—there was a broken-down wharf that did not even have a road connection over the mud flats at the estuary of the Fitzroy River—we could not find a friend. When we undertook to support its development and underwrite its future I was told very definitely that I was putting my head on the block and that there was no way in the world we would make a success of Port Alma.

I can assure hon. members that nothing can stop Port Alma from being a successful port. The latest development under way is for two more wharves in addition to the existing concrete wharf, for which we are signing an underwriting agreement with one of the biggest undertakings in the country—the I.C.I.A.N.Z. people, who run the large salt complex from which they will export over 400,000 tons of salt each year through Port Alma. In regard to this, and in our dealings with the Australian National Line, we are proving beyond doubt that two ports are necessary to cope with increasing exports from Central Queensland. In fact, steps are now being taken along the lines of setting up a third port in Central Queensland, possibly at Sabina Point.

Queensland has achieved remarkable and staggering development in the industrial field in the past decade, which clearly proves that the policies of the Country-Liberal form of Government—policies to provide the ingredients of water, power, transport facilities, port improvements, etc.—do encourage private investments in industry. I cite the example of Central Queensland to prove this point, because this area was recognised formerly as the most retarded part of the country and the area with the lowest population increase. Consider its remarkable record of achievement. Major projects recently completed in Central Queensland include—

	\$
Alumina refinery	115,000,000
Field's meatworks	4,000,000
I.C.I. salt works	2,500,000
Cement works	5,000,000
Lakes Creek, modernisation	2,500,000
Q.C.M.A. flour mill	500,000
Defiance flour mill	500,000
Harbour facilities at Gladstone and Port Alma	8,800,000
Mutton abattoir at Rockhampton	400,000
	\$139,200,000

Projects now under construction in Central Queensland include—

	\$
Brigalow land development scheme	31,500,000
Fitzroy River barrage	6,000,000
Gladstone water scheme	5,000,000
Alumina refinery expansion	50,000,000
Blackwater coal field	17,000,000
Gladstone fertiliser plant	3,000,000
Calcap Power Station	47,000,000
Moura-Gladstone railway	27,500,000
Government building programmes (hospitals, airports, etc.)	6,000,000
Rebuilding Rockhampton-Blackwater railway line	2,600,000
Rockhampton Power Station	1,800,000
Blackwater Weir	1,700,000
Rossllyn Bay Boat Harbour	300,000
Institute of Technology, Rockhampton	2,000,000
	\$201,400,000

Exciting projects that are now being investigated, some of which will come to fruition—I hope all of them will—include the Emerald irrigation scheme, an iron and steel works, an alkali industry, carbide manufacturing, nickel development (this is a very real one), sulphuric acid plant (another very real one), and further coal developments by Utah, B.H.P., and Clutha, which are very definite possibilities.

Despite these truly remarkable achievements in the private and public fields, the Opposition still complains bitterly about the failure of the Commonwealth and State Governments to promote industrial development.

In Central Queensland, under almost 40 years of Labour Government, not one major industrial enterprise was brought into being.

Mr. Houston: Nonsense!

Mr. PILBEAM: If I am wrong, I should like to hear about it now. I have given a long list of the industrial projects completed or now under construction in Central Queensland, which was once the most retarded part of the State. I again make the statement: in Central Queensland, under 40 years of Labour Government, not one major industrial enterprise was brought into being. If I am wrong I should like someone to tell me what enterprise it was. This clearly proves that, unlike the Country-Liberal policy, the Labour policy of socialisation and nationalisation drives industry away.

Self-help is also evidenced here by the Gladstone Harbour Board, the Rockhampton Harbour Board, the Rockhampton City Council and the Rockhampton Research and Promotion Bureau. As a result of this development we have an entirely different picture of employment in Central Queensland. Formerly, under successive Labour

Governments, Rockhampton and Gladstone had staggering figures of unemployment. It cannot be denied that at the end of the meat season in Gladstone a huge number of people were on the dole; the same thing occurred at Rockhampton. Whereas previously at the end of the meat export season there were 1,100 unemployed in Rockhampton, we are now down to about 300. From being in the worst position in Queensland, we are in just about the best at the present time. It is a complete metamorphosis. These figures can be produced by the Commonwealth Statistician. They are matters of truth and I will produce them if anybody challenges them.

The number of jobs in Rockhampton has almost doubled since the advent of automation. More married women are now working, and we need them to work. More people in Rockhampton have two jobs than ever before. Ten years ago, if a married woman took a job someone would write a letter to the Press complaining about single girls being put out of employment. We are now trying to get married women to take jobs. The situation in Central Queensland is vastly different from what it was previously. By no means can I run down this Government on that basis.

It is perhaps on the subject of water conservation that the complainers reach their greatest peak of vociferousness, and of course the Commonwealth Government is again the main target. We hear people like Mr. Whitlam and Dr. Rex Patterson complaining that the Commonwealth Government has not spent a cent on water conservation in Central Queensland. Surely they are speaking with tongue in cheek! No-one should know better than they that the State has sovereign powers which cannot be abrogated by the Commonwealth. Before any major water conservation scheme can be implemented and financed by the Commonwealth, a case has to be presented by the State Government. Let me tell hon. members that the great river system of the Fitzroy has been in existence for centuries, but it is only in the last 10 years that plans for the trapping and utilisation of these waters were prepared by a State Government.

All the possible water conservation schemes for the Fitzroy system are well known to the Department of Irrigation and Water Supply and they will be advanced in their right priorities. As everyone knows, a fully documented case for a major water conservation scheme on the Nogoa River, a tributary of the Fitzroy, has been prepared by the State Government and presented (and re-presented) to the Commonwealth Government.

Even in this direction a spirit of self-help—the spirit I like to see—is clearly evidenced by the people of Rockhampton and district. A great deal of the work necessary to prepare the case for this dam on the Nogoa was undertaken by the local research and promotion bureau, a private

organisation financed by the people of Rockhampton and district. They gave the self-help that I say all people should give before they criticise Governments. People should be prepared to do a little themselves. I ask hon. members to compare this with the record of the State Labour Government prior to 1957. In almost 40 years it did not present one case for a major water conservation scheme in the Fitzroy River basin.

Water conservation on a large scale is a vital necessity in Queensland. Major finance is inevitable, and it is just as inevitable that this major finance must be found. Much publicity has been given to the necessity to retain in this country the personnel constituting the Snowy Mountains Authority. Here, again, we must get our thinking right; most of the authority personnel are Australians; only comparatively few of the top echelon of engineers are from overseas. We have enough first-class engineers in this country to carry out all the water conservation schemes possible in this State, although certainly the desirability of retaining the services of the top personnel in the Snowy Mountains Authority cannot be gainsaid. What we want more than the personnel of the Snowy Mountains Authority is finance. We do not want the engineers; we want the money. We certainly do not lack engineers.

Mr. Walsh: Do you think the State should finance the schemes?

Mr. PILBEAM: No. The State is presenting a case to the Commonwealth. As I have said on previous occasions, I think the Commonwealth will come in on this one although the hon. member does not believe me.

Mr. Walsh: No, I do not believe you.

Mr. PILBEAM: I intended to make a few comments about roads, but I think I will reserve them until the debate on the Estimates for the Main Roads Department.

I listened with keen interest to the hon. member for Toowoomba West when, in his Budget speech, he propounded the theory that there should be, within the Premier's Department, a section dealing with new market trends. That section could induce primary and secondary industries to produce more crops or articles that could be sold on the new markets that must be found when Britain enters the Common Market. One industry that surely can be developed, because of Queensland's suitable climate and soil, is cotton.

I think there is merit in the suggestion of the hon. member for Toowoomba West, and I think that he would be fair enough to admit that private enterprise is already reaching out for these new markets. This applies particularly to the meat trade, with the diversification of markets now available to it. Where formerly meat ships went only to the United Kingdom and the United States, they now go to many ports in the East. The

hon. member for Toowoomba West would surely be fair enough to admit that the Commonwealth Government is giving all possible assistance to private enterprise in the development of new export markets. Anybody who has seen the television programme "Export Action" must admit that.

I appreciated the remarks of the hon. member for Toowong, who advocated considerable changes in the nature of various Government departments to meet the changing trends and the needs of the community. Whether we agree with that, or whether we agree that the new trends could be appreciated by the present Ministers and their departments, we must all agree that changed thinking on many matters is required in this modern day and age. After reading some of the figures I have quoted, I should not like to contemplate a change to another form of government. But the people are entitled to expect changed thinking on many of the controversial subjects discussed lately. I say quite definitely that what was considered to be a suitable type of administration 20 years ago certainly would not meet today's needs.

I refer particularly to the need for a new thinking on highways. I have spoken many times in this Chamber on the necessity for a highways system to be planned and financed separately and apart from other forms of roads in the various States. While speaking about roads, perhaps I will be permitted to digress and mention one road in which I am particularly interested, namely, the Windorah-Yaraka beef road. It is of particular significance this year because, following a reasonable season in the Channel Country, there has been quite a considerable movement in and out of this part of Australia. I have been able to ascertain that, for the last six months of the year, fat cattle coming out of the Yaraka area totalled 7,935 head and store cattle going into that area totalled 14,965 head, a total of 22,900 truckings. Those figures prove the necessity for bituminising the Windorah-Yaraka road to allow store cattle to go into this area and to allow fat cattle to go to the Central Queensland meat-works.

An article in "Queensland Country Life" under the title "Biggest Channel Country Turn-off" reads—

"The biggest consignment of cattle out of Channel country this season reached Cannon Hill saleyards on Wednesday."

The final paragraphs read—

"It was just fortuitous a flood in the Cooper had provided good channel fattening country. This was now drying off.

"Mr. Capper said the property cattle were always sent to the Brisbane market as transport arrangements were better than for any other market."

Why should not graziers in that area have the right to send their cattle where they wish? They should be able to take advantage of the highest prices offered on any market. But they say they must send their cattle to Cannon

Hill because this road is not bituminised. I say that those figures establish the need for such a road.

Mr. Walsh: Do you think Brisbane is getting the benefit of the beef roads?

Mr. PILBEAM: I say that the beef roads that have been constructed up till now have been almost entirely to aid meatworks in the North and the South. Meatworks operators in Central Queensland have asked for only one road in the whole scheme, and this is one that was half completed by, I hate to say, a Commonwealth Labour Government. That Government abandoned construction of that road years before it went out of office; it ran out of money and let it go.

Mr. Walsh interjected.

Mr. PILBEAM: That Government ran out of money and stopped the building of the road. I admit that we have had plenty of time to finish it, and I also admit the necessity for it. I again make representations to have completed the only road that we in Central Queensland have requested in the scheme.

I cite particularly the need for new thinking on education, and I appreciate the need for water conservation schemes on the principal rivers of Queensland. Co-operation between the State and the Commonwealth is necessary for these things. As I said before, I am quite sure that no change of Government is desirable. Labour policy, which failed in the past, would certainly fail again, because I have seen no evidence of change in recent years. In the meantime, I think I can rightly exhort the people to count their blessings and try to live contentedly, because contentment is on the inside, not the outside. Let there be an end to the continual complaining about one form of government or another, most of which is without any real justification. There are many avenues in both Budgets, Commonwealth and State, that allow of many forms of self-help under many headings. I say again that there is no excuse for constant criticism of the Commonwealth Government, because I think I have clearly proved that we are living more prosperously now than we ever did before. I conclude my remarks on that note.

Mr. ADAIR (Cook) (3.18 p.m.): I have always regarded the Budget debate as an excellent opportunity for a member representing a large electorate to work the parish pump and speak on matters relative to his area. So far as the Budget itself is concerned, never in the years during which I have represented Cook has it contained anything of great importance to that electorate. The position is just the same on this occasion.

The matter that I wish to discuss today, which I claim to be of major importance to my electorate, is the missing link road

between Daintree and China Camp, or Bloomfield. The Minister for Mines and Main Roads said in a Press statement on Friday or Saturday, in answer to a letter written by the Mayor of Cairns, that the construction of this 18 miles of road from Daintree River to China Camp would cost millions of dollars. The Minister does not know anything about this road; he has never been over it. He is acting only on the advice of the engineer who is administering the Cook Shire. In the past 14 years, neither former Ministers nor the present Minister have visited the area and travelled over the road. The Commissioner for Main Roads also is acting on the advice of the Administrator, and I claim that the Commissioner has never been in the area to see whether the advice he is receiving is correct. The Administrator of the Cook Shire has been opposed to the construction of the road ever since it was mooted. His "baby" is the Mulligan Highway. I have nothing against the construction of the Mulligan Highway, which has now been declared a beef road. Eventually it will, I hope, service the area right up the Cape and go through to Bamaga. However, although it has been declared a beef road, there is no way in the world that it will be completed in under 50 years or be an all-weather road if the present rate of progress in its construction is maintained. Ironstone gravel is taken from the side of the road and used for surfacing it and, with the heavy trailer trucks that are used to transport cattle in the area, it does not take very long for the road to get a corduroy surface. That is quite unsuitable for the transport of cattle, which are bruised very severely under such conditions. The Mulligan Highway will never be a first-class road until the Government spends millions of dollars on its construction. An enormous amount of money will have to be spent on building suitable bridges.

As I said earlier, the Minister claims that the road about which I have been speaking for the past 14 years will cost millions of dollars to construct. It is virtually half-constructed now, and four-wheel drive trucks are travelling from Cairns to Cooktown over the road built by the Cairns Regional Electricity Board. The board's engineer who constructed the road did not find any obstacles. He went over the mountains, took the line of least resistance as the crow flies, and constructed the road. A few months ago I came down from Cooktown to Mossman over that road in a 30-passenger bus.

Probably I shall not have another opportunity to speak at such length about the construction of this road, so I am stressing now how important it is to Cooktown, which is the most neglected town in Queensland. In fact, the road is a "must". The Government has virtually given Cooktown away. It has decided to build the Mulligan Highway and has said, "That is enough for Cooktown."

It closed the Cooktown-Laura railway line, and I claim that the money it received from the sale of the rails on that line would have paid for the construction of the road to which I am referring. Even the royalty on the stand of timber through which C.R.E.B. went would more than pay for the construction of this road. It is the largest stand of good scrub softwoods in the State of Queensland. If that stand of timber was anywhere else in the State there would be a bitumen road put through it, but the Minister takes the advice of the Administrator of the Cook Shire, and the Commissioner for Main Roads on the building of this road. Although those gentlemen have not been over it, they would not experience any trouble in doing so. They could get into a four-wheel drive vehicle and in five to six hours drive from Cairns right through to Cooktown. I invite the Minister to go out there and have a look for himself. I am sure he will then realise that his statement in the Press is not true and that he has been given wrong advice by the Administrator of the Cook Shire.

On this road the only bridge that would have to be built would be over the Daintree River, and that would be merely a one-span bridge. There are creeks, of course, over which culverts would have to be put, but the stand of timber through which the road would run is one of the largest of both softwood and hardwood timber in the State, and I repeat that the royalties from it would more than pay for the construction of the road.

In the 1957 election campaign the Premier spoke in my electorate on behalf of the person who was then contesting the seat of Cook and, on that occasion, he promised that if his Government was returned he would build this road. He promised further that he would continue the Cook Highway on to Cooktown and from there to the top of Cape York. The first question I asked in this Chamber after his return to office related to the construction of this road and the Premier replied that he had been wrongly informed and that it would cost millions of pounds to put this road through, and he referred also to the £31,000, in subsidy and outright grants, that was offered to the Douglas Shire Council. It knocked back the offer because of the Premier's promise at that time that he would construct this road if elected. I repeat now that £31,000 would still construct that road, in spite of the advice of the engineer who is definitely against its construction.

In addition to the stand of timber I have mentioned, the road would traverse an area that B.H.P. has drilled for tin. It is an alluvial area and B.H.P. reports disclose rich pockets of tin. The deposits are not suitable for a company like B.H.P. but they are very suitable for and could be worked by a group of prospectors of, say, three to six men. The area also has rich agricultural soil, as, I am sure, the Minister for Works and Housing would concede. He knows the area.

I am battling for this road because the Mulligan Highway, although declared as a beef road, will not for many years be built to the standard of an all-weather road. I repeat that the road I seek is a "must" if Cooktown is to survive. The people of Cooktown are hanging on in the hope that the road will be built in the very near future. C.R.E.B. engineers went through the area and constructed a road suitable for four-wheel drive vehicles. Without great expenditure the grades could be reduced so that the road would be trafficable for ordinary motor vehicles. It would cut 60 miles off the distance via the Milligan Highway, and could be made an all-weather road. For five months of the year the Mulligan Highway cannot be used.

The Government has little interest in Cooktown. At one time it was one of the biggest towns in Queensland with a population of over 45,000. The original buildings are still there. The old school, court-house and police station are still standing. No new Government building has been constructed in Cooktown in the last 40 years. It is a great shame that Cooktown has been neglected by this Government. Here is an opportunity for the Government to do something for this dying town. Unless it acts soon the people will not remain there; they will have to go elsewhere. The tearing up of the Cooktown-Laura railway line forced a lot of people out of the area. Many of them are now living in Mareeba and Cairns. Cooktown is already the Cinderella town of Queensland and if the Government does not do something for it very shortly it will become a ghost town.

I suppose that 50 per cent. of the people who travel to the North go on to Cooktown. Because of its association with Captain Cook and the "Endeavour", they like to be able to say that they have been there. It is one of the main tourist attractions in the Far North. If the Government would construct this road it would provide one of the most attractive tourist drives in the State. It is accepted generally that Cairns and its hinterland provide the best scenic attractions in the State. The tourist can travel for 500 miles on bitumen roads around the Atherton Tableland and through Mareeba, down the Palmerston Highway and on to Innisfail. I do not think there is any other part of the State with more natural tourist attractions than the Cairns district.

As this will probably be my last opportunity to press for this road, I remind the Premier that, in 1957, he promised that the Government if returned to office would construct it. He later claimed that he had been misinformed about the cost of constructing it. The stretch from Daintree to Bloomfield has been built by C.R.E.B., although I admit it is a four-wheel-drive road. It could be built for less than the sum of \$62,000 which I claimed it would cost at that time. This road should be made a first-class road and I now ask the Premier

to honour the promise he gave before the 1957 election. It is essential to have a first-class road if Cooktown is to go ahead.

I give credit to Mr. Cecil Holdcroft, chairman of the Cairns Regional Electricity Board, and to Mr. Sharman, also of the Cairns Regional Electricity Board, for extending the electric power-line to Cooktown. That is typical of developmental work sponsored by Mr. Holdcroft and Mr. Sharman. They are interested in the development of rural areas. I believe it is only through their interest that electric power was extended to Cooktown, and that the road was constructed. I have talked about this road as much as I want to, but I still claim it is the Government's responsibility to do something for Cooktown.

A new school should be built as quickly as possible. The present building is old; in fact, it is the original building, and has been there since the town was first established. The police station and the court-house are old buildings. New buildings are urgently required in the town. Cooktown has not got reticulated water despite the fact that water is available from the Endeavour River, the Annie River and an underground source.

The Administrator of the area is not concerned about these matters. The Government should make sure he provides all these necessary amenities. I cannot even make representations in this Assembly about Cooktown because the Administrator is a Cabinet appointee. I have asked the Minister for Local Government questions on several occasions about these matters and have been told to see the Administrator. He is not concerned about the people in the area. He ignores my request and does not do anything. I might as well not be here as the elected representative of the district because the Administrator runs the area. It is useless for me to approach even the Premier and ask him to do something because the Administrator has all the say as to what will happen. I am not "crooked" on the man but as the member for the area I believe I should have some say in what happens; I should have some say as the representative of the people in Cooktown. In this Assembly any hon. member can ask a question and get satisfaction. He can be told, "It can be done," or "It cannot be done." In these matters, however, I am referred to the Administrator, and I might as well talk to the "black stump" or to "Blind Freddie."

Mr. Walsh: You consider that your views should be given more consideration because you know the area?

Mr. ADAIR: Of course. Neither the Minister nor any previous Minister has been over this road, yet the Minister says that to construct this 18 miles of road would cost millions of dollars. It is mostly Crown land. Even the Commissioner of Main Roads gets his information from the Administrator. He is definitely against constructing this road.

The Mulligan Highway is his responsibility, and to him that is the only road, and it will be the only road because nobody else is interested in the other road. I have always been interested in it and will be until I leave Parliament.

Mr. Walsh: Is Ken Morris backing you?

Mr. ADAIR: No. He has never been over this road. The road must be built for the survival of Cooktown. The Premier was advised by the Administrator, through the Commissioner of Main Roads, that this road should not be built. This road is a "must" for Cooktown. It is 60 miles shorter than the Mulligan Highway. It goes through the richest timber reserve in the State which contains millions of super feet of scrub timbers, pines, softwoods, millable timbers, plywood, and hardwood. The Department of Forestry has constructed roads in the Mossman area and around the Black Mountains, but they have become overgrown with trees. This road should be built into China Camp so that this timber can be got out. The royalties from the timber would help to pay for the road, and the road would help Cooktown to survive. The Cairns Regional Electricity Board has already constructed half of this road. It can be traversed by ordinary cars, a 30-passenger bus has been over it, and four-wheel-drive vehicles have no trouble negotiating it. By side-swiping the mountains and cutting down the grades the road could be made trafficable at little expense. Culverts would be required, but the only river to be crossed is the Daintree and it would need only a one-span bridge. If it was a case of another lane to the South Coast, it would be provided merely for the asking.

Mr. Carey: I am going to ask for another one today.

Mr. ADAIR: All the hon. member for Albert has to do is ask for it, and that road is used only by a few tourists and pleasure-seekers who go there to spend week-ends. The road to which I refer would keep a town alive and open up thousands of acres of good land. The road to the South Coast is merely swelling the pockets of a few millionaires.

Mr. Carey: It's the biggest industry in the State.

Mr. ADAIR: Probably it is.

I should now like to deal with the development of Cape York Peninsula. I spoke in the Address-in-Reply debate about the opening up of this country by the Americans and Sir William Gunn's party. I said then that I entirely supported the introduction of their capital to the area and the buying out of graziers who were there for years living a very hard life. I do not think that any graziers in any other part of the world had to contend with tougher conditions than did the original settlers in Cape York. As I have mentioned in this Chamber on several occasions, it used to take 12 to 14 weeks

to bring cattle down from the top of Cape York Peninsula to the market across the Byerstown Range, where they had to be thrown and shod, and I do not know of any other part of the world where that has to be done, but with the inauguration of sea transport in 1953 with the barge "Wewak" cattle could be shipped to saleyards in Cairns in 36 hours.

Great difficulty was often experienced in getting supplies to these remote areas. They had to be shipped to Marina Plains and carted from 40 miles to 100 miles to Coen and then out to the properties. I have known occasions when graziers were without supplies for five months. Flour would stick to the bags and the weevils would have to be sifted out before it could be used for cooking. Today, with the work that has been carried out on the road, trucks and cars can be driven to Coen if the conditions are suitable. I would not take my car to Weipa; I tried it once but never again. The Minister said in his statement that a car travelled from Weipa in 22 hours. I am prepared to bet that it was a Government-owned car that could be knocked about without causing much concern. I certainly would not take my car there in 22 hours. I know that the Mayor of Cairns is trying to have this road put through to Weipa. I do not really know what his purpose is. Such a road would service the grazing properties along the route, but Weipa itself is a closed town. Tourists would be a nuisance at Weipa, and I do not think they would get accommodation there. If a person who wishes to travel to Weipa goes to Ansett-A.N.A. and tries to buy a ticket, the company wants to know whether he has authority from Comalco to go there. If he has not, it will not issue a ticket to him.

I cannot see any purpose in building a road to Weipa, other than to serve the grazing properties adjacent to it.

Mr. R. Jones: The road to Coen would serve those properties.

Mr. ADAIR: It is 150 miles farther to the west, and a road there would be of advantage. The road that the Mayor of Cairns should be interested in is the missing link between Cairns and Cooktown, the construction of which, I claim, is of vital importance to Cooktown.

Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt: Do you still think that a good job is being done in the country that has been opened?

Mr. ADAIR: I think that the graziers are doing an excellent job. They are spending a great deal of money. For example, on one property 800 tons of fertiliser have been spread from the air and, in addition, many tons of lucerne seed have been planted. I have been told that the number of cattle coming from the area will be doubled in five or six years, and I believe it because so much money has been spent already on fencing, the construction of homes, fertilising, the planting of seeds, and the clearing of timber. One

property has already produced several bales of Townsville lucerne for the milking cows, and I believe that, as time goes on, the production in Cape York Peninsula will be doubled or trebled. The graziers who were there formerly did not have sufficient money to spend on developing their properties; the people who have taken over from them have. I believe that the green light has been given to vast development.

I turn now to the tobacco industry. Yesterday afternoon a big hail-storm occurred in the Paddy's Green area and out near Dimbulah, and much of the tobacco was ruined by the hail. Harvesting is due to take place in about three weeks or a month's time, and many of the farmers will be ruined. It is unfortunate that such a storm should occur at this stage, but that is only one of the problems that people face when they go onto the land.

The 1968 tobacco crop is well on its way, but the operations of over 500 growers in the Far North are uneconomic because the quotas are too low. I do not think any hon. member will quarrel with me when I say that the quota allocated to many of the farmers is too low to enable them to make a decent living. Excluding last season, in the preceding two seasons 150 growers in the Far North survived only by selling over-quota leaf. If the present unstable and inconsistent market pattern continues, many growers with fair average crops—and principally those with low quotas—will face ruin. I have spoken to many growers, especially in the Mary River and other tobacco-growing areas in the Mareeba district, and several of them have told me that with the low quotas and the prices they got last season they will be forced off their farms. Only a slight further turn of the screw is needed to completely wreck the industry in North Queensland.

In the Far North tobacco is produced mainly in the Mareeba and Dimbulah areas. The yields are about equal, but Dimbulah gets the better price. The Tinaroo irrigation project has cost about \$30,000,000 so far and the production from the area it covers is worth annually \$12,000,000 to \$13,000,000. That is a big return from an area such as this. An outstanding example of practical northern development is the investment by farmers in this area of a further \$30,000,000. The cost of electric light and power supply, research and extension services, health, educational and postal facilities, road and transport services and investment by private business represents another \$30,000,000. These figures give a total of almost \$90,000,000 invested in the North Queensland tobacco industry. With such an amount invested in this industry surely it deserves full protection from Governments, both State and Federal.

The solution to the problem is an increase in the quantity to be purchased each year by manufacturers from 26,000,000 lb. to 28,000,000 lb. The growers all realise that the present poundage of tobacco is insufficient. They think it should be raised from

26,000,000 lb. to 28,000,000 lb. in order to give farmers in the area an equal chance of survival. This will not put growers on an economic footing; it will merely give them a chance to survive, which I believe is the very least they are entitled to.

Mr. Muller: Does that apply to the chaps in the irrigated area as well?

Mr. ADAIR: This is all irrigated area. It would need an Australian total of well over 29,000,000 lb. to put all Queensland growers on a sound footing. The next step would be to make sure that price levels on the selling floor are applied as it was intended that they should apply. There are wide variations in the price offered for leaf of similar grade and quality and this should not be permitted. I have seen it repeatedly at sales in Mareeba. Buyers come to the sales and the price they offer very often depends on what mood they are in or on how much they were entertained the night before. That is not my statement; everybody up there, including farmers themselves, will say the same thing. There is no consistency in the buying.

Mr. Aikens: Do some of the buyers work on the "kick back" system from the growers?

Mr. ADAIR: I do not know about that but it could be so. However, I could not substantiate it.

Several thousand Australians in North Queensland depend directly on tobacco for a living. Many more thousands depend indirectly on it. They are not merely talking about development of the North; they are actually engaged in it. Production each year is worth \$12,000,000 to \$13,000,000. I do not think the Government has ever had another scheme that has given such a high return on the money expended. It is up to the Government to ensure that the industry is protected. All that is needed for its protection is an increase in the percentage of Australian leaf in the manufacture of cigarettes. An increase from 26,000,000 lb. to 28,000,000 lb. would put the farmers on a reasonable footing and an increase to 29,000,000 lb. would make their future secure. And even this increase would give an Australian leaf content of only 60 per cent. in tobacco and cigarettes. I cannot see why this cannot be done; I cannot see why we cannot use 100 per cent. Australian-grown tobacco; I cannot see why we should have to import any tobacco leaf at all. At the present time we are growing only half the quantity of tobacco used in Australia. I cannot see why the Government cannot increase the percentage in order to make the industry stable and secure.

Mr. Aikens: Can a farmer grow over his quota? If he does has he any chance of selling it?

Mr. ADAIR: Up to last season many farmers on low quotas were existing simply because of their over-quota leaf. They

depended on the sale of their over-quota leaf. Last season much of it was not sold. From now on probably they will not be able to sell the over-quota leaf.

Mr. Muller: What would they get for the over-quota leaf?

Mr. ADAIR: It all depends on the grading of it. Probably they would get the standard price for good leaf and lower prices for the rest of it.

Mr. Muller: They haven't got to take any old price?

Mr. ADAIR: They have had to accept the price offered otherwise they would not have been able to sell it. At times they have taken any old price that has been offered. They have taken as low as 50 cents and 60 cents a lb. whereas, they claim, the cost of production is 80 or 90 cents a lb., and consequently on anything sold under 80 cents or 90 cents a lb. they would be suffering a loss.

I draw attention to a recent article in "The Cairns Post" which dealt with a statement made in the Federal House by the Federal member for Leichhardt. The article is headed "Natives not taught pearl culture." That is quite true. When the Japanese were brought out here to practise pearl culture in the Torres Strait area they agreed to teach the islanders their secrets of pearl culture which involve inserting a nucleus into the pearl oyster. The Federal member pointed out that they have not done this. The article continues—

"Not one individual native has been taught this work and it is time the Government looked at the industry to see what is going on." This comment was made by the Member for Leichhardt (Mr. W. J. Fulton) in his Budget debate speech in Canberra.

"Mr. Fulton added that the only persons who have really profited from the industry are the Japanese and those people who are looking after their interests."

He meant by that the managers of the Japanese pearl culture companies of which there are five or six. The managers of these Japanese pearl culture companies are experienced pearl-ers who have lived virtually all their lives in the Torres Strait working with the mother-of-pearl shell. They are all master pearl-ers who have been chosen by the Japanese to manage their interests here. They are highly paid men and they are also highly qualified. They are probably the only men who can manage the companies. They know the pearling industry inside out.

The Torres Strait Islanders are employed in the pearl-culture industry to dive for what is called baby shell. They dive for it on reefs such as Darnley and bring the baby shell to the pearl-culture beds where they are placed in crates. The Japanese then put the nucleus into the shells and the pearls form. It is quite true, as he says in his

article, that the pearls are collected and sent to Japan, and that the Japanese then sell them on the world market. However, I claim he is wrong when he states that nothing is being done for the Torres Strait Islanders, because many Torres Strait Islanders are working for the pearling companies. They used to work on the boats for low wages but today they are getting the basic wage. I claim that pearl culture is a new industry in the area. It has replaced the risky deep-diving for mother-of-pearl. The mother-of-pearl must be in excellent condition or it is not bought at a decent price whereas the baby shell necessary for pearl culture is plentiful, and they get \$1.25 for it. They are making good money from it.

The industry is employing many islanders, and will continue to do so for a long time. I believe it will expand and in time there should not be much unemployment amongst Torres Strait Islanders. But for this industry I do not know how work could be found for these men because there are very few avenues of employment.

Further down in his article he states that the Torres Strait Islanders are Australians. There is no doubt about that. The majority of the men fought in the last war or, at least, they were in the Army. He states that most of the eligible labourers are working on the mainland for the Queensland Government Railways and that the women-folk and the girls and boys going to school on the islands are subject to the influence of bad types of natives coming from New Guinea. I maintain that that statement is not correct. Some of our islands such as Saibai Island and Boigu are close to the New Guinea mainland, and the New Guinea natives come over to them but each of the islands has a police force composed of at least three policemen, a sergeant and two others.

Mr. Aikens: They are native police.

Mr. ADAIR: Yes, they are islanders. They are mostly big fellows who are trained for their job. In addition, there is the chairman of the island and the island councillors. There is no way the New Guinea natives could force themselves on the people on these islands; if they did, the police would soon arrest them. I cannot see how the member for Leichhardt can claim that these natives are forcing themselves on the island people.

Mr. Aikens: Did he visit the islands or did he get his information secondhand?

Mr. ADAIR: He had not been there prior to the last election, but I think he has visited some of the islands recently.

The article continues—

"He stated that an old boat, the 'Melbidir' serves the islands. So much superstructure had been added to it that it is likely to turn over in a wind. It is a slow boat. Not only does it carry cargo but it transports the natives when

they come to the mainland for medical and dental treatment. There are no cabins on the boat, and the natives sit on the cover of the front hold. If the weather is rough, or if it is raining, they get wet. The boat carries about 60 native passengers—men, women and children—but has only one toilet."

That is pretty right, too. This boat is used to transport goods to the Islanders. It carries about 400 tons. If the Islanders want to go from one island to the other, for instance, from Murray to Darnley, Boigu, or Thursday Island, they are transported free, and they get food on the boat on the way over. There is no accommodation on the boat. There are bunks for the island seamen who work on the boat. When the Islanders come onto the forward deck, they spread out their blankets and sleep on them. If it is raining, or if there is a heavy wind, a canvas covering is put right around, but probably some rain does come in. I agree that we should have a better boat and that the "Melbidir" is not suitable for the run. I do not know how much it would cost to get a better boat for this service, but I think the Government should spend some money on a new boat.

The article also states—

"This is the type of boat the Queensland Government uses to serve the Torres Strait islands. The Commonwealth Government should give more aid to the Queensland Government . . ."

Just before that there appears—

"The Queensland Government should give these islands to the Federal Government to administer, because the islands are not being administered properly at present," said Mr. Fulton. "In one way I do not blame the State Government. It has not the resources to undertake proper administration."

I do not know what he means by that. When I retire I would like to live there. I know I would never die from a heart complaint or from ulcers because conditions on the islands are ideal. There are qualified school-teachers on the islands and the Islanders have all the medical care they want. There are certificated sisters—sometimes the wives of the school-teachers—and on some islands there are native girls or women who look after the health of the children and people on those islands.

I do not agree that the State Government is not administering the islands properly. Anybody who makes that claim should go to Sigaibadu Mission on the coast of New Guinea and look at the conditions there. Those who went across to New Guinea will remember that the dogs there could hardly stand up; they had to lean against posts or fall down. The people had scales or a rash all over their bodies, and the babies were similarly affected. We went to the first-aid post, which was a sort of box one could just fit into, but I could not see anything there for the rendering of first aid. On the islands

under our control the people look well, and it would be difficult to imagine healthier and brighter children

Mr. Aikens: What is the significance of Senator Heatley's remarks about Islanders and health problems?

Mr. ADAIR: I do not know. They could relate to V.D., although when I was last at Thursday Island I was told that it has been pretty well cleaned up. I was surprised to see that reference in the Press, and I still do not believe that what was said is correct. My information from the superintendent of the hospital was to the effect that V.D. was well under control.

Mr. Walsh: I think he must have been referring to the islands under Commonwealth jurisdiction.

Mr. ADAIR: I asked a question this morning about Japanese fishermen taking giant clam shells off the reefs outside Mossman and Cooktown. It is claimed that they are in abundance on those reefs, and that the Japanese take the slugs out of the giant clam shells and use them as a substitute for crab meat, or that they are mixed with crab meat and sold on the market.

(Time expired.)

Mr. CAREY (Albert) (4.18 p.m.): I take the opportunity to speak during this debate for three specific reasons, one being that I want to bring before the Committee and the appropriate Ministers certain items of interest for the further development and prosperity of the best part of the State of Queensland, namely, the Albert electorate.

Secondly, I want to deal with some of the items in the Budget that need impressing on the people of Queensland to show what a wonderful budget it is, and to congratulate the Treasurer on presenting it.

Thirdly, I want to put some of the facts straight so that the man in the street will know that many of the things that have been said by Opposition members need clarifying, as they are not too sure what they have been talking about.

I commence by congratulating the Treasurer on the presentation of his second Budget. I am certain in this I speak for all members on the Government side and also many on the other side who would also be prepared to congratulate him if they were not Opposition members. Only one section of the community is really disappointed with the 1967-68 Budget—hon. members opposite. The man in the street believes it is really a wonderful Budget. There has been no increase in State Government rates, freights, or taxes, and that always appeals to each one of us, if we are completely honest with ourselves.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. CAREY: As soon as anything touches their pockets, hon. members opposite scream just as loudly as the man in the street. I assure them that the man in the street is very satisfied with the second Budget brought down by the Treasurer.

This excellent Budget has been produced under rather adverse circumstances. Last year was a fairly difficult year, because the State was affected by drought, floods, and a number of other problems, and I shall mention later some of the expenditure that the Treasurer was forced to make which no Government should have had to make had the season been good. It is an even better Budget than the one brought down by the Treasurer last year, because it sets aside certain moneys for unforeseen contingencies that may arise in this financial year. If no droughts and floods occur, I believe that the surplus will be much higher than that for which the Treasurer has budgeted. Had the Budget for 1966-67 been in the hands of a man less able than Mr. Chalk to carefully husband the financial resources and revenue of the State, Queensland could have been faced with a very much larger deficit. In fact, the Treasurer has reduced the deficit from about \$7,000,000 when he took office, to about \$4,000,000. I believe that he deserves commendation for this.

Revenue for 1967-68 is expected to increase by \$21,007,178, and the proposed expenditure for 1967-68 is \$344,765,370. The Treasurer has budgeted for a surplus of \$22,600, and I am very confident that, because of the way in which he and his officers control the income and expenditure of the State, an additional surplus will be forthcoming.

I suppose many hon. members opposite have not even had a look at the Probable Ways and Means of Expenditure. They had a full week to study the Budget. But they probably went home and slept, or put their feet up and enjoyed themselves, and did not worry even a little bit about their constituents.

Mr. Melloy: What did you do?

Mr. CAREY: In my case, I studied the Budget and the Probable Ways and Means. Hon. members will find that there are seven headings on pages vi and vii, and, of the seven sections, six are expected to bring in increased revenue. The only section that is down is the one under the heading "Territorial", and there is a perfect reason why the Territorial income should be down. I am sure the hon. member for Barcoo will give the Government a pat on the back for this, because the territorial section deals with land revenue, land rents, pastoral rents, selections, survey fees, freehold land sales, and so on.

Mr. O'Donnell: I am not very keen on the latter.

Mr. CAREY: I think it is a wonderful thing; it shows that the Government is truly a Country-Liberal Government, very anxious

to assist the man on the land. There is also a slight decrease under the heading of "Mining", but this, of course, will be overcome and the actual receipts could be very much greater than the estimate when next year's Budget is presented.

On the expenditure side there are only two departments that are down in the estimated required amount for 1967-68. These demonstrate a very unselfish approach by the Treasurer. His own department is down some \$600,000. The other department, down some \$100,000, is the Department of Primary Industries. I may agree with the Treasurer's departmental Estimates being down, but I do not like to see a reduction in the amount set aside for expenditure in the primary industries field. However, I suppose he knows more about that than I do.

Table C4, on page 17 of the Tables relating to the Financial Statement, is another item that I think is worth bringing to the notice of hon. members. Of course, many of the matters that members of the Opposition bring before the Committee are brought forward in an endeavour to discredit the present Country-Liberal Government—of course, without success. We know our abilities, and the people know them better than we do.

Table C4, headed "Consolidated Revenue Fund", contains statistics covering the period from 1859 to 1967. This is a wonderful page to study. All Governments have their ups and downs, and for the 10 years from about 1927 to about 1937 the Labour Government had deficits. They could be forgiven for this because it was during 10 years of depression, which was world wide.

Mr. Bennett: You would not know anything about budgets.

Mr. CAREY: I think I know as much about a budget as the hon. member for South Brisbane does.

From 1957 until about 1965, again in six years of drought, we have had some deficits in our Budgets, but when one realises that over this period of almost 100 years covered in this table there has been a total deficit of only \$37,250,000, Queensland has done a wonderful job.

So again I say, let us compliment our Treasurer and wish him a successful year in 1967-68, without any droughts or floods or cyclones to take off more money than he expects.

Let me deal with a few of the comments of hon. members opposite in their efforts to try to discredit the Government. I really have no criticism of them because, after all, any Opposition worth its salt must endeavour to break down the confidence the public has in the Government so that it, in turn, can occupy the Treasury benches.

Mr. Sullivan: They put up a weak case.

Mr. CAREY: They certainly have a weak case. The man in the street is very happy

with the work we are doing and with the Budget we have presented. He realises it is a very weak case that the Labour Party is putting up.

The Leader of the Opposition said that Government members are the guilty members. He suggested that we must consider ourselves the guilty members.

Mr. O'Donnell: You haven't done much over the years you have been there.

Mr. CAREY: The hon. gentleman agrees that we are the guilty members?

Mr. O'Donnell: Of course you are.

Mr. CAREY: Of course; I agree with that. We are guilty of bringing the State of Queensland into the greatest era of prosperity ever known in this State or any other State in the Commonwealth of Australia. If that is what the hon. gentleman calls "guilt", the man outside gives us credit for it. If the Labour Party wants to make us the guilty men we will accept that guilt, because never before has the State enjoyed such marvellous prosperity. The people are very satisfied with what we are doing.

I wish to comment on a remark by the hon. member for Toowoomba West. He said that the seven-year itch in marriage was a small thing compared with the 10-year danger period for a Government. He was talking about a different Government to this; he was talking about the Government he knew. The hon. member for Toowoomba West is a long-time parliamentarian, a very capable man and a very good speaker. It is good to see that he is becoming worried about our livelihood, but does not he, as a married man, realise that the marriage between people keeps on improving year after year, and that the longer people are married the closer their relationship becomes? I assure him that this marriage of the coalition parties—we have family squabbles of course—is stronger today than it was when the seven-year itch worried the hon. member.

I wish to say a little about the comments of my fellow retailer on the Labour side. There are only two of us in the Chamber—two genuine retailers in the person of Mr. Ted Harris, the hon. member for Wynnum, and myself. I want to comment on his one-man mannequin parade. I was wondering if I might be able to take off my coat and get some of the very good publicity that he obtained for himself. He deplored the fact that the clothes he produced had been made by prisoners at the gaol. I am glad he did. It was right that he should do so because he supports private enterprise. He is a private-enterprise man himself; he knows private enterprise takes care of these things. It is a grand compliment to this State that the hon. member realises this and supports the private enterprise that he knows so well, and that I know so well, and in which we both grew up.

Mr. Davies: Who gave you your brief?

Mr. CAREY: I would not get a brief from the hon. member. He offered me some sand from Yangan. How in the name of fortune could we put that half-gravel rubbish on our beautiful Gold Coast beaches?

Mr. Bennett interjected.

Mr. CAREY: I give the hon. member for South Brisbane full credit for being a very intelligent and capable barrister, but it is quite natural that he cannot join forces with many commoners as he is a professional man who knows little, if anything, about the commercial world. He criticised my ability to speak on the Budget, but when he criticises the Police Force persistently as he does, I am rather astounded. Any commercial man knows that on a board of directors there is the chairman of the board, who in this case is the Minister, Honourable J. C. A. Pizzey; then there is the managing director, who is the Commissioner of Police, and then there are many other directors who are the deputy commissioners, and so on. I am at a loss to understand why in the name of goodness the hon. member for South Brisbane should continually criticise the running of this department, when, in fact, he is criticising the directors and the management of the department. I was further surprised today—and agreeably surprised—to find that his colleague, the hon. member for Kedron, was defending the very police-station members whom the hon. member for South Brisbane recently attacked.

Mr. Bennett: That is only because he does not know the real story; he does not know what he is talking about.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. CAREY: As a shareholder in this great State of ours—as a matter of fact, the hon. member draws his dividends fairly frequently—it might be a good idea if the hon. member were to leave the management of these various departments to the Minister and his directors.

Mr. Walsh interjected.

Mr. CAREY: This afternoon I heard the hon. member for Rockhampton South say that Governments, generally, do not like changes. The hon. member for Bundaberg, being the old campaigner that he is, would not appreciate this new suggestion. The affairs of State, particularly the little ones—the big ones we can change—should be left to the Minister and the various departmental officers.

I have a few comments to make—I am sure every hon. member opposite will back me on this—concerning representations to the Minister for assistance in getting more work in my area. As Opposition members are anxious to see more employment in this State they will naturally want to have more work done in my area, because the majority of the people in the State wish to reside there,

although many of them, because of circumstances, are forced to live at Cooktown or elsewhere. The more work we have in our area the better. When there is plenty of work there we could outdo the Greater Brisbane area in population, because many people are living on the Gold Coast and working in Brisbane.

I specifically and especially ask the Treasurer, through you, Mr. Hooper, as Minister controlling the Department of Harbours and Marine, to consider spending a large sum of money on dredging the Nerang River and the Broadwater. Some hon. members may claim this is tedious repetition—and so it is. Like my friend the hon. member for Cook, Mr. "Bunny" Adair, I shall continue to fight for the development of the Nerang River and the Broadwater. If this waterway was in America it would be of national importance. I claim that it is today of national importance. Only last week I received a letter from the Treasurer informing me that his department intended to purchase transistorised beacon lights so that tourists could travel down these lovely waterways at night-time. But the time is long overdue when a large amount of money should be spent on the waterways, because they are silting up.

Mr. Melloy: They have neglected you.

Mr. CAREY: They have not neglected me. But we certainly could not sail the "Melbidir" down there. If we did, the hon. member for Nudgee would not be allowed on board.

The condition of the Broadwater and the Nerang River is starting to affect the tourist traffic. We have wonderful tourist-boat owners who are taking many thousands of passengers along these waterways. Since the last flood a sandbank has formed where the old Jubilee Bridge was situated—of course, it has been removed—and it is now almost impossible for these pleasure launches to get over this sandbank.

Mr. Sherrington: You should get Alderman Harley to help you.

Mr. CAREY: Mr. Harley is the least of my worries.

I should like a dredge permanently stationed in these waters so that these sandbanks can be removed as soon as they form. The Grand Channel and parts of the Nerang River are continually silting up. The Minister should consider stationing a dredge there so that it can continually remove these sandbanks. If the Treasurer wanted to make money out of the operation, he could sell the surplus sand to landowners on the foreshores as filling. This is an urgent necessity and I hope the Minister will accede to my request.

I place before the Minister for Transport, the Honourable Bill Knox, a sincere request to set aside the railway land on the western side of Scarborough Street. He could hand

it over to some authority—I am not particular which authority gets it. I believe it is possible for the department to hand over this unused, unwanted, vacant railway land to the Department of Lands, which could then become the owner or trustee of it and could let it out for certain purposes. This is very important to the people of Southport. I have mentioned this previously in the Chamber.

Mr. Bromley interjected.

Mr. CAREY: We will get a transport connection, but it will not be from a Labour Government. This Government will eventually provide my area with some means of fast transport. It may not be a railway; it may be a monorail, a private aeroplane, or a hovercraft service over the water.

Mr. Aikens: I'll lend you my bike, for a start.

Mr. CAREY: I do not want to answer that. I might say something that would not look very well in "Hansard".

The original land on the eastern side of Scarborough Street has been sold for a considerable amount of money. In the main it was purchased by local residents, and new shops and offices will be built facing Scarborough Street. The land facing Railway Street will also have a number of shops. I do not know whether they are to be of two storeys.

Mr. Bromley: They tell me you got in on the ground floor and bought it cheaply from the Government.

Mr. CAREY: I do not stoop to that sort of thing. In fact, I cannot remember ever doing anything like that. Perhaps the hon. member for Norman would be tempted to do so if his was such a fast-growing area and he could see an opportunity to make a lot of money. I believe that this land, which has been declared vacant and useless to the Railway Department, belongs to the people.

Mr. Sherrington: No.

Mr. CAREY: Yes, it does. For many years the Government has been establishing railway stations and providing a railway service for the people, and, if that service is taken from an area, surely it is fair and equitable that the land thus made available should be retained for the use of those living in the area that lost the service.

Mr. Aikens: That land belongs to the people of Queensland.

Mr. CAREY: The hon. member for Townsville South is quite right. However, so many people visit Southport that virtually half the population of Queensland will some day pass through the terminal, the provision of which I suggest, probably every 12 months. They will therefore be getting their share of the use of the land. We need to think not merely of the present but of the future. As the representative of the area, I do not want to see

another debacle similar to the one surrounding King George Square in Brisbane, which involves the resumption of large buildings.

Mr. Bennett: Are you against that?

Mr. CAREY: I do not know anything about it. I am not a metropolitan member.

Mr. Bennett: You are a cosmopolitan member.

Mr. CAREY: I mix with all the people of my electorate; I do not pick out merely one section of it. I am friendly with all my people, so I am quite happy to be called a cosmopolitan member by the hon. member for South Brisbane. He has his head a little too high in the legal air.

Mr. Davies: What do you think about King George Square?

Mr. CAREY: I am not "coming in" on that one. There are 20 members representing Greater Brisbane; they can say what they think about it.

Mr. Davies: All you want to do is have a sneer at the Lord Mayor.

Mr. CAREY: I now want to deal briefly with education, which is a very big field.

Mr. Bromley: How do you know? You have never been to school.

Mr. CAREY: One would hardly think the hon. member for Norman ever went to school. I remember, when a Labour Government was in power, being taught under a camphor laurel tree. I had to sit on the ground, too, because I could not even get a stool.

Mr. Sherrington: You wouldn't know the difference between a camphor laurel tree and sida retusa.

Mr. CAREY: The hon. member for Salisbury says I would not know the difference between camphor laurel and sida retusa. Let me tell him that my old head-master (one or two others know about this) used to give us the choice of six cuts or pulling up a hundred sida retusa plants. If we wanted to get away early, we asked for the cuts; but invariably we pulled the sida retusa and got away late. As a result, I do know the difference.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. CAREY: For the record, let me say that, as did many other hon. members, I received a circular letter from the President of the Queensland Teachers' Union, Mr. Gavin Semple, who is a very estimable fellow. I have met him personally, and he is doing a good job and endeavouring to get the best he can for his members, as hon.

members in this Chamber do for their constituents. It is strange that this letter, which is headed "Budget Reaction—Disappointment," says—

"Mr. Semple, who is also President of the Australian Teachers' Federation, said the rise of 11.39 per cent. in the Education Vote, against a total budget rise of 8 per cent., at first sight appeared generous."

That is a commendation of the Government, and that is where he should have stopped.

Mr. Sherrington: He had a second look at it.

Mr. CAREY: Yes, he did have a second look at it. I am glad he did, because I am now going to shoot him down in flames. Not only does it appear generous; it is generous. The letter continued—

"He said, however, it was not generous in comparison with last year's increase in the Education Vote of 15.1 per cent."

I ask hon. members opposite, particularly the hon. member for South Brisbane, to get their pencils and paper out and add the two figures. They will find that, at first sight, in the two years in which the Treasurer has been responsible for the presentation of the Budget the Vote for education has been increased by 26.49 per cent.

Mr. Aikens: More than that, because the 11 per cent. is superimposed on the 15 per cent.

Mr. CAREY: True. But if one works out all the figures—

Mr. Sherrington: You should go back to the camphor laurels, on that reckoning.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. CAREY: If one takes the two figures into consideration and does a little bit of mathematics, one finds that in two years the Vote for education has been increased by 28 per cent.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. CAREY: Hon. members opposite can work it out for themselves. They will come back tomorrow and say, "By golly, you are right."

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Pilbeam: It is a good effort.

Mr. CAREY: It is a good effort on the part of the Government to increase the Vote for education by 28 per cent.

Mr. Bromley: Not only is it marvellous; it is a miracle.

Mr. CAREY: I am glad to hear the hon. member say it is a miracle.

Mr. Bromley: On figures.

Mr. CAREY: This Government has consistently performed miracles. Look at what the State Government has done to assist the area represented by my colleague the hon. member for South Coast, Mr. Russ Hinze, since the erosion of the Gold Coast beaches that occurred during this year's cyclones. It said immediately, "We will give you a 20 per cent. subsidy on any money you provide." Nothing is impossible under a Country-Liberal Government, whereas it was impossible to get anything done while Labour was in office.

I was rather interested in a television programme recently in which Dr. Drinkwater was interviewed. He did a wonderful job. He backed the Government in 90 per cent. of the comments he made. After admitting that any delay in furthering education was caused by a lack of money, he said that the Government was doing all it could with the finances available to it.

Now, for the record, I want to read a letter that I received from a friend of mine. I show hon. members that this letter comes from Canada.

An Opposition Member: Is it perfumed?

Mr. CAREY: No, it is not perfumed. It was written to me by a young gentleman—a young male teacher—who left my area recently to go to Canada to get all those wonderful things that are available in that country across the seas. Let me read some of this gentleman's comments. He says—

"The school is really enormous—but the kids! Talk about 'Alcatraz cadets!' They are indescribable. I'm having a shocking time getting through to them, and teaching is nowhere near as pleasant as it is at home.

"At present, I plan to be home next year, but haven't really settled down since working here and may pack up and fly home at Christmas."

Mr. Bennett: Does he paint his fingernails?

Mr. CAREY: The hon. member will have to withdraw that remark when he meets him. He is a life-saver.

I am very glad to see three aldermen from the Gold Coast City Council sitting in the gallery, particularly His Worship the Mayor, Alderman Bruce Small, because I am now able to let these gentlemen know just what one of their fellow ratepayers, who went overseas to what he thought was the best country in the world, has to say about the Gold Coast. This is what he says—

"There's no doubt about it, there is nothing like our Gold Coast! I miss the surf, the club . . ."

This, of course, refers to the surf-lifesavers' club. He goes on—

". . . and the way of life, but am saving to become a landowner when I get back. Everything here is very expensive."

Remember I said that this letter comes from Canada, and I repeat that. He goes on to say—

"Everything here is very expensive, and apartments range from \$150 to \$200 a month unfurnished. I've indoctrinated every teacher and kid with 'Gold Coast fever' and envy. All my kids are planning to go to Surfers when they grow up—really funny! I've got the brochures and folders from George Schofield and 'am spreading the gospel'."

This proves that the Gold Coast even makes capital out of the men who go overseas to see what they can learn, and then find there is no place like home.

Mr. Aikens: Can you tell me why the taxpayers of Queensland should pay a 20 per cent. subsidy for the Gold Coast beaches?

Mr. CAREY: Would the hon. member tell me why the people of the Gold Coast should have had to subscribe—I agree they should participate—any more than the people of North Queensland subscribed for drought relief? Last year the Government spent on drought relief—and so it should—\$4,787,999, and this year it has set aside an amount of \$3,750,000 for drought and disastrous circumstances.

Mr. Aikens: Droughts are not caused by cupidity and stupidity.

Mr. CAREY: I am not prepared to argue that.

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

Mr. CAREY: I apologise, Mr. Hooper. I am trying to get my message across and I am very happy to get it over, even with the interjections, because they do not worry me a bit.

I make a special appeal to the Minister for Education for a technical college in Southport. I hear someone saying, "On the Gold Coast". All right, I make an appeal for a technical college on the Gold Coast, but naturally I am endeavouring to get it at Southport. It is urgent and important that we have such a technical college built. I hope it can be provided in the 1967-68 financial year. I had hoped to assist in the introduction of a deputation of three aldermen from the Gold Coast City Council, but I had to miss that opportunity because I did not know when I would have to speak today.

Let me give the reasons for establishing a technical college in that area as soon as possible. I am confident that the Minister will start the building in 1967-68.

Mr. Aikens: Will it have a course on how to "touch" the tourists?

Mr. CAREY: I am coming to that, if the hon. member cares to wait. He is a very impatient man.

On the latest figures given to me for this year, we have 530 apprentices on the Gold Coast. Of this number 93 are young hairdressers. It is virtually impossible to establish centres all over the State for the training in hairdressing of young ladies and a few young gentlemen, so we cannot expect that on the Gold Coast. However, we would hope for an early start on a technical college to provide a training centre in carpentry and associated trades, in which there are 194 apprentices on the Gold Coast. That number is made up of 106 carpenters and joiners, 28 cabinet-makers, 37 bricklayers and 23 painters. In addition, if we could establish a course for plumbers we have 28 apprentices in that field.

Let me compare our figures with the figures for Toowoomba, which, I admit, is 100 miles from the metropolitan area and the technical college here. On the latest available figures, Toowoomba has a total of 684 apprentices. There are no hairdressers in that total. Apprentice fitters and turners number 116. It is natural to expect 116 young apprentices in the fitting and turning trade because of the big foundry and the railway workshops in Toowoomba. The number of apprentices in the building trades is much the same as on the Gold Coast, 181 compared with 194. The technical college in Toowoomba cost \$200,000 to build and \$90,000 to equip. Of course, it has many apprentice fitters and turners to cater for. We would be very happy to see the Minister proceed with the construction of a building on the Gold Coast for building trades apprentices so that they could continue with their training without having to travel to Brisbane each week. In fairness to the Minister, let me point out that immediately he became aware that these young apprentices on the Gold Coast had to travel to Brisbane he arranged for free bus transport for them to the technical college in Brisbane once a week.

As we are a tourist area, and as so much of the business done on the Gold Coast relies on tourist activities, such as hotels, motels, and so on, I should like to recommend—of course, this is an item that the hon. member for Townsville South was very interested in—that there be established at our technical college (to offset the 116 apprentices we will not have in the fitting and turning field) a catering course, a hotel management course and a course covering the serving of good food and liquor. These courses should be established at our technical college so that we may look after the people who come there and give them the service they get overseas. I firmly believe that our people are capable of doing this. We are trying to encourage overseas visitors to our country, and the best way to do this is to give them the highest possible service.

I have dealt with education very briefly because we have not very much time available to us in this debate, although I know it affords us the longest time of all

debates. There can never be enough time when we have a good story to tell, and I have a very good story to tell.

I now have a request to put to the Minister for Main Roads and his departmental officers. This matter concerns the farsightedness and ability of the Treasurer who, in answer to a Press statement on containerisation and the suggestion that Queensland would not be a State of any importance in this new field, is reported in "The Courier-Mail" of 7 September, 1967, as follows:—

"Top Port Role for Queensland now, says Chalk.

"The Treasurer (Mr. Chalk) said yesterday he was not prepared to accept the opinion that Queensland ports would play only a 'feeder' role in the container shipping trade of the future.

"He said the recent changing patterns of trade put the State at the front door of ever-increasing markets."

A further statement appeared in "The Sunday Mail" of 3 October which must have pleased the Treasurer greatly. I know that the Minister for Transport also played a major part in fostering the idea of container transport for the State of Queensland.

Mr. Sherrington: It is a pity you aren't doing something about redundancy.

Mr. CAREY: If the hon. member puts that to me a little later, I will talk to him about it.

In the article in "The Sunday Mail" of 3 October, 1967, this appeared in big headlines—

"Brisbane Big Container Port Hopes
From Jap Visit.

"Brisbane has a very good chance of becoming a main-line container port for a powerful Japanese shipping combine of five lines.

"If the combine approves its reports now being studied by individual boards, container ships from America and Japan will come direct to Brisbane.

"Farrell Line of America has announced its intention of sending container ships direct to Brisbane, beginning in 1970."

I am bringing this to the notice of hon. members to let them know how important it is that I should bring to the attention of the Minister for Main Roads and his departmental officers the fact that the roads to the coastal areas and the Northern Rivers of New South Wales, which pass through my area and that of the hon. member for South Coast, will be carrying tremendous tonnages of goods. The volume of traffic will probably double by 1975. I hope the strength of our roads is such that they will be able to carry this very heavy volume of road transport, which must come into being at an early date.

This afternoon the hon. member for Rockhampton South said that Governments do not like change. But I make a plea to all members of this Assembly—not only Government members, but members of the Opposition as well—to back me in my request that speed limits should be painted on road surfaces so that motorists will know exactly the speed at which they should travel. Speed-limit signs are placed on the side of the road. But it is difficult for a motorist to look at the sign to discover the speed limit and also keep his eye on the speedometer to make sure he is not exceeding it. If it is good enough to have the speed signs painted on the road surface of the Hawkesbury-Sydney Freeway it should be good enough to have them painted on Queensland road surfaces. I brought this matter to the notice of hon. members two or three years ago and I wrote to the R.A.C.Q., the Minister, and everyone else I could think of to get support for this proposal. The general consensus of opinion was to wait until this idea was adopted by the Commonwealth. Why can't we in Queensland be the leaders?

It is just as important to have these signs painted on the Brisbane-Gold Coast Road, the Brisbane-Toowoomba Road, and the road from Brisbane to the fairly Far North as it is to have signs 6-ft high painted on the Hawkesbury-Sydney Freeway, because an efficient driver should watch the road in case a child, a dog, a kangaroo or something else jumps out from the side of the road; he must keep his eyes on the road. The Queensland Road Safety Council, whose chairman is the Honourable W. Knox, is always looking for ways of cutting down the road toll.

Mrs. Jordan: It could certainly help.

Mr. CAREY: I believe this will play a part in doing that. I ask all hon. members for their assistance in showing that Queensland is the leader in Australia and does not just follow what the other States do.

I congratulate the Main Roads Department on its beautification schemes on most main roads in the State. Anybody who has travelled to the Gold Coast has seen the work this department is doing in providing parks and planting trees. It is gratifying that the department is planting native trees such as gum, box, and bloodwood. I noticed today that in one area the trees are not taking kindly to being shifted from their natural habitat.

Mr. Bennett: What about the ones they cut down?

Mr. CAREY: That is a very good question. The Government realises that if one tree is cut down another must be planted, and it is planting trees in an endeavour to give some shade to the travelling public and tourists and something beautiful to look at.

Mr. Bennett: Why were they cut down? It wasn't necessary to cut them down.

Mr. CAREY: Trees must be cut down to build roads. Did the hon. member for South Brisbane allow the trees to remain in his area and go around them?

Mr. Bennett: Yes, I did.

Mr. CAREY: As the hon. member has been going around them for so long, we know why he has been going around in circles since he entered Parliament.

My only point of criticism is one that would probably be made by each one of us here, and no doubt by many others throughout the State. Why do people deface our beautiful parks by throwing tins, beer bottles, ice-cream packets, pie bags and other types of rubbish all over the place? Let us start a drive among ourselves and our friends to try to keep these places well and truly clean.

Mr. O'Donnell: Don't be a litter-bug.

Mr. CAREY: I thank the hon. member for Barcoo very much. Let us have in these places the civic spirit and pride we show in our own localities.

Finally, I should like to say that I am very grateful to the Minister for Health for informing me this week that the Child and Maternal Welfare Centre at Southport will be opened for the use of the public on 11 November. Naturally I am very proud at being asked to perform its official opening. The need for such a centre was one of the first things I brought before this Assembly, to save mothers from having to drag prams up two storeys of the S.E.A. building. Here is an example of further development in my area, brought about by the fine support I receive from Ministers when I ask for things to be done.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (5.17 p.m.): There are those on this side of the Chamber who have dealt specifically with the Budget as a documentary presentation of figures, and this they have done adequately and efficiently. There are others in the Chamber who consider it so uninspired, unimaginative and lifeless that it is hardly worth wasting an hour on it, short though that time is, and dealing with mundane figures that do not paint a very rosy picture of the future of Queensland but follow the pattern of the past in deepening the rut into which the Government has plunged itself.

When delivering the policy speech of the Australian Labour Party at the last election the then Leader of the Opposition, now the hon. member for Toowoomba West, said—

"Indecision, vacillation, bickering, complacency, inadequacy and compromise are but a few of the terms which can, with truth, be applied to the outgoing Government."

History since then has proved those allegations to be only too true. The conference of the Liberal Party last week-end clearly indicates the climate in which that party is operating, although its members are so keen to oust their senior partner in the coalition in an attempt to obtain the reins of government. The new constitutional reforms that were argued for the whole week-end were thrown out, I understand, by the rather strong arguments of the hon. member for Windsor, who spent some time showing that those who endeavoured to implant some constitutional reform in the Liberal Party did not know what their duties and powers were. At least the Labour Party is well able to govern itself constitutionally. We have never spent a whole week-end trying to arrange changes in the constitution that were previously considered by a committee, only to have them hurled out in their entirety by a conference. That has never happened in the Labour Party.

In keeping with the remarks of the member who delivered Labour's policy speech, it can well be said that the Budget is a very dreary one and Government members have dutifully attended to their obligations by trying to put some colour into it. They have spent most of their time back-scratching Ministers.

Of course that is typical of the present condition of the Queensland Parliament, because not only has the Country Party Leader, the Premier—as will his successor—the right to choose the individual members of his Cabinet, but also, unfortunately, the Liberal Party Leader has been vested with that authority, and Government members have degenerated into a team of sycophants trying to impress their leader for the next Cabinet vacancy. In my opinion, that is a sorry feature of the activities of this Parliament, because no longer are many Government members prepared to criticise the Government or to offer constructive suggestions. In fact, they go even one step farther and try to conceal the truth in order to preserve Ministers in office.

I have noticed the Minister for Education, who has made a big mess of education in addition to the police, but who, according to present prognostications, is the Premier-elect—I still think Mr. Bjelke-Petersen will beat him—spending time briefing the hon. member for Albert relative to certain matters that have been raised by me, in an endeavour, of course, to create an impasse on this side of the Chamber, purely, in my opinion, to conceal the truth from the public. The hon. member for Albert was prepared to listen because he is hoping that Mr. Pizzey will have the right to choose the next Cabinet Minister and that he will be the one chosen.

Mr. Sullivan: He would make a very good Minister.

Mr. BENNETT: He might make a good Minister; but there are many others who would make better Ministers.

Mr. Sullivan: Whoever it is, he will be a better Minister than any hon. member opposite would be.

Mr. BENNETT: It will not be the hon. member for Albert.

Mr. Sullivan: Whoever it is, I will support him.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Hodges): Order!

Mr. BENNETT: Dealing with the impasse that could be created by devilment and impishness of that nature, I say that I will never shrink from any controversy and I will deal without emotion with the remarks that have been made in relation to that matter. I do not come into the Chamber full of spirit. I do not engage in bar-room bargaining, and I do not need to get myself chemically fit to engage in controversies such as this. I will deal with the Minister and others who may choose to criticise the stands that I take from time to time.

It serves little purpose to examine the Budget purely on the basis of figures. A mess has been made of the Department of Transport in this State, and court litigation has proved that the Cabinet, and particularly the Minister for Transport, is not equal to the task of administering the department. The Government was beaten in court so often by a barrister who applied himself to that type of litigation that Cabinet obviously saw that it would be wise to get rid of its opposition by making him a judge. I refer to Mr. Justice Matthews.

During the whole course of this debate, the Committee has not heard from any member of the Government exactly what the Government is prepared to do about the problem of redundancy in the Railway Department. It obviously has not an answer to the problem. Hon. members opposite quite clearly know that the unions' criticism and protests are justified and that the Government's approach to the problem is not humanitarian. The Government, therefore, chooses to stick its head in the sand to avoid discussion of the problem of redundancy in the Railway Department, instead of taking it into its teeth, accepting it as a biting problem, and dealing with it publicly on the platform and saying what it is prepared to do.

Mr. Chinchen: You will hear that next Tuesday.

Mr. BENNETT: I have been waiting a long time to hear it, and I hope that some constructive suggestions will be made so that the men's problems can be dealt with as they ought to be.

Without embarking on my submissions relative to that matter, I think the union representatives have advanced sufficient reasons and arguments to justify some concrete action being taken by the Government. Surely if there is to be progress in this State—and we all want progress—the State should pay for that progress. Individual

members in industries which are adversely affected should not be called upon to shoulder the financial burdens of the Government and of taxpayers generally.

A mess has also been made of education—and again my colleagues on this side of the Chamber have dealt fairly adequately with that aspect of the State's development. For a long time it used to be argued that the Department of Education was the crown jewel in the Government's achievements. The Minister for Education had a false image built around him as a result of the claim that he had done much for education in this State.

Mr. Armstrong: So he has.

Mr. BENNETT: I concede that in the early part of his career he achieved good results, but the only reason for that was that he was merely implementing plans that were laid by the Labour Government. When he ran out of Labour's plans he was lost, and many educational authorities in this State are dissatisfied and disappointed.

Mr. Hughes: You admit that the D.L.P. did something worth while.

Mr. BENNETT: The D.L.P. has never been the Government.

The latest defect in education really shocked me as a parent who is trying to do something for the higher education of his family and who understands the difficulties involved for other parents, particularly those who are in the low-income bracket but who nevertheless want to give their children a higher education so that they can hold their own in this competitive world with young people much more endowed educationally and much more knowledgeable than were their parents. The fact that a man is in receipt of a meagre income is no reason why his pocket should be "touched" or his children should be prevented from receiving the same educational benefits as others who are more fortunately endowed.

I was horrified to see that the Queensland University authorities found it necessary to increase fees to an extent that will deprive many university students next year of a tertiary education. This has happened simply because the Federal and State Governments have imposed financial restrictions which have, in fact, gravely threatened educational standards in our university and have imposed crippling limitations on urgently required expansion. As a result, a start on construction of the new university at Mt. Gravatt has obviously been postponed indefinitely.

The staff situation at the present university is so acute and the ordinary facilities and accommodation are so lacking that some system has to be imposed, and it is obviously the system dictated by the policy of this Government, not only by way of quota but also by way of financial restrictions. In effect, therefore, it will be only the sons and daughters of wealthy men in this State

who will be able to seek and secure tertiary education, which I think is a sad and shocking thing.

Mr. Chinchen: How much have fees gone up?

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member knows very well.

Mr. Chinchen: You tell me how much they have gone up.

Mr. BENNETT: The fees were increased recently, and they received wide publicity. I, as a parent, read them closely. If the interjector has not read them, I am not wasting my time by outlining to him what was in the newspaper. If he cannot read the newspapers, surely he can arrange to attend a school for New Australians where basic English is taught.

The role of the university is summarised in the Murray Committee report of 1957. Leaving the welfare of students out of it, and leaving aside the inequity of imposing a class distinction at the university—only the sons and daughters of wealthy parents will be able to attend—it is also a sad and sorry affair from the point of view of the demands of the State. The most urgent demand is the provision of sufficient graduates. We speak about the development of industry and commerce. The hon. member for Albert spoke about my knowledge, or lack of knowledge, of commerce. I do not pretend to be a great expert in that field; nevertheless, I do understand that it is necessary to have experts to practise in that field, and the Government is depriving us of the graduates we need for that purpose. We need graduates trained in government and public administration; we need graduates in law; we need doctors, scientists and engineers; we need graduates in all the various professions. The Government is stifling the development of this State in refusing to educate future generations of young Queenslanders by placing an embargo on them by way of increased fees.

The university should not have to grovel to the Government for financial support. Whilst this Government's record has been unsatisfactory at the primary and secondary level of education, it is now stifling development at university level and depriving this State of the trained brains that we need so urgently.

Mr. Hughes: Would you not agree after the civil liberties fiasco that there are many at the university who are not taking their studies as seriously as they should?

Mr. BENNETT: There are in all communities those who do not apply themselves to their task assiduously and with enthusiasm, as is typified by the conduct of the hon. member for Kurilpa. There are at the university some examples of that type. Fortunately, they are in the minority. I attend the university every night without exception, and I can tell the hon. member

that there are thousands of university students who are working hard. I should not like to have to return to the hard grind and long hours of study they put in.

We hear so much spoken about what has been done in the development of mining in this State. We have heard about what has been done in the removal of coal and other products. Again the Government has been found wanting because of the inefficient manner in which it has organised the mining rights—if they might be termed as such—of these mines. Under the 1965 agreement, royalty amounting to 5c a ton is charged by the Queensland Government to Thiess Peabody Mitsui. According to "The Sydney Bulletin" of 21 January, 1967, and 11 March, 1967, it was revealed that profits from the Thiess Peabody Mitsui mine at Moura would exceed \$1 a ton. Thiess Bros. Pty. Ltd. is the lessee of the mine and has a 22 per cent. interest in Thiess Peabody Mitsui. A total of 5,000,000 tons of coal will be mined shortly at Moura, and Thiess Bros. Pty. Ltd. charges Thiess Peabody Mitsui 20c a ton royalty. On a 5,000,000-ton basis, this represents a large sum. For the benefit of the members of the non-intellectual "ginger group" of the Liberal Party, I do not propose to work out the amount for them if they cannot do their own mathematics. It does appear that this royalty is contrary to the Coal Mining Act of 1960, which embodies the principle that a royalty on a coal lease cannot be higher than that due to the Crown—in this case, 5c a ton.

In any case, it is perfectly obvious that Thiess Bros. are getting more royalty for work that they are not doing in the winning of this coal than is the Government itself. It would seem to be a most inefficient method of organising mining in this State, but, again, it is typical of the Government's ineptitude. Surely the authority that should get the most royalty is the real owner, namely, the Crown itself. A private company should not be getting four times as much as the Crown is getting.

I now pass to another portfolio. Time will not permit me to traverse all the portfolios that comprise the Cabinet. We have a Justice portfolio, namely, the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General. Why that department is not administered, from a ministerial point of view, by a professional man, I will never know. It was the continual cry of the Government when in Opposition that it was a shocking thing to have a non-professional man administering this portfolio. During the reign of the Government three barristers have been on the Government side—two of them Queen's Counsel—but they were ignored by the Government in filling this portfolio. There is still a barrister within the ranks of the Government. Incidentally, one of them, a Queen's Counsel I mentioned was regarded as having sufficient ability to be appointed a Supreme

Court judge, but he was never considered for appointment as Minister for Justice and Attorney-General.

I do not wish to trespass in the field that I raised in the newspapers many months ago. This matter was dealt with by my Deputy Leader, the hon. member for Townsville North, in his question this morning when he referred to the anomalous and scandalous position that was revealed by one of the District Court judges—a senior District Court judge—namely, the lag in the District Court list. All that I say is that I know of instances of people who were committed for trial back in March of this year, and I will be amazed if they are tried before Christmas. That means they will have waited many months for a hearing and they will have to spend Christmas with the strain of awaiting the outcome after the Christmas vacation, which, I concede, is only a short vacation for the Criminal Court. Nevertheless there will be, and there should be, a brief vacation. There is a trite saying—a very well-known one—that justice delayed is justice denied. Apparently there are 65 cases—and I can name a few that have been waiting since March—in which the people concerned have been waiting all this time knowing that the delay is denying them justice.

No doubt in his answer to the question by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition the Minister may give some reason for his procrastination. Whoever is responsible for the delay, I feel that an conscientious Minister for Justice would have brought down a short, quick amendment to the Act at the beginning of this session to avoid the obvious inequities that were manifest at the beginning of this session of Parliament. In fact, I raised this matter before Parliament resumed. As a result, the extra appointments that are necessary could have been made without delay. One extra judge next year will not possibly cope with the lag, which means that it must continue. If the lag had been dealt with before getting beyond reasonable bounds it would have been kept within reasonable bounds.

The reason I say it is no use looking at the Treasurer's Budget—he tries to blind us with science and deceive us with figures that are not accurate—is that if there is to be any new appointment, the Budget has not made provision for it. We have been told all along by the Attorney-General that the numerical strength of the District Court judiciary is to be increased. Obviously, if it is to be increased, provision must be made for extra salaries. Furthermore, as I understand it, the Minister has promised the judges that their salaries will be increased. So that to say the least, if his promises are true, the Budget must provide for an increase in expenditure on salaries. In the schedules contained in the Estimates of Expenditure for the year 1967-68 the number of judges of the District Court is quoted as seven. The appropriation for 1966-67 was \$74,000, the expenditure in that year was

\$74,000, and the amount required and set aside for 1967-68 is \$74,000. That indicates clearly that when the Budget went to press the Minister had no intention of increasing the numerical strength of the District Court judiciary.

I do not wish to go through all the portfolios, because some, I believe, are performing a satisfactory task. Therefore, I do not want to waste time gilding the lily on an occasion such as this when more important duties have to be done. The police portfolio is far from satisfactory. I propose to deal with this again. I have a good deal of material on two subjects that are important to this State, namely, law reform and hire-purchase.

As there are busy-bodies who choose to make comments on matters I raise conscientiously and on information I receive that I consider to be reasonably substantial, I must explain my attitude on some matters. The first commentator is a retired stipendiary magistrate, namely, Alderman Dan Kearney, who, in his years of retirement, decided that he would serve on the Toowoomba City Council. I have a fair amount of respect for him. I appeared before him and have spoken to him. He has always claimed to be a strong, staunch and loyal member of the A.L.P. and a member of the A.W.U. But I noticed that he was not averse to accepting Imperial honours. He protests association with the A.L.P., and should not wish to conceal it.

In his position as a stipendiary magistrate, Mr. Kearney had to apply himself with fairness and adopt an objective attitude to the cases that came before him, be they civil or criminal. If they were criminal I would expect that he, like all other magistrates, would adopt an objective attitude and would not form a close association with the police, as he apparently says he did. People in judicial positions should remain detached from any particular organisation in the community, particularly, in my opinion, from the police, on whom they have to sit in judgment so often.

Of course, Mr. Kearney is no longer a stipendiary magistrate but an alderman of the Toowoomba City Council, and one would expect that his manifold duties in that office would not include anything to do with the administration of the Police Force, which is a State function. I do not know why he had to butt in on the controversy. He commented on the claim of my colleague the hon. member for Nudgee, who asked a question concerning the 72,244 unsolved offences in Queensland during the last three years. Surely the hon. member for Nudgee was entitled to ask a question about that. Obviously it was not designed to castigate or criticise the police or any specific policemen, but to obtain information to which hon. members are entitled and which is of vital interest to the people of Queensland. Again I stress that it is not criticism of the Queensland Police Force.

It is, of course, criticism of the Government, and I do not know whether Mr. Dan Kearney realises that. I heard that he had changed his attitude in recent times. It is a criticism of the Government for not appointing sufficient police officers to deal with crime in this State. Because of lack of numbers, police cannot, and do not, investigate many of the crimes reported to them. Unless they stumble upon solutions by accident or coincidence, it is not humanly possible to follow them up. The Queensland Police Union will confirm that assertion; its secretary, Mr. Callaghan, has been saying it for months. The Commissioner of Police should also be prepared to admit it, although I do now know whether he would.

The majority of genuine and decent police officers, which most of them are, will say that they have not the numbers to deal with crime in this State. For Mr. Dan Kearney to suggest that the action of the hon. member for Nudgee is criticism of the Police Force is a non sequitur. It is fallacious argument and biased judgment, and I sincerely hope that his court judgments were delivered in a better and more objective way than that one was.

Parliamentarians have an obligation to ascertain what crimes are unsolved in the State. There is, for instance, the McKim-Hill murder, which is a very serious matter that was bungled. I shall not give the reason why it was bungled. Perhaps if there had been a lot more policemen around, it would have been dealt with efficiently. Parliamentarians have a bounden duty to bring before the people the fact that the Government is not prepared to appoint sufficient policemen. That is in the interest of the Police Force as well as the public, because there could be many dangerous incidents if police officers did not have the numbers to look after themselves and investigate all crime. One wonders why Mr. Dan Kearney criticised the hon. member for Nudgee for doing what he did.

In the report in "The Courier-Mail" of Monday, 23 October, 1967, Mr. Dan Kearney also commented on a reply given to me by the Minister in charge of the Police Force to the effect that the theft of \$340 from the Ashgrove Police Station was unsolved. Let me say without equivocation, and with a lot of confidence, that the whole matter concerning the Ashgrove Police Station stinks in the nostrils of all fair-minded men.

Mr. Sullivan: You and the hon. member for Kedron had a clash over that.

Mr. BENNETT: I am not concerned about that. If something needs correction, I consider it my duty, in accordance with my oath of office as a parliamentarian, to ventilate it so that it can be properly dealt with by those in authority, or so that an explanation can be given. If I have certain information which may or may not be accurate, it is my duty as a parliamentarian to have

the matter in question straightened out by seeking a fair, reasonable and proper answer to a question. The people of Queensland are entitled to be told the truth, because that also is in the interests of the Police Force. I can assure the Committee that the subsequent transfer to Bundaberg has meant hardship and lack of promotion to other decent police officers who had applied for promotion in Bundaberg, one of whom would certainly have received it. Because a sergeant was transferred from Ashgrove, the man who was entitled to promotion did not receive it. His prospects of progress in the Police Force have been impaired by the arrangements that had to be made at the Ashgrove Police Station.

Mr. Walsh: What is the union going to do about it?

Mr. BENNETT: I should like to know what the union is going to do about it. I have not consulted the union again; I consider that there is an obligation on me, as a parliamentarian, to raise these matters independently of the union. However, if the union considers that the transfers were unjustified, or if it does not consider that they were necessary, it should do something about them—that is, if the union has any guts.

Mr. Kearney went on to say that, with almost 50 years' experience working close to policemen in all parts of Queensland, he had had an excellent opportunity to observe their conduct, on and off the job. I think he retired at 66 years of age, which is the Public Service retiring age. If he had 50 years' close association with the Queensland Police Force, he must have started it when he was 16. At 16 years of age one is an insignificant office boy in the Public Service, perhaps in a clerk of petty sessions office, as they were known in those days, and would hardly ever see a policeman. Therefore, I do not know whether or not his remarks are truthful.

He says he has been working close to policemen. I am amazed that a magistrate would say that, because members of the legal profession are always told when we appear before magistrates, with the police on the other side, that the police are entitled to fight their case strong and hard and that we should fight our case strong and hard. We believe that the magistrate is detached from the police and has no close association with them; but apparently Mr. Kearney did, on his own admission, have a close association with the police for these 50 years. I think, therefore, that he has tarnished his reputation as a magistrate by buying into a political controversy that had nothing to do with him.

Furthermore, I do not necessarily take the parliamentary platform as a forum to raise these matters if I think I am getting a fair deal privately by raising queries with the Minister. This matter was raised as a result

of a letter that I received dated 19 July, 1967, which makes rather interesting reading. It says—

“Dear Mr. Bennett,

“Further to the matter of burglaries in Ashgrove, . . .”

There have been burglaries at Ashgrove—according to this man, many of them—that have gone unsolved. I do not know whether they have been too busy at the Ashgrove police station. It continues—

“ . . . I have heard a television news item one day last week to the effect that this time the Police Station was burgled in Ashgrove.

“Characteristically enough I could find no trace of this event in the paper.

“I just wonder whether Mr. Pizzey has heard of this.

“At this rate of going we shall soon have the parallel of the case I heard in Budapest a long time ago where a well-known criminal went to the Police to report that his best set of housebreaking instruments was stolen.”

I decided that it was not necessary to raise the matter in Parliament, and I wrote direct to the Minister for Education, by letter dated 26 July, 1967, to this effect—

“Dear Mr. Pizzey,

“I have been advised that in recent times, in fact on or about 12th July, 1967, a news item came over television to the effect that the Ashgrove Police Station had been burgled.

“I should be pleased if you would advise me if, in fact, this information is correct, and if so, what are the full circumstances and particulars.”

That was a perfectly fair and decent letter asking for information so that the information I had could be verified or disproved.

The reason I raised the matter in Parliament was that Mr. Pizzey, who, in my opinion, will go down in history as the “Great Denier”, replied with a letter that concealed truthful information from me, and I knew that it did so. The Minister tried to evade the real issue. He tried to tell me an untruth, and I was not going to be put upon, or put off, by Mr. Pizzey, and that is why I raised the matter in Parliament. He took two months to answer my letter of 26 July, 1967, and to give me the information. Apparently the investigation was going on for two months after I raised the matter. By letter dated 29 September, 1967, he tried to give me the big “brush-off”, and I am always suspicious and sceptical when men will not answer truthfully. I always like a Minister to answer a question frankly and give the impression that he is answering it honestly. That is why I always believe the Minister for Works and Housing, who seems, in my opinion anyway, not to hide the truth, because truth will always out.

Anyway, this is what Mr. Pizzey said, in my opinion, in typical Pizzey fashion. By letter dated 29 September, 1967, he said—

“Dear Mr. Bennett,

“I again refer to your letter of the 26th July, 1967, and would advise that the Ashgrove Police Station was unlawfully entered in the early hours of the 13th July, 1967, and money and other property was removed therefrom.”

We still do not know what the other property was; it has never been revealed. The Minister is concealing and concealing until it is all prised out of him like a dentist taking out a tooth.

This is the great evasion—

“Official money involved amounted to \$4.”

I emphasise the word “official”. He did not say what the other property was, but he said—

“An investigation of the matter at Police Commissioned Officer level has failed to locate the missing property, or establish the identity of the person or persons who unlawfully entered the Ashgrove Police Station and removed that property therefrom.”

This is the big question, on evidence from the Minister himself: official money involved amounted to \$4. What was the other property involved? Why won't he table the report? There is no rule of Parliament, or any statute, which says the report is confidential and therefore cannot be tabled, and if he has nothing to hide he should be proud and pleased to table it. There is only one conclusion one can draw from his failure to table the report and his concealment of this information, that is, that it will embarrass him and his Government.

I believe that there was sufficient justification to transfer these men but, like the hon. member for Wavell, who claimed that he is entitled to a trial, I say that these men were entitled to be charged and tried so that the allegations levelled against them by the Commissioner of Police, following which they were transferred, could have been dealt with properly, either by departmental investigation or inquiry, or through the courts in the fashion that ordinary citizens are dealt with.

Mr. Pizzey admits, now that I have prised it out of him, that the amount involved was over \$340. What is the difference between \$4 and \$340 except the word “official”, and what was it doing at the police station if it was not official? Was it the pool of poker funds?

If the Minister was not worried about any embarrassment because of the impending lift he is hoping for—to be appointed to the Premiership—he would have told the full story on 29 September, 1967. Instead of that, he said that official money involved amounted to \$4. If he was not worried he would have said that the money stolen from the police station amounted to whatever it

was. I happen to know that it was over \$340, and it is passing strange that he refused to table the report. The rules of this Parliament make provision for the tabling of documents of that nature.

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

Mr. BENNETT: Standing Order No. 298 provides—

“A document read or cited by a Member may be ordered to be laid upon the Table.”

Therefore there is provision for the tabling of the report referred to by the Minister for Education. Erskine May's “Parliamentary Practice,” which we in Parliament slavishly follow when it suits us, states at page 269 in the 17th Edition—

“Parliament is invested with the power of ordering all documents to be laid before it which are necessary for its information.”

Those authorities are against the Minister for Education, who claims that these documents should not be made available for the information of hon. members.

As I pointed out, I do not believe in anything behind closed doors. I am a firm believer in the pronouncement of Lord Denning that you get a fairer and better administration when it is subject to public scrutiny and open to the Press.

I do not believe that these men should have been penalised without a trial. I do not think that they should have been dealt with behind closed doors by the Commissioner of Police. Whether they were guilty or not guilty these were penal transfers made as a result of the evidence following that investigation. I am disappointed that the Commissioner of Police is ready to deceive even his own Minister, who apparently likes to be deceived, by saying that these unusual transfers which, in effect, were made in one bulk, were not penal transfers. They were clearly penal transfers, and this is not the first time this sort of thing has happened in the Police Force. But the Police Rules have been abused to try to silence public criticism and to blacken people's character without a trial. To ensure the proper administration of the Police Force all these things should be made public. It relates back to the time when the Commissioner of Police appointed a private inquiry into the unanimous decision of our top court in Queensland. I never cease to be horrified at the technique and manoeuvring that went on after the Full Court of Queensland unanimously found that a detective had been guilty of deliberately deceiving the court. One of the judges said it was deliberate—

Mr. Walsh: Committing a fraud on the court.

Mr. BENNETT: Committing a fraud on the court, which one of the judges said was deliberate. That judge was a former Liberal member of Parliament. Although he found

that this was a deliberate fraud on the court—the top court in this State—the Commissioner of Police was allowed virtually to sit in appeal on that unanimous decision and behind closed doors clear the name of the policeman concerned following the verdict that had been given. I do not believe in that secret type of administration or those Star Chamber tactics designed obviously to cover up malpractices and maladministration.

I had intended to deal with the subject of hire-purchase, but the observations that were made precipitated, of necessity, the observations I have now made.

Hire-purchase is an important part of Australian activity. Every Australian family comes into contact with consumer credit—every one, without exception. A total of 1,500,000 Australians engage in hire-purchase transactions, and hire-purchase has an annual turn-over of some \$1,000,000,000 a year. Therefore it is big business, and something that has got out of control in Queensland. The Australian Labour Party's policy on hire-purchase is that it firmly believes in protecting the wage-earner by reducing interest rates on hire-purchase transactions. Labour regards hire-purchase as the small man's overdraft. Unlike the big man's overdraft it is not subject to Government regulation. If the Commonwealth Constitution prevents effective action to control hire-purchase a Federal Labour Government will seek adequate powers to do so at a referendum.

Labour believes that the Commonwealth Bank by offering lower-interest rates should be able to compete with hire-purchase companies most of which have close links with private banks.

The attitude of the Labour Party to hire-purchase is that it is a system which, in spite of all its iniquities, is fundamentally necessary. The manufacture of articles that are sold through the hire-purchase system keeps thousands of men in employment throughout Australia. Furthermore, it is a system which affords the ordinary man the opportunity of buying facilities and amenities that he can enjoy during his lifetime instead of having to wait until his old age to save up sufficient funds for the purchase of what can be properly regarded now as necessities of life.

The Labour Party's attitude, however, to hire-purchase is that it should not be exploited by big business and lending companies; that usurious rates of interest should not be allowed; and that the hirer should be protected from unfair and dishonest methods of repossession generally carried out by strong-arm men employed for that purpose who have no regard for the fundamental right of the citizen and very often disregard the dignity of man.

These professionals in repossession are strong in muscle but thick in the head. They are prepared to do anything at the dictates of the lending companies, in order to earn a few cheap dollars in carrying out their

odious directions. I feel it is high time that something was done. I said this about tow truck companies, but it applies even more so in my opinion and estimation to these repossession agents who do not understand the fundamental law that applies to the entry of a person's property. They trespass and use their bulk and the fear of the housewife at being in debt to usurp what is known as man's fundamental rights in respect of his property, namely, that an Englishman's home is his castle. In spite of all the discussions that have been taking place about civil liberties in recent times, perhaps the greatest incursion into civil liberties is that perpetrated by these repossession agents. I believe that they should be registered; that their background should be checked; and that they should have to prove they have a fundamental knowledge of their duties and rights, and the householder's rights, before a licence is given to them to repossess any article, be it a car or anything else.

I can cite a recent happening where a thug of this nature—and that is the only way to describe people who are prepared to earn their living in this fashion—entered the home of a person and demanded repossession of the husband's motor-car. The husband happened to be absent temporarily, earning his livelihood, and he was sending his wages down to his wife. Because the pay packet was a little late in arriving the agent was directed to repossess this vehicle. All of them know the money that can be made by unfair repossession. The housewife told him that the pay packet had been delayed and that she would pay. They were only one payment behind but, nevertheless, he proceeded with the repossession of the vehicle. I tried to speak to him on the phone but he said he would not speak to any lawyer. Not only did he break and enter the vehicle—she would not give him the keys on my advice—but also he short-circuited the points in order to get it going to take it away. The pay packet came down within a day or two and the money was paid, but the company then said, "You have to pay for the cost of repossession, and for the cost of redelivery." The person said, "We will take delivery of the vehicle ourselves at your yard." But the company said, "Oh, no, we are going to redeliver it for you and charge you." It is time the Government realised, as it surely should, that there is a real racket in this system of repossession where the hire purchase laws are implemented.

A hire-purchase agreement is a contract whereby one person, the owner, delivers goods over to another person, the hirer, upon terms that the hirer is to hire them at a fixed periodic rental but has in addition an option of purchasing the goods by paying the total amount of the agreed hire at any time or of returning them before the total amount is paid. The evolution of the present hiring agreement can be put shortly. The owner of goods desiring to sell them upon instalment or

time-payment terms but wishing to retain a security over them until payment in full has three possible courses open to him—

1. He may sell the goods outright and deliver them to the purchaser who agrees to pay for them by instalments the owner to have a right upon default to retake possession;

2. He may provide that the property in the goods is not to pass until all instalments are paid and the hirer agrees to pay all instalments. The right to retake possession upon default is also included; or

3. He may provide that the property in the goods is not to pass until all the instalments are paid.

Of those available sources the first is undesirable. Time does not permit me to go into that.

One of the iniquities that are creeping into hire-purchase arrangements relates to the rate of interest that can be charged. I said earlier that the wealthy man has a bank account and can obtain a bank overdraft at the bank at bank interest of $7\frac{1}{2}$ to 8 per cent. at the outside. But the little man who cannot afford a bank account and therefore cannot obtain a bank overdraft has to get his overdraft, as it were, in the small man's way, namely, by way of hire-purchase, and there is nothing in the hire-purchase legislation that limits the rate of interest. The only statute applicable in Queensland is the Money Lenders Act which in effect allows these hire-purchase moguls to charge 20 per cent. with monthly rests whereas, with a bank overdraft, the amount on which interest is charged decreases as repayments are made.

In my opinion people should clamour for the fixation of the rate of interest that can be charged under hire-purchase agreements. The amount that hire-purchase companies charge by way of interest, instalment charges, etc. is iniquitous. It is something in the vicinity of 20 per cent. It is the most usurious and worst form of flensing of the ordinary man that can be conceived, and it is made legitimate or is legalised by a Government that does not seem to care, and will tolerate such activities.

Before an article is repossessed certain statutory enactments should be complied with but they are honoured more in the breach than in the observance because these rapacious repossession agents know that a hirer who is in a state when repossession is possible and likely, because he has no money, cannot take them to court in any circumstances. There again, it should not only be necessary from the point of view of contractual obligations to comply with the notice of repossession, but it should also be a criminal offence in my estimation and submission for any repossession agent to take the article or vehicle without having complied strictly with the Act. Most of them, when they take a vehicle, will tell

the person that the firm or owner demands certain payments because of the high value of the vehicle. If those payments are not made the owner, being one of a ring of commercial dealers in repossessed articles, resells the article, not at the best possible value that could be got but at some ridiculously low price to a friend, and thus enhances his own funds.

Mr. Hughes: Aren't they obliged by law to advertise—

Mr. BENNETT: I have not the time to deal with the hon. member for Kurilpa.

In view of what I have said here, particularly relative to the Police Force and hire-purchase, Labour's policy as enunciated during the last election campaign and the one before it should be implemented, and we should have an ombudsman to inquire into these matters. An ombudsman is not appointed solely to make himself a nuisance with the Public Service. Largely he is there to protect the Public Service and to correct evils that may creep in from time to time in the administration of justice in this State. If we had an ombudsman he could tell the Minister for Justice that the Criminal Court backlog is scandalous. If we had an ombudsman he would have inquired into the Ashgrove matter long since, and his report would have been tabled in Parliament. The policeman concerned would have been exonerated, or justice would have been done and he would have been dealt with according to law. The presence of an ombudsman would ensure clean and decent government, and it will be found that most ombudsmen throughout the world have been appointed by Governments that have nothing to fear or hide. Governments of lower standard that will not table reports, and will not answer questions truthfully and frankly, do not want ombudsmen because they would reveal the truth about their inefficiency and ineptitude. The reports of an ombudsman would be tabled in Parliament.

Queensland is sadly in need of the policy enunciated by the Australian Labour Party.

Mr. Duggan: He could be called the Parliamentary Commissioner.

Mr. BENNETT: Call him what you like. The hon. member for Toowoomba West says that he could be referred to as the Parliamentary Commissioner. In other words, he would be a commissioner to carry out the dictates of this Parliament in a free, fair and unfettered fashion. He would carry out his duties without interference, or fear of reprisal, by the Government. He would be a protection to those who are doing what is right and good, a threat to those who are not carrying out their duties properly, and certainly a servant of Parliament who is badly needed. Before a parliamentary commissioner investigates any matter, he should fully inform the permanent head of the

department affected, or the organisation affected, of his intention to make an investigation.

(Time expired.)

Mr. SULLIVAN (Condamine) (7.32 p.m.): It can be said in truth that the Budget debate gives members the opportunity to speak on many matters. I suppose it can honestly be said that the present debate has not proved to be any exception in that regard. I feel that the Budget presented by the Treasurer some weeks ago is acceptable to the people of Queensland generally. It can be said of the Treasurer that he has "chalked" up a satisfactory Budget for the State of Queensland.

It is factual enough, and indeed to be expected, that the Opposition endeavours to embarrass the Government wherever possible, and hon. members opposite have tried to use this debate for that very purpose. There are a few things that I should like to deal with. In the first place, the hon. member for South Brisbane, who has just resumed his seat, has shown his fear for his security in the electorate of South Brisbane at the 1969 election by putting in a claim for the position of ombudsman in this State. In attacking the Minister for Education, he was, of course, following the pattern set by so many Opposition members.

In case hon. members opposite return to their familiar old line of saying that I am pushing my barrow for the next ministerial position, I want to lay it on the line and make the position perfectly clear right now. We know that the Premier is retiring early in the New Year, and that a new Minister will be elected. I am proud to be able to stand here and say that virtually all back-bench members of the Country Party are qualified for that position. Every one of them would go into Cabinet knowing that he had the full backing of his back-bench colleagues. I wonder whether that could be said by hon. members opposite? They need not worry about me pushing my barrow for a ministerial appointment. If the Premier asks me to be a Minister, I will take the job and do it to the best of my ability. If he does not, the man who is appointed will have my support.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Let us all grow up a little.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. SULLIVAN: As have so many of his colleagues, the hon. member for South Brisbane has endeavoured to break down any image that the Minister for Education has created in administering his portfolio. The hon. gentleman is almost sure to be elected to the position of Premier of this State, and I say to the hon. member for South Brisbane that he should go outside Brisbane if he wants to see the full picture. Having heard the criticism that he has

levelled at the Minister in this debate, I put it to him that he did not go out during the Roma by-election and charge the Minister with neglect in that area.

Mr. Bennett: I was out there. I saw you out there making a mess of things.

Mr. SULLIVAN: If I made a mess of things, it is to be hoped that I continue making a mess of things and that the Government continues to get the results that it got on that occasion. The hon. member knows full well what sort of a reception he would have received in country areas if he had come out there and criticised the Government, and particularly the Minister for Education, for neglecting education. Charges of that kind are becoming a bit sickening. Of course, hon. members on this side of the Chamber know that they are made and that we have to put up with them.

I recently had the privilege of having the Minister for Education in my electorate, where he had the appreciation of the people expressed to him. He was able to see the fruits of his work. He knows what a mess that particular area of Queensland was in—many other areas were in a similar mess—as far as facilities for secondary education were concerned when he took office, and it was pleasing that he was able to see what has been achieved under his administration and to give the people an opportunity of expressing their appreciation. There is a new wind blowing through the country areas of Queensland.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Tucker: That is an understatement; it is a cyclone.

Mr. SULLIVAN: If the hon. member and some other hon. members opposite were equally vociferous in their criticism of the small number of university students who have been playing up in recent weeks, I think they might then be doing a better job for the people they represent.

Mr. Bennett: Did you read about Harold and the dancing girl?

Mr. SULLIVAN: I will come back to the hon. member for South Brisbane later.

In dealing with the change-over that will take place upon the retirement of Mr. Nicklin next year—

Mr. Melloy interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Hon members on my left know the rule that interjecting from a place in the Chamber other than their usual place is out of order.

Mr. SULLIVAN: I do not take much notice of the hon. member for Nudgee, no matter where he interjects from. I do not care whether he interjects or not.

I believe that the criticism of the Minister for Education that has been voiced is unfounded. Recently in this Chamber the hon. member for Townsville North levelled criticism at the Premier, Mr. Nicklin, and charged the Government with being weak and leaderless. I do not believe he has one friend in Queensland who believes what he said, because the people of this State know what a wonderful job Frank Nicklin has done over the last decade.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SULLIVAN: So that it will be on record, I shall read an editorial that appeared in "The Toowoomba Chronicle".

Mr. Tucker: No. Read what Mr. James said; read what the Chamber of Commerce said.

Mr. SULLIVAN: The hon. member read what somebody said, so I will read this editorial from "The Toowoomba Chronicle" of last week. I think the hon. member for Toowoomba East and the hon. member for Toowoomba West know what an unbiased and fair paper it is. This is what it says—

"The Nicklin Image.

"The tribute paid to the Premier (Mr. Nicklin) by Mr. Murray, Liberal Member for Clayfield, when speaking in the Budget debate in the State Parliament, is well merited; and it is one that will have general acclaim.

"Mr. Nicklin's image of honesty and decency in the administration of public affairs is not confined to Queensland; it is an asset in the national scene.

"Mr. Nicklin became Premier of Queensland in 1957, and is approaching a record tenure of that office. In those 10 years he has guided the destinies of this State with vision, wisdom and balance.

"A typical countryman, he has always had a keen and practical interest in the rural scene, with full realisation of its prime importance in State affairs. A sportsman, he has brought to his high office, the sportsman's ethics of fair play in all things.

"Future generations will look back on this decade as one of untarnished integrity in Queensland public administration, and will agree that the State's leader well merited the appellation of 'Honest Frank'."

This criticism of the Premier, after what is almost a record term as Premier, anyone who is politically fair or fair to himself must agree, is unfair. It must also be agreed that this State has gone through a period of great development under his stewardship. These are the things to which we have to give the lie and it amazes me how men in the position of the hon. member for Townsville North, as Deputy Leader of the Opposition, will stoop to making these accusations.

Mr. Tucker: I still reckon he is a poor leader.

Mr. SULLIVAN: I do not know whom you are trying to convince, because you cannot convince anybody outside.

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

Mr. SULLIVAN: Through you, sir, if he insists on saying that, I wonder what opinion he has of his own leader? How could we compare him with the Premier?

Mr. Tucker: Give us a go and we will show you.

Mr. SULLIVAN: It is up to the people of Queensland to give hon. members opposite a go.

To revert to the Budget, there are certain things that I will discuss in the Estimates of the Minister for Transport next week—I will not touch on them tonight—things that concern me and people within my electorate. All I should like to say now relative to that matter is that at this time last year, when the previous Budget was presented, it was not a popular Budget with certain sections of people, particularly the increased freights on grain. The increase was necessary, as outlined by the Treasurer at the time. It was the first increase in grain freights for something like six years.

There has been over the years a clamour by wheat and grain growers for more rolling-stock, bulk wagons and that type of thing, and I am pleased to be able to say now that, with the harvest upon us, as a result of these increased rail freights the Government has measured up to its promises and more rolling-stock in the way of bulk trucks is now available for this harvest. Fifty of these bulk wagons are in the course of construction and will be almost completed for this harvest. A tender has been accepted for a further 75 and, with the conversion of coal wagons to bulk grain wagons, the Government will have expended in excess of \$1,500,000. Therefore, I believe that in increasing freight rates the Minister has allowed the grain grower to assist himself in that regard.

Mr. Hanlon interjected.

Mr. SULLIVAN: I respect the hon. member very much, but this might be a little out of his depth, just as sometimes I am a little out of my depth on other subjects.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Seeing that this seems to be a bit of a joke to hon. members opposite, let me point out that when the industry makes up its mind what it wants about pool freights I will be only too pleased to have a discussion with its members.

Mr. P. Wood: You will sit on the fence in the meantime.

Mr. SULLIVAN: It is not a matter of sitting on the fence. I have always worked this way and allowed any industry to decide for itself what it wants. I do not want to tell the wheat farmer or the dairy farmer what he should or should not do. Let the farmers make up their own minds. We have good industry men who are very experienced in their job.

Mr. Chalk: You have complete liaison.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Of course we have. The Minister for Mines and Main Roads is sitting behind them. I have sat in the office and had discussions with grain growers on matters concerning freights and road transport. That is the way we, as a Government, work. We know it did not work in that way in the days of the Labour Government. I know that only too well, because I was a primary producer and too often we had things pushed upon us without any discussion about what was required. That is how this Government works, and hon. members opposite need not worry too much about that.

For his presentation of a Budget without any steep increases in taxation, fares, freights or fees, I believe that the Treasurer is to be complimented. As the hon. member for Albert outlined, the way the money has been expended by the Government in drought relief, flood relief and fire relief over the last 12 months indicates that it is prepared to assist people in need. We know that in the primary-producing areas—whether they be agricultural areas, pastoral areas, wool-growing areas or cattle areas—that have been affected by drought the people have endured many hardships. I am sure that hon. members on both sides have the greatest respect for those people. As we are all aware of the hardships they have endured, I am sure we all agree that they deserve any assistance that can be given to them. It is with these people in mind—people who were called upon to pay taxes to provide education for young people—that I express concern at the attitude I mentioned earlier and said I would come back to later.

I think that most hon. members will agree that the recent farcical foray of some of Queensland's university students in the "lists of freedom" made them the laughing-stock of the country. We have only to go to country areas to see this, but it applies in the city areas, too. Hon. members representing city electorates will agree, I am sure, that these students made a laughing-stock of themselves by the manner in which they behaved. They have lost a tremendous amount by it. They have lost the good will of the general public and the previously high community assessment of their standard of intelligence and degree of maturity. How could one regard as sage and sophisticated the counsels of a larrikin group bleating "Freedom" and "Democracy" while attempting to take the law into their

own hands? How could one seriously entertain their arrogant decrees on processions, permits and the like when they were prepared to busy themselves with the tearing up of permits, the staging of illegal processions and a move against Parliament House itself? It would amaze me if anybody in this Chamber could be sympathetic towards them because of that behaviour.

It is a great pity to realise that two-thirds of the student body of the university and 99 per cent. of the professional staff have had their proud standing in the community undermined by this infantile mob which had the gall to represent its minority views and actions as a 100 per cent. university effort. Leaders of the demonstration have since come to recognise that their march was a costly blunder and abysmal failure, but I have yet to hear of any one of them making a private or public apology to their responsible fellow students and tutors for dragging their good names and reputations into the dust.

Rather, instead, we have an increasingly arrogant and belligerent attitude, as was illustrated by the boast of Mr. Brian Laver on Sunday night over the Labour radio station when he stated that the students will bring down the Nicklin Government through marches and pressure groups. I have too much faith in the people of Queensland to think that this idle boast of this militant, arrogant person will ever come to fruition.

Mr. Chinchen: He is going to work for Macdonald.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Of course he is.

Mr. Bennett: Who is that?

Mr. SULLIVAN: Brian Laver.

Mr. Bennett: I thought he was a member of the Country Party; his father has a large property.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Of course he isn't.

How strongly all this justifies the statement by Professor McAuley last week that university students in Australia were becoming manipulative political groups. We have had a clear demonstration of the truth of this assertion in these recent events in Brisbane. To the people who inspire these activities, freedom apparently means complete disregard of the rights and reputations of others.

I might mention that it has been brought to my notice that when this parade, or demonstration, was being staged in King George Square and these people were clamouring for rights, liberties and all sorts of things, they had no regard for other people. It has been brought to my notice that five mothers had left their children in the care of a kindergarten in one of the inner western suburbs for the day so that they could come to town and do some shopping. These five mothers were held up and were an hour late getting back to pick up their children from the kindergarten. The mothers were frantic, and so were the children. Is this

something we can countenance in a democratic country? These people think they will become a political force in bringing down the Nicklin Government. I think they will do us more good than harm, and I hope the Opposition will be sensible enough to have no part of them.

Also, seemingly, it means that none can hold an opposite view to theirs in the matter of civil liberties. If this were not so, why should they have attacked with complete hostility and intolerance the views of two hon. members of this Parliament, namely, the hon. member for South Brisbane and the hon. member for Toowong, after inviting them to address a university seminar that discussed this subject on 22 September? Well might one of these gentlemen have challenged the bona fides of these students, as "The Courier-Mail" reported, and the other have found the freedom-lovers both "venomous" and "uncouth".

University students are a privileged group in the community. Even those who pay all fees charged are by no means meeting anything approaching the cost of their education—an education that opens the door to a much higher status in the professions and in the world of industry than the great majority of people can hope for. For these reasons, they owe it both to themselves and to the tax-payers to devote their energies and abilities towards the primary object for which the university was established.

I believe, as the hon. member for South Brisbane indicated—he said he visits the university every night—that the big percentage of university students are genuine and sincere in their approach to their studies and work. But why allow this small minority group to give an entirely wrong impression to the people of Queensland? And, by God, this is happening! In the country areas, where people are so remote from the true picture and what is happening, it is regrettable that our university is being smeared by the actions of this minority group.

I believe that we, as members of Parliament, and those whose good names are being smeared, both university students and lecturers or professors, have a responsibility to see that this sort of thing is not allowed to continue. Any attempt on the part of this minority group to become a privileged pressure group must be resisted as an attack upon democratic rights in general. I believe we have this responsibility. We have seen this happen in other parts of the world and other parts of Australia. Any attempts which might lead to this militant group within the university becoming a pressure group on the Government must be resisted.

Mr. Chinchen: Don't you think the students are being unwittingly manipulated?

Mr. SULLIVAN: True. This is the work of extreme left-wingers, agitators, and Communists. I once read a book on this subject. That is the way they work throughout the world. I commend the book to anybody who

has not read it. Its title is, "You can Trust the Communists." The author of the book starts off by explaining his title by saying that you can trust the Communist to do the job he is given to do.

An Honourable Member: Who was the author?

Mr. SULLIVAN: Dr. Swarz. I am being kind to the hon. member and answering all of his interjections. I hope he has asked enough questions now. He should not over-play his hand.

I seriously recommend that book to everybody. It tells the story of how the Communists work and the way they achieve their ends.

I have several other matters with which I should like to deal. Some of them relative to transport and land matters I shall leave until we debate the Estimates and legislation for the third area of brigalow development.

I should now like to reply to some of the criticism levelled by the hon. member for South Brisbane, who has gone home.

Mr. Davies: The hon. member for South Brisbane has not gone home; he has gone to answer the telephone.

Mr. SULLIVAN: I thank the Opposition Whip. It is natural enough for me to presume that the hon. member has gone home, because it is usually at this hour that he vacates the Chamber and goes home. On numerous occasions he has launched attacks on the Police Force. He said earlier that he does not speak about things behind closed doors. He did not display that principle when he was given the opportunity to give evidence before the royal commission into the National Hotel. On that occasion he ducked behind closed doors. Before he holds himself out as a paragon of virtue in these matters he should try to act in such a way that does not give us a false impression.

Mr. Chalk: He is not here now.

Mr. SULLIVAN: That is right; he has gone behind closed doors. He has displayed a desire to be critical of the Police Force.

I do not know whether I have been more fortunate than others. However, I always think that the policemen whom I know in my area must give a fair indication of the Police Force itself. I have nothing but full marks to give for the men who administer the law in my electorate, and I should like to pay a particular tribute to Senior Sergeant O'Dea, who has now been promoted and transferred from Chinchilla to Dalby. To my mind, he has been a magnificent officer of police in the eight years that I have known him, and I understand that he was similarly regarded in his previous appointments. The type of man that he is is portrayed in those who serve under him. They, in turn, are very excellent officers who are held in very high regard by the people of Chinchilla and district.

When Senior Sergeant O'Dea came to Chinchilla, the behaviour of some of the people was not as good as it is now. He was quick to take action, and he won the respect of the people through the manner in which he ruled the town. Some on whom he had to be a little hard proved in later years to be among his strongest supporters. When later they had families of their own and saw what Senior Sergeant O'Dea was prepared to do voluntarily for the children and young people of the town, they became some of his greatest supporters.

Mr. Lee: They are the police officers whom the hon. member for South Brisbane is knocking all the time.

Mr. SULLIVAN: I am glad the hon. member for Yeronga mentioned that. The Police Force is a large force. The teaching service is a large service. The Public Service is a large body of men and women. In a case of apples there is always the likelihood that one is a bit bad, and the same analogy applies to the three bodies I have mentioned. However, do not let us judge the majority by one or two. A similar situation applies to the university students to whom I have already referred. Let us give credit where it is due. I mention this because Senior Sergeant O'Dea has been a very excellent policeman. He has been very co-operative with me, and a good friend. Whilst he may perhaps have preferred to move farther away, I think he is very happy about his appointment to Dalby.

Mr. Walsh: He was a good officer when he was in Bundaberg, too.

Mr. SULLIVAN: I am very pleased to hear that; I think the hon. member for Bundaberg and I have spoken of him before. When criticism is levelled at people, I think we have a responsibility to relate our own experiences when we can say something good about them.

Let me now pass to another matter. I believe that there is something in this State that needs cleaning up, and I think on this matter hon. members on both sides of the Chamber will agree with me. I refer to the dumps of used cars that one sees on the approaches to all cities and towns of any size. They are a shocking sight, and I believe it is time something was done to remove them completely from the landscape. On the western side of Toowoomba as I drive home, three or four years ago there were two or three cars dumped in a gully on a farm. Today that area is like a little township. Farther along the road towards Dalby there is a used-car yard nearly as big as Dalby itself. That is the pattern followed throughout all towns.

I know that such yards are necessary. I know they provide employment and a livelihood for many people. I also know the value of parts that can be salvaged from

vehicles that are obsolete or no longer road-worthy. I believe that people who conduct yards of this type must have some regard for civic pride. Of course, it probably is good business to put used-car yards in a fairly prominent place, so that people will see them. Whatever the final answer might be, I suggest that for the time being they should be enclosed with a high fence, or something of that sort.

When I was in North Queensland about 12 or 18 months ago, I was told that Mount Isa Mines Ltd. had purchased a machine that, when all the required parts had been taken from a motor-car, or whatever it might be, could crush the body into a block of metal about 12 inches square. I was also told that, using that machine, the company would be able to virtually clean up North Queensland in about three years.

Mr. E. G. W. Wood: Local authorities have all the necessary powers to enforce that.

Mr. SULLIVAN: If that is so, I hope they will take action along these lines. I have heard other hon. members mention the matter in this Chamber; I have heard many people outside Parliament speaking about it. If, as the hon. member for Logan says, local authorities have the necessary powers, I hope they will get the people concerned to assist them in tidying up all the dumps over the countryside.

Finally, I thank hon. members for agreeing to my recent appointment to the Refreshment Rooms Committee.

Mr. Walsh: Have you changed the menu?

Mr. SULLIVAN: The menu has done me fairly well, so why change it? I again thank hon. members for agreeing to my appointment.

Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (8.7 p.m.): I think it will be agreed that this debate does allow an hon. member to place before other hon. members his or her experience with the varying problems confronting the constituents in his or her electorate. Although it might seem boring to some hon. members to listen to a long tirade about matters relating to rural industries, I am sure that many of them who have resided in the city all their lives have learnt much from what has been said by hon. members representing country electorates. If they have not, it is just too bad. That is one of the reasons why I hope that, as the years go by, no attempt will be made in any way to reduce the time allowed to members in this particular debate. If an hon. member wanted to concentrate on matters that are dealt with in the Financial Statement itself, he would probably find that he could, without any difficulty, take up the best part of three-quarters of an hour in doing so and have very little time to deal with other matters of public importance.

In the early stages of my remarks tonight, I do not propose to introduce matters that relate specifically to the statistical side of the Financial Statement or to particular statements made by the Treasurer in it. I hope to come to some of those matters later.

I wish to refer first to the statement made by the hon. member for Clayfield, who, in his enthusiasm to applaud the Premier for his 10 years' reign in that office in this State, proceeded to give the hon. gentleman credit for many and varied things. That is fair enough; I do not deny that the hon. member has a right to do that. But in saying that under the leadership of the Premier the Government had cleaned up graft, corruption and rackets that existed under previous Governments, I think he was allowing his tongue to slide away from his more serious thoughts.

I want to say to the hon. member that, so far as I am concerned, I do not have to stand here and make apologies for anybody whether in Parliament or outside it, or whether associated with public administration or not. I have never placed myself in the position of having to defend such people and I do not speak tonight with the idea of defending previous Governments with which I have been associated as a Minister from 1940 till 1957 with a break of three years.

I will say to the hon. member for Clayfield that in every instance when a charge of graft or corruption was made in connection with political or public administration of any previous Government with which I have been associated, action was taken and public inquiries were held. I ask the hon. member for Clayfield to point his finger specifically to any inquiry that resulted in a finding that any minister materially or financially benefited by way of graft. Going back to the lands case, he overlooked the fact that the judge in that case made it quite clear that the then Minister for Lands did not benefit materially or financially but that, because of something that he had done for a Crown tenant as distinct from what might have been done for another Crown tenant, he had corrupted his office. If I had to accept that interpretation I could name many people who have corrupted their offices without any doubt whatever. So, I throw his remarks back into the teeth of the hon. member.

Let him take the attitude of his own party and his own Government to the charges that have been made during its period in office. What assistance did we get either from the Government benches or from the A.L.P. in trying to uncover some of these charges that have been made? None whatever. It was left to the few Independents in this Chamber to bring these matters before hon. members. In particular, if I may say so, the charges made by Jack Egerton at the Trades Hall were specific enough, surely. They were published in the

Press and repeated in the Press after the debate took place in this Parliament. The hon. member had better look at the record of members on his own side.

Of all that has been said about the police, and the charges that have been made against members who seek to offer some criticism of police administration in this State, I want to say that I am not going to join with the band of people who, for reasons best known to themselves, simply will not bring to the surface the irregularities and other things that are happening in police administration today. I do not propose to go very deeply into matters that concern individual members of the Force; rather am I concerned about the loose administration of the Police Force in this State, and I propose to give hon. members some figures for expenditure on police administration in Queensland. After they have heard those figures, I doubt if they will be able to reaffirm their view that everything in the Police Force is all right.

In my opinion the Police Force in Queensland today is no longer an organisation that can be looked upon to give the best service in the prevention or detection of crime. Because of the system and rules under which the police work, they are occupying something more in the nature of a public servant's job. I first want to deal specifically with this phase of it, because every time there is a Press campaign regarding crimes committed, traffic accidents, road fatalities, etc., up goes the cry, "More police!"

From a serious examination of the position I am firmly convinced that an increase in the number of police is not the answer to the problem of combating the increase in crime, or the number of road fatalities or traffic accidents in this State. As I go along and set out the position, I hope that all members will agree with me. In 1966-67 this Parliament appropriated \$13,046,920 for police. There was expended in that year \$13,768,377 or \$721,457 more than Parliament appropriated. For 1967-68 the appropriation we have been asked to approve of is \$14,748,744, an excess of \$1,701,824 over the 1966-67 appropriation or \$980,367 over the actual expenditure for that year.

I hope that the busybodies in the corner on the opposite side who have been so busy trying to justify the present-day administration will look into this. The increase in the number of personnel of the police administration in this State for this year is 16. This can be found at page 20 of the Estimates that have been circulated to all hon. members. The whole increase of 16 has taken place in the Commissioner's office; not one extra policeman has been appointed or provided for by this appropriation. One additional clerk in the Commissioner's office takes the number from 43 to 44; nine additional clerk-typists takes the number from 98 to 107; in addition there are six additional

staff under the heading of "Civilian Clerks at Police Offices, Testing Officers, Drivers' Licenses."

When hon. members study the appropriation before them covering the whole of the Police Force, including the Commissioner's office and general personnel, they will see that there is an increase of 16.

To give the Committee a comparison of what has happened over a period of 10 years, I go back to 1957-58, the first full year of this Government's administration. There was expended on the Commissioner's office that year the sum of \$117,000. I want hon. members to keep these figures in their minds. Apart from the Commissioner, his deputy, secretary, chief clerk and accountant there was a staff of 37 clerks, 24 clerk-typists and two messengers, or a total of 63. The Estimates for this year indicate that that figure has increased from 63 to 274. In dealing with the percentage increases in various branches of the Public Service administration, the Opposition left this one alone. Why, I do not know.

In 1957-58, to cover the expenditure to meet the salaries, etc., of inspectors, sub-inspectors and other personnel, exclusive of the native trackers, the expenditure was \$4,550,496 and the total of personnel at that stage was 2,677. I think it is fair enough for me to go back to the year when the Government started and give the employment figures. In the same year, 1957-58, the expenditure on contingencies amounted to \$1,978,772 or a total expenditure for 1957-58 of \$7,043,256. If I have to keep repeating these figures, I will do so. This year we are asked to approve \$14,748,744. I know that it may be hard for hon. members to follow these figures but I suggest that they look them over when they appear in "Hansard." The appropriation this year represents an increase over 10 years of \$7,705,488, for an increase in police personnel of 423. In 10 years the increase in police personnel is only 423, but the increase in expenditure is over \$7,000,000!

It is true that in recent times the police have come under scrutiny as a result of questions asked by certain hon. members, in particular, the hon. member for South Brisbane. I am not interested in the individual aspects of the case, but I am interested in the over-all picture of police administration.

I have already pointed out that we have before us for approval an amount of \$14,748,744 for the current financial year to administer the Police Force of Queensland. In addition to that sum, an amount of \$1,447,238 has been provided for as a grant to aid the Police Superannuation Fund. In dissecting the figure of \$14,748,744 for this year we find that included in this amount is \$600,000 to meet expenditure in the Commissioner's office. This should be contrasted with the figure I gave earlier, for 10 years ago, of \$117,000. In the

Commissioner's office, which I referred to in a previous session as an empire that has been built up around that officer's position, apart from the Commissioner, his deputy, secretary, accountant, chief clerk, and so on there are 107 clerk-typists, 44 clerks, and 24 assistants, messengers, switchboard attendants and reception officers, and 99 clerks at police stations. They are civilian clerks. When I think of those 24 assistants, switchboard attendants, public relations officers and so on, I remember that there were two in 1957-58. The number of personnel in the Police Force, apart from those in the Commissioner's office, is 3,100, as provided for in the Estimates, compared with 2,677 10 years ago. Hon. members will see that financially there has been a pretty handsome hand-out to this department.

Further, approval is sought of the sum of \$4,000,000 for contingencies which include overtime and pay for statutory holidays, allowance for week-end work, allowance to meet increased cost of living, allowance for fuel and light, allowance in lieu of quarters, travelling allowances, and cash equivalent of long-service leave. That is in addition to the \$10,496,516 required to meet the salaries and other pay of inspectors, sub-inspectors, and other members of the Force, who number 3,100.

These are colossal figures when we take into account the service that is being given to the community today. I have no hesitation in emphasising that, in my view, the public are not getting the best results and are entitled to expect a more efficient service for the expenditure of such a large sum of money. If the figures relating to unsolved crime are taken as a guide, no intelligent person could argue that the public are getting value for the money expended.

Mr. Hanlon: Don't forget the number of police stations that have been closed.

Mr. WALSH: I am coming to that. The hon. member for Baroona no doubt appreciates that I am not by any means loading this responsibility onto the rank and file. Let us ask ourselves: does the fault rest with the rank and file of the Police Force? Are they to blame? Of course they are not. They do not lay down the policy of administration in the Police Department. They look for a lead from the man in charge and those surrounding his administration. How can any police officers, no matter how genuinely the great body of the rank and file are desirous of doing it, give efficient service if in the main they are rostered for duty on an 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. basis or a 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. basis? That cannot be accepted any longer as being an effective means of crime prevention or crime detection. This surely is not the fault of the rank and file.

As the hon. member for Baroona pointed out, the Government, no doubt on the advice of the Commissioner, has seen fit to close many individual police stations. Do not let

us throw this back onto the general body of police in this State. We must remember that the police are rostered on this basis, and I am not overlooking the fact that this is in their industrial award. But the public are entitled to know what the conditions are. I do not think there will be any disagreement when I say that the more serious breaches of the law take place between sundown and early morning than at any other time, and if in the main members of the Police Force are rostered on a Public Service basis, how can the public have protection? Again that is not the fault of the rank and file. In saying I doubt that even 20 per cent. of the effective police strength is rostered for duty between 4 p.m. and 10 p.m. and that 10 per cent. of the effective police strength is rostered for duty between 11 p.m. and 6 a.m., I am only guessing the figures, but I suppose I am as entitled as anybody else to do so, and I think my figures are somewhat conservative. Well might I and the public ask what chance has the Police Force as a whole to provide an effective service under those conditions? If the Minister wants to query my stab in the dark at the number of police rostered for duty between the hours that I have stated, it is up to him to indicate to the Committee the exact position. Frankly, I feel that I have been somewhat conservative in my estimates. That is only one phase of the problem of providing effective and efficient police services.

Mr. Bennett: It takes an hour and a half to get police to an accident some nights in Brisbane because they are just not there to turn out.

Mr. WALSH: I must state that I have heard within the last fortnight of an incident similar to that referred to by the hon. member for South Brisbane. The delay was not as long as he mentioned, but the police did not arrive till long after the ambulance and machinery inspector had arrived.

Mr. Chinchon: But you only hear of the delayed ones; you never hear of the ones who arrive on time.

Mr. WALSH: That is all right. If the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt seeks to justify this position, I am sure that he is not in line with the public view on these matters.

Mr. Chinchon: My observation was a valid one.

Mr. WALSH: That is one phase of the problem. I ask the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt not to invite me to go into specific instances of police action in these matters because I might get a little dirty and say things that I do not want to say.

Mr. Chinchon: Don't pick the exceptions. There is no point in that.

Mr. Bennett: It is not a question of picking exceptions. I tried to report an accident to the West End police on Sunday and they didn't open all day.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. WALSH: It could be that both the hon. members for South Brisbane and Mt. Gravatt are exaggerating.

Mr. Bennett: You know I don't exaggerate.

Mr. WALSH: I think I am voicing the opinion of a very large section of the Police Force when I say that they expect intelligent leadership and direction from the Commissioner down. After all my years of experience in public life, I think I am entitled to put the view that the general rank and file of the Police Force are not getting that leadership and direction. If that is so, the sooner the Government does something about it, the better. That obligation is not only upon the shoulders of the Commissioner but also on the shoulders of every commissioned officer who has charge of a district throughout the State.

The hon. member for South Brisbane dealt with the remarks of a retired stipendiary magistrate. What he thinks, or what I think, does not matter much. What matters is what members of the public are thinking. The public want to see more police on patrol, day and night.

The honesty and integrity of the great body of the Police Force of the State are not questioned. In reply to the retired S.M., may I say that the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Mr. Donovan, who occupied that position when the Country-Liberal Government took over, possessed those characteristics of honesty and integrity and was a proved and efficient investigator throughout his career; but that did not qualify him for the position of Commissioner, by any means. I ask the retired S.M. to have another look at the question.

Mr. Bennett: I think he might have been too honest for this Government.

Mr. WALSH: I am not making any observation on that; I am just making the point that nobody could question Mr. Donovan's honesty and integrity or his ability as an investigator. I leave it to the hon. member for South Brisbane, or any other hon. member, to assess for himself why Mr. Donovan was not appointed.

Apart from what the public may expect, no doubt a large section of the Police Force would like to see a large-scale reorganisation to bring about efficiency. I am surprised that an hon. member should rise in this Chamber and attempt to lead hon. members generally to believe that there is nothing wrong in the Police Force. Surely all hon. members have met a police officer in their own electorate who has complained about these matters. If I have time later, I shall refer to a letter that I received from Bundaberg relative to them.

There are many cases that one could cite which point to the inefficiency within the Police Force. I mention the case to which

the hon. member for South Brisbane referred briefly. Would any hon. members in this Chamber be happy about the way the McKim-Hill murder investigations were handled in the central district? If they are, they are very easy to please. I remind them that a vehicle in which, no doubt, the woman travelled, or which was used by her, was removed by another person from one point to another and was subsequently taken and cleaned throughout and all fingerprints and other evidence that might have been of value removed from it, and that a week or 10 days later experts were sent up from Brisbane. To look for what evidence? In addition, the Commissioner undertook the responsibility of sending up there an officer who, according to Press reports, was to be responsible only to the Commissioner. Why? What has happened to the administration of the C.I. Branch? Why did the Commissioner send a special officer up there?

From the things I have heard about this case, I cannot say that I feel very happy about it. I think that the only way to deal with it at the moment would be to arrange immediately for a coronial inquiry. All the available evidence that is in the hands of the police today could be placed before the Coroner, and every person who has been questioned in the matter should be called to give evidence. That would help to remove some of the suspicions that are obviously abroad in the central district.

I hope the Government will take cognisance of my suggestion. Action has been delayed for too long, and the way that case was handled is not good for the future administration of the Police Force in this State. If the Government wishes to give the public effective and efficient service, drastic action is required now, without any further delay. This matter has been going on for too long and the Government should take immediate steps to review the top structure of police control in this State.

Mr. Bennett: Is it not correct that originally the police posted her as a missing person and did not suggest foul play?

Mr. WALSH: I do not know about that. The important thing is that it is patent to everybody who has followed the case that something has to be done with it at this stage. If not, there will be a continuous barrage in this Chamber until the Government makes up its mind to do something about it. I suggest that there should be a thorough investigation of the control in all police districts. To my mind, it is long overdue if the police are not getting correct and intelligent leadership and direction from the Commissioner's office.

I do not believe that the inspectors are to blame for many things that are happening in their districts. I think it should be apparent that the whole system needs a thorough scarifying, and those members sitting on the front ministerial bench know what that term means because they have all been associated

with scarifying on their properties. Similar application is required here. This job, as I have said before in this Chamber, requires the full, non-stop attention of the Commissioner. Previously I had to draw attention to the part he played in the social world, as it were, opening agricultural shows and so on. In my opinion, too much time is spent by the Commissioner today at social functions. One cannot do a job such as this as an administrator, any more than a Minister can whilst travelling around the country and leaving it to the Public Service to make decisions for him.

There have been a number of specially appointed police officers to maintain good relations with the public. If that is so there should not be the same necessity for the Commissioner to move around on these social occasions as extensively as he does. I hope that the Government will not yield to the clamour for more police unless it is satisfied that it is getting the best results for the moneys provided by this Parliament. As I have said, I do not think it is. It is easy for any Minister to acquaint himself of the position and ascertain if what I have said today is correct, that is, that the Police Force generally can be regarded as a subsidiary of the Public Service, working from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. or 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

I do not generally deal with anonymous correspondence, but I have here a document that was forwarded to me. It is, in fact, a copy of a document. I was not going to place in the hands of the Commissioner of Police, or the Minister, or anybody else, any evidence that might incriminate the person who desired to bring these things before my notice. As I say, I brought it to the Minister's notice and if he can, through his Commissioner, give a reply that will deny the charges made, well and good; I will be quite happy about it. I think the statements made in it are obviously made by somebody who had an inside knowledge of the workings of the Bundaberg Police Station.

The document is addressed to me and reads as follows:—

“Mr. E. J. Walsh,
Parliament House,
George Street,
Brisbane.

“Where are the police in Bundaberg on Saturday nights sixteen of them are at home every week-end but they still get paid week-end penalty rates and then on Saturday nights three of the six police on duty go to Avondale trying to catch the pubs for after hours trading while all the hotels in Bundaberg are openly trading till well after midnight.”

Avondale is in the electorate of my friend the hon. member for Burnett. I think this chap is probably letting his imagination run away with him. He proceeds to nominate a few hotels. He says—

“Federal, Queens, Bundaberg, Railway, Melbourne and Club Hotels to name just a few are all within a short distance of

the police station there are two senior sergeants and twelve sergeants at Bundaberg but on certain shifts constables are in charge of the station on 30/8/1967 four constables were on duty at Bundaberg for the 4 p.m. till 12 midnight shift and one of the constables was in charge of the shift. On 24/9/67 one sergeant and one constable was on duty for the 8 a.m.-4 p.m. shift.”

There are 43 police in Bundaberg, five of whom are in the Criminal Investigation Branch. I draw attention to the fact that this document says that there are 12 sergeants in Bundaberg.

Mr. Bennett: One of the sergeants is from Ashgrove.

Mr. WALSH; I hope he is all right. If he is he will suit me down to the ground. I want the Commissioner of Police and everybody else concerned to understand that Bundaberg is not to be regarded as a dumping ground. There is another man coming to Bundaberg who was alleged to have made a mess of things in the investigation of the McKim-Hill murder. I want to make it quite clear to the Government and the Commissioner of Police that Bundaberg is not to be a dumping ground. I do not want any “brumbies” in my territory. They did not go there in my time as Treasurer and I am not going to put up with them now, either.

The document proceeds—

“Sixteen police in this station should pay the department an allowance for having such a cushy job they're in 9 a.m.-5 p.m. jobs they get every week-end off every time there's a public holiday they work 9 a.m. till 12 midday and take the rest of the day off but they're always available to cop the overtime to assist in a search for watchhouse escapees, missing persons etc. Any of us would jump at the chance to change jobs with most of the sixteen police here who have every week-end off at the expense of the rest. The two senior sergeants work 8 a.m.-4 p.m. Monday to Friday or that's shown on the roster. One has Tuesday and Thursday off to play golf while the other has at least one day off to play bowls plus every week-end off. One senior constable with 15 years' service the senior sergeant clerks 8 a.m.-4 p.m. Monday to Friday and every week-end off and all three have two hours for lunch daily. Also there is a female clerk-typist. Previously this office had only one senior sergeant and one constable. In the Inspector's office are four police, one sergeant and three senior constables and a female clerk-typist all on 8 a.m.-4 p.m. Monday to Friday, one senior constable is an addition to the staff since the girl commenced work two of the three senior constables are surplus and could be released for active police duty.

"We have a sergeant to wash police cars working 8 a.m.-4 p.m. Monday to Friday and every week-end off then there is a radio technician and his assistant in a 9 a.m.-5 p.m. job Monday to Friday and every week-end off then we have two police to work issuing driver's licences until recently comfortably handled by one man, the last three on 8 a.m.-4 p.m. Monday to Friday every week-end off are the watchhouse keeper, the traffic sergeant and the inquiry sergeant so you can see we have sixteen police here who are giving little and getting much.

"The senior sergeants office is over-staffed previously one senior sergeant and one constable ran this office efficiently a senior sergeants clerk is no longer required now that a female clerk typist is employed in that office. The staff have so much time to spare that senior sergeant Cumming plays golf on Tuesday and Thursday and Senior Sergeant Harding takes time off during the week to play bowls they could easily increase the number of police on the general staff which is only three at present by releasing some of the staff from the various offices here.

"If senior sergeant Harding is supposed to work on Saturday from 8 a.m.-4 p.m. he finishes at noon and goes off to play bowls if he is rostered from 4 p.m.-12 midnight which is a rare happening he shuts his office door and says he does not want to be disturbed and usually goes home at 8 o'clock the men at this station are poorly organised and things do not look like improving.

"The administration is lax a constable here who is a paid footballer player goes on sick leave regularly with injuries supposedly received playing football and then works full time at an outside job he always goes to sleep when on night work he's overtired from working at the other job the senior sergeants know but there too weak to do anything about it.

"The sergeant from the inspector's office is running the station and district why because the inspector has lost his grip on things at the station presently there are two sergeants on night work and one constable why because all the constables are in the offices the radio technician and his operators decide what shifts they will work recently the inspector permitted a traffic constable to work 9 a.m.-5 p.m. for period of six weeks selling tickets for a ball he was being paid by the police department and was effecting what was termed good public relations."

Mr. Miller: If you were the Minister, wouldn't you have consigned that anonymous letter to the waste-paper basket?

Mr. WALSH: The hon. member should not "kid" himself about anonymous letters. I point out to him that not only the present

Commissioner of Police but other commissioners have acted on anonymous letters and telephone calls they have received—quite a few of them. Admittedly it is a job by somebody inside, but it only confirms, in some respects, much of what I have heard personally within the Bundaberg area.

Mr. Row: I will bet a disgruntled policeman wrote that letter.

Mr. WALSH: Is there any area where there is not a disgruntled policeman?

Now that the Minister is in the Chamber, I will make the statement that I do not want Bundaberg to be regarded as a dumping ground.

A Government Member: You said "Adavale" before.

Mr. WALSH: I did not say "Adavale"; I said "Avondale".

The Minister already knows this story. If he can produce an effective and truthful reply to this document I will be quite happy. But it must be truthful, because I know a little of the local horizon myself. The Minister knows that I do and that I know a lot more than other hon. members.

Before concluding in this vein, let me repeat that this is not a one-man show—and it should not be. In the previous Government's time it was never a one-man show. In many cases the inspectors have to take the blame for directions that probably have been given verbally by the Commissioner. If there is a public outcry, who has to take the blame? Of course it is the local district inspector.

Finally on police matters, I am somewhat surprised at the attempt made concerning the control of the Queensland Police-Citizens Youth Welfare Association in Brisbane. I think it is in the area of the hon. member for Baroona. I know he is an active member of it but probably he was not at the meeting when this happened. I cannot see that it will get past him and I doubt that it will get past the Minister. There is a proposal to amend the memorandum and articles of association, or whatever they may be—I understand it is registered under the Companies Act—of this association, to make it quite clear that only a person holding the office of chief inspector or above that rank within the Police Force can occupy the office of president.

Mr. Bennett: A shocking thing!

Mr. WALSH: I agree. Talk about a police State! One would think they would keep as far away as possible from youth clubs and associations of that nature. There is more justification for any citizen to be president of this association than there is for a police officer to hold that position. I know the dog-fight that has been going on, and it has now reached the stage where there is a gang within this association that seeks to write into its articles of

association the definite provision that this office can be held only by a person holding the rank of chief inspector or a higher rank.

Mr. Murray interjected.

Mr. WALSH: I am not interested in what the hon. member for Clayfield asks me at this stage. He was not here when I replied to the charges that he levelled. I do not want him to plan my speech for me. If he wants to raise this question on another occasion, I shall be happy to listen to him.

The Treasurer could not be accused of unnecessarily trailing his coat in the statements he made in his Financial Statement; nor can we depict him as the stand-over man that he is generally described as in many quarters, more particularly when I remember the attitude adopted by him as a responsible Minister in yarding the A.L.P. members and putting them in the position of having to withdraw their opposition to a Bill that was introduced by the Government. That is a shocking state of affairs. It was bad enough having to put up with the Trades Hall combination and so on in 1957. But when we get to the position where a Minister challenges the official Opposition in this Chamber and compels it to withdraw its opposition, that is too bad. All I have to say is that if the A.L.P. wants to build up an image—and I hope it can—it will want to adopt different tactics from those. There is no way in the world that it can justify to the large body of workers outside the action of a Minister in determining the extent of criticism that can be levelled by the Opposition. Recently we read in the Press that the Q.C.E. will catch up with the Lord Mayor in some ways.

I do not blame the Treasurer for endeavouring to emphasise or pinpoint some of the things that he claims have added to the economic and financial progress and stability of this State. Most Treasurers have done that in the past and no doubt they will continue to do so. But it is a good thing to have a look at the whole of the picture. The Treasurer drew attention to such projects as the Blackwater and Moura railway projects and beef-cattle roads.

It is perfectly true that in many instances a few people will gain employment as a result of the works that are being undertaken, largely because of the upsurge in the demand by Japan and other countries for minerals in this State. But I think we are entitled to ask ourselves what permanent assets will remain in Queensland after the expenditure of such a large amount of money by overseas interests. True, we are blessed with many natural resources, but Queensland's share of this wealth will be very small. The great bulk of the machinery used in this production, and the material used for constructing the railways and other things, will come from overseas or from other States.

While the Treasurer may quote the millions of dollars that are being spent, he does not say how much is actually being spent in Queensland. It is the Commonwealth Government that benefits from money spent in Tokyo and elsewhere, and this is where the Treasurer is falling down on the job. The Commonwealth benefits from import duties, income tax, and similar things that result from increases in production and employment. Overseas balances are also assisted. I was therefore interested in some remarks made by Liberal members who wish to see the development of secondary industry in this State. The hon. member for Wavell was inclined to agree at an earlier stage of the session with that observation made by several of his Liberal colleagues. Later he contradicted it when he made the definite statement that Victoria and New South Wales are riding on Queensland's back, and that it was a case of a large volume of exports from Queensland maintaining the favourable external trading balance which benefits the Commonwealth. I should like the hon. member for Clayfield to let that sink into his head.

Mr. Murray: We have always known that.

Mr. WALSH: If that is so, I should like to know the great advantage to be gained from an increase in secondary industry if it is still necessary to depend on primary industry, which includes mining.

Mr. Murray: We want employment for our children.

Mr. WALSH: Very well. Now that my 5-minute bell has sounded, I had better come to the crux of the matter. I ask hon. members opposite how they assess real progress in this State. Is it to be assessed on the basis of tons of coal, tons of bauxite, computers, mechanisation of industry, and so on, or is it to be assessed in terms of people? As I see it, it is a combination of both—an increase in primary and secondary production, and an increase in population.

When one examines population figures, the Government's claim of real progress falls flat. According to figures tabled by the Treasurer himself, during the last 10 years that the Labour Party was in office the population increase was 296,785. In the last ten years of office of the present Government the increase was 280,757, or 16,000 fewer than in 10 years of Labour administration.

If ten years is considered too long a period, I shall take it over 5 years. In that case, the difference in favour of Labour is 9,900. Taking it over the last two years of Labour administration and the last two years of the Government's term, the difference is still 6,408 in favour of Labour. Is progress to be assessed on the basis of things taken out of the ground and sent overseas, or an increase in the number of permanent residents of this State? Queensland is lagging

in population increases since this Government took office, and that cannot be denied. Hon. members cannot deny that. I know that statistics show a fall in the birth-rate.

Mr. Murray: It stayed still in 1957.

Mr. WALSH: It stayed still under this Government; it did not stay still under Labour. The hon. member for Clayfield can give the Committee the answer to that.

Why is it that the State cannot attract and retain its proportion of the migrants who come to this country? All the talk of hon. members opposite about progress falls flat on the ground unless they can prove to the great body of people in Queensland that the Government is attracting more people here, settling more and more people on the land, and increasing the population in that way.

I have only a few seconds left, Mr. Hooper, but I emphasise that one of the biggest problems confronting the State, a problem which the Government should do something about, is in the field of water supply and water conservation. When the rich Utah Development Co. went to Blackwater, it did not take the Government long to come to the party and find over \$1,000,000 to build a weir to assist the company to produce huge quantities of coal for export. But where schemes such as that can be justified for rural production, what assistance is the Government giving?

I hope that before the Senate election the Government of Queensland will get from the Federal Government a specific promise relative to the extent to which it will assist in developing water conservation and irrigation in this State. If it cannot get such a promise, the Federal Government will have to put up with losing its Senate seats in Queensland, just as it put up with its losses in 1961.

(Time expired.)

Hon. J. C. A. PIZZEY (Isis—Minister for Education) (9.7 p.m.): I had intended to speak about education. When I spoke in the Address-in-Reply debate, I dealt with what the Government had achieved in comparison with what Labour Governments had achieved before I took over the education portfolio in 1957. In this debate, if time permits, I will give some indication of the Government's future programmes in the field of education.

First, I think I should address a few remarks to one or two hon. members who have taken part in the debate today and spoken about the Police Force. I refer particularly to the hon. member for South Brisbane.

Hon. members are becoming heartily sick of this hon. member's snide and despicable innuendoes against the Police Force. He is the greatest mud-slinger in this Parliament, always hoping that some mud will stick. He even criticised a member of his own party in respect of the action taken by the

Government relative to a robbery at the Ashgrove Police Station. He apparently cares little whose reputation he besmirches in the process.

I think it is an abuse of the privileges of this Chamber to pose baseless bar-room gossip in a question, knowing full well that the Press will highlight the question without covering the answer given at the same time. Hon. members had evidence of that last week when certain things were implied. For example, the hon. member implied that a policeman had robbed a corpse. He said that someone had made that allegation but gave no indication of who had made it. Of course, that became headlines, and there is not a scintilla of truth in it. It was a baseless and disgusting implication relative to the sergeant of police at Ashgrove. Nothing could be more contemptible than that. The hon. member should be the last to talk of blackening people's characters without a fair trial. He does it each time he makes an attack on a particular person by posing a question of which he has very little, if any, evidence.

Mr. Bromley: Are you speaking on the Budget or replying to the hon. member for South Brisbane?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. PIZZEY: Let me have a look at some of the questions. The hon. member for South Brisbane implied that the police had stolen bricks.

Mr. Melloy: You haven't the right to sling mud, either.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Nudgee has already been warned about interjecting from other than his own place in the Chamber.

Mr. PIZZEY: Who is slinging the mud, when a member of this Committee gets up and says that the police robbed a corpse, although there is no truth in it whatever; when he asks how much of the money that was stolen relatives have asked for, although relatives did not complain about money being stolen; when he says that police stole bricks to build a wall, although no bricks were stolen; when he says they were playing poker, hoping that some people would tie up the loss of a sum of money with a game of poker? That is what he was hoping for—again a filthy inference. No evidence whatsoever was forthcoming throughout the investigation that poker was played at that police station.

The hon. member talks about questions being answered truthfully. Let me have a look at some of the questions. This is the way the hon. member gets his publicity, irrespective of whose character he besmirches. He talks about not getting a truthful answer, yet the answer I gave was the absolute truth.

Mr. Melloy: But not all of it.

Mr. PIZZEY: Of course it is. The hon. member asked if the amount involved was in excess of \$340. He asked whether inquiries revealed that it was not a member of the public involved in the stealing but a police officer. The answer, of course, was "No". It is not known who stole the money and, if the hon. member for Port Curtis knows, he had better come along and give a bit of evidence.

Mr. HANSON: I rise to a point of order. The Minister has mentioned me. I was sitting here and did not open my mouth. I tell him quite frankly that he is not going to stand over me at any time.

Mr. PIZZEY: I merely suggested that if the hon. member or anybody else had any evidence, let him produce it.

The hon. member for South Brisbane asked—

"Was the police vehicle attached to Ashgrove police station used for the cartage of stolen bricks from a quarry?"

The answer was "No". It was not used to cart stolen bricks from a quarry. The hon. member for Kedron, a member of his own party, gave the truth on that question today.

The hon. member then asked—

"Was the police station being used for the purpose of conducting a poker school involving big sums of money?"

The answer was another "No".

He then asked—

"Had liquor parties been indulged in by the police at the Newmarket Bowling Club while on special duty?"

Another "No".

He then asked—

"Was a policewoman from Roma Street police station involved?"

And so it goes on.

Now let us get to the other question. It is the filthiest of the lot. It was asked in the knowledge that it would hit the Press because of its sensational character, even though it was merely the allegation of an anonymous person. Incidentally, the hon. member is not the only one who likes to tell this Chamber what anonymous persons say.

The hon. member asked whether it was alleged that a person at the police station had originally stolen money from the corpse of a man who died on his way from the races; if not, where did the money come from? Could there be any more contemptible implication than that? I think it must have disgusted hon. members on his own side.

He asked if the relatives of the deceased man claimed the money that was stolen and what sum did they allege was stolen. Again there was no allegation by the relatives; they did not claim that any money had been stolen.

It is true that the hon. member communicated with me on 26 July—I was overseas at the time—to the effect that on or about

12 July he had heard a news flash about the Ashgrove Police Station. The acting Minister at the time—the Premier—acknowledged his letter and said inquiries would be made.

An inquiry into a theft at a police station is not something that is carried out overnight; it is a rather serious matter and is not an every-day occurrence, I am glad to say. As a consequence an investigation was made with a view to ascertaining the identity of the person responsible for the offence. As a natural consequence the whole of the working of the station was examined. The investigation naturally took time, and as soon as it was possible for me to do so I replied on 29 September, telling the hon. member that the Ashgrove Police Station had been unlawfully entered in the early hours of 13 July, and that money and other property had been removed therefrom. I told him that the official money involved amounted to \$4. I naturally assumed that he was interested in knowing whether public moneys were involved. I told him that an investigation of the matter at police commissioned officer level had been carried out. The investigation was carried out by Inspector Strophair. I do not think there would be a more experienced and thorough investigator. I told the hon. member that the investigation had failed to locate the missing property or establish the identity of the person or persons who had entered the Ashgrove Police Station and removed the property therefrom.

The whole investigation was subject to close scrutiny and no evidence was forthcoming to prove that the other property stolen was other than the property of the officer in charge of the police station. There was no evidence to prove that he had come by that property other than lawfully. An amount of \$350 was reported by the officer in charge of the station as having been stolen from him, and that a lady's broken gold wrist-watch and a cigarette lighter, also his property had been stolen. If the hon. member had asked for details he would have got them. There was nothing to hide. I do not see the relevance of minor items such as these.

The Commissioner of Police is charged with the superintendence of the Police Force. That duty is imposed upon him by law. In the carrying out of this duty he transfers members of the Police Force on the basis that it is in the interests of the public to do so and to the best advantage of the Police Force. He considered that the recent transfers from Ashgrove should be made on this basis, and he made them. I expect that when the public interest is involved, coupled with the necessity to give the public the best service at all times, he will continue to make transfers on this basis.

The interest of the public is paramount. I say that the interest of the public would be neither served nor impaired by the non-production by me of the file of investigation. The file is closed. I do not think it is right

that files should be made available, particularly to a member who glorifies in the base, false and unfair innuendoes that we hear from him. In almost every case that he makes such statements his remarks are completely unfounded.

The hon. member for Bundaberg had a lot to say about the increase in expenditure over appropriation. As a former Treasurer he would know that this often occurs, particularly when substantial wage increases are granted during the year. These are not always provided for.

Mr. Walsh: \$700,000?

Mr. PIZZEY: In the opinion of the Police Force, at any rate, it was a fairly good Industrial Commission decision. The Police Force generally were happy with the award given in the last year. Every year certain provision is made for basic wage adjustments or, say, for the 2½ per cent. flowing through all awards, but if a union goes to the Industrial Commission and gains an award for an amount above or below what is expected then the expenditure will be different from the appropriation.

Mr. Walsh: Are you telling us that the Treasurer does not make provision for it in his Budget?

Mr. PIZZEY: He cannot make provision for exactly what is required. He does not always know when he is framing his Budget whether a submission will be made by a union to the Industrial Commission. He makes certain provision—of course he does.

The hon. member then spoke about the considerable increase in the staff of the Public Service.

Mr. Walsh: Who?

Mr. PIZZEY: I think the hon. member did. I think he named the number of public servants there were eight years ago and those on the staff today.

Mr. Walsh: Not me.

Mr. PIZZEY: The staff, apart from the policemen in the Commissioner's office. That is what I understood him to say.

Of course, the point is that over the years we have been progressively, and I believe wisely, replacing policemen in the clerical section with clerical staff, not only at headquarters but in the Traffic Branch and the district offices. Although the figures show the same number of policemen, with 20 or 30 clerks relieving policemen on clerical duties, extra policemen are then available for police duties.

Statistics indicate that in the clearing up of major crime the Queensland Police Force can hold its head very high. Eighty per cent. of all major crimes in this State have been cleared up. Those figures compare favourably with figures for any other State; in fact, they are as good as, if not better than, the performance of any other Police Force. Obviously, if a major crime occurs, many

police will be taken off minor investigations to concentrate on solving the serious crime. The hon. member referred to some police complaining. In any large service where promotion is involved there are always people who are not happy. I think it would be wrong if it were otherwise. It would mean that they had no ambition if they were not disappointed when they missed out on promotion. Wherever we look, be it the teaching service, the Public Service, the police, or the Opposition front bench, if a man misses out he is a little disappointed. He should be disappointed for a time; it is right that he should be.

Mr. Hanson: It would not occur over on that side—much!

Mr. PIZZEY: It occurs on this side, and it occurs wherever there is promotion. If it does not there is no ambition among those seeking promotion—if they are quite happy to be superseded believing that they have superior qualities.

I assure the hon. member that he need have no doubt about whether or not a coronial inquiry will be held into the death of Miss McKim-Hill. It will be a full and open inquiry, and many of the questions that perhaps now worry hon. members will be cleared up.

I think there has been too much of a personal attack on the Commissioner of Police. Naturally the hon. member for Bundaberg was disappointed at the non-appointment of another commissioned officer when the Commissioner of Police was appointed.

Mr. Walsh: That is not my complaint.

Mr. PIZZEY: The hon. member said so tonight.

Mr. Walsh: No, I did not. I said nothing of the sort.

Mr. PIZZEY: That is natural, of course, when the horse that we think is going to win—I will not say “we are backing”—does not get the top place. It is only natural to feel that the one who supplanted that person is not as capable. People are entitled to their points of view.

The hon. member referred to public relations. How is it that the Queensland Police Force is the only Police Force in Australia ever to win an award of the Institute of Public Relations? This was an institute that had no Police Force representative on it. There is no nominating for the award. The institute looks at industry, at commerce, at State Government departments and at Federal Government departments and, on its own initiative, without asking for nominations from various groups it examines the public relations of the various departments or sections of commerce, industries and so forth, and, in 1966, the Queensland Police Department was granted the Queensland award by this completely independent group, for the best public relations.

They are the people who should know. They are the people whose business it is to know whether or not the Police Force is held in high esteem by the public. The work of the Police Force in detecting and preventing crime and its standard of general courtesy are the highest they have ever been, and the regard in which the public holds the force is well known. It does not help when hon. members bring forward anonymous letters. They are always dangerous and are generally written by a person who has an axe to grind and has not the guts to put his name to the letter.

Mr. Walsh interjected.

Mr. PIZZEY: Before an anonymous letter containing accusations is read, an opportunity should be given for the accusations to be examined. If this is to be the pattern, it will be easy for any hon. member to get somebody else to write an anonymous letter and then read it in the Chamber and say, "That is what is being said about the Leader of the Opposition," or the hon. member for Nudgee, or the hon. member for South Brisbane, as the case may be. I am surprised that anyone with the hon. member's experience would use anonymous information the way he did tonight.

In the time available I shall deal with education—past, present and future. It goes without saying that considerable progress has been made in education during the past decade, and even those who politically must try to find fault with the Government know in their own hearts that this is true. But, as they would hasten to add, that is not enough. With education we must always be looking to the future or we will not operate at optimum efficiency. There are many different aspects and fields of education, each with its own particular needs.

Let us look firstly at tertiary education. It is quite true to say that the way is wide open to young Queenslanders. The hon. member for South Brisbane claimed that the increase in fees would prejudice smart young Queenslanders and deny them an opportunity of tertiary education. That is not true. If a young Queenslanders has more than average ability he has a chance to win a Commonwealth scholarship, under which all his fees are paid. To win a scholarship he must be within the first 1,500. There are scholarships other than Commonwealth scholarships. There are opportunities to go to a teachers' college, where no fees are paid. There are scholarships to the institutes of technology. The university is not the only source of tertiary education in Queensland. Some hon. members and some members of the public seem to think that if a student cannot get to the university he is denied tertiary education. There are now three very fine institutes of technology—at Brisbane, Rockhampton, and Toowoomba.

Mr. Melloy: They are not the same standard as the university.

Mr. PIZZEY: They are the same standard. When students qualify from them they are given recognition by the professional associations.

Mr. Melloy: Outside Queensland?

Mr. PIZZEY: Throughout Australia. Any student who receives an associate diploma of engineering from one of those institutes

Mr. Houston: There is no proof of that.

Mr. PIZZEY: Of course there is proof of it. They are accepted by the Institute of Engineers, Australia, with full membership rights.

Mr. Houston: How many have been accepted?

Mr. PIZZEY: Many of them; those who have qualified.

Mr. Houston: How many have qualified from a technical college?

Mr. PIZZEY: I do not know the exact number who have qualified.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. PIZZEY: I do not think the number is relevant. The relevant point is that people have qualified and have been accepted.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for South Brisbane that they each had an opportunity to speak during this debate. I now ask them to discontinue persistent interjecting.

Mr. HOUSTON: I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister for Education.

Mr. PIZZEY: The development of the new institutes—

Mr. Bennett: Tell us the truth, too.

Mr. PIZZEY: That would be something new for the hon. member for South Brisbane.

The development of the new institutes, and the uplifting of the levels of courses at Gatton, do not mean that emphasis on the university should slacken from the viewpoint of its importance as an institute of higher learning. Anyone who has visited the university during the past few years cannot fail to be impressed with the development that has taken place at St. Lucia. There has also been great development at the Townsville University College, which is something that was never envisaged by a Labour Government. According to the hon. member for South Brisbane, the university college and all the high schools that have been built in the last 10 years were planned in 1957. Did anyone ever hear such nonsense! He well knows that there was no planning except for a few high schools for the following year.

Mr. Duggan: That is completely untrue.

Mr. PIZZEY: The only plans were for the extension of a few high schools. There were no plans for the Townsville University College.

Mr. Duggan: I say you are telling an untruth if you say that there are no records in your department of plans for university extensions in Central and North Queensland.

Mr. PIZZEY: There were no plans whatever. What the hon. member for Toowoomba West is talking about are submissions by the late J. D. Story in which he referred to a certain type of institute. There were no plans, and there was no land available; it was merely what Mr. Story, as vice-chancellor of the university, envisaged for future development.

In the past five years capital expenditure at St. Lucia has totalled \$11,800,000, compared with \$2,100,000 in the last five years of Labour administration. In the past decade capital expenditure at St. Lucia has been about six times the total spent in the previous 10 years. Anyone who drives around the university will be aware of the very many new buildings that have been provided in the last decade—far more than existed there prior to 1957.

Last year and this year, in addition to the amount being spent at St. Lucia, a further \$1,200,000 has been, and is being, spent on teaching facilities at Brisbane hospitals.

The time has come to plan for the establishment of a new university, although on conservative estimates at least \$20,000,000 will be required for the completion of undergraduate facilities at St. Lucia. Total enrolments there have risen from 5,600 in 1957 to about 14,700 now. At Townsville, enrolments are now 532.

Capital expenditure at the Townsville University College since 1960-61 has totalled \$4,000,000, and many more millions will be spent there to develop the excellent new site at Ross River. Townsville University College is developing to such an extent that we can look forward to its becoming autonomous in 1970. From that time it will no longer be an adjunct of the University of Queensland but a university in its own right belonging to the people of North Queensland.

Site work is now proceeding at Mt. Gravatt, where the State's third university will be constructed. A great deal of planning is necessary before it can begin to take shape. It has to be set out carefully and designed in such a way as to be not only functional but a credit to the Brisbane skyline. Already a total of more than \$650,000 has been spent on acquisition of site, planning, and preparation of land.

As I said earlier, the university is not the only field of tertiary education. The Government has formed institutes which now provide largely part-time courses but which, in the future, will provide full-time tertiary courses.

Since its opening in 1965, enrolments at the Queensland Institute of Technology in Brisbane have risen from 2,100 to 3,350, and there is gradually developing on the site an institute complex providing facilities of a very high order. The new optometry clinic and the chemistry facilities are among the best of their kind in Australia and have the best and most up-to-date equipment. More than \$1,100,000 will be spent on the institute in Brisbane this year.

When talking about these institutes, I believe it should always be kept in mind that they are designed to produce graduates for industry—that is, young men and women trained towards the more practical side of a science or profession.

The two regional institutes, at Toowoomba and Rockhampton, opened their doors this year, each with a total enrolment of about 140. The first building for each institute has already been completed. Incidentally, both sites are excellent; they offer plenty of area for development and beautification. The second, third and fourth buildings at these institutes are now being planned. They will be for general studies and residential accommodation, and their total cost will be over \$2,000,000.

Mr. Houston: This is what you promised last year.

Mr. PIZZEY: These are already firm projects to which the Government is committed at both these institutes.

An area has been reserved on the site of each institute for the establishment of a teachers' college, and we envisage that students at the college will share facilities with students of the institute of technology.

To attract staff of a high calibre, salaries competitive with those in other States are offered, and I foresee the day in the not very distant future when the institutes will be among the great educational institutions of this State. I pay a tribute to the very high quality of the principals—Dr. A. Skertchly in Rockhampton, Mr. L. Barker in Toowoomba, and Dr. A. M. Fraser in Brisbane—and say to hon. members that the Government has been very fortunate also in the very high quality of the staff it has been able to attract to the institutes.

In 1964 the apprenticeship courses were recast in a more modern mould, with a reduction of one year in the period of training and a generally revised approach to apprenticeship training.

Mr. Houston: What a mess you made of that!

Mr. PIZZEY: If a mess was made of it, the unions and industry must share the responsibility for it, because they played a part in it. It now appears that other States are planning to follow the lead that Queensland has given.

As part of the redevelopment of technical training, it is planned to replace the Central Technical College complex with a series of

perimeter technical colleges in Brisbane, leaving the site of the Central Technical College free for the development of the Queensland Institute of Technology. That programme is well under way. The first of the colleges is in operation at Eagle Farm, the Yeronga college is well under construction, and future district colleges are under investigation. At Kangaroo Point the Graphic Arts School is in operation, and another specialist school, the Automotive Training School at South Brisbane, is offering high-level training.

The revitalisation of technical training has not been confined to Brisbane, and many improvements are being made to colleges in provincial cities. Much of this has been done with very generous help from the Commonwealth Government, which has come forward with an unmatched grant in this instance. As hon. members are aware, these colleges have been separated from high schools and have been given principals of their own. Almost all tradesmen in all the major provincial cities, and, indeed, in many of the smaller cities, are able to attend a well-equipped technical college that has its own principal and its own autonomy.

Mr. Houston: Tell us why the Technical Correspondence School is far behind.

Mr. PIZZEY: The Technical Correspondence School was so far behind because it was not possible to rewrite the courses fast enough.

Technical education is an extremely expensive field because of the needs for costly equipment, and its expansion into new areas is not a simple matter. Because of the high cost of equipment it is more economical, in some cases, to transport the apprentices to the equipment, and that is what we are doing at the Gold Coast at the present time. We are also doing it at Mt. Morgan, bringing the apprentices to Rockhampton. We are bringing them from the smaller centres into the larger centres.

I believe that the hon. member for Albert put up a case today for the establishment of a technical college at the Gold Coast. There is no doubt that as the figures rise there will be justification for it, and that with the number of carpentry and joinery apprentices there will be every justification for the establishment of a building trade section there at the earliest possible date, and this will be done. It may be only an embryo college catering at first only for the building trades, but as apprentices in the other trades grow it will be necessary to provide facilities for them.

Not much has been said in this debate about rural education and the tremendous change that has taken place in recent years. The Agricultural College at Lawes is being completely rebuilt. It was a collection mainly of Army huts, especially in the accommodation section.

Mr. Houston: It has taken you 10 years to do something.

Mr. PIZZEY: Hon. members opposite had not done anything for 20 years, and quite a lot has been done in the last 10 years. There are very fine residential buildings at Lawes. There are first-class laboratories, classrooms, lecture rooms and theatres. Anyone who pays a visit there now will see a tremendous change in the development of the Agricultural College at Gatton. There, too, there will be an opportunity for tertiary education, where young people can go after they matriculate and qualify as professional men in the fields of agriculture, horticulture and veterinary science.

These new courses now being offered at Gatton will have far-reaching effects in Queensland. Whichever way we look at it, we in this State will still be dependent on our rural industries as a pillar of our economy for many years to come. In accordance with the new look we are giving to Gatton, we are redeveloping the college physically at a cost of some \$5,000,000.

At the same time as we are developing Gatton, we are venturing into a new field of rural education with the rural training school at Longreach, a full-time two-year boarding establishment providing for young men who want to enter into occupation in the sheep and wool industry.

Mr. Houston: Will it give them entry to Gatton?

Mr. PIZZEY: No; the wool industry itself has played a large part in designing this course. Students are told before they go there that it will be an end course. It will have a particular purpose and will not give them entry to Gatton.

Agricultural courses have been provided at 20 high schools throughout the State and these, too, are providing a worthwhile service for all young people wishing to start life on the land. It has been decided to open two new colleges similar to the Longreach Rural Training School in the future. These will be new schools.

Mr. Houston: Where will they be?

Mr. PIZZEY: That has not yet been decided, but one will be in Central Queensland and the other in North Queensland. When they will operate and their exact locations have not yet been determined, but these two colleges will be of a similar type, offering a two-year post-Junior training course for those who wish to go straight into primary industry.

I pay a tribute at this stage to Mr. John Park, who was the first principal and who has given a wonderful start to this type of education. He was previously an organiser of the Junior Farmer movement and is now principal at the Longreach Rural Training School. I should also like to thank all those representatives of primary industry

and leaders of other organisations for the help they have given in developing rural technical education. With the Agricultural Education Advisory Council and the Technical Education Advisory Council, we are relying largely on the advice of industry representatives on the type of course they would like for people entering as tradesmen, technicians or technologists. This is as I think it should be. It should not be our job to say, "You ought to take this or that course." It should be our job to go to industry and say, "What do you feel is the training you need?", and then provide such training.

Teacher training is part of the field of tertiary education because entrance to it is at Senior level. This area of education has been expanded and uplifted during the past decade. Ten years ago the number of teachers in training was 1,178; we now have 2,759 in training. Ten years ago the period of teacher training was one year, yet hon. members opposite keep saying that the Government has fallen down on teacher training. They were satisfied to commence at Junior level in many cases; they were satisfied to give them only one year's training.

Mr. Melloy: Does that not apply to any industry today?

Mr. PIZZEY: No. The period of training was increased to two years in 1961, and a second teachers' college was established at Kedron Park.

Mr. Bennett interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I suggest that the hon. member for South Brisbane be more temperate in his interjections and remarks.

Mr. Bennett: What did I say?

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair does not have to repeat what any hon. member says. If the hon. member for South Brisbane attacks the Chair he will be asked to leave the Chamber.

Mr. Bennett: Mr. Hooper—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Bennett: With respect, Mr. Hooper, I did not say anything intemperate, and I never do, as you know.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I warn the hon. member under Standing Order 123A at this stage.

Mr. PIZZEY: Even though teacher training was extended to a period of two years, which meant that there was one year in which no teachers came out of the college, it is significant that there are still over 1,000 more primary teachers than there were in the service 10 years ago, with primary school enrolments now roughly the same as they were 10 years ago—about 200,000. The standard of entry to our teachers' colleges is high—as high as in any other Australian

State. Proportionately we would have as many at matriculation level as in any other State.

The basis of selection of teachers will change this year with the introduction of a new grading system at Senior, but the general standard will be the same. Generally speaking, the level of entry to teachers' colleges will be again the requirement of matriculation to the university.

A special committee has been set up to review teacher education in Queensland, comprising representatives of the Department of Education, the teachers' colleges, the university and the Queensland Teachers' Union.

As part of our plans for this development we are now building an art and library block at the Kelvin Grove College at a cost of \$520,000, and we plan to build a students' amenities block to cost \$150,000. At Kedron Park plans provide for an assembly hall and students' amenities block costing \$250,000. Meanwhile planning is under way for the establishment of two more colleges, one at Mt. Gravatt and one at Townsville. Both will open in 1969 and will provide accommodation for 500 in the first year, rising ultimately to 1,500. The Townsville college initially will cost about \$1,100,000 with a further \$600,000 of ancillary buildings to come later. Mt. Gravatt will cost about \$2,000,000 with a further \$1,200,000 worth of ancillary buildings to come later. A feature of the new colleges will be that for the first time residential accommodation will be provided at them.

As further teacher training accommodation is required colleges will be built, as I said before, adjacent to the institutes of technology at Toowoomba and Rockhampton. One of the conditions attaching to the Commonwealth's offer to build these colleges, or to participate in the building of these colleges, was that 10 per cent. of the total number of new places should be available for student teachers from non-State schools. The Queensland Government was happy to accept this and next year the first group of students who will not be bonded, and who will not necessarily be coming into the State teaching service, will be given an opportunity to go into those colleges.

There are many considerations when we look at the future of teachers' training courses. The committee will have no easy task—indeed it will have quite a difficult one—to work out what is the best form that this training should take and the qualifications that the teachers should have when they complete the course. While I naturally will await this committee's recommendations I think I can say at this stage that there is a trend Australia-wide (and world-wide) to give teacher training at a three-year-course level.

Some hon. members say that there has been no planning ahead, but there has been planning. Our Research and Guidance Section

has been looking at estimates of enrolments and requirements to reduce class sizes year by year. Provision is being made progressively to increase the number of teachers in training until, by 1971, the intake will be somewhere near 3,700 and, in 1975, it will be about 4,300. This will provide the aim of all education systems in Australia, namely, that of getting a teacher-pupil ratio of 1 to 26 in the primary schools and 1 to 16 in the secondary schools by 1975. I do not want to repeat what I said recently about class sizes but all statistics indicate that class sizes are being reduced progressively. The average size of primary school classes has now dropped from 38.9 in 1963 to 37.1 in 1967. It is getting smaller each year. To get it down by one requires 210 extra teachers, so it is not just a simple matter of saying that a drop of one or two is not very much because a lot of teachers are required to bring about a drop in class sizes.

Mr. Houston: Are you recruiting any teachers from other States?

Mr. PIZZEY: We are getting many from other States and overseas.

The number of primary classes exceeding 50 pupils has dropped from 4.5 per cent. to .7 per cent. of the total, and the number exceeding 45 has dropped from 16.8 per cent. in 1963 to 6.2 per cent. today. More than one-third of all primary classes—excluding those in small schools—in Queensland State schools have 35 or fewer pupils this year.

In the secondary branch, average class sizes are determined on the basis of the size of the English class because all students take English. In 1965 the average English class size was 33.6; now it is 31.4. In 1965, 24.7 per cent. of classes in English had more than 40 pupils. This percentage is now down to 11.4 and it will be reduced year by year. The same applies in every other grade. In Grades 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 the percentage of large classes is getting smaller and, naturally, the percentage of small classes is rising in proportion. In the Senior English grades, grades 11 and 12, 3.1 per cent. and .6 per cent. of classes have more than 40 pupils, while 87.5 per cent. and 90.4 per cent. have 35 or fewer pupils. Almost all senior English grades, grades 11 and 12, have 35 pupils or fewer. I do not claim that no class has no more than 35 pupils.

Thus we are making substantial progress towards our goal of having no class of more than 40 in a primary school, no class of more than 35 in the lower secondary grades, and no class of more than 30 in the upper secondary grades. To the layman, perhaps, the progress we are making may not seem substantial or spectacular. But the pupil-teacher ratio is now 31.2 in primary schools, a very considerable improvement on what it was several years ago.

This Budget has provided for 600 extra teachers next year over and above those required for increased enrolments, and there will be, as a result, a marked improvement in the staffing of schools at the beginning of the year. If we employ married women—they are approaching the 2,000 mark—to make class sizes smaller and to obtain better staffing at schools, there will be no staff available later in the year to fill vacancies caused by normal resignations, and resignations there will always be because with such a large female content in the staff there will be hundreds of women marrying or having a family and not wanting to continue after their marriage. There are many who want to go overseas to gain experience in other systems.

Something was said about lack of accommodation for teachers in the country. This Government has provided countless twin flatettes in numerous country towns to give all teachers, both male and female, decent accommodation when they are transferred to country areas.

In this Budget we have also provided for clerical assistance at primary schools. This is the first occasion on which primary schools have had clerical assistance. There were primary schools in the past with over 1,000 children at which there was no clerical assistance. It has been our practice to provide clerical assistance at high schools because of the nature of the clerical work involved. Already 20 such appointments have been made to primary schools in this State and as the Junior examination results become available more will be appointed to all primary schools with an enrolment of more than 800, and primary schools with secondary departments, if the total enrolment at the school is over 400, will be entitled to apply for a clerk-typist to assist with the duties. This will provide a total of 80 clerical staff in primary schools.

Mr. Houston: They will not interfere with the assistant head teachers?

Mr. PIZZEY: No. There is plenty of work for them to do. This policy will be extended as funds become available. Over the past year or so we have been providing a small sum of money to secondary departments to enable them to engage clerical assistance for one, two, or three days a week, according to their needs.

In-service training has been greatly increased and seminars are now held regularly. Science telecasts for teachers are now being made as part of this in-service training. Very successful in-training courses have been held at Tallebudgera Camp for principals and head-teachers.

Apart from the regular courses held in school time, the vacation seminars such as those offered at Townsville and Brisbane for primary teachers have proved very popular. Last year 1,100 teachers attended, and so far this year 1,200 applications have been received for the 16 courses to be offered in

Townsville and Brisbane during the Christmas vacation. That is a very heartening indication of the keen professional interest of teachers.

A new professional journal known as "Quest" is now being produced by the department, and will be contributed to largely by practising teachers who will pass on the benefits of their experience and knowledge to others.

Mr. Bromley: What is the name of it—"Trend"?

Mr. PIZZEY: "Quest". If the hon. member for Norman is interested, I shall provide him with a copy.

In the field of special education services, I should like to say that there are being provided in this State services acknowledged to be equal to the best in Australia and throughout the rest of the world. If hon. members watch "Week-end Magazine" on television next Sunday or the following Sunday they will see what Queensland is doing in providing secondary education for blind children.

Mr. Bromley: It is very good.

Mr. PIZZEY: No member knows more than does the hon. member for Norman about the work being done in this field. In the education of deaf children, the Government is helping the pre-school centre for deaf children at Yeronga in various ways of which you, Mr. Hooper, will be fully aware seeing that you have been active in the organisation of that school. The Government provides teachers as well as other forms of assistance. The school for deaf children at Annerley is being re-developed at present at an over-all cost of \$1,300,000 in a programme which is providing excellent classrooms and residential facilities.

Visually handicapped children are receiving the special attention that they require at Narbethong, where we will spend \$40,000 this year on extra class-rooms, administration and canteen facilities. The Government this year also assisted the head-teacher of Narbethong to attend an international conference in the United States. Anyone who speaks with him realises that when he was there he was proud of what was being done in Queensland and was able to hold his head high in discussions with those holding comparable positions in other countries.

The value of all this work can be judged by the fact that handicapped children are entering normal schools and sitting for, and passing, public examinations. Later they are moving out into the community and into worth-while occupations.

The field of education for slow learners at opportunity schools has also expanded considerably in the past decade. The Government has quadrupled the number of places available for slow learners in Queensland, and surely nobody will say that there are now four times as many slow learners

as there were 10 years ago. At that time only a start had been made in providing facilities for them. There were then 500 places available, and there are now 1,850. It will not be long before more classes are provided for them, and over 2,000 slow learners will then be accommodated.

I now want to say something about the primary education syllabus. The other night those who watched Dr. Drinkwater being interviewed on television heard him say that he had no complaints to make about our syllabus planning. He felt that both primary and secondary syllabuses were of a standard generally accepted in all States.

Mr. Houston: Are you coming to our seminar to hear him?

Mr. PIZZEY: I do not know what he will say at that seminar. I was surprised to learn that Baldwin is to speak at it.

Mr. Houston: What's wrong with him?

Mr. PIZZEY: You know.

Mr. Houston: You use this Chamber to condemn one of your own teachers.

Mr. Bennett: You are casting a smear and then leaving it in the air.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Bennett: Mud-slinging, that is all you are doing. Mud-slinger!

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. PIZZEY: A syllabus committee is continually revising the syllabuses for the various subjects. Nothing is static. Year by year the committee is examining, revising, improving, and studying modern trends and new experiments that have been successful and incorporating them in the syllabuses. In both primary and secondary school syllabuses, a regular, thorough and searching revision is being carried out. A new science course was introduced this year, and next year a new physics course will be used in about 24 pilot schools. In addition, a new biological course will be introduced. Teachers will be trained so that these courses can be provided.

The provision of wide opportunities for the children of the State has been the result of careful planning in association with practising teachers and professional educationists. It has been said by some that the department lays down the syllabuses for examinations. On the Board of Junior Studies and the Board of Senior Studies the department has only some of the representatives: there also are representatives from the private schools and from the university.

(Time expired.)

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 10.8 p.m.