

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 15 OCTOBER 1968**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

**TUESDAY, 15 OCTOBER, 1968**

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

**ADDRESS IN REPLY**

**HER MAJESTY'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

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

"Government House,  
Brisbane, 14 October, 1968.

"Sir,

"I have the honour to inform you that the Message of Loyalty from the Legislative Assembly of Queensland dated 19 September, 1968, has been laid before the Queen.

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

"Yours faithfully,

"ALAN J. MANSFIELD,  
Governor.

"The Honourable

"The Speaker of the Legislative

Assembly,

"Parliament House,  
"Brisbane."

**ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES**

**NOMINATION OF MR. P. R. SMITH**

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members, I nominate Mr. P. R. Smith to be Acting Chairman during the absence of the Chairman of Committees, Mr. Hooper, on account of illness.

**AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT**

**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS**

Mr. SPEAKER announced the receipt from the Auditor-General of his report on the public accounts of the State for the year 1967-68.

Ordered to be printed.

**DISTINGUISHED VISITOR**

Mr. N. I. UROE, M.P. (PAPUA-NEW GUINEA)

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members, it is my pleasant duty this morning, on your behalf, to extend a very sincere welcome to our Assembly to an hon. member of the Parliament of Papua-New Guinea, Mr. N. I. Uroe, elected member for Rigo-Abau.

Mr. Uroe, we extend to you a very sincere welcome and trust that your visit to us will be not only an enjoyable one but that it will also be informative.

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

20

**QUESTIONS**

**EXPENDITURE FROM ROAD  
CONSTRUCTION FUNDS**

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

What amount was spent on roads, etc., throughout the State for the financial year 1967-68 from each of the following funds:—(a) Main Roads Funds Permanent Works and Maintenance, (b) Commonwealth Aid Fund, (c) Road Maintenance Fund, (d) Traffic Engineering Trust Fund, (e) Treasury Subsidies on Road, Street and Bridge Works, (f) Urban Road Construction Fund and (g) any other fund in (i) Brisbane City Area, (ii) Northern Division, (iii) Central Division and (iv) Southern Division?

Answer:—

"\$2,682,381 was spent in 1967-68 on Treasury subsidies for road, street and bridge works. Of this sum, \$1,654,237 was paid to Brisbane City Council and the balance to other local authorities. It is not practicable to dissect the expenditure further without considerable detailed re-examination of the year's records, which would involve considerable expense."

**HOUSING FOR EMPLOYEES OF COAL  
DEVELOPERS, BARCOO ELECTORATE**

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

As Blackwater has obviously become the residential centre for most of the employees of Utah Development Coy. coal mine which is in the electorate of Barcoo, have Clutha and Thies, who are anticipated as becoming mine operators in the same district, entered into negotiations with the Housing Commission for the provision of homes for employees and, if so, at what location or locations?

Answer:—

"I am not aware whether either of these organisations has yet taken a decision as to where it would prefer its employees to be located for residential purposes."

**LOCAL AUTHORITY RATING OF UTAH  
DEVELOPMENT COY. LEASE**

Mr. O'Donnell, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Local Government,—

As Local Authorities have two alternatives in rating mining leases, viz., on the basis of (a) a valuation equal to twenty times the annual rent or (b) the fee simple valuation as determined by the Valuer-General,—

(1) Who determines which basis is used and at what time relative to the granting of the mining lease is the determination made?

(2) Was the rating basis an item in an agreement between Utah Development Coy. and the Government signed in October, 1967, and, if so, why was no public statement made about it?

*Answer:—*

(1 and 2) "Local Authorities have no alternatives under the Local Government Acts as to the method of rating mining leases. Under the Acts, rates are required to be made and levied equally on the rateable value of rateable land in the particular local authority area. The method of determining the rateable value is set forth in section 24 of the Acts. I have no knowledge of the matter raised in the Honourable Member's Question No. 2."

SOUTHERN ELECTRIC AUTHORITY  
CIRCULAR ON V.I. STOCK

**Mr. Davies for Mr. Bennett**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Mines,—

(1) Is he aware that in a circular of August 31, 1968, from the Southern Electric Authority of Queensland to variable interest stockholders, there is a grossly inaccurate statement in that the circular states that in 1975 holders "will then receive Government guaranteed fixed term stock" when, in fact, clause 14 of the agreement merely gives an option to the Minister to convert the V.I. stock in 1975, or some later date, without providing any right to the V.I. stockholders for automatic conversion at any time?

(2) To prevent the possibility of this inaccurate information misleading investors and distorting stock exchange values for the V.I. stock, will he take prompt action to require the Authority to (a) retract the incorrect statement and issue a circular to V.I. stockholders informing them that they have no right of conversion in 1975 or at any future date, (b) advise Brisbane Stock Exchange and stock exchanges in other capital cities of the correction and (c) inform all capital city newspapers and financial journals in Australia of the correction?

(3) Will he take action to see that the Authority refrains from making such grossly misleading statements in future and remind the members of the board of the Authority of their obligation to provide accurate factual information to the investing public?

*Answers:—*

(1) "The circular of August 31, 1968, from the Southern Electric Authority of Queensland to variable interest stockholders did not contain a grossly inaccurate statement that in 1975 'holders will then receive Government guaranteed fixed term stock'. In referring to the agreement reached at the recent meeting of the

Australian Loan Council that issues of variable interest stock by the Southern Electric Authority of Queensland would cease after June, 1975, the circular clearly indicated that, under the agreement between the State of Queensland and the Authority, the Government upon giving prescribed notice had the right to require that variable interest stock be converted into fixed interest bearing stock at the rate of interest then payable on variable interest stock redeemable in from 15 to 20 years. The circular indicated further that this stock would be Government guaranteed and examples were included of two alternative ways in which payment might be made if the Government decided on the conversion. All of these statements are in accordance with fact, and the words quoted out of context by the Honourable Member are qualified in this way and in other ways in the circular to which he refers."

(2 and 3) "As no grossly inaccurate statement or inaccurate information was included in the circular, no action of the kind suggested is necessary."

INJURY TO MR. BARRY CLARKE

**Mr. Davies for Mr. Bennett**, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

(1) Is he aware that Barry Clarke is presently a patient in Ward S.7, Princess Alexandra Hospital, with a fractured neck received following a send-off to a detective who was leaving the Queensland Police Force? If so, what inquiries have been made regarding the injuries to Clarke?

(2) Did Clarke receive the injury in his own home?

(3) What action will be taken about this affair?

*Answers:—*

(1) "Yes. This matter has been investigated."

(2 and 3) "Appropriate Court action has been commenced and the matter is therefore *sub judice*."

ALLEGED ACCIDENT AT PEDESTRIAN  
CROSSING, WYNNUM

**Mr. Davies for Mr. Bennett**, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

(1) Was an elderly lady, Mrs. E. E. Poole, 286 Tingal Road, Wynnum, knocked down on a pedestrian crossing in Florence Street, Wynnum, by a traffic constable, thereby causing her to break her glasses and forcing hospital treatment to her head and arms? If so, what action will be taken about the matter?

(2) Was her husband's death caused by worry over her accident? If so, is it proposed to pay Mrs. Poole any compensation?

Answers:—

(1) "No. The Honourable Member has been incorrectly informed."

(2) "No."

EXTERNAL UNIVERSITY COURSES  
UNDERTAKEN BY STATE SCHOOL  
TEACHERS

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

(1) How many teachers sat as part-time students for University subjects last year?

(2) How many passed their examinations?

(3) What was the total number of units passed by teachers in Government schools?

Answers:—

(1) "1,742 teachers."

(2) "251 teachers passed in two subjects; 1,218 teachers passed in one subject."

(3) "1,720 subjects."

RATIONALISATION PLAN FOR MARKETING  
OF PINEAPPLES

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

(1) As, during the period of pineapple direction, in order to obtain quotas, canners entered into agreement with the Committee of Direction of Fruit Marketing to abide by industry policy and as this policy will involve the suspension of pineapple direction when the rationalisation plan comes into effect, can the C.O.D. legally prevent the canners from buying pineapples direct from growers?

(2) If the pineapple direction is re-introduced after a period of suspension, will the C.O.D. have the power to refuse supplies to canners who entered into contracts with growers during the period the suspension of the direction was in operation?

Answers:—

(1) "Whether or not the C.O.D., in the event of the pineapple direction being suspended, could legally prevent a canner from buying pineapples direct from growers who were non-subscribers to the Northgate Cannery would depend upon the existence or otherwise of an agreement or a contract between the canner concerned and the C.O.D. and the nature of such agreement or contract."

(2) "At any time when the marketing of pineapples is subject to the same directive control as currently exists, the supplying of pineapples to processors could be done only by the C.O.D. or under the instructions and with the authority of the C.O.D."

DREDGING WORK AND BOAT HARBOUR  
DEVELOPMENT, CABBAGE TREE CREEK

**Mr. Dean**, pursuant to notice, asked The Treasurer,—

(1) Are dredging operations taking place in Cabbage Tree Creek, Sandgate, at the present time? If not, why not?

(2) What is the amount of capital allocated for the dredging of Cabbage Tree Creek and the development of the boat harbour there?

Answers:—

(1) "No. Some urgent dredging was carried out by departmental plant which has since been returned to normal river maintenance work. Tenders were called for the completion of the dredging work and the tenders are now under consideration."

(2) "\$142,830 has been expended to June 30, 1968, and \$42,000 has been allocated for the financial year 1968-69."

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY; PREMIER AND  
MINISTER FOR STATE DEVELOPMENT

**Hon. G. W. W. CHALK** (Lockyer—Treasurer) (11.12 a.m.): I desire to inform the House that, in connection with the visit overseas of the Premier and Minister for State Development, His Excellency the Governor has, by virtue of the provisions of the Officials in Parliament Act, 1896-1968, authorised and empowered the Honourable Gordon William Wesley Chalk, Treasurer, to perform and exercise all or any of the duties, powers and authorities imposed or conferred upon the Honourable the Premier and Minister for State Development by any Act, rule, practice or ordinance on and from 28 September, 1968, and until the return to Queensland of the Honourable Johannes Bjelke-Petersen.

I lay upon the table of the House a copy of the Queensland Government Gazette Extraordinary of 26 September, 1968, notifying this arrangement.

Whereupon the hon. gentleman laid the Government Gazette Extraordinary upon the table

OVERTIME PAID IN GOVERNMENT  
DEPARTMENTS

RETURN TO ORDER

The following paper was laid on the table:—

Return to an Order made by the House on 22 August last, on the motion of **Mr. Harris**, showing the amount of overtime paid in each Government department (all funds) in 1967-68.

## PAPERS

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

## Reports—

Public Service Commissioner, for the year 1967-68.

Public Accountants Registration Board of Queensland, for the year 1967-68.

Agricultural Bank, for the year 1967-68.

Minister for Education, for the year 1967.

Chief Safety Engineer, Chief Inspector of Machinery, Scaffolding, and Weights and Measures, for the year 1967-68.

Registrar of Co-operative Housing Societies, for the year 1967-68.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

## Proclamations under—

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

The Weights and Measures Acts Amendment Act of 1967.

## Orders in Council under—

The Harbours Acts, 1955 to 1968.

The Racing and Betting Acts, 1954 to 1967.

The Water Acts, 1926 to 1967.

The River Improvement Trust Acts, 1940 to 1965.

The City of Brisbane Acts, 1924 to 1967.

The State Electricity Commission Acts, 1937 to 1965.

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

## Regulations under—

The Local Government Acts, 1936 to 1967.

The Weights and Measures Acts, 1951 to 1967.

The Traffic Acts, 1949 to 1968.

By-law No. 975 under the Railways Acts, 1914 to 1965.

## Reports—

State Stores Board, for the year 1967-68.

Secretary, Queensland Law Society Incorporated, under the provisions of the Legal Assistance Act of 1965.

Brisbane Market Trust, for the year 1967-68.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

## FLAMMABLE CLOTHING

**Hon. J. D. HERBERT** (Sherwood—Minister for Labour and Tourism) (11.16 a.m.), by leave: Hon. members are aware that, at present, the Standards Association of Australia is actively investigating the practicability of developing a satisfactory Australian standard regarding flammable

clothing. I have received from the Technical Director of that association a detailed statement regarding the consideration that has been given to this matter to date by the Standards Association of Australia.

In view of the general interest in this matter and for the information of hon. members, I lay upon the table of the House a copy of the statement to which I have referred.

Whereupon the hon. gentleman laid the paper upon the table.

## FORM OF QUESTION

**Mr. HOUGHTON** (Redcliffe) having given notice of a question—

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The latter part of the question seeks an expression of opinion.

## DEATH OF MR. A. J. SKINNER

## MOTION OF CONDOLENCE

**Hon. G. W. W. CHALK** (Lockyer—Acting Premier) (11.34 a.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"1. That this House desires to place on record its appreciation of the services rendered to this State by the late Alexander James Skinner, Esquire, a former member of the Parliament of Queensland.

"2. That Mr. Speaker be requested to convey to the widow and family of the deceased gentleman the above resolution, together with an expression of the sympathy and sorrow of the members of the Parliament of Queensland in the loss they have sustained."

Frequently this Legislature is called upon to record its appreciation of the services rendered to the State by a former member who has died after his term in Parliament has ceased. The occasion is always sad for those who served with him. The majority of hon. members probably were not acquainted with the late Alexander James Skinner, who entered the Queensland Parliament after the general election in March, 1953, as representative of the electorate of Somerset, and who made his first appearance along with the Minister for Education and Cultural Activities and the hon. members for Cook, Norman and Aubigny.

The late Mr. Skinner remained in Parliament until his defeat in the general election on 2 August, 1957, which brought about a change of Government. His Parliamentary career was, therefore, relatively brief, but it was by no means inactive, as the records of "Hansard" will show. He was most attentive at the House and was a contributor to debates in the House on a variety of issues. Those who sat with him—and I am included in that number—will credit him with having spent much time on the preparation of his arguments. He had many brushes, if I can

put it that way, with members on this side, who were then in Opposition, but he always vigorously defended what he conscientiously believed to be right in the interests of his constituents and of the State of Queensland.

Before entering Parliament the late hon. gentleman was employed as a fitter and turner at the Ipswich Railway Workshops for a number of years and was, I believe, a very active member of the Amalgamated Engineering Union. After vacating politics and until the time of his death he was on the staff of the Main Roads Department.

The late hon. gentleman gave very valuable service to this State, and I commend to hon. members this expression of sympathy to his widow and family.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (11.38 a.m.): The Opposition wishes to join with the Acting Premier in this motion of condolence to the late Mr. Skinner's family. As the Acting Premier has said, it is always sad for members of this House to have to move and support condolence motions, not only because of the passing of the person concerned but also because of the loss that his family and relatives have suffered. I think this is the worst feature of any motion such as this; they are the ones who are left to battle through life's problems, and therefore they are the ones who naturally suffer the greatest loss.

Unfortunately I did not know the deceased gentleman so I cannot say very much about his parliamentary associations. I can, of course, endorse what the Acting Premier has said with regard to his entry into Parliament. From his reputation he was a person who engaged in very vigorous debate when the occasion demanded.

On behalf of the Opposition, I join with the Acting Premier in extending to the late Mr. Skinner's family and relatives, and those near and dear to him, our sincere condolences.

**Mr. DIPLOCK** (Aubigny) (11.40 a.m.): On behalf of the Queensland Labour Party, I wish to associate myself with the motion moved by the Acting Premier and seconded by the Leader of the Opposition. I endorse the remarks of the Acting Premier. Prior to Mr. Skinner's coming to this House, he had wide industrial experience and was well versed in rural matters. During his term as a member of this Assembly he was never found wanting in pressing the needs of the rural community, and he was always striving to improve the conditions of his former fellow-workers. He was a keen student of politics and consequently he was very effective in debate. Those who knew him well will agree with me when I say that he was a good mate and a loyal colleague. It is very sad for me to have to associate myself with this motion.

Motion (Mr. Chalk) agreed to, hon. members standing in silence.

## LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

### INITIATION

**Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE** (Bowen—Minister for Justice): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Legal Practitioners Acts 1881 to 1965 and for other purposes."

Motion agreed to.

## JUDGES' PENSIONS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

### INITIATION

**Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE** (Bowen—Minister for Justice): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Judges' Pensions Acts 1957 to 1967 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

## SUPPLY

### COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT— RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

(The Acting Chairman of Committees,  
Mr. Smith, Windsor, in the chair)

Debate resumed from 26 September (see p. 607) on Mr. Chalk's motion—

"That there be granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1968-69, a sum not exceeding \$4,321 to defray the salary of Aide-de-Camp to His Excellency the Governor."

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (11.43 a.m.): Today, according to the Treasurer, we are discussing Queensland's "march of progress" Budget. To me, it is the Government's "guilty conscience" or "election jitters" Budget. Apparently the Treasurer likes giving his Budgets a name. He called his first Budget, in 1966-67, a "push ahead" Budget, and in that year he introduced a lot of new taxation. We should note that it was his first Budget—the Government's first Budget—after an election. He imposed some very severe taxes on the people of this State. I believed they were so severe for two purposes: first, the Government was not honest in its budgeting in 1965 because of the approaching 1966 election, and second, in the 1966-67 Budget it had its eyes on the 1969 election.

The increased taxes involved a suburban rail fare increase averaging 25 per cent. and a country rail fare increase of 20 per cent. Neither of those increases has been reduced. People travelling by our railways have received no concessions at all in this Budget. Of course, this could be a step in the Government's attitude against the railways and an effort to force people to use other means of

transport. There is plenty of evidence to show that the Government is more inclined to foster the private bus operator than to improve our own railway passenger system.

The Government increased, to the tune of 15 per cent., the freight on coal, coke and other minerals, wheat, maize and other grains, hay and chaff, flour, refined sugar and parcels.

Let us look at these increases. First of all, the coal referred to is not that going from Blackwater to Japan or from Moura to Japan; it is coal, in the main, for home consumption. The coal from Moura and Blackwater is subject to an agreement and is not, and was not, affected by the increase.

In this Budget the Government has seen fit to reduce, by 5 per cent., the freight rate on raw sugar, hay, livestock, general merchandise, log and sawn timber, fruit, wool and cotton.

Let us not forget that only two years ago the Government drastically increased, by 15 per cent., the freight charges on wheat and hay. Even after reducing it by 5 per cent., the rate is still much higher than it was prior to the 1966-67 Budget. It is still around 10 per cent. above the 1966 election charges, when primary producers were suffering drought.

Let us see what else the Government did two years ago. Freight rates on cement, livestock and general merchandise were increased by 10 per cent. Here again the Government is saying that it is reducing the freight rates on livestock and general merchandise by 5 per cent., but the charges are still higher by some 5 per cent. than they were in May, 1966.

The Government talks about the reduction of freight on log and sawn timbers, fruit, wool and cotton. These rates were increased by 7½ per cent. in 1966, so, even with the present reductions, they are still higher by 2½ per cent. than they were in 1966-67.

Let us look at the amount of reduction that has been offered—the total reduction—and see whether the producers are getting an over-all reduction. The 1967-68 annual increase arising from the charges in the 1966-67 Budget was estimated by the Treasurer at \$8,400,000. Naturally, it was expected that that would continue over the years and would gradually increase owing to the higher tonnages being carried.

For the whole of this year, the estimated saving by reason of the reduction in rate is \$3,150,000. So, even with the reduction, the users of our rail system will still be required to pay over \$5,000,000 more than they did prior to mid-1966.

The Treasurer went on to indicate that there would be a reduction in road transport fees payable on the carriage of livestock, and he gave details of it. But the main feature is that the concession for the full year was to be \$400,000. In 1966-67 the increased State transport fees were to

return \$750,000 for the year. In other words, the reduction is \$350,000 less than the annual increase proposed in that earlier increase in taxation.

The Government talks about a State land tax reduction. But here again the amount offered (\$150,000) will in no way compensate the landholders for their increases in valuations, which are gradually appearing this year and will continue to do so next year. The increased valuations will soon swallow up the concessions.

In reference to succession duty, let me say that any relief that can be given to the people who are left small estates is welcome. Naturally we support this reduction. My complaint is that it is easy to allow a reduction if there has been over-taxation for a couple of years. I claim that the Government deliberately overtaxed in 1966-67 with a view to being able to reduce taxation at this point of time. In fact, the public has been the subject of a decent-sized confidence trick.

When this State's primary producers needed assistance—particularly at the height of the drought—the Government was callous in increasing freight rates. The Treasurer said that the total cost to the Government of the concessions for the remainder of this financial year will be \$3,000,000. The increase in 1966-67 was estimated at \$8,250,000, so the Government is still \$5,250,000 up. For a total year the estimated saving to the community is \$4,250,000, compared with the estimated increase of \$14,685,000.

Even on the Government's own figures, this reduction is "peanuts" compared to what the Government calculated it would, and did, in fact, take from the various people concerned in the 1966-67 increases.

To summarise, then, on the state of the 1966-67 increases, the following rates are still in effect and have not been changed in the intervening period. On the 1966 figures, we still have a suburban rail fare increase of 25 per cent., and a country rail fare increase of 20 per cent. Those rates are both for passengers.

The freight rates on coke and other minerals, and chaff, flour, refined sugar and parcels, are still up by 15 per cent. on the 1966 rates. The freight rate on hay is now 10 per cent. up on the 1966 rates. The rates for general contracts and sugar-cane are still up 7½ per cent. on the 1966 rates. The rates for cement, livestock and general merchandise are up 5 per cent. and the rates for logs, sawn timber, fruit, cotton and wool are still up by 2½ per cent. on the 1966 rates. State transport fees have not been reduced, and motor vehicle registration fees are still up. I ask the primary producer: what has the Government given you in this three-year term?

The Treasurer said that the increases in stamp duty and hospital fees on those in the 1966-67 Budget merely followed the practices in other States, and I believe that if the Government is returned Queensland can be

sure that the anti-Labour Treasurer will argue that in the Budget of 1969 his Government must follow those of other States and further increase taxation as the other States have done this year. In fact, last week the Treasurer met other Premiers to seek increased taxation fields.

Queensland can look forward to the imposition of a receipt duty such as the one imposed in Victoria and South Australia, and it can also look forward to higher purchase duties and a further increase in hospital charges. In fact, the 1966 increase in hospital fees has not been reduced, and a further increase can well be expected in 1969 under an anti-Labour Government.

Let us now have a look at the 1967-68 Estimates to see how accurate they were. For the purpose of this analysis, I have removed from the figures the sugar industry assistance supplementary payment for the 1966 pool of \$19,768,397. That was a payment received which was not expected and has not been carried forward in this year, so the facts and figures to which I refer in my calculations exclude that amount.

We find that the actual income from Commonwealth sources for the year 1967-68 amounted to \$154,624,131, compared with the estimate of \$151,862,970. In other words, there was an increase of 1.16 per cent. above the estimate, which could mean, I suppose, that this was fairly close budgeting when dealing with amounts of such magnitude and also some variables.

Let us look at the position for this year. We find that the estimate for 1968-69 is \$165,362,060, or an increase of \$10,737,929 on last year's Commonwealth income, excluding the sugar industry's assistance payment. That is an increase of 6.9 per cent. from this source. With an extra \$10,700,000 available, one would expect that some work could be done in addition to last year's effort.

Let us now look at the State taxation fields of various licences and permits, land tax, various duties, betting tax and turnover tax. Taxes from these fields were estimated in 1967-68 to give an income of \$54,934,000, whereas in fact they returned \$60,445,083. In other words, the amount received exceeded the estimate by \$5,700,000, or 10.4 per cent., which proves my point at that time that the extra taxation was excessive. If you have an extra \$5,700,000, naturally you expect a lot of work to be done, so I do not think the Government is entitled to any great praise when its estimate of income was out not by 1 per cent. or approximately that figure, but by 10 per cent.

This year the estimated income is \$62,342,310, which is still up 2.8 per cent. on last year's actual income. This shows that even though the Treasurer talks about reductions in State transport fees and stamp duty and succession duty, he is still estimating

that there will be an over-all increase of 2.8 per cent. in the income obtained from these sources.

Under territorial income—that is, land revenue particularly—the estimated income was \$9,252,000, whereas the amount received was \$10,831,886, which shows that receipts were under-estimated by 17 per cent. Surely one should be able to expect a Treasurer to be closer than that in his estimating.

The Government estimates that this year \$11,860,000, or an increase of over \$1,000,000, will be received from this source, which shows that it is a good source of income for the Government. In other words, receipts will be up by 9.4 per cent. When one recalls that the Treasurer stated when presenting his Financial Statement that he intended to reduce land tax by a total of \$150,000, one could believe that here was something for the people on the land. On the contrary, we find that he expects to pick up in rents an extra \$1,000,000, or 9.4 per cent., on the revenue obtained last year. This money will come from the same group of people to whom he is giving back \$150,000.

Let me now refer to mining. One finds here that the estimated income was \$2,300,000 and that, in fact, the income was \$2,627,292—an increase of \$327,000, or 14.2 per cent. This is one source of income that I am very happy is on the increase, because it is our return as a State from our natural resources. It is not coming from individuals. It is estimated that next year there will be a further increase to \$2,729,000, an increase of just over \$100,000 or 3.8 per cent.

I should like the Treasurer to explain this: If we are going to have all this massive increase in coal production and in exports to Japan, how can we justify the increase in the return to the State of only 3.8 per cent.? It is very enlightening to realise that the total royalties, etc., are less than half of the amount received from the totalisator tax, betting tax and bookmakers' turnover tax. It is worth noting, also, that although the State receives only 5c a ton for coal (which is a national asset), we take from the kangaroo-shooter, who is killing an animal that is considered to be in pest proportions, 5c for every kangaroo he shoots, and a kangaroo is worth approximately \$1.50. But that is not all we get from the kangaroo. We receive also \$1.50 for every ton of kangaroo-meat processed. Surely coal is a greater asset and worth more than a kangaroo!

I refer next to fines and forfeitures, receipts from which were \$184,800 over the estimate. The Government expects that the income from these sources will rise further, to \$2,250,000, this year. The figures hardly show the Government's belief that our traffic problems are going to ease, with fewer fines resulting from less breaking of the law in this field and the other fields in which fines are the order of penalty.



I come next to the Railway Department, where the estimated income was \$90,000,000 and the actual income \$91,171,330, an increase of 1.3 per cent. I suppose one could say that this was fairly close to the estimate. However, the estimated income for this year is up to \$95,000,000, which represents an increase of \$3,800,000, or 3.5 per cent. One would think that, with the boasted increase in mineral carriage and coal carriage, there would be a larger increase than this. As it is a trading section of a State enterprise, we would like it to be showing a much greater income than this, particularly when one realises the extent of the expenditure in the running and servicing of the system. This year it is up to \$95,226,000, which will give a loss of \$226,000. There is also available this year the \$970,028 which was surplus from last year's operations.

One finds that the estimated income for last year was \$334,787,970, with an actual income of \$357,218,571—in other words, an actual income of \$12,400,000 more than the estimate, or an increase of 3.6 per cent. Naturally, the Government was able to do some work that it had not planned, and with this I have no complaint—using to advantage the money that happens to be there.

This year the estimate is \$377,227,598, an increase of 5.5 per cent. on the 1967-68 figures obtained. So one would expect that, with \$19,800,000 extra to spend, the Government would be able to do quite a few things that it could not do in other years. To suggest, then, that it is going to spend an additional \$14,100,000 on education is not really very wonderful, to my way of thinking. Surely it is not worthy of all the praise that the Government hopes will be showered on it. It is made up of part of the additional \$19,000,000 and the many millions not spent from the appropriation made for education last year.

As I proceed through the Budget I shall show quite conclusively—and I will be supported by other hon. members on this side of the Chamber—that the Government is spending additional money that is available purely and simply on actions that it thinks will have appeal in an election. This is not a balanced Budget over all sections of State activity.

Analysing the position in the Trust and Special Funds section, I find that the Treasurer, referring to the expenditure for 1967-68, had this to say in his Financial Statement for 1967—

"The total expenditure for the Trust and Special Funds is expected to increase from \$315,191,140 in 1966-67 to \$381,873,203 in the present year. This is a record year for expenditure in these funds."

Let us see how much of this \$381,000,000 was actually spent. From the Treasurer's own statement, the actual amount expended for the year was \$348,442,112. Of course, in the Treasurer's present report he said that

this was an increase of \$33,000,000 above expenditure for 1966-67. The point is that the amount spent was \$33,431,091 under the amount allocated in 1967-68. It is also worth noting that last year's expenditure from Trust and Special Funds was \$6,677,854 less than receipts. In other words, the value of the amount held in Trust and Special Funds was increased by this amount.

When considering the Trust and Special Funds, we have to note also the value of the funds—that is, the cash balance at 30 June, 1968, increased to \$55,278,500 in the preceding 12 months but, at the same time, the amounts invested in the various funds increased by \$41,626,728. In other words, in spite of all the talk about large expenditure from the Trust and Special Funds last year, much of it was not used in productive work within the fund but was invested in other funds. Certainly that money would have been used in other fields, because of its investment, but the picture that the Treasurer painted last year, and that he wishes to be seen, is certainly not the factual picture as we see it now.

Again this year we find the Treasurer trying to convince us that there is going to be a massive increase in expenditure of Trust and Special Funds, from \$348,442,112 in 1967-68 to \$397,214,300 this year. Two points occur to me in regard to this. The first is that if he could not carry out his Estimates last year, what hope has he of doing so this year, particularly as the increase this time is in the vicinity of \$50,000,000 extra? The second point that strikes me is how much of that money is to be spent in work as against further investment within the funds themselves? Investigation shows some quite interesting facts.

The Co-ordinator-General of Public Works Funds, the Mount Isa Railway Project Fund, the Moura Project Fund, the University Capital Works Fund, the Drought Relief Fund, the Fitzroy Brigalow Land Development Fund, the Reforestation Fund, the Beef Cattle Roads Construction Fund and the Traffic Engineering Trust Fund all show expenditure well below the amount expended in 1967-68, to a total of nearly \$10,000,000. It is also noticed that in this year's Estimates all funds show an allocation exceeding that of last year. How is that for doctoring a Budget?

The allocation in the Federal Aid Rehabilitation Fund last year was \$500,000, yet nothing at all was spent. \$250,000 is allocated for this year. In the State Insurance Fund the Estimates, as appropriated for last year, were \$22,270,000. In fact, only \$14,700,000 was invested but this year it is suggested that over \$30,000,000 will be invested, so this would tend to bump up the total amount from the Trust and Special Fund alone by \$15,000,000—not a massive sum when dealing with expenditure, but significant when dealing with election propaganda.

Coming now to the Education Department and the Commonwealth Education Fund, we find the amount appropriated was \$9,500,000 but only \$6,300,000 was actually spent out of this fund. It is quite easy to suggest that \$9,400,000 is to be spent this year. The question I ask is this: why was the appropriated amount not spent last year? The Treasurer, in his report, has not given us any indication of the reason for this.

In the Hospital, Motherhood and Child Welfare Fund, the estimated amount last year was \$3,000,000 to be transferred to other funds within the State's finances, made up of \$2,600,000 to the Hospital Administration Trust Fund and \$400,000 to the Loan Fund. In fact, we find that just over that amount was transferred and, in this Budget, we expect \$2,950,000 to be transferred to the Hospital Administration Trust Fund and again \$400,000 to the Loan Fund, making a total of \$3,350,000. The point I make is that this is a transference of money which is not producing results in its own category.

Referring to the Department of Industrial Development Assistance to Industries Fund, \$20,000 was allocated last year and a sum total of \$284 was used. This year the allocation is \$350,000, from which it appears that the Government wishes to make some spectacular issues out of advancing money to industries.

In the Industrial Estates Construction Fund the allocation was \$1,563,000, but only \$1,530,200 was spent. This year the allocation is nearly doubled, to \$2,793,000. Again I ask the Treasurer why, if he could not spend the amount allocated last year, he thinks he can spend double the amount this year.

When we consider works and housing we find that, here again, the picture is not at all bright. On the erection of homes and on the acquisition and development of land under the Commonwealth-State Housing Fund an amount of \$16,361,000 was allocated, but only \$12,337,760 was expended. Again this year the Government is talking of spending \$16,500,000, but this is conjecture, and on the Government's effort last year it cannot be said whether or not this amount will be spent.

In the Home Builders' Account an amount of \$4,500,000 was allocated to approved building societies and institutions, but just under \$4,000,000 was in fact advanced to them. In other words, \$500,000 was available to the societies and institutions but was not advanced, and this year the Government suggests that it will use \$4,782,725.

I have mentioned some of the main items, and many other examples can be seen of where the amount that was allocated was not in fact used. One wonders what reliance can be placed on the Estimates for this year in the spending of the Trust and Special Funds when the Estimates for last year were so grossly inaccurate.

I turn now to the Loan Fund Account. In 1967-68 an amount of \$84,960,000 was appropriated and an amount of \$88,166,339 was actually expended. From this amount expended the credit amounts from the Suspension Account are to be deducted, and the result is that the total loan expenditure amounted to \$87,502,875.

If we analyse the difference between the appropriation and the expenditure we find that some of the main differences occurred in loans and subsidies paid to local bodies. Here, \$15,100,000 was appropriated and \$12,085,339 was expended, so that it can be seen that the expenditure was \$3,000,000 lower than the amount estimated.

In subsidies to maternity works, etc.—that is, subsidies paid to charitable institutions towards the cost of capital works for children's homes and other institutions—\$1,200,000 was appropriated but only \$665,959 was spent. In the Industrial Estates Construction Fund the sum of \$1,000,000 was appropriated whereas in fact \$1,700,000 was allocated. This resulted in a build-up to \$669,810 as at June, 1968. If to this credit we add the \$2,000,000 that has been allocated for this year we see that a substantial amount has been set aside for expenditure on the development of industrial estates—in this, the election year. The Treasurer expects that from the Trust Fund an expenditure of \$2,793,000 will be incurred.

It is significant that the amount expended last year on financial assistance to industry was only \$284, and this year the Government expects that amount to blossom into a total of \$350,000. It will be quite interesting to see in what field this expenditure is made.

Certainly this year sees an appropriation of \$15,052,000 from Loan Funds for loans and subsidies paid to local bodies, and this is a greater sum than that spent in this way last year, but it is \$48,000 less than the allocation for 1967-68. From Consolidated Revenue \$1,959,000 was provided last year, but this year only \$1,470,000 is provided. This is a clear indication of the Government's lack of intention to increase the amounts available to local bodies by way of loans and subsidies, and this is a very regrettable fact.

Of course, the amount of loan money to be credited to the Trust Funds for works controlled by the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works is substantially down, to \$5,050,000, owing mainly to the cessation of the requirement to expend just on \$8,000,000 annually on the Moura-Gladstone railway project. However, an amount of \$1,730,000 needs to be taken into account for the construction of the Riverside Expressway.

The loan allocation for this year has increased to approximately \$91,112,000, and one finds that the bulk of the expenditure of approximately \$8,000,000 that previously went to the Moura railway project is being diversified over many other activities, the main ones being the construction and

improvement of technical colleges, high-school buildings and primary school buildings.

I wish to devote some time now to an analysis of the effects of the Government's policy relative to its expenditure on some Government departments. Unfortunately, time will not allow an investigation of all departments.

Last year I had a good deal to say about the working conditions of hon. members and also the assistance that is given to them in their electorates. I mentioned also the living conditions of members while they are in Brisbane. I do not intend to canvass all those matters again, although what I said on that occasion is still true today. Conditions have not improved. However, I wish to raise the specific matter of assistance that members receive from clerk-typists.

In the Budget I notice that 10 clerk-typists are located in the Correspondence Room, which leaves eight typists to assist 63 members. In other words, one clerk-typist will be provided to assist every eight members.

I believe that every member must have a typist to do his work when it is convenient to do it. He should not be regulated to do work in this House when it suits the establishment. After all, members of Parliament are not office boys. They are paid salaries commensurate with their responsible positions. Reports on research, investigations and interviews are a necessary part of their duties. There is a type of duty that should not be regulated like that of a clerk in an office.

I say here and now that I believe that if we cannot have what the Federal Parliament has, that is, one typist for every two members in the House, and one private secretary in each electorate, let us at least have twice as many typists as we now have so that no more than four members of the same party share the one clerk-typist.

I know that various people in authority have said that we cannot get suitable girls here. To my way of thinking, this is all nonsense. When I checked on some of the other departments, I found that in the Premier's Department two extra typists have been budgeted for this year, 20 extra in the Police Department, eight extra in the Harbours and Marine Department, five extra in the Department of Education and seven extra in the Department of Health. I could follow the same pattern throughout the Estimates. Therefore, through you, Mr. Smith, I say to the Premier that I do not care who is responsible in the final analysis, whether it be the Premier or Mr. Speaker, but conditions at the present time are most unsatisfactory. Whether the Public Service Commissioner likes it or not, more clerk-typists must be obtained immediately, as an urgent requirement, so that this Parliament can function properly and members can attend promptly to all requirements of their constituents.

As a point of contrast, without complaining about it, it is significant that last year, in the Chief Office of the Premier's Department, the number of clerks increased from nine to 15, and it is estimated that this year the number will increase to 25. If those additional clerks are required to permit the Premier's Office to function properly and well, I have no objection, but I believe it shows very clearly that the clerical assistance which was sufficient 10 years ago, or five years ago, is certainly not sufficient today in this field of public service and duty. It is about time we stopped making members' wives and daughters their unpaid secretaries.

While dealing with the Premier's Department, I should like to refer to some statements made by the Premier in his Address-in-Reply speech. He said first that I charged the Government with failing to exploit Queensland's resources in the interests of the people of Queensland—and this I did. He then said that I had claimed, in effect, that the Government had done nothing to exploit our resources. He said that in his view my statement was a very unrealistic and strange one to be made by any hon. member, let alone the Leader of the Opposition. Let me answer that. I said that the Government had failed to exploit Queensland's resources in the interests of the people of Queensland. The important words are, "in the interests of the people of Queensland". It was on that basis that we attacked the Government. I, my Deputy Leader, and others, did not spend our time attacking the Government for exploiting our resources. We are well aware of that. We attacked it because our resources have not been exploited in the interests of the people of Queensland; they have been exploited in the interests of overseas investments. I repeat that the Government is giving away our heritage.

The Premier then reminded us that much of this exploitation related to things that had lain dormant for 40 years. They were lying dormant because Labour Governments were not prepared to give away our resources for nothing, merely because some foreign country wanted them. We had no fight then, or now, against using our natural resources to benefit the State. The whole difference in attitudes relates to whether they are being given away or are being used to the advantage of the State.

The Premier went on to say that it was left to his Government to exploit the bauxite deposits at Weipa. That is nonsense, as he knows. Weipa was under way in 1956. He also knows that if his Government had paid more attention to electrical development throughout the State we would today have an aluminium plant in Central Queensland. He knows that this plant was lost to Queensland largely because of his Government's failure to provide cheap electricity. He spoke of a modern township on Cape York Peninsula. I said then, and I repeat, that he has not told us what other industries have started there. The whole town depends

on one thing, namely, the winning of the raw bauxite. When the children leave school, particularly the girls, what will they work at?

The Premier tried to make out that the Opposition opposes what is being done in Gladstone. That is completely untrue. At no stage have we opposed the establishment of the alumina plant at Gladstone. We support it; we support its development, and we will support power-houses and further development, but it is our policy—and it always has been—to use our natural resources, wherever possible, within our own State.

As to Moura coal, it is a fact that the Japanese sent delegations to this State over a considerable period of time. Each delegation came here for the purpose of finding suitable coal for export to Japan. I am sure that even the most violent anti-Labour person would not suggest that the Japanese would refrain from coming here to negotiate with a Labour Government. The Japanese did business with the New South Wales Labour Government, and on a higher royalty basis.

The Premier went on to state that the carriage of that coal provided great revenue for the Railway Department. As the Government is keen not to let the Opposition know the freight rates from Blackwater, we cannot accept his assessment. However, we can assume that the charges are so low that there would be a complete public outcry, and certainly one from the grain-growers and others, if it was known how cheaply coal is being carried for these foreign interests.

We have heard a good deal about not letting us know because it is a private arrangement. There should be no private arrangements when it comes to Government expenditure and Government finance. The basic Moura charges and the grain charges are not secret, so why is this one? The Opposition should know in full what the charges are. It is only when things are not known that corruption and other undesirable practices enter public administration. Far too many secret agreements are being entered into. Recently the Premier refused to give the names of doctors who are getting Government pay for operating the breathalysers.

The Premier then referred to development. He said that under Labour there would not be any bragalow development scheme because members of the Opposition do not believe in freeholding. The Premier should know that that is rubbish. Areas do not have to be freeholded to be developed. What we do not believe in is his Government's policy of handing over large tracts of our land to big financial companies which do nothing to establish or assist us as a State but take all they can from us. This attitude of giving Queensland away is not confined to coal; it applies also to the ownership of our land—our country. This is what we object to, and the Premier well knows it.

The Government said that the areas opened up would increase cattle production by 350 per cent. I hope the Government has done a lot more to obtain markets than it has in the past. As soon as there was a crash in the American meat market, the whole industry nearly collapsed around our heads. Now, with a contemplated increase in production—not 10 per cent, or 20 per cent., but 350 per cent. more cattle than we have at present—I ask the Government what it has done to ensure markets for this greatly increased cattle production; or is the Premier exaggerating the figures? Surely we do not want a repetition in our cattle industry of what happened in the sugar industry where, because of lack of markets at the right price, that industry is in a precarious position.

The Premier then said that the Labour Party did not welcome overseas investment. Here again, that is only a half-truth. We do not welcome overseas investment purely and simply to take over and exploit our country. We welcome overseas investment that is here to help us develop our country, but which allows for our participation and for our getting a just return from that which is ours, namely, our natural resources and our land.

The Premier went on to challenge my statement that we are losing the decentralisation battle. He said a good deal about Moura and Blackwater, and Gladstone, Weipa and other coastal towns. In other words, he endorsed my previously stated views that this is purely a coastal Government made up of men who are purely for big business.

Never in the history of the Country Party have so many right-wing Liberals been its elected representatives. It is no wonder that in the main this Government's policy is predominantly anti-primary-producer and anti-worker.

Relative to decentralisation, let us look at some figures for electorates. I shall deal with the western areas of Queensland. In 1966 there were 7,617 electors in Gregory whereas, in January, 1968—that is, less than two years later—there were 7,058 electors, a decrease of 559.

In Barcoo, which contains the centres in which the Government likes to think there is development, the number has decreased by 66, from 8,522 to 8,456.

**Mr. Hanlon:** It has had good representation, too.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Yes. In Flinders there has been a decrease of nearly 1,000 in the past eight years and of 175 in the past two years.

In Roma, where the Government boasts it has found oil and natural gas, thus making a tremendous contribution to decentralisation, there has been a decrease of 472, from 8,897 in 1966 to 8,425 in 1968.

In Tablelands, even though the Aboriginal population was included in the census, there was still an over-all decrease of 37 in the year.

In Warrego, another area containing many western towns, there was a decrease of 169.

In Burke, which contains Mt. Isa and, according to the Premier, the great development going on there, there has been a decrease of 13.

Surely these figures belie any statement that this Government has effected decentralisation.

The Premier then spoke for some considerable time on Socialism and the Labour Party. He tried to couple Labour with Communism in Yugoslavia, Russia and various people associated with the Communist movement, none of whom are known to me although they are apparently well known to the Premier and his advisers.

Perhaps this part of his speech showed more than anything else his mixed-up thinking in trying to suggest that because a member of the A.L.P. went to Russia he was a Communist and, because he was a Communist, the A.L.P. was Communist. Of course, trading with a Russian country does not make a person a Communist, any more than visiting a country makes a person a Communist.

If Communism and Communist people are as unwelcome as the Premier likes to make out in his attempt to smear me and my party, how can he explain the trading with them? Sir William Gunn and other hopeful Country Party and Liberal candidates not only trade with them but have been feted in mainland China. Of course, the realities are that without trade with these countries millions of dollars a year would be lost to the producers in this State. We find that last year over \$500,000 worth of wool and rutille was sent to Austria, and wool, wheat, apples and tallow worth \$3,852,000 were sent to mainland China. Just imagine what would happen to the wheat industry if we were not able to sell nearly \$3,000,000 worth of wheat in any one year! In the previous year, total exports to mainland China were worth \$8,407,000, of which \$6,865,000 came from wheat. In those two years alone the sale of wheat to mainland China was very important.

When we hear the Government talk about the sales of coal and bauxite overseas to Japan, there is no talk of the wheat worth millions of dollars being sold to mainland China, or the wool worth millions of dollars being sold to other countries. For instance, goods worth \$9,907,000, including greasy wool worth over \$7,000,000, rutille worth \$345,000, scoured wool worth \$379,000, cattle hides worth \$897,000, copper lead scrap, and many other commodities, were sold in this financial year 1967-68 to the Federal Republic of Germany. In 1966-67 this country bought nearly \$9,000,000 worth of products from Queensland. In 1967-68 the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics bought \$3,500,000 worth of products, mainly wool, and the year before it bought goods worth

nearly \$2,000,000. In 1967-68 Yugoslavia bought products worth \$1,617,000, compared with \$1,785,000 the previous year. They are only some of the countries that are considered to be Russian-dominated and Communist-dominated.

Surely we have to live and trade with these countries. However, let the Premier remember that we are a party that is dedicated to Australia and its progress. We are true Australians, every bit as true and loyal as he and his colleagues, but we do not go along with his attitudes or ideas of living for today and "to hell with tomorrow", or giving away our natural assets to the highest bidder, irrespective of the results in the future. We do not trade on propaganda when it is to the detriment of our people and that which is our natural heritage.

I refer now to the Treasurer's statement that the strength of the Police Force will be increased by 200 over three years. I wonder why he did not say by how many it would be increased this year? The obvious answer is that 200 sounds many more than the 100 allowed for this year. This is even more enlightening when it is realised that the number of constables resulting from the proposed intake of 100 will be only 47. The other 53 will be absorbed by a 25 per cent. increase in the number of sub-inspectors, and a 20 per cent. increase in the number of probationers. Incidentally, there will be a reduction of 16-2/3rds per cent. in the number of policewomen.

I have said on previous occasions—and I say it again—that the Queensland Police Force requires many more constables to do the routine work necessary in keeping our land free and safe. It is very good to have promotion within the service and I have no fight at all with the increase in the number of sub-inspectors, but I believe that if the whole additional 200 were brought in in this one year the Police Force would still be, considering the amount of unsolved crime and the number of road deaths and accidents, below the required strength for a State the size of Queensland.

The reduction in the number of policewomen is to be regretted, because I believe that there is a job for them to do if they are used to maximum advantage. The Opposition approved of the introduction of women into the Police Force, but I must say that this reduction confirms our original thought that it was only a token entry of women in the first place.

I now wish to refer to the proposed increase of 96 in the civilian staff in the Police Force. This amounts to 20 clerks-typists and 17 more clerks, making a total of 37, for this year. I call on the Government here and now to review and revise the role of many of our police. Let it stop using them to play "hide-and-seek" with Queensland citizens and visitors to this State; I feel ashamed every time I see a policeman hiding behind a fence or a tree. Police

officers will not earn the respect of law-abiding citizens whilst they are required to act in this way.

At this point let me say that, as the Auditor-General's Report and departmental reports are not all available, it is impossible to counter-check all statements made in the various documents available from the Treasurer. For example, in his speech he used the expressions "extra 95 police" and "40 extra clerical staff", whereas the Estimates of the Probable Ways and Means and Expenditure show the figures "100" and "37".

Surely a computerised official Treasury document such as the Auditor-General's Report should be available to all hon. members to study in conjunction with the Treasurer's Financial Statement and Ways and Means. At the time of presenting the Budget, surely Parliament should have before it all relevant material. It should not be only the Treasurer or Cabinet who has that material.

Before proceeding to deal with the Treasurer's departments, let me refer to his speech in the Address-in-Reply debate. He spoke about the railway line from Moura to Gladstone and suggested that the Labour Party wanted the line built by a private company. As he knows, that is a complete misrepresentation of the true position. I believe that the hon. member for Barooka answered him effectively in that regard.

As for the suggestion that the Australian Labour Party wanted to deny railwaymen employment, I think it is ridiculous to use an argument of that type. Provided that railways are run, then railwaymen will be employed, whether they are private or Government railways; so the employment of railwaymen does not come into it at all. What does come into the employment of railwaymen, however, is the Government's attitude in closing railways and allowing road transport to take over this service in various areas, the latest example being the passenger service between Brisbane and North Queensland. The Minister says that this is to allow of competition. He was certainly not worried that the competition would be such that fewer trains would be required.

The next part of the Treasurer's speech is the most remarkable of all, particularly as it came from the Treasurer of the State. He told us that the railway line from Moura to Gladstone was to be built by the State on the basis of the State's providing half the cost, the other half to be found by the company. He went on to say that the company cheerfully provided its half of the required cash figure for the railway line and lodged it with the State. I said, "As a loan?" and the Treasurer said, "As a security deposit, but only repayable on the basis that coal comes down the line; not one cent of the

deposit would be repaid if no coal was supplied, and that is the position today." I said, "What interest?" but the Treasurer did not answer that question.

He then went on to say—

"As the coal begins to come down the line there will be a refund to the company of an amount related to each ton. At the end of the contract period, the Government will have a railway line that has been paid for and will have involved the State in only half the outlay it would have if we had had to find all the money ourselves."

He went on to say that, in return, the company will have received the money it borrowed and the State will have paid the interest on that borrowed money. He said, "Surely this is a sound basis on which to finance a project that the State itself could not finance unless it received that money."

Now, let us analyse that. How can the Government claim that the State is paying only half the cost of the railway line when, in fact, the company only lodged an amount of money equal to half the cost of the line as a security deposit against the using of the line and that is held in trust by the State in Commonwealth inscribed stock? That amount is to be paid back to the company, plus the interest the money earned whilst in trust, as the line is being used for the carrying of coal on a basis of so much a ton. The position was that the Government, in fact, had to find all the money required to meet all payments in the construction of the line.

The costs paid by the State were—

	\$
1964-65 .. ..	1,504,618
1965-66 .. ..	6,522,580
1966-67 .. ..	10,994,525
1967-68 .. ..	7,559,126
	<hr/>
	\$26,580,849
Plus this year ..	1,296,500
	<hr/>
	\$27,877,349

In full fact, then, this line has been built in the main from State loan money. I ask the Treasurer, "Why tell such an inaccurate story?" Was it panic, or did he not know how the line was financed?

The Treasurer's argument is still further misleading in that if the company can be regarded as having paid for half the cost of the railway line by taking out Commonwealth bonds as a security deposit, then the unknown investor or investors who provided the other half of the cost by investing in Commonwealth bonds has paid the balance of the cost of this railway. If the Treasurer's argument is valid, he could say that the State paid nothing, which we know to be crazy. Loan money from any source has to be repaid with interest.

The Treasurer next went on to speak about the houses at Moura and at Gladstone, and he said in defence of the Government's

actions, "These are homes for the people." He said to the company, "Because of your venture, which may not succeed, we will take from you, and expect from you, a guaranteed rental for these homes over the period of the contract." "Is that not sound business?", asked the Treasurer.

Now, let me analyse that. Firstly, the Government was prepared to spend \$28,000,000 of State money on the railway line to the coal fields, and then the Treasurer said he had doubts whether the mine would be a success. Surely the Treasurer does not want hon. members to believe that the Government went into a project involving the spending of almost \$30,000,000 with no thoughts that the project may not be successful.

Secondly, he misconstrued the facts. What we object to is that the Government built these homes from Government money instead of requiring the company to build them from company money. It is as simple as that. Mount Isa Mines Limited built homes for its workers, and every other major project in other States has provided living accommodation for its own workers. As for the guaranteeing of rent, all this has done had been to make houses available for the company to let to whomever the company wishes.

With State housing, we have a priority system which lays it down that unless a person is evicted or is in some other desperate circumstance, he cannot get a State rental home. Certainly, whether or not a person gets a home does not depend on whom he works for. In towns and areas where these companies have control of housing, priority depends solely on whom one works for. If a person leaves employment with the particular company he has to leave the house, even though he might continue to work in the same town. This is the aspect with which the Opposition does not agree.

No matter how the Treasurer tries to twist the position, he cannot justify spending millions of dollars of the State's money purely and simply to provide housing for isolated companies when they themselves have the financial backing to provide homes for their own workers. In fact, one company expected its employees to live in hovels and, after industrial action was taken by the unions, the Government came good with the houses. We agree that over a period of time these workers should be eligible for State homes, but such homes should come through the same priority as applies to anyone else. Why have two different priority systems, one depending purely on who your employer happens to be? In fact, the Government prefers to build homes for foreign companies rather than for its own employees.

Let me refer now to subsidies to local bodies. I feel that the Government has to make a much larger contribution to local authorities than it is making at the present time. Local authorities cannot afford, on rates and subsidies alone, to do the work they would like to do. The great problem

with local authorities is that there is a limit to the rate that can be charged. I believe that the local authority, apart from increased subsidies, has to be given another field of income. Free grants to local authorities are necessities. I do not believe that the State should dictate to local authorities what work they should carry out, just as I do not believe that the Federal Government should dictate to the State what field of education or other development it should carry out. The States should know best what they want and, by the same token, the local authorities should know best in what sector they want their development to take place.

I feel that the State Government, as the tax-collector in so many fields, will have to make a more generous allocation to local authorities. I think we have to do to local authorities what we expect the Commonwealth Government to do to us. A study of the report and the discovery of the true position over the years that this Government has been in office, when the rate of subsidy to local authorities has been continually reduced, makes me wonder whether or not the Treasurer and the Government, who themselves, wish to be well treated, have any real regard for local authorities. Surely their motto should be to treat others as they themselves wish to be treated.

We can talk of great development and of a powerful, developing nation, but in the final analysis the test is whether or not the people in their own homes, in their own environments, in their own locations, are living a freer and more highly developed life than they previously were. If they are, the State and the nation have shown progress; if they are not, then we are not developing.

I now pass on to the Education Department because, as I said previously, this is the department the Government is using as a political weapon. Year after year, particularly in the year before an election, it is the great boom in education that the Government puts before the people, and this year has been no exception. This year, we again find the Government talking of spending on education many more millions than previously—an easy task when spending has been restricted over preceding years.

As I said earlier, the appropriation in the Commonwealth Education Fund was under-spent by \$3,200,000. Out of that fund, the Government suggests it is going to spend this year another \$3,100,000 over and above what it spent last year, but this is still \$150,000 less than the amount appropriated the year before.

Let us next have a look at some of the vote-catching schemes the Government has put up on this occasion. We find that special financial assistance is to be given to approved non-State primary schools. In addition, the level of assistance already given to secondary schools will be increased so that both primary and secondary schools will receive \$25 per student as from January, 1969. The making of a straight-out grant to a school based on

the number of students who attend is certainly the easy way to help non-State schools, but this may not be the best way. Surely amongst those which are to receive this money are some which have been established for many years and which have a high reputation. Because of the type of background of the students they take and the parents' incomes, they have been able over many years to provide the latest teaching amenities and to keep well up to date with the equipment and subsidiary equipment required in a modern school, whereas unfortunately many non-State schools cannot even afford to pay their teachers the full salary laid down by the Teachers' Award.

If the Government really wanted to improve the State's educational facilities and help the non-State schools to function efficiently, it should have conducted an investigation into the activities of all schools. If this had been done, each school could be assisted to an extent commensurable with its needs. If the Government's policy was that each parent should have the right to choose the school that he wants his child to attend and that all children should have the same opportunities of taking advantage of this State's educational facilities, and if its policy was that each teacher should be of a capacity and ability equal to that of all other teachers and that the same type of teaching aids should be provided at all schools, then no-one could argue against the Government's policy; provided, of course, that State and non-State schools were treated on similar bases. However, this has not been the Government's policy. The Government has said, "We will give to the schools to use the way they want so many dollars per student. This should buy us votes from the parents who send their children to non-State schools." Some church schools are established in very poor and sparsely populated areas, and surely those schools are more in need of help than are the more fashionable schools, whether they are State or non-State schools.

I turn now to the subsidies that are paid to State schools through parents and citizens' associations. In the past I have praised the work performed by these associations, and I shall continue to praise it because the associations comprise willing people who are subsidising State education. Without their help and assistance, many State schools would today be merely buildings with willing teachers but with very few modern teaching aids, if any, let alone other school fixtures, aids, equipment and libraries.

If we look at the amount of money received by these associations towards improving school grounds, we find that only \$98,957 was expended. Not only did the Government fail to expend the sum of money that was allocated for schoolground improvements, but it also contributed an amount that was less than half of the amount spent by the parents and citizens' associations. I suggest that the time has come when the whole subsidy scheme should be reviewed, for I believe that parents and citizens'

associations are required to provide far too many of the items that the Education Department should provide. I mention particularly teaching aids.

It is pleasing to see that \$2,000,000 has been set aside for special projects; however, the Treasurer and the Minister for Education should do more than simply state a figure. As I have said previously, it is one thing to allocate money for a project and it is another thing to spend the amount that is allocated. I should like the Treasurer to tell hon. members a lot more about the pieces of equipment that he has in mind and about any variation that might occur in the responsibility of parents and citizens' associations. He should inform hon. members also of the direct responsibilities of the Education Department.

I turn now to teachers and teachers in training. The Treasurer suggests that this year 2,050 people will be recruited into the teaching service, and says that this number will be a record. Look at the effect that that number will have on the future teaching strength of this State. Some time ago Cabinet decided that it would gradually introduce a three-year training course for teachers and that approximately one-third of the number of recruits would do a three-year course and two-thirds of the number would do a two-year course. This decision means that in two years' time two-thirds of this year's recruitment will be available for teaching. The Treasurer's figures reveal that the number of teachers in training next year will increase from 3,167 to 3,824. That figure is made up of 1,774 second-year students doing a two-year course, 1,370 first-year students doing a two-year course, and 680 students doing the first year of a three-year course. In fact, at the end of 1969 approximately 1,774 student teachers will be available for teaching duties, and at the end of 1970 the number will be reduced to 1,370. One can hardly say that the Government is planning ahead in this field. If the shortage of teachers in all our schools, not only in State schools, is to be overcome, the Government should undertake a more positive approach to the problem.

Of course, this is another attempt by the Government to camouflage the true state of affairs with figures. In fact, the Treasurer's figures reveal that in two years' time the number of student teachers available for duty will be less than the number available next year.

In turning to the Department of Health, I mention particularly the training of nurses. Unfortunately, the Minister has not seen fit to take notice of what the nurses, through their recognised associations, have to say about their training. It is imperative that the Government should take prompt action to ensure that nurses are trained in a more efficient manner than that existing at the present time. The nursing profession is not at all happy with the situation, and surely its members are the ones who know.



To my way of thinking, the suggested training scheme is nothing short of an attempt to smooth rough waters and find a way out. Some years ago the Department of Education instituted in high schools a course known as the "Home Science Course". It was said that it was designed specifically to help those wanting to take nursing as a career. It was up to Junior standard, but far too many school principals looked upon it as a course for girls who showed little inclination for academic studies. The suggestion that we should institute a special course for girls who want to be nurses, in my view, is not tackling the problem at all. Nursing is a profession that calls for trained thinking; thus an academic course, with emphasis on certain subjects is required. The problem is not the training, through a high-school education, of students to be nurses, but that of training them to be efficient nurses once they have joined the profession—once they start their first-year training, prior to being accredited in the nursing profession. That is when they want specialised courses of training to fit them in the modern world of nursing. If the argument for special courses at secondary schools is sound, surely we should have special courses to fit girls and boys for all other callings, which is totally impracticable. The suggestion of the Minister for Health and the Minister for Education, to my way of thinking, is what they would like to be a smart move to get over a very serious situation.

I now wish to spend a few moments referring to the Department of Justice, and particularly to the latest outbursts of the Minister for Justice in his treatment of prisoners. It is true that the new remand section at Boggo Road gaol is a tremendous improvement on what previously existed. I do not want to take away any credit from the Government for what it is doing in this way. Perhaps it could be said that it was long overdue under Labour, but I could equally say that the Government has been in power for 11 years and that the first phase is just completed, so it is still well overdue.

I am concerned more about the training of prisoners from an education point of view. It is all very well to say that we will make tradesmen, etc. out of them and prepare them for the outside world. I am prepared to accept the Government's suggestions in good faith because I expect even this Government to do some good, and to produce some results in its term of office. However, I want to know how, on the one hand, the Minister can say that the Government is helping these people on their release while the Government itself refuses to give them employment. Even worse than that, if anyone in the Government service commits an offence, even though it has no bearing on the place of employment or the work that is being done, he or she is immediately sacked. We have the situation in which a Minister is telling the private sector that it should

employ these people and help to train them, yet the Government itself refuses to employ them. I suggest to the Government that if it is really sincere it should take a practical lead in assisting in their employment.

I should now like to make some brief comments on the activities of the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission and the administration of the trust fund associated with the building of farm water-conservation schemes. Many people who would like to build small dams are unable to do so because of the unavailability of finance. Those who need finance to build dams cannot qualify because their properties are already mortgaged to banks or other lending institutions. Surely water conservation is a good investment for this country. I suggest to the Government that it should amend the procedures relative to the lending of money to people on the land so that they can obtain an allocation to build dams, irrespective of whether or not a first mortgage is available, bearing in mind that the practical reality of farming means that most people on the smaller-sized farms are operating on overdrafts, where a first mortgage on their properties is the normal thing.

I emphasise that a Government should have faith in its people, and should back that faith with hard cash when necessary. These people are not asking for charity; they are asking for a loan. I urge the Government to give this matter immediate consideration and to put this procedure into practice.

The development of electric power throughout the State is a matter that is very close to the heart of the A.L.P. I should say that one of the most important developments, other than water conservation, is that of the provision of electric power. It should have top priority, not only in the development of more power by larger powerhouses but also in the reticulation of power throughout the State.

Steps must also be taken to ensure that there is a levelling out of electricity charges throughout the State. I am opposed to any vicious subsidy idea where one area subsidises another, but I am sure that with efficient planning we could do a lot better than we are doing at the present time. If we are going to talk of decentralisation and of encouraging industries to go into our country areas, we must provide cheap power—we must reduce the cost per unit. We will certainly not get industries to go into country areas if they have to pay three or four times the price of power in the metropolitan area.

I believe that the Government should immediately review charges and try to ascertain how much it would cost to subsidise the use of electric power throughout the State. The Commonwealth Government did this with petrol some time ago and I think this was a very worthwhile idea. However, is it not just as important to have a uniform price for electricity as it is for fuel power?

The price per unit is such that the monthly electricity bill for the same size commercial establishment would be as follows:—

	\$
Brisbane .. .. .	240
Capricornia region .. .. .	318
Mackay and Townsville divisions .. .. .	310
Cairns .. .. .	280
Barcoo Shire .. .. .	457
Injune .. .. .	456
Blackall .. .. .	545
Charleville .. .. .	468
Mt. Isa .. .. .	199

For the same size industrial establishment the monthly bill would amount to—

	\$
Brisbane .. .. .	138
Capricornia region .. .. .	87
Barcoo Shire .. .. .	303
Injune .. .. .	257
Blackall .. .. .	195
Charleville .. .. .	187
Mt. Isa .. .. .	118

It is difficult to encourage people who compete on State or world markets to shift their industries to towns where differences in electricity charges are important.

For the same size farm, the monthly bill would be—

	\$
Brisbane .. .. .	35
Mackay region .. .. .	71
Capricornia region .. .. .	70
Balonne Shire .. .. .	97
Longreach .. .. .	108
Charleville .. .. .	130

Here again, a section of the community would be, and is, adversely affected.

I next refer to the Railway Department, where a policy that is not in the interests of this State has been undertaken, namely, the gradual, but deliberate, loss of patrons of long-distance passenger services. This is the only State in the Commonwealth that is not modernising its long-distance services. I remarked earlier on the Government's fostering road-passenger services over rail services. To me, this is one of the great "sell-outs" of this Government. It has let the railways deteriorate to such an extent that the public will not use them. That is not smart. It is a complete reversal of the trust placed in the Government by the people.

Yesterday I noticed obvious rust and a breaking away of metal on the outside of the carriages of the train in which I travelled from Mackay. I do not know when the carriages were last maintained, but I suggest that immediate action be taken to put them into first-class order. I shall go into more detail on this matter in the debate on the Railway Department Estimates. This was something noticeable not only to me but also to anyone else waiting to board the train.

The people of this State, and its tourists, expect a first-class long-distance passenger service. All other States have developed not only comfortable two-berth but also single-berth accommodation and are now adding amenity and observation carriages. It is laughable to read the boasts of the Minister for Tourism, because tourists who use our long-distance railways are not among our greatest ambassadors. In the main our rail passenger services—particularly the Rockhampton mail—are shocking. The smoothness, speed and up-to-date comfort of the "Sunlander", the "Inlander" and the "Westlander" are now well below other State standards.

I call on the Government to take immediate steps to have designed new carriages, of both the sleeping and observation types, to cater for the tourist potential that we hear so much about. Failure to do something about it now will lead to a refusal by visitors to travel on our railways and to go to our tourist areas in the North and the West.

I read with interest the recent report of the Minister for Tourism in the Press. I ask, "Who is kidding whom?" The position clearly is that this State is not getting a full share of the tourist trade which comes to Australia. In fact, there are many more Queenslanders who leave this State to travel to other States and overseas than there are people from interstate and overseas travelling and touring to our State. I am afraid that, if it were not for some Japanese delegations that come to this State from time to time, the number of Japanese tourists who travel through Queensland would hardly amount to a handful, whereas, on the other hand, there is a steady influx of Queenslanders to Japan as tourists.

I suggest to the Government that little notice be taken of the Australian figures or, for that matter, the figures from the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau which, incidentally, are down this year on those of last year. The proof of whether or not Queensland is developing as a tourist State is, I think, to be found in talking to people involved in the tourist trade in tourist centres, and they will not give a picture of a booming tourist industry.

Let us face facts. What is there to enthrall the tourist on most stretches of our roads between Brisbane and Mackay, or on any western trip outside the Darling Downs and the Tablelands? The dull, time-consuming miles must be compensated for by outstanding attractions at the end of the trip. Unfortunately our natural assets have not been developed to suit the overseas traveller, let alone our own people. If the Government is sincere in its claim that it is interested in the tourist industry, I urge it to take more practical steps to improve our main tourist-area roads and, as I said before, our railways, and also to assist, by grants to local authorities, to improve what nature has provided.

Whilst on this matter, let me say to the Premier that his assurances of no interference with the Barrier Reef did not do him any credit. He knows full well that, contrary to his statement, oil-mining companies can in fact blast and drill the Barrier Reef as they please, provided they can say that they are looking for oil.

This brings me to the next point, which concerns the Premier, the Railway Department and tourists, namely, the elimination of dangerous railway level crossings. Although the Premier took prompt action on the Beenleigh-Waterford road level crossing, the work that can be done this year will certainly not live up to his statements, which were made to give the impression that much will be done over the next 12 months.

**Mr. E. G. W. Wood:** How many level-crossing lights were put in during your period in office?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** How long has the hon. member been in Parliament? The point is that the Government has been in power for 11 years, yet a paltry amount is put up for this work. The volume of road traffic has grown during this period, and the speed of trains has increased. The Government has allowed so much grass to grow along railway lines that nothing can be seen coming along them. Under Labour administration, at least railway lines were kept clean and it was possible to see for miles along them. At present, because of the Government's neglect, trains cannot be seen coming along the lines.

We find that the Treasurer is to provide from the Loan Fund Account \$11,000 for the elimination of level crossings and, under the Trust and Special Funds of the Premier's Department, the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works Construction Fund will use an amount of \$6,638 for the elimination of level crossings. There is still a level crossing virtually in the middle of the Valley.

From the documents so far available for hon. members to study, it is not clear if this means that there will be \$17,638 available or whether the \$6,638 is some part of the loan allocation. As I said earlier, quite often amounts are transferred from one account to the other. In any case, even if it is the total amount, it is completely inadequate for making our roads safe for road-users. All the Government's boasting and propaganda on road safety is to no avail if we allow known death-traps and hazards to remain year after year. With more vehicles on the roads, these crossings become greater potential death-traps. I therefore say to the Government, "Get on to the job and make more money available in this field. It might not win many votes, but it will certainly save many lives."

I have endeavoured during this speech to analyse the main parts of the Budget and, at the same time, to make some comments on Government policy and action in

many fields of Government activity, some involving the expenditure of money and others being administrative decisions.

This is a budget of guilt. It is the financial confession of a Government that has sinned in the past. For two years it has deliberately under-spent and over-taxed. The Government has made Queensland and Queenslanders suffer so it can camouflage its pre-election propaganda with promises today. When the rural areas of the State were staggering under the effects of drought, this Government penalised them with savage freight increases. Our children—the life-blood of the State—have been forced to endure substandard educational facilities. Motorists have been treated as some kind of economic gigolo, to be plundered and ravaged at the whim of those who control this administration.

This Government has made Queensland suffer. It has stifled the development of the State. The two years that have been wasted can never be recaptured. The belated promises—or should I say concessions?—in this Budget are welcome; but the price of these has already been paid many times over and, for Queensland and Queenslanders, the cost is far too high. No State can prosper or progress when a Government is content—even enthusiastic—to use its financial machinery for nothing more than greedy political propaganda.

**Mr. HINZE** (South Coast) (12.56 p.m.): I have much pleasure in offering my congratulations to the Treasurer on the presentation of the 1968 "march to progress" Budget, and I should like also to congratulate the Under Treasurer, Mr. Sewell.

The Budget for 1968 is so good that it has taken the Leader of the Opposition 75 minutes to endeavour to indicate some weaknesses in it. Obviously, he could not find a weakness of any note.

**Mr. Houston:** You must have been asleep.

**Mr. HINZE:** I listened intently for the 75 minutes, but I could not hear one real criticism. The hon. gentleman may have offered some criticisms, but he did not highlight them.

I offer my congratulations to the Treasurer not only for the presentation of the Budget on this occasion but also for the work that he has done while he has been in office as Treasurer of the State. Hon. members know that there was a deficit when the Treasurer came to office; they know what the financial position of the State is today. That reflects very great credit indeed on the Honourable G. W. W. Chalk.

I listened attentively to the Treasurer while he was delivering his Financial Statement. As I did so, I was thinking, as were all other hon. members, of my own electorate, and I was waiting to hear whether it would be possible this year to establish a police district for the Gold Coast area, which takes in the Albert and South Coast electorates. Although

I will concede that there was no special mention of that in the Budget, I discussed the matter with the Treasurer later, and he indicated to me that funds will be made available this year for the setting up of that police district. The establishment of such a police district on the Gold Coast is very necessary, as you know, Mr. Carey. The Treasurer said that it was intended to try to get another 200 police officers for the State, at the rate of about 80 a year, and it is only fair and reasonable, when there is such a shortage of police throughout the State, that a police district should not be established in that area until such time—

**Mr. Houston:** Why is there a shortage? Don't you support my suggestion that 200 should be brought in this year?

**Mr. HINZE:** Of course I do.

**Mr. Houston:** You said that I did not say anything that you could support. That is one issue, anyway.

**Mr. HINZE:** The hon. member spoke for 75 minutes. He will have about 55 minutes to have a "shot" at me, which should give him plenty of time.

I appreciate the force of the Treasurer's argument that I will have to wait until more police are available; but at least I know that I shall have to wait only a few months for the establishment of a police district on the Gold Coast. Because of the great influx of visitors and because the border of the State is in the area, it is necessary that more police be made available. I think that the Albert and South Coast electorates are entitled to at least another 20 or 30 policemen.

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

**Mr. HINZE:** I was referring to the setting up of a police district in the South Coast area. I notice that provision has been made in the Budget for a police station at Surfers Paradise. Consideration was given to this last year, and I understand that the necessary planning is under way. I believe it will not be too long before work commences on this very important police station at Surfers Paradise.

**Mr. Bennett:** Did they tell you how much they paid for the premises?

**Mr. HINZE:** It would not matter what they paid for them; I think it would be a good deal on both sides. We need the police station and, of course, the land is very valuable.

The part of the Budget to which I wish to refer particularly is the recognition by the Government of the educational problems and the necessity to keep up with the times and to continue to allocate the necessary funds for educational purposes. I wish to refer particularly to the \$25 grants to non-State primary and secondary schools. This is a matter that has been causing non-State schools great concern for a considerable time. Funds were running low, and this

was having a detrimental effect on the education of young students attending these schools. The very generous attitude of the Government in recognising the plight of these schools will materially improve their position, and I am sure the non-State schools will be very pleased with the Government's recognition.

In the Address-in-Reply debate I referred at length to problems associated with education on the Gold Coast as a result of greatly increased enrolments at all the schools, and I want to say how pleased I am that last week the Minister for Education accepted my invitation to come to the Gold Coast area and personally inspect the coastal schools. I have some 15 schools in my electorate, but it was only possible to inspect the coastal schools in the one day.

The Gold Coast area, as everybody knows, attracts thousands of tourists, amongst whom are many educationists who, when they come to the area, naturally have a look at our schools. I am very sorry to say that two of the schools in my electorate do not measure up to present-day standards. One of them—the Coolangatta school—is the first school they would see after they cross the border, and the other is the Surfers Paradise school. I appreciate that the Works Department is continually spending large sums on education throughout the State, including my electorate. It is necessary to do so to keep up with requirements of this vast and greatly expanding area, and I suggest to the Minister for Education and the Treasurer that funds be made available as quickly as possible for new schools at both Coolangatta and Surfers Paradise.

Ample land has already been bought on the Isle of Capri to shift the school from Surfers Paradise. It is an ideal site which, incidentally, Mr. Carey, is in your area. I will be giving away a school, but I do not mind that if it is for the benefit of the education of the children in the area. It is an ideal site and there are playing fields adjacent to the land that has been purchased by the Education Department on the Isle of Capri. At Coolangatta, next to the Len Peak oval, there is another site that has been purchased by the department. It is necessary to build schools on both these sites as soon as possible.

The blocks of land on which the present Surfers Paradise and Coolangatta schools stand are invaluable, and I hope both sites are retained for all time by the Government. I do not want to see them sold for subdivisational purposes. They should be retained for parks or for some other purpose.

I was pleased to see that the sum of \$200,000 will be allocated this year to the Co-ordinator-General's Department to enable it to carry out further ocean-going survey work in consultation with Delft Laboratories in Holland. This work has been going on for some four or five years, and the stage has almost been reached when we can accept the recommendation of the Delft Laboratories

for the development and preservation of the very wonderful tourist area on the Gold Coast. Within the last 12 months a boulder wall has been under construction on the Gold Coast, and it is nearly completed. I thank the Treasurer for his very generous attitude and his prompt attention in making funds available for the construction of this wall.

**Mr. Bennett:** When the Liberal Party has the electorate, do you think it will improve it?

**Mr. HINZE:** That could be in 50 or 60 years' time. It will not be in the immediate future; the hon. member knows that.

Returning to the boulder wall, I understand from Mr. Brian McGrath, who is a very capable engineering officer in the Co-ordinator-General's Department, that there is no need now to construct much more of the boulder wall because the sand is returning to the beaches. Some critics who were not prepared to accept the necessity of protecting private and public property with a boulder wall indicated that its construction would upset the beaches and would result in a lack of sand. Up and down the coast ample evidence exists that this is not the case. Up to 6 feet of sand has built up in front of these walls. I thank the Treasurer for allocating a further \$200,000 this year to the Co-ordinator-General's Department to complete its survey work.

The Treasurer mentioned that it is necessary to stop what he referred to as the "brain drain". I heartily agree with his suggestion. This State will never develop if, after training its young people and doing everything possible to bring them to the highest pitch possible, it continues to allow them to leave the State. It is galling to all Queenslanders to see these top-line executive officers leave our State to take employment in other States, in Commonwealth departments, or overseas.

**Mr. Bennett:** The answer is pretty obvious. They have not got the opportunities here.

**Mr. HINZE:** I am suggesting that we have to reverse the situation and attract the top brains to this State. That is done only by paying higher salaries. We have to be able to attract the best brains to this State and keep them here. We should retain those to whom we give so much consideration by way of our educational system if we are to develop this State, with its great potential and wonderful possibilities.

**Mr. Houston:** Your Government talks and takes no action; that is the trouble.

**Mr. HINZE:** I would not say that that is the case. Hon. members must admit that this "march to progress" Budget that has been presented by the Treasurer will go a long way to doing the things that I am suggesting. The State will be in a position to pay higher salaries because of the way it can now balance its Budget.

**Mr. Sherrington:** You do not see any significance in the fact that there is to be an election next year?

**Mr. HINZE:** I would not think so. I see significance in the fact that this is a Budget presented in a period without drought. The State has enjoyed a wonderful season. Queensland is a primary-industry State in the main and the good season and the mining boom must obviously result in benefits to the State. I suggest to the hon. member for Salisbury that this is not a pre-election Budget and that he will find that next year's Budget will be even better.

**Mr. Bennett:** Because we will be delivering it.

**Mr. HINZE:** Undoubtedly there will be an increase in the number of Government members, and we will be able to present a much better Budget next year.

I agree with the Treasurer's comment about the brain drain. That was brought home to me very clearly when I saw the report on market milk supplies. However, I cannot for the life of me understand why a Government should allow two of its officers to investigate one of our most important industries, and then make the report public.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** Is that their report or someone else's report?

**Mr. HINZE:** I will tell the hon. member all about it, if he takes his time.

I do not know that we have treated the bread industry, the liquor industry or any other industry in the same way by having two junior officers conduct an investigation into all its aspects. In their own words, they said—

"The present system of milk distribution within the Brisbane Milk District is efficient and there can be no quarrel with it on grounds of cost, quality or service . . ."

**An Opposition Member** interjected.

**Mr. HINZE:** They said that, but later in the report they made a number of contradictory suggestions.

As I see it, the report should not have been made public until the industry had examined it. All that it has done for me and some of my colleagues—and I suppose other hon. members, too—is to create confusion in the milk industry, confusion that was totally unnecessary.

The inquiry was instigated by a Cabinet decision. Prior to this, sections of the industry wanted to supply the Brisbane market and indicated their wishes to the Minister, who, I now know, asked Mr. Whitaker of the Auditor-General's Department to conduct a survey to see whether there was any economic

justification for allowing another milk distribution centre to be established in the City of Brisbane. The officers said—

"The additional cost of establishing a further milk pasteurising plant within the present Brisbane Milk District is not warranted and could lead to increased milk distribution costs and/or failure of the new plant."

But they did not stop at that. They took up a lot of time, and obviously incurred a good deal of expense, in presenting a report of some 24 pages. As I indicated previously, all that it has done is to throw the industry into great confusion.

If we want to be honest as a Government we should accept that this report should be withdrawn. That would be much better than allowing it to remain in the hands of the public. That would be the honourable thing to do. The officers said—

"Existing franchises within the areas encompassed by Zones 1, 2 and 3 as defined should be allowed to expire and should not be renewed."

Quite honestly, I cannot understand this attitude. I want to give credit for what happened under the Australian Labour Party. I know that one franchise was granted for 15 years. I cannot understand a free-enterprise Government such as the Country-Liberal Government allowing or agreeing that such a franchise should expire.

**Mr. Porter** interjected.

**Mr. HINZE:** I am suggesting that it is fair and reasonable for a company to be granted a franchise. When a franchise is granted many responsibilities go with it, and, under these circumstances, if the service is being provided, such as the one in Brisbane, which is a public utility, as it is termed now, it should be allowed to continue. If a company undertakes to do something on behalf of the Government it is entitled to some protection by way of a franchise, particularly in my area, which is so close to the New South Wales border and a New South Wales company. I know that we spend many thousands of dollars to protect Queensland industries. We see this aspect in relation to our highways. We do everything to develop industry in Queensland. I am greatly concerned to find in my position, where I am so closely associated with this industry, that a report of such a nature should be issued. They will throw me to the wolves if they get half a chance.

**Mr. Duggan:** Who are "they"?

**Mr. HINZE:** These two fellows who have been deputed by the Director of Marketing. The report was put out by the Director of Marketing, although he did not put his name to it. It is the first document I have seen that has not been signed. If somebody said in 10 years or 15 years, "Who put this document out?", nobody would know then who the Director of Marketing was at the time.

**An Opposition Member** interjected.

**Mr. HINZE:** Ivers and Hamilton are mentioned by name. They compiled and collated the information for the Director of Marketing, Mr. Lapidge, who should have put his name somewhere on the document if he accepted responsibility for it. That is my opinion.

The report says that in Zone 2, a single milk wholesaler's licence should be granted to an amalgamated group incorporating the Downs Co-operative, the Queensland Farmers' Co-operative—this is Booval—and the Warwick Co-operative, and that no other milk wholesaler's licence should be granted in this zone at this stage. They say that those three companies should amalgamate.

This is quite the reverse of what we keep talking about, namely, decentralisation in this State. We say, "Let us decentralise the State and do everything to develop and allow these industries to mushroom in these areas". But these fellows come out and say, "Centralise". An additional factor is that another company in Zone 2 does not even get a mention, so I suppose it would have to amalgamate.

The Cabinet decision reads—

"1. That the appeal by the Country Milk Co-operative Federation Ltd. against the refusal of the Brisbane Milk Board of the Company's application for the establishment of a co-operative wholesale milk plant in Brisbane, be not granted pending further investigation of matters outlined in paragraph 10 of the Submission.

"2. That the Division of Marketing of the Department of Primary Industries undertake the necessary detailed research and report to Cabinet on the feasibility of extending the Brisbane Milk District and of servicing the expanding area."

That was the charter given to them. I suggest that they went much further than that. I do not know why, but apparently they took this upon themselves because they believed that it was necessary to do this. In the first paragraph they indicate that it is the most efficient industry in Australia, that it provides a service and quality milk at the cheapest possible price, and that they will continue to investigate something that they were not given a charter to do.

Another paragraph reads—

"Messrs. Ivers and Hamilton have furnished a report on their investigations in Victoria and New South Wales"—

This is the part I cannot understand yet—

"and a draft interim report on their studies in South-Eastern Queensland. This latter report is in process of revision in respect of a number of aspects but the detailed data contained therein as well as other data have been used by the Director of Marketing in the preparation of this summary report."

What does this mean? Does this give us to understand that these fellows did not agree between themselves? I am at a loss to understand this. The industry in my electorate,

and in every other electorate that contains milk-producing areas, is in great confusion over this report. We want something done about it. For my own part, I should like to indicate to the Committee that I believe it is necessary to refer to three different sections of the industry—wholesaling, retailing and producing.

Representatives of the retail section are asking for some collateral security for the retailers. They want what they refer to as zoning. They want legalised runs. Personally, I cannot see anything wrong with this. If a person is providing a service I cannot see anything wrong with the granting of a zone to vendors. It is the same in any other public service.

Under the present circumstances it would be impossible to get the retailers to agree to carry their weight in the cost of sales promotion. At this time they do not, of course. The whole cost of promotion in the sale of milk products in this State is carried by the producing or wholesaling sections because the retailers are not in a position to carry their responsibility in this direction. But if they were granted this right and privilege, to which I believe they are entitled, they could reasonably be expected to carry some of the responsibility in this regard. In addition, when they want to borrow money to buy a run, which costs \$120 to \$140 a gallon, they have to borrow dear money because it cannot be got through the ordinary banking channels. I suggest that if the retailers had some collateral security, such as zoned runs, it would be much easier for them to borrow funds at more reasonable rates to allow them to conduct their business on a more sensible basis. So much for the retailing section of the industry.

In the wholesaling section, there is no room in the City of Brisbane for more than one wholesaler. This is the ultimate. Years ago, when there were a dozen or more wholesalers in this city, things were chaotic and conditions in the milk industry could not have been worse. Today we have reached what has been described in this report as the best system of milk distribution in the State, yet these men say, "Let us change it. Let us let in Caboolture on one side, the Downs on another, and Booval on another, and let us get in and have a good old scramble again, in the interests of competition." How silly can they be!

The factory that is in Brisbane now, owned by Queensland United Foods Ltd., is carrying out the services referred to by Messrs. Ivers and Hamilton. Although some refer to it as a monopoly, I understand that "public utility" is the other term for it. The prices that this company pays for its milk and receives for its product are governed by regulation. How, then, can it be referred to in all seriousness as a monopoly? I say, let the position remain

as it is. There is no place for duplication and there is no need for another wholesaling plant in this city.

On the other hand, if the Government is not satisfied with the present situation, why not allow the 13 or 14 country factories, together with the direct suppliers, to take over Queensland United Foods Ltd. and keep it as it is? There, again, it is debatable whether a better job can be done in this way. That is the second branch of the milk industry.

The third branch is the producing section, where obviously the problem arose with the "haves" and the "have nots". The "haves" have a quota supplying the Brisbane market, and they sell 60 per cent. of their milk at the "liquid" rate, as it is called, which is about 20c a gallon higher than the rate received by the producers who supply milk for manufacturing purposes. The "have nots" are on the outer fringe, looking at the Brisbane market and saying, "This is not a fair go. We want some of this market." This position has been brought about by the depressed state of the dairying industry in Australia, particularly in Queensland. Rather than go out of the industry, these farmers want to get into a market which they believe to be a more lucrative one.

**Mr. Diplock:** Do you think they should go out of the industry?

**Mr. HINZE:** I am not suggesting that they go out of it, but, if I was a dairy farmer in this State working under the conditions that some farmers have to work under, there would obviously be for me more attractive industries than dairying to take my family into. In the last 10 years 10,000 dairy-men have been lost to the industry in Queensland.

**Mr. Davies:** Under your Government.

**Mr. HINZE:** That would have been the position under any Government. This is a world-wide problem, and the only way to overcome it is for it to be accepted by the people who are selling 60 per cent. of their milk production at liquid rates. Every year more milk is being sold. In the City of Brisbane last year 4 per cent. more milk, or nearly another 1,000,000 gallons, was sold.

A better way of overcoming the present problem than accepting any of the recommendations in this report would be allowing those who are not selling so much of their milk at liquid rates, or have not a high quota, to obtain a bigger share of the increased sales of milk as time goes on. If there is a factory on the fringe that should be entitled to right of entry to the Brisbane market, the 13 country factories, together with the direct suppliers, should admit that they will have to allow another factory to come in and agree among themselves on the amount of milk to be received

by way of quota to allow them to serve the Brisbane milk market economically. That is the only way of doing it.

**Mr. Davies:** Will you tell us where the Minister stands in all this confusion?

**Mr. HINZE:** The Minister is, I think, seeking advice from responsible leaders of the industry. He indicated when he released the report that he wanted to hear the opinions of leaders in all sections of the industry. As a person who has been in the industry all his life, I am saying quite clearly and publicly what I think about it.

**Mr. Davies:** What do you think of the Minister?

**Mr. HINZE:** The hon. member for Maryborough can look at the Minister for himself. There is no need for me to tell him what I think of the Minister.

Let me now leave the dairying industry and say something about electoral reform. I just cannot understand why the Australian public would be so gullible as to accept the recommendation by the Prime Minister—if he does recommend it; I do not know yet whether or not he is going to—that an early election should be held. I cannot subscribe to the idea that any Government, whether Federal or State, should have the right, 12 months before the end of the period for which it has been elected to serve the country or the State, and purely as a matter of convenience, to hold an election so that the Prime Minister can say that he has been “elected in his own right” (I think that is the term). He wants to go to the people and put them to the time and effort of electing him, Mr. Gorton, in his own right when he has a majority of 20 or 30 in the House of Representatives. I am condemning it because I think it is grossly wrong, and the public has become very gullible, and will accept almost anything, if it will accept that. I do not care whether it is Mr. Gorton or any other Prime Minister who does it. I have people coming up to me and saying, “We are going to the polls in November”. They think that a State election is being held in November. There are local government elections, State elections, Federal elections, and Senate elections, and a few by-elections for good measure.

I suggest that elections should be held after a more reasonable interval, and I believe that every four years would be a much more suitable period.

**Mr. Bromley** interjected.

**Mr. HINZE:** The hon. member is taking up my time. I understand that it is five years in the United Kingdom and four years in the United States of America. We could well take a leaf out of their book and hold elections in Australia every four years.

**Mr. Sherrington:** You will still go out on the hustings and support Gorton.

**Mr. HINZE:** I shall deal with other electoral reforms.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Carey): Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

**Mr. HINZE:** As the Minister for Justice is in the Chamber, I shall suggest some more electoral reforms. Firstly, I think that there should be a draw for positions on the ballot paper. Because my name begins with “H”, I do not like having to take second or third place to men with names beginning with “A”, “B” or “C”.

In addition, I think that the names of the parties should appear on the ballot papers. Naturalised migrants have said to me, “I do not know who I am voting for. I want to vote for the “A.L.P.” or for the “Country Party”, as the case may be.

**Mr. Bromley** interjected.

**Mr. HINZE:** Although there are “how to vote” cards, I think that the name of the party should be on the ballot paper next to the name of the candidate.

I think that we should also stop people handing out “how to vote” cards. People trip over them on the way in to have a vote. There are about 10 people outside the polling booth, in some instances, and in one case a woman was nearly knocked over by people who rushed from all directions to give her cards. I suggest to the Minister for Justice that there is no need for that. A very sensible way of doing it would be to have several boxes for these cards, each with a distinctive colour—a red box for the A.L.P. (I am not being derogatory when I say that), a blue box for the Liberal Party, a white box for the Country Party, and so on. If I wanted to vote in a certain way, I would take a card from the appropriate box before casting my vote. It might be said that somebody could be there watching to see which box I went to and thus ascertain how I am going to vote. In those circumstances a person would take a card from each box. In my opinion, that would be a much tidier way of voting.

I think, too, that sitting members could well have an asterisk against their names, so that people would know who had been representing them.

**Mr. Bromley** interjected.

**Mr. HINZE:** The hon. member for Norman suggests that sitting members should not have to contest an election. I think we all agree with that.

**Mr. Row:** There will be no Federal election this year.

**Mr. HINZE:** The Prime Minister must have got the message.

One very wonderful service in my electorate to which I wish to refer is the surf life-saving movement. We do not hear much about this movement in this Chamber,



but, out of probably 51 clubs in Queensland, 21 are in my electorate. Hon. members know as well as I do the wonderful job these surf life-saving clubs have been doing for so long. I think it was only yesterday that two club members swam out at Kirra and held up a boy, giving him mouth-to-mouth resuscitation some 60 yards from the beach.

These things are lost sight of. The terrific job that these clubs are doing is being forgotten today. I have discussed the matter with officials of various clubs and they are pleased with the assistance they get from the Government by way of subsidy. I asked them if there was anything more we could do to assist them and they said, "No. So far as the Queensland Government is concerned, the subsidy we attract is the highest in Australia." I am very pleased to report that to this Committee.

However, these clubs are finding it very difficult to retain members as a result of outside attractions and also because of the condition of the club-houses. These buildings need a facelift. In days gone by, Mr. Carey, you and I would sleep in these club-houses because they were the best accommodation offering to us, but young people today want something more and I think amenities that supply more of a club atmosphere should be provided for them. That should attract more young fellows into the clubs.

We have a wonderful "nipper" club operating now with hundreds of young boys in it, and it will only be a short time before the numbers coming into the clubs will be greater than those going out. This will be attributable solely to this wonderful "nipper" movement, which I heartily commend.

In the time left to me I want to give some consideration to a very important matter, something that is dear to my heart. I refer to the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs. In my opinion, that is one of the most important departments in the State. I heard the Leader of the Opposition, in the Address-in-Reply debate, suggest that we should set up parliamentary select committees. The hon. member for Merthyr also referred to parliamentary select committees. This is one department in respect of which I think a parliamentary select committee could do a wonderful job. I do not think it is quite right that this department should be successively swung from one Minister to another. I think some six or seven different Ministers have administered this department in this Government's term of office, and I do not think that that is good enough. I should think that with the land available to our 27,000 Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders, this department is going to become one of the wealthiest in the State.

I know that the Minister for Lands has the ability to administer the department efficiently—I have no doubt about that, and I hope that he continues to do so—but I do not like to see the responsibility for it switched from one Minister to the other.

It is a department that will become increasingly important and it will probably end up with more funds than any other because it has the ability to retain the funds that it produces. If another department creates a saving in any activity the saving goes to Consolidated Revenue, but whatever income is obtained by this department in selling its products is retained for the benefit of the native people of the State.

The Acting Premier extended an invitation to me, the hon. member for Roma and other hon. members to accompany him to the Torres Strait Islands. This was probably the greatest experience I have had, and I am sure that the memory of it will live with me for the rest of my life. I went up to Torres Strait thinking that I was going on a three-weeks' jaunt, but I became so absorbed in the work that the department is doing that I hope that I can be a member of one of the future select committees so that I can give consideration to some of the things that are necessary for the development of our wonderful native people. When I travel through South Brisbane I am galled to see Aborigines standing round hotels. I also hate to read that Aborigines have had a fight at Murgon and that some native girls are selling themselves to get a few bob to give to their boy-friends to buy "plonk". I do not like to see this in 1968. Something has to be done about it.

**Mr. Davies:** That was not true, was it?

**Mr. HINZE:** I do not know. I saw the Press report, but I am not prepared to say whether it was true or not. I am simply saying that these things are not good enough.

The State possesses an extremely capable Director of Aboriginal and Island Affairs. I have gone with Pat Killoran up into the Torres Strait, and he would be probably one of the best-liked people whom I have met. He seems to know everyone by his Christian name and he knows everybody's problems; but he has too much to do. If a road is to be built he decides how it is to be built; if a house is to be constructed he decides on the type to be constructed; and if a jetty is to be constructed he decides what type it shall be. He makes all the decisions. I do not care whether it is Pat Killoran, me or you, Mr. Carey; we all make mistakes. I think that a parliamentary select committee should be set up to talk about these things and to ensure that if a road needs to be constructed the best equipment is obtained for its construction. This department does not want to buy some broken-down plant from the Main Roads Department that it has to try to keep together in order to construct the next road.

No jetties are provided on the Torres Strait Islands. When a boat gets within 200 yards of the shore of any of the Torres Strait islands the natives try to carry the passengers ashore. Hon. members can imagine what happened when they tried to carry me. They sank in the mud. They had

no chance. They could carry the Acting Premier—he is only half my weight—but when they got hold of me they went down in the mud. I said, “She’s right, mate. Drop me.” Otherwise, they would have gone down in the mud.

**An Opposition Member:** Fancy asking the natives to carry you.

**Mr. HINZE:** I did not ask them to carry me; they came out and wanted to carry me. The point I am making is that no jetties exist there, and this is not good enough in 1968.

The Torres Strait Islanders are the most fantastic people I have met, and they are the happiest. The State should do everything in its power to keep them happy and healthy. Thousands of the children are the strongest and healthiest I have seen, but when they reach 15 or 16 years of age they do not know what to do because there is no work for them. The Federal Government did not have enough guts to cut off the Gulf of Carpentaria; it was too worried about what somebody might say about it. It should have said, “These are our waters, and these are our people. Fishing is the living of the Torres Strait Islanders, and we are going to protect it.” No industry exists for these young people on the islands, and they have to leave Torres Strait and the Gulf and go down to Western Australia to work on the railway lines. This is not good enough for Queensland; we have to make sure that we do everything possible to keep these people fully employed in our own areas and to provide the amenities that will make them comfortable in the conditions of present-day living.

**Mr. Bromley:** What sort of industry do you suggest?

**Mr. HINZE:** I suggest that they love fishing and they love this type of industry. Cape York Peninsula has the best soil I have seen in my life, at Bamaga and across to Somerset and Cowal Creek. It reminds me of the Wondai-Proston-Kingaroy soil. There is no better soil than that on Cape York Peninsula. With the introduction of new grasses and legumes the carrying capacity could be increased in time from one beast to 40 acres to one beast to an acre. With the improved strains of beef cattle that we now have, as I said at the outset, this department will be one of the most profitable in the State.

I am concerned in that the Aboriginal Relics Preservation Act, which we passed last year, has not gone all the way in my area. In the Broadbeach area we have Aboriginal midden-heaps. Some people from the university come to the area and take these relics away to analyse them. I do not like that. As these Aboriginal relics exist in my area I want some recognition given to the people who found them, and I want those that have been taken away returned to the area.

**Mr. Sherrington:** You have them on Tallebudgera Creek.

**Mr. HINZE:** We have them on Tallebudgera, around Big Burleigh Hill, and at Broadbeach. We have them in a number of other areas. But what happens? Some people in my area refer to the university people as academic vandals and pirates. They say that these archaeologists or anthropologists who take these relics away are academic pirates.

**Mr. W. D. Hewitt:** Don’t you think the land developers are sometimes the biggest vandals?

**Mr. HINZE:** I will not say yes or no to that. I could not agree that that is right.

We have a wealth of Aboriginal culture in Queensland, some of it in my electorate. I am proud of it. A few men in my area are greatly interested in this work and I do not want to break their hearts. I want the Government to do everything possible to create an interest in these relics and keep these men interested so that they will continue in their great work. I suggest that we should have an Aboriginal museum on the Gold Coast. All the visitors who come to the area from overseas want to see something Australian. They do not want to see Florida Gardens, Rio Vista or Monaco Street. They say, “Where are the natives? Where is the culture? Where are the dancers? Where is everything associated with this culture? Where are the names?” They want to see things associated with Australia. In future we will be getting many more thousands of visitors, and somewhere in our area we should have a museum so that we can show them all the things that the Aborigines made and the musical instruments that they used. They should be in a museum in the area as a tourist attraction.

I have exhausted the matters on which I wished to comment in this debate. I once again commend the Treasurer on what I believe to be a very good Budget, which he refers to as “Queensland’s march to progress” Budget.

**Mr. O’DONNELL (Barcoo) (2.59 p.m.):** I feel that, to a certain extent, I must support the remarks of the previous speaker relative to the report on market milk supplies. These reports, and other reports, perhaps issued in the form of Press statements, concern me at times because they are most disturbing to industries or sections of industries. Some reports could well have a closed circulation because of the resultant confusion, turmoil and sometimes financial worry associated with matters raised in them.

I say this because last year a report was circulated throughout Queensland concerning a glut in the safflower industry. Fortunately I was able to steady its effect with a Press release. To the people in the safflower industry with contracts, and to the primary producers who were at that time looking to the banks for credit to

obtain plant, it was a period of great confusion and temporary worry. As a matter of fact, instead of there being a glut in the safflower industry the exact opposite prevailed. The season was almost a flop, and a major company probably lost hundreds of thousands of dollars. These reports can be disturbing, and to a certain extent there is validity in what the hon. member for South Coast said about the publication of this report being disturbing to the various sections of the industry.

Another matter raised by the hon. member with which I agree is his doubt about how practical the implementation of this report would be. I appreciate his statement that this whole system was introduced by a Labour Government way back in 1956, and for a very sincere reason. My research indicates that from 1939 to 1957 seven companies ceased trading through financial failure or uneconomic throughputs. As a consequence, the Honourable H. A. Collins agreed to a rationalisation of the Brisbane milk supply. This is what we have today. This is what has been described in the report as efficient. The report says that there can be no quarrel with it on the grounds of cost, quality and service. This is a rather flattering statement to be made about any industry. There is more to that sentence, namely, that there is scope for reduction of the transport costs of raw milk supplies. But the compliment is there. Consequently, the question is—why?

The hon. member for South Coast has answered that in part. Like him, I feel that while it is apparently a conflict between direct and indirect suppliers we will reach the stage where we will not have just that simple situation as it is stated in the report but will have co-operative against co-operative as well. We will have this division in the dairy industry. I know that there is keen competition for milk supply, which is very important, but the industry has had some troublesome days and it looks like having a few more. Therefore, there should be a coming-together to resolve these problems.

A report such as this brings to the notice of the public certain aspects of the dairy industry, and certainly it is of value there. I should like to say that no other industry in Australia can take from the dairy industry the accolade of being the only industry that has never endeavoured to exploit the public. I say this in all sincerity. A study of the butter industry, its set-up, price and so on, down through the years shows that never has the consuming public been exploited by it.

I often wonder why the consuming public has not shown a little more appreciation of the butter section of the industry in the acceptance of higher prices for the product on the market. I remember quite distinctly when the price of butter was increased by 3d. a lb. Consumption dropped quite a number of tons and those in the industry

said, "All we got out of that increase was 3d. a lb." I think it will be found that those figures are correct.

I have stated that my particular interest was aroused by the mention of Labour's part in the rationalisation of this industry. I feel that over the last 12 or 13 years we have obtained here the cheapest retail price of milk of all Australian capital cities. To show that, I have taken out the prices of a pint bottle of milk in each capital city as at May, 1968. They are —

	Cents
Sydney .. .. .	11
Perth .. .. .	10
Melbourne .. .. .	10
Hobart .. .. .	10
Adelaide .. .. .	10
Brisbane .. .. .	9

There is complete proof of my statement. We have also the lowest margin in Australia from farm price to consumer price, which means much to the consumer. The retail price to the consumer has varied from 9d. in 1958 to 9c in 1968, which is an increase of 20 per cent. The producer's price has varied from 3s. 7½d. in 1958 to 42.3c in 1968, which is an increase of approximately 17.3 to 17.4 per cent. The proof of what I am saying is in those figures. There is here the highest per capita consumption in Australia, and, of the milk marketed in all capital cities, the quality of Brisbane's milk is the highest.

If Brisbane's milk is of the best quality, there is definitely a big task ahead of any other milk supplier who wishes to say that his milk is of better quality. This was acknowledged in statements made by the Minister on one occasion, and also by authorities on the dairying industry. Consequently, the product obtainable here is nothing to be ashamed of. Brisbane also is the only capital city in Australia in which this industry has a six-day working week; in other States it has a seven-day working week.

The use of the word "monopoly" has been referred to, namely, Q.U.F. I suppose it could be called a monopoly because, after all, there is only one operator. If there is a monopoly, however, it is the Brisbane Milk Board, because it controls the price both to the producer and the consumer.

I feel that in effecting any alteration in the framework of the industry there are many things to be considered. I am not going to say that outside interests have not a right to endeavour to increase the market for their product. As a matter of fact, I suggest that they do have such a right. But I also say that those who are now concerned with the industry must have their rights reserved. I think that their investment must be preserved, and their opportunity to expand must also remain. There should be no taking away from any operating concern anything that it now possesses. The difficulty is how to phase this out effectively, and I suggest that those in the industry can do that themselves, to

the satisfaction of all, by consultation and conferences round the table. Nobody will then feel that his association is in jeopardy.

I know very well that the hon. member for South Coast has an interest in the Brisbane milk market because his association has a quota. It would not be right, in my opinion, if that quota was reduced. I can see a moral argument for its being maintained; perhaps there may be an argument for its expansion being approved. That applies to all associations, not only to the one to which I have referred.

I wish to conclude my remarks on this subject with a reference to page 20 of the report, which, strange to say, deals with the minor section of the industry, the vendors. It is worth reading because it indicates quite clearly that there will be problems—they are outlined here—relative to vendors, who are the small operators. The report discusses how they are going to handle brands and speaks about promotion of brands, and then says—

“It would seem inevitable that vendors would be under some pressure from wholesalers to push one or other of the competitive brands.

“The answer may well be the operation of separate vendors for each wholesaler with competition as between vendors.”

There is the simple set-up; it is mentioned in the report.

Let me get back to the big competition between the operators. We have the present set-up in Brisbane. I know that the competition is to be limited to two operators a zone. But wherever another operator comes in, the whole machinery of the business has to be set up, and this will, in my opinion, add to the cost. Costs have to be borne by one of two people—either by the producer, or by the consumer—and it is only fair—in my book, anyway—to see that the producer gets the highest possible return and that the consumer gets the lowest price. If that principle is to be maintained—and in Queensland, at least, the dairying industry has endeavoured to maintain it—a very careful look will have to be taken at the methods, procedures and proposals that are to be put forward by the competitors who decide to enter this zone, which apparently is the Mecca of all monopolists in the marketing of their products.

I should say that this report should be considered very cautiously. If the industry is not very careful, and if organisations are not ready to submit their ideas, some undesirable features could be introduced as a result of their complacency or what may be regarded as acquiescence. This could affect the price to the producer and later, as I said, to the consumer.

When speaking in the Address-in-Reply debate, I ran out of time when speaking on land matters, and I should like to return to the battle. I see that the Minister for Lands

is in the Chamber, and I remind him that I said the Government's freeholding policy was giving away the State's assets.

**Mr. Sullivan:** Will you say that again, please?

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I said that the Government's freeholding policy was giving away the State's assets. I will go back in history. Perhaps I am a little older than the Minister, and I remember the Moore Government and the fact that it introduced freeholding of rural lands.

I wish to present a little case that I have made out to indicate exactly what I mean when I say that the Government's freeholding policy is giving away the assets of the State. In 1931-32 it was possible under the Moore Government to take out a freehold purchase lease, if you want to call it that, over a 40-year period. Let us consider 4,000 acres taken out in 1931. Assuming it was taken out by me, this is how well off I would be today: it would cost me £32, or \$64, a year, instalment over the 40 years, to be completed in 1971 or 1972.

**Mr. Sullivan** interjected.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I do not want any interruptions. I want to finish this.

**Mr. Sullivan:** I will hear you out and then tear you to ribbons.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** If we look at the figures I have given, for 40 years it works out, at present-day values, at 1.6c per acre per annum. That is on a total unimproved valuation of \$2,560. If we convert the rent payment into stock, in those days I would have had to pay my rent by selling cattle and I would have needed to sell six or seven head to pay the annual instalment on my freeholding purchase.

Now, think of \$64 today. I am paying this off over 40 years and, because of the inflationary spiral, I would not be foolish enough to pay it off in a hurry. Every year I am paying less and less as a result, and all I would need to sell today would be one bullock to pay my rent for the next three years. In other words, anybody freeholding under the principles I have just laid down from the days when the Moore Government was in power, under a set-up similar to what I have stated today, is paying exactly one-third of a fat bullock per year in instalment. This is why I say that the assets of the State are being given away.

Now let us come to a present-day transaction.

**Mr. Sullivan:** What area is this?

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** 4,000 acres; that is good enough to suit my purpose.

**Mr. Sullivan** interjected.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** Do not talk to me about those things. I will tell the hon. member about that very smartly. Do not tell me I do not know what I am talking about, because I do.

Taking a similar transaction today with another 4,000 acres, this would be on a basis of £400, or \$800, a year rent. The total unimproved value of the property would be \$24,000, or, over a period of 30 years, 20c per acre per annum.

The rent in stock value, present day, would be about five head. Can hon. members just imagine in 20 years how low that will be? It is quite clear, in these illustrations, how cheap these properties have been. To my mind, it is foolish to say anything else but that the land has been virtually given away.

I want hon. members to understand that I am nothing but concerned about this. When I look at the figures from 1958 to 1963—there is a slight variation, because reports have changed from full-year to financial-year statements—proceeds from the sale of freehold land in this State amounted to \$3,623,790. Since the change-over to the 1963, 1964 and up to 1967-68 type of report there has been a return to the Lands Department of \$7,907,852 as proceeds from the sale of freehold land.

The figure I am going to give is approximate because of this cross-over in the 1963 year. If the two are added together the total sum that has been paid into the department is \$11,000,000. While freeholding continues money will come in year by year, but the day will come when the revenue from the 100 million acres available in Queensland for freehold will be exhausted. The Lands Department will say, "We cannot go on this way. We want money."

The people who are presently enjoying the benefit of this gesture by the Government—and they would be fools if they did not enjoy it—will find that their children and grandchildren will be faced with not paying rent, as they would if the Government carried on with a leasehold policy—and it is probably a fair rent—but with paying a land tax, which everybody will have to pay. That is what will need to be done with future generations because of this consistent giving away of land.

Besides involving a loss of rental, some of the properties that are to be converted to freehold will be bonanzas, not only on the basis of the present "give-away" policy, but, with the areas that have been given and with changing techniques, an opportunity will be presented to change some of those areas to at least two, or possibly three living areas. So there is a tremendous future for some lucky people. Anybody who does not freehold is a fool; he is a nitwit. If he freeholds he will receive tremendous advantages. He gets the present-day valuation and he has no interest to pay. We do not seem to be able to do anything to curb inflation, so there must be nothing but an advantage in freeholding. People who are fortunate enough to convert

to freehold those areas that are in excess of the one living area and could perhaps later be subdivided into three living areas are even better off. That is the crux of my attitude on land matters.

**Mr. Sullivan:** It is good to see you on that side of the Chamber.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I am prepared to accept what I see around me in the cities, with people with their own little area of land and their own home. In my book, this is a very good thing, but I do not think that Queensland has yet developed to the stage where it can adopt a policy of converting all land to freehold tenure.

I shall now illustrate how one can rush into these things too quickly. A moment ago we were talking about the dairying industry. Over the years the dairying industry has had to seek a subsidy, and justifiably so. The Commonwealth Government has now had to allocate money in an endeavour to re-organise that industry. I remind hon. members that that means the re-organisation of areas and not just the introduction of certain techniques. If the State does not proceed cautiously it will reach the stage in its history when it will have to ask itself, "Where is all our freehold country now? Where are we going?"

**Mr. Chinchin:** Only 7 per cent. of the State is freehold.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I propose to deal with that point, too.

Where is the State going to obtain land for the controlled organisation of industry or even subdivision? The land will be gone completely, beyond the control of the Government and beyond the capacity of the Government to resume for cash. That is the point.

**Mr. Sullivan:** Are you completely opposed to freeholding rural lands?

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** Not completely. I concede that in the sugar industry and the dairying industry certain properties are quite appropriate for freeholding.

**Mr. Sullivan:** What about the grazing industry?

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** Certain grazing properties.

**Mr. Sullivan:** Don't you see the advantage of Arcadia Valley and the development of other areas in your electorate?

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** The Minister puts his question in a silly way. One would think he was Perry Mason. I shall take Arcadia Valley as a case in point. Some day the Arcadia Valley properties will be quite capable of subdivision.

**Mr. Sullivan:** Is there anything wrong with those?

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** There is in the sense that the opportunity will be taken from people to enter into land activities for the simple reason that these properties can be held without subdivision.

**Mr. Sullivan:** You have no consideration for the sons of the settlers who have worked to make it possible.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I will answer that in this way: I believe that not only are the sons of graziers and farmers entitled to a place in the sun on the land. The sons of other people also deserve an opportunity to make the grade. I believe in opportunity for all. I do not believe in an inherited type of land policy under which, just because a father had a piece of land, his son is also entitled to a piece of land. That is not right; it is not fair.

**Mr. Sullivan:** Do you believe the blocks in the Arcadia Valley are too big?

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I did not say that. I said that one day they will be capable of subdivision.

**Mr. Sullivan:** You must believe in one thing or the other.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I am afraid that the Minister is a very poor lawyer.

**Mr. Sullivan:** You ought to get off the fence.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** This is with apologies to Perry Mason now.

**Mr. Sullivan:** Be a little factual.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I am quite factual. As a matter of fact, I flew over Arcadia Valley last Sunday. I saw something that I was very pleased to see. Some of those properties are now going in for cultivation. I saw three properties with cultivation, and I was very pleased to see it. If this Government had had the foresight to retain the Roma-Injune railway line it would have been an incentive for those people to really get into the production of grain, which would perhaps have assisted them to emerge from the tremendous debts that weigh down on every property. When the debts are paid subdivision will come; the share-farmers and subdivision will come.

**Mr. Sullivan:** It should come before then.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** Not under the brigalow scheme. They must first pay off their mortgage.

**Mr. Sullivan:** I should like to sit down and have a talk with you at some time and let you know just what is going on.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** All this brings me back to the two points I made. First, in the years to come, the Lands Department, in order to function as a department, somewhere along the line will have to rely on a tax on the

land. This is a short-sighted policy. After all, with people purchasing the blocks today eventually posterity will have to pay a tax.

**Mr. Lickiss:** It is strange that that has not happened in Victoria, where they have had a freehold policy ever since its inception.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** That day will come. The Premier of Victoria is looking for further avenues of State taxation.

I now wish to refer to the shooting of kangaroos. I read in the Press that a report on this subject was before Cabinet yesterday. I should like to make some comments on it. Yesterday five petitions were sent to me from grazing people in the Aramac area who are concerned that there is a possibility of a closed season. Unfortunately they did not set out the petition in the correct form and therefore I must send the names on to the Minister so that he may have an indication of the opinions of these people.

It is important to realise that kangaroo shooting has become controversial.

**Mr. Row:** How do you and the hon. member for Salisbury agree on this?

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** After I have finished, the Minister can make up his mind.

There are controversial aspects of this matter. I can remember when the Americans controlled the skin industry and they paid when and how they liked. Consequently the industry, never a very good one, was based on shooting roos for the skins.

Because of the incidence of roos, many people regard them as pests and menaces, whereas others regard them more favourably. I can remember drives against roos. Many people do not know these things. There were drives against roos and they were shot for 2s. 6d. a head. There was no waiting to skin them; it was simply a matter of shooting them.

Today it is a rather organised industry. In many instances people on the land want to get rid of the roo, and justifiably so. On a property outside Aramac, 60,000 roos have been shot in the past five years, and the roo-shooters are still there and are strongly active. The returns to the property have been quite considerable, to the extent, I believe, of \$25,000 in additional lambing.

I know that we view with some degree of disquiet the sight of dead roos on the roadside. In many cases these marsupials commit suicide. No driver runs into them intentionally. On many occasions I have been in a car and seen roos run out and hit the side, not the front, of the car. They run straight into the side of it.

We have seen many facets of this matter. Naturally, roos have a certain amount of attractiveness. They are not easily handled. Past a certain stage they go to the bush. Unlike other animals the cannot be held as domestic pets. Therefore they present a problem, and the big problem seems to be in the preservation of certain species.

I do not want to see a closed season for kangaroos. I should like to see an operation continuing all the year round. This would mean that the professional roo-shooters would not have their occupation hindered and the people who are interested not only in the skins but also in the meat for pet food would have their occupations preserved, and the industry could be carried on so that there would be some form of control to see that the industry does not kill itself.

**Mr. W. D. Hewitt:** Could you control the butt size?

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** The controlling of size is possible. There is a certain degree of validity in saying that size can be controlled. Some people have suggested 36 lb. and others have gone as low as 25 lb. To be arbitrary about it, it would be most difficult to police, and competition would make this difficult because some people would be a little unscrupulous with a standard such as that, and would not take much notice of it.

Relative to the economics of the industry, where nature is concerned there is a certain form of control. In bad times, such as periods of drought, when disease is rife in mobs of kangaroos, or when insect pests, such as sandflies, do untold harm, there is not much shooting. The kangaroo-shooter will not operate if it is not to his advantage to do so. Of course, the chiller operator and related industries would be affected, too. There is a certain amount of natural control, and I really believe that, by consultation with the Minister for Primary Industries and other expert people, the industry should be able to decide how to maintain a controlled activity. Kangaroos will then be kept at reasonable numbers, and the associated industries dealing with skins and meat will continue to be valuable assets to the State.

**Mr. Carey:** Does the hon. member for Salisbury agree with your opinion on that?

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I suggest that the hon. member ask him and not me. I do not know, nor can I answer for other people. If this industry is looked at intelligently, it will be possible to help the graziers and farmers who, it is quite true, need some protection. Occasionally one finds groups of graziers saying that kangaroos should not be shot. I saw such a statement made in the Press the other day by a group at Marella. Graziers can, without any trouble at all, prevent any shooting on their properties. Some graziers, because of drought conditions, have no stock on their properties, so that kangaroos are not of much concern to them. There are others who are in just the opposite position; they have more kangaroos than stock on their properties, and they are genuinely trying to do well. Where they can be assisted, I think they should be.

At the two extremes, there are graziers who say that kangaroos should be completely exterminated and others who say that not one should be shot. In all aspects of conservation, there must be a balanced outlook. We must realise that humans have been the greatest example of disturbing the balance of nature. Let us look at Australia before the arrival of the white man, and compare the human population then and now with kangaroo numbers for the same periods.

**Mr. McKechnie:** In the scrub country there are many more kangaroos now than there were when Captain Cook came.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** That is so. Anyone who flies over outback Queensland will see that there is plenty of country in which kangaroos can breed. I have not seen the report referred to, but I shall read it with interest when it is available. I feel that an intelligent approach is what is needed, and that it is possible to protect the interests of all, including the ultra-conservative conservationist, in these matters. I noticed in the Press the other day a reference to preserving bats because they destroy tons of moths. I was a little disappointed that next day someone did not come out in favour of preserving the moths because they do wonderful work in another way. Some sense has to be brought to bear in these matters.

I now wish to make some reference to my electorate. I take this opportunity to say that I have received repeated complaints from shire councils on a matter which concerns them very greatly. I refer to access roads. This matter has been before the Minister for Main Roads many times, and I should now like to mention it in the Chamber. It concerns the Minister for Lands, too, because in certain areas land comes up for subdivision. As a consequence, the shire council knows it has to carry out a programme to build access roads at least to the boundaries of the subdivisions. The point is that it is the council's full responsibility, and I think that councils resent the fact that the Department of Lands decides to carry out a subdivision and then throws the responsibility on the local authority to build roads to the boundary fences. They feel that it is unjust and is not fair to them.

**Mr. Sullivan:** We have had some discussions about that.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I know, but I shall go a little farther.

**Mr. Sullivan:** You are a bit out of date.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I am not altogether out of date, because some of the residents of the district who have been there 40, 50 or 60 years—

**Mr. Sullivan:** What would you do if you were Minister for Lands?

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** If I were Minister for Lands I would do a better job than the present Minister is doing. The Minister asked for that.

**Mr. Sullivan:** If you did a better job, you would be doing a very good job.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** Some of the people who live there had grandparents who lived in the district, and they have not even had a grader over their roads for the last 10 or 15 years. As a result, they get rather resentful when they see graders being used on access roads to new subdivisions. They do not always give visiting local councillors the hospitable greetings that they should be given, because they feel "done in the eye". They have paid for the roads over the decades and got nothing, whereas newcomers to the area who are fortunate enough to draw a block get the benefit of the access roads.

That applies particularly in the case of two shires in my area—I have heard the complaint from only two shires—Belyando and Bauhinia. As a matter of fact, the Bauhinia Shire Council raised the question of access roads some years ago, when it was anxious to get an access road into the Carnarvons, but it could not get any Government help on that occasion, either. Access roads always raise problems for councils, and I do not know whether there has been any satisfactory consultation between the Government and local authorities on that question to see whether something can be done.

In the brigalow land development something was done, and it was done well. I appreciate that because it was something of value. As a matter of fact, some of the councils have come out of it quite well. The Bauhinia Shire Council had a good scrap with the Minister for Lands and the result was very satisfactory.

**Mr. Sullivan:** They are quite happy. They have come out of it fairly well.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** That is right. The councils think, "If this can happen in the brigalow, why can't it happen outside?" I am throwing the question into the ring in the hope that somebody in the department will consider it and do something about it.

**Mr. Sullivan:** Two or three of the councils with which we have had discussions are fairly happy with those discussions. Although I appreciate your bringing it to our notice, I point out that we are aware of the problem and are concerned about it.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I hope that something is done about it.

I appreciate what has been done in the "O'Donnell" Budget, as one person has had the audacity to call it because my electorate has received quite a few benefits.

**Mr. Hanson:** Good representation.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** Persistent and insistent representation, I call it.

**Mr. Sullivan:** interjected.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I do not want my name on a dam. I appreciate receiving these things; I should be very foolish if I did not. I say that in all sincerity, because I am not the only one who has worked for these things. There is a sort of team spirit in the Central West, and there are many things that we do not ask each other about when we want something like the Maraboon Dam, a separate State high school, or a rural college. We are all wearing the same jersey. This is important. I do not give any credit to myself personally; I regard myself as part of a team, and we do a pretty good job.

**Mr. Sullivan:** During the next election campaign you will have to give a lot of credit to the Government.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I shall not be giving any credit to anybody. I shall just be stating Labour's policy, and I shall get around that very nicely.

**Mr. Sullivan:** interjected.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** The Minister for Lands is trying to dominate my time, and I do not want him to do that. I want to refer to certain matters in my electorate that I feel should be raised. There has been much planning, co-operation and working together to turn it into a pretty good all-round area, but there are two or three deficiencies. Two of them are in Emerald. They reached the eyesore stage some time ago because they are in the midst of progressive private-enterprise buildings and local-authority buildings. I refer to the police station and the court-house.

The police station has had a long history. Originally it was the black-trackers' quarters. Today it is the Emerald police station, and I think that that kind of appreciation of status for a building is a very poor show indeed. I should like to see it demolished. As a matter of fact, a new police station for Emerald was included in the Budget two years ago. The old police residence was pulled down and a new residence erected, and then all of a sudden that was the end of the story and the black-trackers' quarters stood.

We do need a new police station. In fact, we need additional police—if not two, at least one—in the area. This is a boom area. The Minister for Local Government and Conservation is here and he will confirm that next year we will have possibly 300 or 400 more men in the area. As accommodation is going up for 500 men, it could possibly reach a figure of 500 extra.

**Mr. Richter:** On the over-all picture, you are getting a good deal from the Government.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** I am doing all right, but I still think we should have a new police station, a new court-house, and at least an additional man at the police station to cope with all this development. If we are to have numbers of additional people employed there we must also have the means of serving the town's needs, and extra police



will be needed. There will be a township at Maraboon, or is it Fairbairn? There will be a township of 500 people there, even though they may not be all active workers, and it is important that we have these amenities.

I have only one request educationally, and that is for a new school at Gindie. This school has been operating in demountables for the last three or four years. As a matter of fact, it was my idea that a transfer should be made from the old school building into demountables, but the demountables have become too permanent and I think it is time we had a look at this situation. I think Gindie will be the nearest school to the Maraboon Dam site and I do not know what provision is to be made for the education of the children at the dam. I do not know whether they are to be given the benefit of a school at the site or are to be conveyed to another school. If they are to be conveyed to another school, and we adopt the principle that pupils cannot be taken past an existing State school, then Gindie is the nearest State school.

That is the problem that is concerning me at the present time. If I could have from the Minister for Local Government and Conservation an indication of his plans for the future of these people I should appreciate it, because then some decision could be made in this respect.

It is very important to have an education facility available. I do not want to go into a spate of other demountables. While I appreciate what has been done, I often feel that when one looks at something else that is done one wonders if one is doing as well. When one looks at the Blackwater State School one realises how the Government jumped into it and put it up far ahead of the expected enrolment. Certainly its enrolment will grow to the expected number.

**Mr. Newton:** Houses were not even occupied.

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** That is right, and yet the Government was establishing this beautiful school with even an administration block attached to it. When the residents of Gindie pass through Blackwater and see the situation there they get a personal resentment about it and say, "We are not well done by". It is hard to explain to them that they have a rural college. They say, "That does not interest us. The Gindie State School is what we want." This is an individual viewpoint and a group viewpoint that cannot be obviated. It is just there. Those are my three major problems.

The only thing I regret relative to the Education Department is the alteration in the approach to the requirements of a Senior class, or, rather, Grades 11 and 12. I feel that as time has gone on conditions have been stepped up and up, until now areas exist which seven or eight years ago would normally have obtained a Senior top but under the present policy will not obtain one.

On account of their figures they will possibly have a stability far in excess of that of some of the schools that have been granted Senior tops in the past.

I am pleased to say that Emerald has progressed so well that a separate State high school is to be provided in the New Year. Its construction has been approved, and an amount of \$236,000 has been appropriated. I cannot see Clermont ever obtaining a Senior top under the present conditions that are applied by the Education Department, nor can I see Blackall obtaining one. An enrolment of 200 needs to be obtained before a Senior top is granted, and that is simultaneously with a separate high school being granted.

I can go back to the days when all that was needed was a number of six for sub-Senior; then it grew to 10; then it grew to 15. Now the department does not stipulate any number; it only says 200. Obviously that means that there will be 200 over Grades 8, 9, 10. There will need to be 200 in those three grades with an examination coming up to indicate that in the next year there will be a sub-Senior class. There will be Grades 8, 9 and 10, and then Grade 7 will be brought in the following year to become Grade 8, and those pupils in Grade 10 who decide to go on to Senior will move into Grade 11. This is a great lift from the old requirement of only six, and it is a great lift, too, when the figure of 15 is considered.

This concerns me because I feel that there are drawbacks in the remote-area allowance. I was the person who agitated for remote-area allowances. Hon. members can read through "Hansard" and will find that no other member asked for them. I feel that the allowance does not go far enough to cover the needs of people in the Blackall-Clermont district. In an area like that, where some pupils are prepared to go on to sub-Senior and Senior, they are missing out on the remote-area allowance.

**Mr. Hodges:** Where do they go to?

**Mr. O'DONNELL:** It is decided by the Commonwealth examination. So many get Commonwealth scholarships and, after that, so many get remote-area allowances. Some of the students do pretty well but they just miss out on it. Certainly only a handful are involved, but when I asked for remote-area allowances I asked for an opportunity for all. I feel that one or two worthy children can miss out. Sometimes it just seems to fall on the children who have no chance of going away unless they receive assistance. That always seems to happen; it is the unfortunate ones who are affected.

I think I have covered fairly adequately what I wanted to say. I have engaged in some dialogue from time to time, but I have made my points.

I feel that we are at a very difficult stage in our development. After listening to the Acting Premier yesterday speaking to fellow Queenslanders, and perhaps to people from outside the State, on the need for export action, I am worried because I feel that Australians should not need such encouragement. They should be alive to the necessity to develop this State. They should be ready to do something about it and they should not need a rejuvenation programme telling them to get on with the job. With our primary industries in their present state, and with the difficulty they have in finding overseas markets, we need intelligent promoters of this country as well as intelligent managers within the country. That is why I feel so concerned that our land should be developed properly and adequately. We offer the best land in our freehold policy to encourage people. Good heavens, who needs the most encouragement? I think it is those people battling on the blocks in the Far West of the State. If freehold is an incentive, won't they share in it? Can't they share in it? Is it an advantage after all? It sometimes strikes me as anomalous; if there is value in it, it seems to be a restricted value provided it is in a good area. We also have settlement in the North, with American interests taking over some of our cattle lands. Who is to blame? Naturally, Australians are to blame. That land is classed as some of our poor country. When I saw the gathering yesterday which needed the spur to give it incentive and inspiration, I thought it was not very good from an Australian point of view. As Queenslanders and Australians, we should be doing our best all the time.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT** (Chatsworth) (3.58 p.m.): It is probably fair to say that no electorate fared better in the recently presented Budget than Barcoo. It was good to hear the hon. member for that district being gracious enough to acknowledge that the Government has smiled benevolently upon his district in its allocation. While I suspect that he will attack the Government in the next State election campaign—and we all understand that these are the rules of the game—I suspect that he will be attacking with his tongue in his cheek. Indeed he will probably be hoping for two things, first, that he retains the seat as the member for Barcoo, and, second, that the present Government is returned so that it may continue to look after Barcoo so effectively and well.

The Budget that was delivered a few weeks ago was pleasing not only in content but also in presentation. It was attractive and easy to follow, and introduced innovation and change. I believe that every hon. member should acknowledge the change that has been introduced in this document and should commend the Treasurer for accepting suggestions and his officers for making suggestions.

I hope that it augurs well for change in this place in many ways. It suggests that we have a Treasurer who is attuned to change and is susceptible to suggestion and to innovation. I identify this new presentation not as something complete in itself but as the start of better things. There is no question that there are many things yet to be done in this State of Queensland and particularly in this Parliament of Queensland before impatient souls like me are satisfied. It is unnecessary to repeat the catalogue of those claims. We know them all. They relate to select committees, parliamentary committees, joint committees and some of the procedures in this Parliament. Therefore we hope that what we see in this document is the start of a new trend.

I say to you, Mr. Acting Chairman, and indeed to every other hon. member, "You can call me Oliver Twist if you like, but I intend to ask for more." Unlike Oliver Twist, I intend to get more.

The attack upon the Budget was led by the Leader of the Opposition in traditional style. I thought that the hon. gentleman flitted around like a bee in the first full blush of spring touching upon a flower here and a flower there, not staying long enough to bog down in detail, but enjoying the heady experience of being able to advocate without being called upon to implement.

He delivered a long speech, using all of the time at his disposal, but he did not, to my point of view anyway, highlight any shortcomings in the Treasurer's handling of the finances of the State. Indeed, the absence of specific criticism could in fact be interpreted to mean that the hon. gentleman could find very few chinks in the Treasurer's armour.

On a few points he selected he dwelt longer than he did on others, and some of these should be debated with him. In the early part of his speech he made lengthy reference to freights and he submitted figures to establish that freights have not been cut back to a previous level, and that increases that were introduced by the Government have been maintained. I put to him: what precisely is his proposition? Is his proposition that all charges should remain static and that by some strange chance the Railway Department alone of all enterprises must not and cannot pass on charges that it, in turn, has to incur? If this is his proposition, it is a farcical one and one that cannot hold any water at all. Like any other department, the Railway Department must on occasion pass on increases in charges. The simple fact of the matter is that the Government's record in this field is very creditable indeed. The rises in its period of office have been few and far between and none could be described as savage.

The hon. gentleman also referred to passenger fares. I think his proposition was that these, too, should be reduced, although it was significant that he was careful not

to say so. A Leader of the Opposition walks a tightrope; he must criticise and try to say what things are lacking, but at the same time he must not commit himself in case of the freakish possibility that one day he will be called upon to honour his word. Whilst he skirted round the edge of these things, he did not commit himself but merely told us that passenger fares and freights had been increased, and that those rates had been maintained. That is something of which we are all aware.

The hon. member referred to the shortage of clerk-typists on the staff of this Parliament. He is not going to buy a fight there—certainly not with me. Those are sentiments with which we all agree, and I hope that in the fullness of time there will be some solution to the problem that he touched upon.

As was to be expected, the hon. member made some reference to the Police Force. Whilst the Budget spells an increase in police strength, I glean that that increase does not satisfy the hon. member. I was disappointed that he did not grasp the recent suggestion that funds be made available to investigate the incidence of crime at its source rather than concentrate more upon its prevention. I think the Government is going to accept the suggestion that funds be made available to investigate the whole fabric of crime and make a detailed study of it. That is the emphasis that I support. I believe that crime prevention is better than the apprehension of criminals, and the suggestions recently made in this field by a gentleman from the university were very constructive and useful ones. I shall be disappointed if the Government does not act upon them.

The hon. member also referred to local government subsidies. He prefers not to acknowledge the fact that this Government is the most generous of all State Governments in the field of subsidies to local authorities.

In discussing education, he made the allegation that the percentage increase in the education vote was attributable to the fact that we are now on the downhill run to an election. That statement may have carried some validity if it were not for the fact that in the last Budget the Government increased the education vote by 11.39 per cent., which means, with the increase in the present Budget, that in two years the education vote has been lifted by 32 per cent. I dispute the claim that education is enjoying its present priority because we are entering a pre-election period. I believe it to be a fact that the Government is acknowledging the importance of education and, as it has done in past years, is directing all available funds to this field.

A detailed study of the contents of the Budget shows that obviously the weight of Government spending has been directed to education. I particularly commend the Government for earmarking \$2,000,000 for modernisation of school furniture and the

supply of requisites. As this is indeed a great need, I am pleased that there is acknowledgment of it by the Government.

I recall the Government's announcement only a few months ago that when the Petrie Terrace school was rebuilt it would be constructed on modern lines. It is timely to remind ourselves that this move by the Government was completely in step with the measures advocated by the Queensland Teachers' Union, and one would therefore have expected this announcement to be received with a great shout of support and congratulations by the president of the union. It was therefore disappointing to me to see the miserable reception that was forthcoming from him. Instead of being gracious about it, he immediately flew off at another tangent and said, "Of course, the building should be air-conditioned." I do not know how one could ever advocate the creation of a state of Utopia for this gentleman because, on the day on which it was created, within half an hour he would be identifying the shortcomings of even that wonderful place.

It is significant that the gentleman to whom I refer has been remarkably silent on the Vote for education. I think that his silence on the Budget connotes an approval of it that he, as an A.L.P. candidate, cannot voice. I hope that his career in the teaching world is longer than his career in the political world, which I do not think will get off the ground.

The education Vote also provides for the payment of \$25 a head to non-State primary schools, and this, of course, has been acknowledged and welcomed in many circles. I am pleased that State aid has been substantially removed from the political arena. I do not think it will ever be removed entirely, because Governments of the day control the purse-strings and allocate their funds at particular times and, therefore, we delude ourselves by saying that it will ever be removed entirely. However, the Australian Labour Party Federal conference at Surfers Paradise came to the realities of the situation and acknowledged the need for State aid. In so doing, it substantially removed the issue from the political arena. I therefore welcome a situation in which a Vote of this proportion and magnitude can be devoted to church schools without creating the controversy that it once created.

Let me, as a person who tries to be practical, not delude myself. I do not pretend for a moment that we are without critics for making these moneys available. I respect the point of view of those who say that all funds should go to State schools, even though I do not agree with them. Their proposition is that our obligation is to maintain a State-school system and to cater for anyone who comes to that State-school system. The simple fact of the matter is that if every person attending a church school suddenly availed himself of the State-school system, we should not be able to cope, and,

in terms of simple economics, it is easier to help them stay where they are than to try to absorb them into a State-school system.

**Mr. Carey:** And less costly to the State.

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** Yes, that is true. It enables people to abide by their own consciences, their own ways, their own attitudes; at the same time, it establishes the fact that the Government has an obligation that it is prepared to discharge. In fact, a very discernible drift has been noticed from church schools to State schools even in the last few years; but I believe that that drift would have been accelerated quite alarmingly if the proposed help had not been forthcoming.

Every person would draw a budget differently; there is no question about that. Each hon. member in this Chamber would lay different emphasis on different things. Therefore, when I express disappointment in one part of the Budget, that does not mean necessarily that there is a shortcoming; it merely means that my emphasis possibly would be different.

I express some disappointment that the assistance to Creche and Kindergarten Association centres has been increased by only \$150 per annum. Increasing importance is being attached to these centres, and I think that all students now acknowledge that a child is moulded in this environment. He is absorbed more easily into the school system if he has had pre-school training. Because of this, we help ourselves with some of our problems if we give assistance to pre-school centres.

All hon. members know the mechanics by which pre-school centres are established. Some noble citizens first of all kick along an idea. They approach organisations; they solicit support; they negotiate leases of land; and then they go through the heavy work of raising substantial funds to build the centres. They then have to enlist children who will attend them and the children have to be charged appropriate fees to maintain them.

Might I say that I understand these problems very intimately, because I am at the moment trying to create a kindergarten in my own electorate, and the going is hard for a number of reasons. I think the going would be harder in other districts because I do not believe that my area is, by any means, depressed. In an area where the community is essentially in a lower-income bracket, the problems would be very great indeed, and I believe there is a sense of urgency about this matter. I hope that when budgets are being looked at in future years additional assistance can be given to the creche and kindergarten movement. It is a worthy one and deserving of greater emphasis.

I content myself, in reference to the assistance to foster mothers, deserted wives and unmarried mothers, with saying that this is the action of a Government with a social

conscience, and I commend the Government for the increased aid it has made available in this field.

The case that will possibly be put forward in the Budget debate is that the Government is conserving funds to expend in this financial year to make its programme look good just before an election. This statement deserves to be analysed to see whether there is any validity in it. On the figures that I can produce, all of these increased expenditures will come out of current earnings and there is no bonus from any previous year. The estimated revenue for the year recently finished was \$344,780,000; the actual revenue was \$376,980,000, an increase of \$32,190,000, which is an appreciable increase by any standard.

If we remove from that \$32,000,000-odd surplus the repayable sugar grant in excess of \$19,000,000, the extra drought relief, which was nearly \$3,000,000, and the extra Commonwealth payment of \$3,500,000, which was devoted to the writing off of the accumulated deficit—if we deduct those, we find that the surplus was \$5,919,000. But what is to the credit of the Government is that this increase in funds is identified in the early part of the year and there was no attempt to salt it away. In February of this year \$6,883,000 in extra funds was released to discharge obligations that we were then in a position to meet. This, in my book at least, was evidence of good faith. It was evidence of the fact that the Government was not playing politics, that it was prepared to share a windfall immediately.

The concessions that have now been introduced represent extra expenditure and cut-back in charges as a result of anticipated funds for the current year. They are not because of any carry-forward from previous years. If any suggestion is made that we are playing politics on these things we should remind ourselves of the pre-election Budget three years ago when, in fact, extra charges were incurred. The adjustment for the decimal currency conversion added an extra cost of \$90,000 for the balance of that year and \$210,000 for the full year, and the increase of stamp duty on cheques incurred a cost of \$826,000 for the balance of the year and \$1,408,000 for the full year. This happened in a pre-election Budget three years ago, so I repudiate suggestions that this Government is playing politics with its finances.

The position is easily explained. The State has gone through a trying time. It experienced a drought of immense proportions, which cost this State an estimated \$17,000,000. Funds have to be recouped somehow, and obviously until they are recouped they cannot be made available for other purposes. The strike at the Mount Isa mine had a detrimental effect upon the State's economy, and the State could not recover overnight; it took time. It stands to reason that, with the loss of revenue aggravated by the effects of the strike and

the drought, years were needed to elapse before the funds of the State again became buoyant. Now they are buoyant, and the Government can and will increase its spending programme. I find nothing sinister or suspect in this at all.

**Mr. Newton:** There is a drought in South-east Queensland now, and there has been one for months.

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** This is true, but this is something we cannot control. Let us all recognise the fact that if another drought of the same proportions developed, the State's revenue would suffer. This is as plain as the nose on the hon. member's face.

**Mr. Newton:** You will increase taxation again after the election next year, the same as you did in 1966.

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** The hon. member is very good at anticipating. It is impossible to keep members of the Opposition happy. When the Government introduces a good Budget containing many of the things that they have been crying about for so long, instead of being gracious even for a moment they start anticipating the worst in future years, when, quite frankly, no-one can forecast these things with any certainty at all. If the seasons went bad again certainly the State's finances would go bad; if the seasons remain favourable, so will the State's funds remain buoyant.

It is said that money is the key to all things, and therefore in a Budget debate there are few things that cannot be debated. I want to take advantage of this situation this afternoon to discuss three things, each of which is quite unrelated to the other but each of which carries some degree of importance and weight.

**Mr. Newton:** This should be interesting. Now we are getting down to something.

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** It is nice to have an appreciative audience.

Many years ago I heard something said about the parallelism of great minds, and I never quite knew about it because I had never seen an example of it. But an example was presented to me today when the hon. member for South Coast made reference to four-year Parliaments. I thought, "This is it; this is a parallelism of great minds". Of all things, this is a subject on which I have prepared notes. There may be some who will dispute this statement. I most certainly think that the hon. member for South Coast has a great mind, but some people will reflect upon mine to my detriment. Be this as it may, I have some observations to make about a four-year Parliament.

The figures presented in the Estimates show that the budgeted costs this year for the election will be \$311,790. The normal Vote in a non-election year is a figure in excess of \$70,000, so obviously the surplus of \$241,425 is the cost of next year's State

election. It will be costly. If that is apportioned over a three-year Parliament it means that each year the cost of the election to the State is \$80,475. If a four-year Parliament was introduced suddenly, the cost to the State would be \$60,356 each year.

**Mr. R. Jones:** Any advance on four? Do I hear "five"?

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** No. I can assure the hon. member that he will not hear "five".

**Mr. Hanlon:** You have to add an extra \$40,000 for the Public Relations Bureau in an election year.

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** The hon. member for Baroona makes that pertinent point. I am in no position to accept it or reject it, so I let it hang on the desert air.

The difference would be the low figure of \$20,000, and I concede that in terms of State finances that is "peanuts"; but I believe that other substantial reasons exist for thinking about lengthening the life of each Parliament. The first thing we should acknowledge is the fact that we have no impediment with an Upper House. In the Federal scene, and in many of the other State scenes, there is a constant problem of balance with the Upper House. We do not have any such problem here. The only impediment we have is the provision in the Constitution Act itself, which, in the 1890 Act, laid down that each Parliament shall be of three years' duration unless it is dissolved earlier by the Governor. In the Constitution Act Amendment Act of 1934, a provision was entrenched whereby moves to re-create the Upper House or to extend the life of a parliament can be made only with the consent of the people. This means that if we as a Parliament decided to lengthen the life of Parliament we could do so only by recourse to the people.

The history of recourse to the people on issues such as this is an unhappy one. I remind the Committee that in May of last year, even with the two major political parties supporting a Federal referendum with respect to the breaking of the nexus, the issue was rejected very heavily by the people. I remind the Committee also that in a referendum in New Zealand asking the people to lengthen the life of the Parliament from three years to four years, the issue was again very heavily rejected. The majority against was 351,325, so the New Zealanders found it a formidable problem. I do not pretend that it will be any less formidable here in Queensland.

We should analyse the reasons, if any, why there should be four-year Parliaments.

**Mr. Bromley:** Why not five years?

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** That is the second time that a period of five years has been mentioned. It is a matter of judgment. I believe that five years is too long, and I firmly believe that three years is too short. Four years is a pretty fair balance.

What are the reasons for advocating a longer Parliament? I am one who believes that longer Parliaments produce better administration. They give Governments the time to have the courage of their convictions, to do things which they believe are right even if they are not for the time being popular, believing also that the time is available to see the vindication of those policies, if, indeed, they are right.

The best example I can give of this is the Wilson Government in Great Britain at the moment. I do not intend to debate the economic situation in the United Kingdom, but unpopular measures have been necessary. They have had to be applied with firmness and courage. Harold Wilson has been able to disregard the minor and temporary setbacks that he has suffered in by-elections in the hope, forlorn though it may be, that time will vindicate his policies. I do not believe that the same firmness would have been applied if Great Britain had merely had a three-year or four-year Parliament.

I have a firm conviction that longer Parliaments produce better and stronger administration. I believe this would be particularly so in Queensland, and I advocate it in Queensland, because we do not have the impediment of an Upper House. I believe it is more important in the Federal situation, but it is difficult there, almost to the point of being impossible. Although that may be so, I should certainly like to see moves in the Federal realm to lengthen the life of the Parliament to four years.

Let me confine my comments to the Queensland Parliament. I hope that, at some time, the Government will establish some dialogue with the Opposition party to gauge its attitude towards this suggestion. If support for it is forthcoming, in the fullness of time the Government may see fit to sound out this proposal at a referendum. Certainly, with the support of the Opposition the going would not be easy. Without the support of the Opposition the going would be impossible, and the Government may as well dismiss the proposition to the waste-paper basket straight away.

The second matter I want to refer to relates to a case advocated by the Lord Mayor of Brisbane, Alderman Clem Jones. Not for the first time I find myself in agreement with something that this gentleman has said. Last Thursday he advocated anti-litter laws and pointed out that the Victorian Government has already implemented such laws. He said that the untidiness prevalent in this State is now of such an order that the Queensland Government should do something about it. I believe that this necessity is quite obvious. Anyone who drives through the countryside, goes to a picnic spot, or indeed walks around the suburbs, sees rubbish, litter, waste and papers everywhere. It is surprising how we appear to be so blind to this problem.

I am pleased to say that everyone is not as blind to it. Indeed, there is in existence at the moment a committee called the Keep Queensland Tidy Committee. It is under the auspices of the Royal Automobile Club of Queensland and it is now leading up to an anti-litter week in the first week in December. The Government has made \$1,000 available to that committee. It is my privilege to represent the Government on the committee and I sit on it with the hon. member for Wynnum, who represents the Opposition on it. If that hon. member was in the Chamber at the moment I am sure that he would be happy to support me when I say that the committee does a useful job and that it should be encouraged. But a voluntary organisation, with the best will in the world, cannot contain a problem that is showing all signs of getting completely out of hand. I believe that the Government must consider this suggestion from a number of sources that anti-litter laws are necessary.

My final point relates to recent activity in the high schools. There has suddenly appeared a remarkable flashpoint—an attempt at student involvement in the Vietnam dissent and the first rumblings of student rejection of authority. Strangely enough, because these two things happened simultaneously, they are being identified as only one problem. I think this is a mistake. Two episodes have merged, but there are two problems, and I want to deal with them separately and not together.

The first problem deals with the activities of students at the Brisbane State High School last Friday, when obscenities were chalked up on the walls, when disrespect was shown to those in authority and when there was evidence of behaviour beyond the accepted limits. The principal acted with commendable speed and firmness. He took control of the situation that could have become ugly. He did the only possible thing, under the circumstances. He could not identify the few guilty ones, so, I am sure quite reluctantly, he dismissed the lot for the day.

It is important to identify this episode as part of a world-wide assault upon discipline. It is also important that we should decide what we are going to do about it. It is certain that we cannot make our schools cloistered institutions, and indeed there should be no attempt to do so. Student councils should be encouraged to discuss, debate, argue and question. But at a high-school level they must not depart from the understanding that they are there to learn, at great cost to their State and to their parents, and that, therefore, activities beyond the acceptable standards must be punished severely and, if necessary, expulsions should be implemented.

It would be regrettable if a boy's high-school career was cut off as suddenly and as severely as this. But if examples must be made and that is the only thing that can

happen, then it must happen. If we unleash a blackboard jungle in Queensland, we will wonder what has hit us.

What worries me more than anything else is that an isolated situation might be magnified out of all proportion. That could easily happen. I would not want my comments to magnify a situation out of proportion. I am a person who has tremendous faith and confidence in, and respect for, the youth of today. I go out of my way to establish contact with them and enjoy dialogue with them, and I refuse to believe that the youth of today, by and large, are any worse than were their predecessors. In many ways—in their frankness of discussion and the way in which they can mix and collaborate in such an uninhibited fashion—I believe that they are possibly better than were those who preceded them. There are warning signs flashing, but I believe that as long as the Government is prepared to back principals who act in the way in which the principal acted the other day we probably do not have much to worry about. The Government should know where it is going in these things, and let its principals know to what degree it will back them.

A second issue is the attempted involvement of high-school students in the Vietnam dissent. Let me say right at the outset that I would take equal exception to what happened if those distributing the pamphlets supported the Vietnam commitment.

**Mr. Bromley:** Do you know who the members of the Liberal Party were who were distributing the literature? Can you name them?

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** I am not very interested, because we do not persecute members in the Liberal Party. I remember a man named Harradine in Tasmania, who a few weeks ago dissented from his party's point of view. I do not believe that he got off too lightly at all. I am pleased to know that the sentiments I have expressed on this issue are supported by people whose political affinity is different from mine. It is significant that the secretary of the Q.C.E. disowned the University Labour Club, and it is also significant that the hon. member for South Brisbane, in the "Telegraph" on Saturday night, deplored this action. I commend the hon. member for speaking about the matter in such terms. Therefore, I do not speak on this matter as a Liberal, nor do I speak upon it because the point of view contained in the pamphlets was not mine. I speak upon it because I resent the use of high-school students to further a biased political point of view.

The basis of the argument of those distributing the pamphlets seemed to be that only one side of the Vietnam conflict had been presented to students. In fact, that is a wrong premise because inside the schools there is no side presented at all.

**Mr. Bromley:** Yes, there is. People from the Army address them there.

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** No doubt that refers to Army cadets. Suddenly the cadets are going to be "rubbished". It is well known that in high schools students become Army cadets of their own volition. No pressure at all is applied to them to join the cadets. They please themselves, and in fact the quotas of cadets in some schools are much smaller than the schools would like them to be.

**Mr. Bromley:** They are subject to propaganda from lieutenant-colonels.

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** I attended a passing-out parade on Tuesday of last week at the Camp Hill State High School. I was immensely proud of every boy, and I was wonderfully proud of their decorum and the way in which they conducted themselves. There was not one word said, publicly or privately, by any Army personnel to which any person could take exception. The officer who addressed them commended them upon their drill and their dress, and he made the observation that if some of them were interested in an Army career, the grounding they had received as cadets would stand them in good stead. What is offensive about that?

**Mr. Bromley:** He didn't say anything about Vietnam?

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** I am not going to have Army cadets "rubbished".

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** I repeat: inside the schools no case is presented; outside the schools every student is subjected to the presentation of the case for and against and has the opportunity to make his own judgment.

**Mr. Newton:** You want to study some of the textbooks that students have at high schools. You say that politics are not involved in it.

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** Complain about it.

**Mr. Newton:** You should read it for yourself.

**Mr. Bromley:** Are you going to tell us the names?

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member for Chatsworth.

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** I said at the outset that I am not presenting a political point of view on this matter. If the hon. member for Belmont believes that there are any textbooks which carry a biased point of view, I say to him that he should present these books. If he can satisfy me that there is a bias in them, I will support him, because I do not believe in political intrusion of any colour in high schools.

What I am trying to say is that outside the schools the students have the opportunity to discuss the issues about them, and they are far better informed than the university people apparently think they are. Before the

university people try to get at them in this way, on the wrong premise that the students do not understand the issues for and against, I think that they ought to establish some dialogue with them and find out what the facts are. I have had many discussions with high-school students. I have met many who have had a strong attitude in favour of our commitment; I have met some who have had a strong attitude against our commitment. It is nonsense to suggest that they would not be interested in this. They are approaching an age group in which they may suddenly find that their way of life is altered dramatically because of the ballot that presently prevails in Australia. These boys are responsible, and to suggest that a boy is racing towards the age of 18 without thinking about the issues of conscription, the issues of the Vietnam conflict, or the issue of war itself, is to pay them a gross insult, an insult with which I will not be associated.

Let us consider the technique of the pamphlet that was distributed.

**Mr. Bromley:** By Liberal Party members.

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** It purported to be a spontaneous effort of past students.

**Mr. Bromley:** I have their names.

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** The hon. member for Norman says he has the names of Liberal Party members who were involved in this. Knowing the scurrilous approach that the hon. member usually makes to such matters, we can rest assured, Mr. Smith, that in the fullness of time he will make all the names available.

**Mr. Bromley:** I do not even intend to talk about it.

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** As a matter of fact, these pamphlets, which purported to be spontaneous efforts of past students, were in fact pre-prepared at the university, and the only things in them that were changed were the name of the school and the names of the signatories. The authors argued that only one case had been presented and then asked that the garbled version be accepted as gospel and that high-school students support the university in demonstrations being organised at the end of this month.

Let us disregard the semantics of the pamphlets, because I am sick and tired of semantics. Semantics that suggest that the Viet Cong are fighting for freedom and independence are the same line of semantics that make peace a dirty word unless it is a Communist or a front organisation that is using it; the same sort of semantics that refer to Mao's conquest of China in 1949 as "the liberation"; the same sort of semantics that now brand the Americans in Vietnam as the aggressors, even though they are there by invitation. Let us disregard these semantics. As I say, I am sick and tired of them. But let us consider the last paragraph of the

pamphlet and try to imagine the effect that it might have, or, indeed, the effect that is intended. It tells the students this—

"Some young people have made a stand on Vietnam. At Kingswood College in Victoria, 50 students, instead of going to a history lesson, marched onto the school oval and sat down holding placards denouncing Australian and United States intervention in Vietnam. Two weeks ago in Sydney 500 High School students marched through Kings Cross in opposition to the war."

The final paragraph says—

"We ask for your support on October 25-27 when world-wide demonstrations in support of the National Liberation Front will be held."

By word of mouth, and in subsequent apologies for this, we are told, "No, we invite their participation by supporting the demonstrations after 5 o'clock in the evening." But that is the last thing that this spells out. If we run those two paragraphs one into the other, in one paragraph they are telling the students that 50 youngsters in Melbourne, instead of going to a history lesson, marched onto the school oval and protested. That is what the students are being told in one paragraph and then, in the last paragraph, there is talk of world-wide demonstrations on October 25-27. There is only one inference there, and the young hotheads who temporarily got out of hand last Friday would possibly attach that inference to it. So, at best, it is a remarkably gullible effort and at worst it is a damaging attempt to involve students in activity in which they should not be invited to participate.

**Mr. Chinchin:** Who do you think would be organising these world-wide demonstrations.

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** It is no problem to answer that. The organisation of these world-wide demonstrations comes from obvious Communist sources, and I make no apology for saying this. But even this is not my strongest objection to such action. What I resent more than anything is the attempt to use young and immature people for biased political purposes. It outrages the sense of decency and fair play, and I go on record again as saying that I would have the same strength of feeling if this pamphlet spelt out a strong pro-Vietnam sentiment. We have an obligation to high-school students to make sure that they do not become tools of any political party, organisation or pressure group. We must allow them to form their own conclusions in the environment of their own high schools. We must protect them from groups which would exploit them for their own dubious purposes, and this must be from right-wing organisations, left-wing organisations, religious organisations, or any other sect at all which chooses to employ this scheme.



The warning has been sounded and I hope the Government acknowledges it. There has, first of all, been a challenge to discipline at high-school level, and principals must be reinforced in the strong attitude they might find it necessary to take. Secondly, there has been an attempt to use young people for a biased political purpose, and this again is to be deplored.

**Mr. P. WOOD** (Toowoomba East) (4.49 p.m.): I should like first of all to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on his most effective reply to the Treasurer's Budget. All members of the Opposition will agree that his reply to the Treasurer was most effective. He brought out many interesting points.

I want briefly to make some comment upon the last remarks of the previous speaker. He was rather hazy on some of the points he tried to make. He suggested that students should be expelled for actions that he alleged took place some time last week. He was not specific. I tried to ask him what actions by students would merit expulsion. He certainly was not specific about the sort of action that would involve expulsion. He threatened expulsion without saying what would justifiably provoke it. He seemed to want to keep students in an ivory tower away from public controversy, and again he did not specifically state what students. I assume that he meant high-school and university students.

**Mr. W. D. Hewitt:** I made no reference at all to university students.

**Mr. P. WOOD:** Well, high-school students. He did not want high-school students to be involved in public commentary and public debate.

**Mr. Porter:** No. He said he welcomed that.

**Mr. P. WOOD:** The hon. member for Chatsworth can answer for himself. I heard what he said, and I took a note of it.

I might deplore, as I do, some of the methods adopted in involving students in the controversy to which the hon. member referred, but I do welcome student involvement in the community. In this world there is much to which students can rightly object. No-one, least of all students, should be complacent about the conditions that exist in this world.

The hon. member for Chatsworth seemed to take exception to the distribution of pamphlets in schoolgrounds. I point out to him that high-school principals have the right to exclude from their schools any literature that comes in from outside, irrespective of its character, whether it is advertising or political. I am sure that very many high-school principals would take this action. High-school principals are not able, and I do not think they ought to be able, to control the sort of literature that is distributed outside the schoolgrounds. It seems

to be quite all right for some sort of political propaganda to be distributed to school-children outside the schoolgrounds but not for other sorts to be distributed. The hon. member for Norman told me that last year information was distributed to high-school students in South Brisbane on how to join the Liberal Party. Provided the literature is distributed outside the school-grounds, I have no objection to it. That is the business of the people who hand out the literature. If it was kept out of the school, as it ought to be, the matter would not concern me. The principals have the authority to decide what is to be distributed in their schools and what is not.

**Mr. Porter:** How does the principal know that it has been distributed?

**Mr. P. WOOD:** The principal knows, I am sure. I have a higher regard for school principals than does the hon. member for Toowong. He seems to believe that the high-school principals do not know what is happening in their schools.

**Mr. Porter:** It is impossible for him to know.

**Mr. P. WOOD:** They know very well. They keep in very close touch with all matters relative to their schools.

I move now to a matter that I believe is very important. This is an opportune time for me to raise the matter of questions that are asked of Ministers in this House. From time to time problems arise in asking and answering questions. I am not going to refer in any way to the questions that are asked, but I do want to refer to the answering of questions, the type of answer that is given, and the reliability of the answer that is given. These are important matters because the integrity of the individual Minister is involved and the integrity of the Government is involved in the accuracy of the answers that are given to questions asked by members on both sides of the Chamber.

**Mr. Bromley:** And the Ministers do not give full answers.

**Mr. P. WOOD:** An answer that is not a full answer can be as misleading as a dishonest answer, and I intend to say something about that.

**A Government Member:** Are you suggesting that dishonest answers are given?

**Mr. P. WOOD:** I am suggesting that an appearance of dishonesty may be given by a Minister if he does not fully answer a question or if he evades it in a certain manner. It is most important that, in answering questions in this House, Ministers should be completely factual and honest.

**Mr. Newton:** They would have difficulty answering questions without notice.

**Mr. P. WOOD:** I should like to see a system of questions without notice. It would certainly add much to the Parliament of Queensland.

If a question is not answered honestly, if a question is evaded, if there is a refusal to answer a question, or if information is not supplied, we on this side have very little redress. We have no means of obtaining a great deal of information other than by questions in Parliament addressed to a Minister. We have no other access to much of the information we seek. We simply have to take what we are given. My point is that sometimes what we are given is almost dishonest, and it is often completely unsatisfactory.

**Mr. Bromley:** Sometimes it is said that the information is not available, but we know it is.

**Mr. P. WOOD:** Sometimes it is said that the information is not available when it is available, but we have no means of proving that. From time to time facts emerge which reveal that information was available at a time when it was said not to be available.

Because the answering of questions is such an important issue, I wish to give the history of a question that I asked last year. I was prompted to ask it when I read a statement in a newspaper concerning Aboriginal infant mortality. I will not debate the problems of Aboriginal infant mortality but I will debate the manner in which my question was answered, and the false impression given by the answer I received. That is the important point at this moment. When I read the article, which indicated that in the Northern Territory infant mortality amongst Aborigines might be as high as 200 to 1,000 live births, I was most interested, so I asked a question of the Minister for Health. I will read the question in full—

“(1) Has his attention been drawn to news reports from the Northern Territory in which a Committee of the Northern Territory Legislative Council claimed that in certain areas the infant mortality rate amongst Aborigines was 200 per 1,000 live births?”

(2) Are any records kept in Queensland of infant mortality amongst Aborigines and, if so, what are the details?

(3) If no records are available, will he take action to see that a suitable recording of the statistics is made.”

The Minister's answer was as follows:—

“(1) Yes.

(2 and 3) The recording of death statistics is not a responsibility of the Health Department.”

In effect, he was saying that his department did not keep, and did not know of, statistics of any kind relating to infant mortality amongst Aborigines. He denied the existence in his department of any such records. Because the matter was important, and because I was interested in it, I pursued it by asking the Minister for Justice, the

Minister responsible for compiling the statistics of births, deaths and marriages, the following question:—

“(1) What is the infant mortality rate in Queensland for the last year for which figures are available?”

(2) What is the infant mortality rate of Aborigines in Queensland for the last year for which figures are available?”

The Minister replied—

“(1) Commonwealth statistics show the infant mortality rate in Queensland for the year 1966 to be 17.7 per 1,000 live births.

(2) These statistics are compiled by the Commonwealth. So far as registrations of death by the State are concerned, the racial origin of a deceased person is not furnished on the certificate. Consequently I am unable to have this information supplied.”

I still found it difficult to believe that there were not recorded somewhere in Queensland statistics as important as those on infant mortality amongst Aborigines. I believe that such figures are of importance. They must be important to the Minister for Health and to the Government Statistician. I also felt, and still feel, that they must be important to the Minister administering the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs.

Not satisfied with that answer, I asked a further question of the then Minister for Education, who had the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs under his control. The question and answer read—

“What is the infant mortality rate in Aboriginal communities under his control for the last year for which figures are available?”

*Answer:—*

“The Government Statistician is the authority responsible for compilation of all statistical figures in Queensland, and he does not have such available specifically for Aboriginal communities or the residents, who include Aborigines, part Aborigines and persons of other racial origins. Statistics are maintained on the basis of Queensland residents irrespective of racial origin, consequently the information sought by the Honourable Member is not available.”

I stress particularly some words used by the Minister, namely, “Statistics are maintained on the basis of Queensland residents irrespective of racial origin.” I shall be referring to that in a moment.

In my search for the information I wanted concerning the Aboriginal infant mortality rate, I came up against three brick walls. The first was the Minister for Health, who, I believe, ought to have these figures and ought to be most concerned with this problem, as it is a problem. The second was the Minister for Justice, who compiles such statistical information as I sought. The third was the Minister controlling the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs, who

should have been concerned about this problem, as the present Minister in charge of that department should be. All of them denied that it was possible to obtain these figures.

**Mr. Davies:** They are too lazy!

**Mr. P. WOOD:** It may have been laziness. I do not know what it was. It may have been a reluctance to provide the figures.

After asking those three questions, and receiving those three answers, I still believed that the information was available had any of the Ministers concerned been prepared to release it to me. But I could do nothing about it. I had asked three Ministers, none of whom had been prepared to give me the information I sought. There was no further action that I could take. I did not have access to any departmental records or officers to obtain the information. It was not available outside Government departments. So, in seeking this information, I came to a full stop. I could not ask any more questions on the matter. I had to be satisfied, or dissatisfied as I really was, with being completely fobbed off. It would be interesting to know the reason. However, to get back to the point, I had been told by three Ministers that separate statistics based on racial origin were not available. The Minister for Health and the other two Ministers said that the figures I wanted were not available.

It was not until recently that I came upon some figures which indicated that this was not so and that there were figures available in the Department of Health which might have given me the answer I sought and which I had not received from the Minister for Health, the Minister for Justice or the Minister controlling the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs.

I think that all hon. members received, from the Minister for Health, a report headed, "Report of the Queensland Committee for the Study of Maternal Deaths". This is a technical report of a medical nature which is mainly for those in the medical profession, but it contains a section which I read with interest. Whilst I had been fobbed off three times last year in my search for information by being told that it was not available, this report indicated to me that it was in fact available in one form. At page 43 of the report, which was published under the authority of the Minister for Health as the result of work done by a committee set up by the Minister for Health and functioning under the Department of Health, there is some statistical information concerning the mortality rate among Aboriginal mothers. This indicates clearly that the information that I sought unsuccessfully last year probably does exist in the Department of Health. It must be remembered that I was told by the then Minister for Education that no statistics were compiled showing deaths under racial origins. There are on page 43 of the report fairly

detailed statistics of deaths among Aboriginal mothers in childbirth. One section, at page 43, reads—

"A survey of maternal mortality in a State such as Queensland would be incomplete without some assessment of the extent to which medical and hospital facilities are available to, and availed of by, the non-white section of the population.

"An analysis of this aspect shows that of the 80 maternal deaths occurring during the period of this survey, all but nine occurred in white females of European extraction."

That shows that there are available statistics of deaths showing racial origins. The report goes further to show the precise racial origins of those who died. I had been told by the then Minister for Education that such statistics did not exist. My question to the Minister for Health was—

"Are any records kept in Queensland of infant mortality amongst Aborigines and, if so, what are the details?"

The answer that I was given was—

"The recording of death statistics is not a responsibility of the Health Department."

But in his department the Minister has statistics such as those quoted from page 43 of the report. It also states—

"In the five years 1961-1965 there were 2,653 Aboriginal births recorded with a yearly average of 531. The mean parity of the 9 non-whites in this series of maternal deaths was 5, and the mean age was 30 years."

On the one hand, the Minister said that the recording of deaths statistics was not the responsibility of his department, and, on the other hand, here is a report submitted to his department which discusses exactly that type of information. I hope that in this session of Parliament I might be able to obtain the statistics that I was seeking last session, and I hope the Minister for Health will obtain the information that I seek. It is quite obvious that it exists.

**Mr. Davies:** It amounts to dishonesty by the Minister.

**Mr. P. WOOD:** It does indeed. It is dishonesty by virtue of presenting a misleading answer. I was told that the information was not available or that it was not compiled, yet 12 months later it appears in a report made on the work of a committee which was set up in 1960. The information I was seeking has been compiled.

**Mr. Davies:** I was told recently that they did not know from which areas training college students came.

**Mr. P. WOOD:** I am sure that that information could be made available.

It is important that questions be answered honestly because, as I said, the integrity of the Minister and the Government as a whole

is involved. Unfortunately, we have to accept information in the answers that are given to us, and sometimes it is just not good enough.

I wish to make some comments now about the operations of certain bus services in the State, and that will, of course, involve the Department of Transport. Airline operators and the Queensland Government railways are obliged to maintain proper facilities for their passengers. Railway stations at all points provide facilities needed for passengers in transit or passengers beginning or terminating journeys. Air terminals provide similar facilities. But many private bus operators do not provide such facilities, and it seems that they are not expected to provide them.

I can give instances of scheduled country bus services for which people are required to wait in parts of a town where no accommodation is provided. For example, people may be asked to wait for a bus at the post office. It may happen—it has happened in certain instances—that young girls are required to wait for a bus in a lonely street during the hours of darkness. They may have to wait for a bus arriving outside the post office at a certain time, for example. The bus may be late—even if it is not late, most passengers like to arrive early for a bus—and it may not be convenient for relatives or friends to escort girls while they are waiting. In other cases people may be required to change from one bus service to a connecting service, and there may be a delay between the arrival of one bus and the departure of the bus that takes them to their destination. It simply is not good enough that people, especially young girls, should be required to wait for a bus in a lonely street during the hours of darkness. They are not sure whether it is going to be on time, and it may be necessary for them to be there unaccompanied. Things of that sort do happen.

I understand that none of the operators of the new bus service between Brisbane and Cairns is required to provide shelter, toilet or eating facilities, or storage facilities for baggage. I suggest to the Minister for Transport that bus operators should have to meet the same requirements as do the railways and the airlines in providing adequate facilities for passengers waiting for or arriving on coaches or in transit.

I shall refer now to a few local matters. The first is that public servants in Toowoomba are long overdue for accommodation of a reasonable standard. They are required—and I dare say this applies to public servants in other centres—to accept office accommodation of a standard far inferior to that which must be provided by private enterprise. They are required to perform their important duties in extremely cramped conditions, with no, or very few, facilities. This places them at a great disadvantage, and in many instances it is also a great disadvantage to the public with whom they have to deal. The courthouse in Toowoomba is crammed out, without one spare inch of space. It accommodates the clerk of the court and other officers of the

court, and court rooms; it contains sections of the Department of Primary Industries, the Lands Office, the Labour Office, the Children's Services Department, the Housing Commission, and I think some officers of the Health Department. And there may be other officers crammed into the place out of sight somewhere—probably most uncomfortably.

This is most unsatisfactory. Other Government offices are required to occupy rented premises in Toowoomba. The Education Department and officers of the Primary Industries Department, the Public Curator Office, the Adult Education Office and the Tourist Bureau are all located in rented premises, while the Works Department and the Valuer-General's Department occupy a dilapidated, converted old house that is long overdue for demolition and replacement.

It is not a matter of parochial pride that makes me say that Toowoomba badly needs a State Government office block. Certainly it would be a great improvement on some of the ramshackle buildings at present provided, but it is a matter of importance to public servants, who deserve better working conditions and better facilities, and to the public who are required to deal, sometimes in confidential matters, with those public servants.

Neither the public servants in Toowoomba nor the general public are being given a reasonable standard of accommodation. If private enterprise was to offer a similar standard of accommodation, I am sure the Government would take the action it can take under the relevant Acts to see that those standards were improved. Yet the Government is not obliged to provide the standard of accommodation it makes it obligatory for private enterprise to provide.

Many Government offices are represented in Toowoomba. This, of course, is much appreciated by me and, I am sure, by the hon. member for Toowoomba West, because it makes the performance of our duties much easier if we can make direct contact with the Public Service when we need to.

I hope that the Minister for Works will take the opportunity one day to have a look at the standard of accommodation provided for his departmental officers in Toowoomba. I am sure that, having seen it, he will agree with me that it is long overdue for replacement. It occupies a site ideally situated for a larger-type Government building, a modern building providing proper amenities for the public servants who will be housed there and facilities for the public who will be required to do business with them. As I say, I hope that the Minister, when the opportunity presents itself, will have a look at some of the facilities available to the Works Department in Toowoomba.

The next matter I wish to raise I do so with regret because it is one that has been raised with the Main Roads Department on previous occasions, always without success. Only yesterday it was sadly brought to mind

again when the driver of a heavy vehicle was killed as the result of his vehicle getting out of control on the Toowoomba Range and going over the side. Safety railings are of little use where a heavily loaded semi-trailer is involved.

From time to time various organisations have made representations to the Main Roads Department to have a safety ramp provided on the down section of the highway on the Toowoomba Range. Some protection is needed, because far too many incidents involving heavy vehicles have occurred on that highway. It is a dangerous highway, especially for heavy vehicles. I can foresee a situation arising in which a heavily loaded vehicle will get out of control and, instead of running over the side of the range, will overrun a passenger vehicle on the roadway, with horrible results.

I believe that satisfactory and suitable sites exist for the construction of safety ramps. If space is not available to provide a means of slowing down a heavy vehicle that is out of control, then it is not beyond the resources of the engineers of the Main Roads Department to devise some means of slowing down the vehicle once it approaches the end of the ramp. I point out that a large aircraft carrier is fitted with some form of safety net to catch a plane that over-shoots its flight deck. If it is possible for engineers to provide a safety device that will arrest an over-shooting aircraft on an aircraft carrier, surely to goodness it is not beyond the resources of the Main Roads Department to provide a means by which a semi-trailer or truck that has got out of control can be slowed down once it approaches the end of a safety ramp.

I understand that the only reason for not providing a safety ramp on the down section of the highway is that the ramp would not be of sufficient length to stop a vehicle. I am sure that it would be of sufficient length to slow down the progress of a vehicle that is out of control, so that all that is then required is a system of nets or fences towards the end of the ramp to halt the vehicle once it has entered upon the ramp. If the Minister or anybody else tries to tell me that the provision of such a safety device is beyond the ability of the engineers of the Main Roads Department, when they can construct roads and bridges that approach a world-class standard, I will not have it.

Only one life needs to be saved before the cost of such a venture is recouped, so it is a matter of sadness that I raise this subject because yesterday one life was lost on the range as a result of a heavy vehicle going out of control.

Many passenger buses travel on that highway; I travel on it quite often, and I can tell hon. members that many more near-misses occur than most people realise. I hope that the Minister for Main Roads and the department will further examine the cost of providing a safety ramp on that highway.

I refer again now to a matter that I have referred to previously, both in this Chamber and outside of it, that of further recruitments to the teaching profession. I do not intend to go into all aspects of education in any detail, as I understand that hon. members will have an opportunity of fully discussing education when the Estimates are debated. Again I present to this Chamber the need for a teachers' college in Toowoomba, not out of some parochial sense but out of a desire to stress the urgent requirement to recruit more teachers to the teaching service in Queensland.

The ideal situation for such a college, as has been proposed by the Department of Education, is attached to the Institute of Technology, Darling Downs. Some time ago when I raised this matter I held the opinion that a teachers' college separate from the institute would be better. However, I have changed my opinion and I now agree with the Minister when he says that the institute of technology is ideally situated to provide facilities for a teachers' college. Quite apart from reasons of economy, which are important, it is an ideal situation from the point of view of a suitable site and a suitable educational environment. The institute of technology is, and will be, one of the finest education institutions in Queensland. Attaching a teachers' college to it will further promote it as an educational institution. The Darling Downs and South-west Queensland generally represent a reservoir that is not being fully tapped for recruits to the teaching profession. Despite statements that come from the Government from time to time, we are not recruiting sufficient teachers. One means of overcoming the difficulty of recruitment is to provide further decentralised facilities for education. The teachers' college in Townsville will be receiving students next year. That is very welcome news. By 1971 I should like to see a teachers' college in Toowoomba receiving students.

I have mentioned the educational environment available at the Darling Downs Institute of Technology. It will be to the advantage of parents financially to send their children to a teachers' college in Toowoomba rather than to one in Brisbane. It will also be an advantage to the department, because I am sure it will thus be able to recruit more teachers. There are excellent primary and secondary schools in Toowoomba available as practising schools. That is one of the most important aspects of a teachers' college. We must have available schools of a very high standard to which students may go for teaching practice. The schools in Toowoomba, both primary and secondary, are of a standard as high as those anywhere else in Queensland, and teachers going to them for teaching practice will do very well indeed. I hope that the Minister will soon set in train plans for a teachers' college in Toowoomba.

Answers to questions that I have asked the Minister do not reveal any movement in this direction at the moment, but I hope that, very soon, some positive action will be taken so that we in Toowoomba, on the Darling Downs, and in South-west Queensland, may know that such facilities will be available. This is not a parochial matter, because the students who will be so well trained in Toowoomba, and who will become such acquisitions to the Department of Education, will serve throughout Queensland.

We must attract more young men to the department. I will discuss this problem in further detail in the Education Department's Estimates. We are making a great deal of trouble for ourselves in the future by our failure to recruit young men into the Department of Education. We are approaching the stage when there will be a gross imbalance between the number of female teachers and the number of male teachers, and, as I say, we must do everything possible to attract young men into the department. A decentralised teachers' college in Toowoomba, Townsville, or anywhere else in Queensland will do a great deal towards this.

I now mention a matter that I have referred to one of the semi-Governmental departments under the control of the Minister for Electricity. It was brought to my notice by a woman whose husband had recently died. Shortly after his death she received a letter from the Southern Electricity Authority of Queensland asking her to forward the sum of \$4 as a security deposit. It seems that the S.E.A. asks, from all of its customers, a security deposit of \$4 in the case of a private residence. In this case the husband had never been called upon to advance a security deposit. He had long been a customer of the old Toowoomba Electric Light and Power Co., which did not require deposits. When the S.E.A. took over the distribution of electricity in Toowoomba it decided upon a \$2 security deposit, and, more recently, \$4. All the customers who had not previously paid a deposit were not called upon to do so. My complaint is that in this and other cases where the original customer had not been asked for a deposit, it is wrong to ask the widow to pay \$4 after the death of the husband in whose name the account was.

This request for \$4 comes at a most embarrassing time. I think that most widows, recently bereaved, are in one way or another in financial difficulty. To many people \$4 might not seem a large sum, but to ask a recently bereaved widow for \$4 is not the decent thing to do, especially when, for many years, the S.E.A. was content to accept her husband as a customer without requiring him to pay a security deposit. When he dies, the S.E.A. is not prepared to accept the widow under the same conditions. To some widows—in the case brought to my attention this applied—it causes financial embarrassment

and is a source of annoyance so soon after a bereavement to be asked for \$4 so that the account can be transferred from the husband's name to the wife's name.

I take it that the \$4 is forfeited if the customer defaults in the payment of his account. Interest on the \$4 is paid to the customer. I think it appears on every account sent out. A certain amount—it is about 5c a half year—is credited to the customer. I do not believe that a deposit of \$4 will deter anybody from defaulting in the payment of his account. If he did, \$4 would not go very far towards paying the account, as most accounts are far in excess of that amount.

Although the Southern Electric Authority is bound by its regulations, I cannot see the point of requiring \$4 from all of its customers. The S.E.A. gets no return from it, and the cost of collecting it, accounting for it, paying interest on it, and refunding or keeping it, as the case may be, must surely far outweigh what is received if some customers default. If the account is not paid by a certain time the S.E.A. will turn the power off and make a charge to re-connect it. That is sufficient deterrent to defaulting, and asking for \$4 and saying, "If you do not pay your account we will keep it", is unnecessary. I suggest that the Minister look at this matter to see whether the S.E.A. should abandon the system of asking for \$4 as a security deposit. I cannot see what advantage it serves, as the cost of accounting for it all the time must be greater than the refunds received from it.

I also think that where the S.E.A. has been content for many years to accept a husband as a customer of sufficient standing not to require from him the \$4 deposit, his widow should not be asked for it. In one such case I asked that the requirement of this \$4 security deposit be waived. My request was refused, which is why I raised the matter here today.

**Mr. R. Jones:** Who signed the letter?

**Mr. P. WOOD:** I do not know who signed the letter.

The Budget debate so far has been interesting, and I congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on the manner in which he replied most effectively to the Treasurer. Another interesting aspect of the debate is the complete lack of interest which appears to be shown by Government members. I do not know why that should be. Perhaps they feel that as the Premier is abroad they can take the opportunity to have a little loaf. I understand that the Government is so hard put to find a member to follow me that the next speaker is to be the hon. member for Nudgee, who, I am sure, will make a most constructive contribution. It is a pretty poor reflection on the Government parties that, with almost twice our numbers, they cannot even raise speakers to support the Treasurer.

**Mr. Chalk:** They are satisfied. What do they want to talk about?

**Mr. P. WOOD:** They may feel reluctant to support the Treasurer, or they may want to have a rest while the Premier is absent. The attitude of the Government in one respect or another is indicated by the fact that it cannot even raise speakers to match Opposition speakers. I think that I am the third Opposition speaker, and now it seems that after providing two speakers, namely, the hon. members for South Coast and Chatsworth, Government members have run out of steam. They have lost interest in the debate and have nothing to contribute to it.

**Mr. Davies:** They have just had two weeks' recess, too.

**Mr. P. WOOD:** As the hon. member for Maryborough points out, they have just had two weeks' recess. Either they did not do their homework during that time, and have come along unprepared to take part in the Budget debate, or they could not care less about it.

**Mr. Hanlon:** It would be better to go on with the Estimates and let some of the reluctant Ministers have their departments discussed.

**Mr. P. WOOD:** It would be an embarrassment, I am sure, if the suggestion of the hon. member for Barooka was adopted. It seems that the Government is relying on the Opposition to keep the debate going.

In conclusion, I again congratulate the Leader of the Opposition upon the fine contribution that he made to the debate.

**Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) (5.41 p.m.):** In the absence of any contribution by a Government member, I rise on behalf of the Opposition to take up the business of the Committee. If it were not for the Opposition, the debate would collapse. Apparently Government members do not think it is desirable for them to speak to the Budget presented by the Treasurer. In their own minds, they believe that it is not a Budget that they can support; they are not game to attack it, so it is left to members of the Opposition to carry on the debate.

Some weeks ago an announcement by the Treasurer that the best-ever Queensland Budget was on the way appeared in the Press. Mr. Chalk stated that the State's future was now secure. With that ballyhoo, we were led to believe that this was to be the year of the tiger for the Government and for Queensland. We find instead that the Treasurer has brought down the Budget of the lamb and that it contributes very little to the progress of the State.

There are items in the Budget such as the one relative to an increase in the number of school-teachers (I think it is 850 for the current year). Where does the department imagine it is going to get those 850 teachers from? It has not been successful in the past in recruiting the necessary numbers of teachers; in fact, I am doubtful whether

the 850 teachers will even match the number of resignations in the teaching service that are predicted this year.

I have here "The Courier-Mail" of 11 July, in which it is stated by the Queensland Teachers' Union that teacher resignations will be a record this year. The article goes on to say that the union's educational committee states in a report on education that up till April of this year 804 teachers had resigned. That is nearly half the number of resignations for the whole of last year. The Government makes a point of saying that to meet educational problems this year it is going to recruit an additional 850 teachers. It gives no indication of where it is going to get the teachers who will be the basis of this teacher recruitment or how it will meet the large number of resignations that will occur during the year.

The Government, as a vote-catching item in the Budget, provides also a special grant of \$25 per annum for each pupil attending private schools.

**Mr. Chinchin:** Are you against that?

**Mr. MELLOY:** The hon. member should get to his feet and say whether or not he is in favour of it.

**Mr. Chinchin:** I certainly am in favour of it.

**Mr. MELLOY:** You have the opportunity. If you support it, get up and say so.

This, as I say, is purely an election bait. It has been forced on the Government to meet the demands of a certain section of the community for additional funds while, at the same time, we are not able to supply enough funds for our own State schools. Owing to sectional pressure and with a view to securing additional votes at the next election—which will be all in vain, I am afraid—the Government is going to provide this per-pupil sum per annum.

**Mr. Chinchin:** Do you object to that?

**Mr. MELLOY:** Let the hon. member get up and make his own speech.

The Treasurer has also announced in his Budget that there will be an over-all increase in the number of nurses in our hospitals. These are the things that have been thrown into the Budget as being desirable and necessary for the proper running of our hospitals, but I do not know why the Government is suddenly so concerned about the shortage of nurses. Until now it has not been able to attract sufficient girls to the nursing service to provide adequate staff for our hospitals. This, of course, is due to the conditions. I am not going into this subject to any extent; I hope to do so at a later stage in the session. Girls have not been attracted to the nursing profession simply because the conditions necessary to attract them are not provided. As was stated in "The Sunday Mail" of 14 July, there is danger in our

State nursing system. Miss Gibson, president of the Student Nurse Unit of the Royal Australian Nursing Federation states—

“One patient out of seven in Queensland hospitals suffered some kind of deterioration in condition attributable to inadequacies in the nursing system.”

It is a very serious statement that one person in seven will not receive adequate treatment or will suffer some deterioration in his condition, because of a lack in our nursing system, during the short time he is in hospital before being “shot” out to his home, where he is not capable of being adequately looked after. What is the Government going to do in this regard? It has been stated that additional nurses are to be recruited, but in view of the Government’s previous record I fail to see how this can be done.

I wish at this stage of the Budget debate to say a few words about our nursing system, and I want to quote from the remarks of Miss Catherine O’Neil, who was commenting on the Minister’s claims in relation to our nursing services. She says that the problems associated with nurses are, to a great extent, due to the onerous duties and responsibilities that are placed on them. This is very true. I know of one student nurse—a fourth-year student—who on occasions was in charge of the casualty department at the Royal Brisbane Hospital. It is a very serious state of affairs that, because of a lack of trained nurses, responsibilities are being placed upon these students out of all proportion to their training and without properly considering the conditions of their patients.

The claim by the Treasurer that the Government is going to increase the number of nurses just does not hold any water. The conditions are such that girls will not take on the calling of nursing and are being advised every day by those who are in it not to enter it. This Budget does not provide the incentive necessary to attract girls to the nursing profession.

All that is new in this Budget are a few sops to special sections of the community. It provides freight concessions to the primary producers, and these concessions are already the subject of criticism by certain primary producers who feel that the concessions are not adequate and do not cover the full field of transportation of goods. I feel that the Government will strike more trouble from its supporters in the country if it is not able to provide better freight concessions.

There are no indications in the Budget of any awareness on the part of the Government of the real problems that face this State. I mention the matter of home-building. There is nothing at all in the Budget to indicate that the Government is going to grapple with this problem.

“The Courier-Mail” of 18 July contains the statement that home-building costs are soaring and may go even higher. It is stated that in the last 12 months the average home-building costs in Brisbane have risen by \$272 and in other cities and large towns by \$346. These figures are revealed in the statistics released by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics for the 12 months ended May, 1968. This is the sort of problem that the Government should be tackling. It is useless for the Treasurer to boast about his Budget and say that it is the best budget that Queensland has ever seen if he is not going to deal with those problems that are nearest to the hearts and minds of the people of the State.

Prosperity does not lie in the dividends and profits that are going overseas from the winning of the State’s natural resources. Prosperity and improved welfare can be recognised by the people of this State only if it is to be seen in the social services and general welfare services that are available. People cannot see this prosperity if there are not sufficient teachers for the State’s schools, if there are not sufficient nurses for the hospitals, and if some hospitals are closed owing to the lack of staff. These are the things that represent prosperity and improvements in social welfare. It is of little use for the Treasurer to quote figures that accrue from the State’s mineral resources and boast about the way in which the mineral resources are being developed. These resources are of no value unless the benefits derived from them are available to the people of this State.

**Mr. Ahern:** Mount Isa paid \$15,000,000 last year.

**Mr. MELLOY:** And we still cannot staff our hospitals. What is the good of that \$15,000,000 when we cannot staff our schools? Don’t talk about any company showing a profit of \$15,000,000.

**Mr. Ahern:** I did not say that. The company paid that amount to the Government.

**Mr. Hanlon:** For that sum, the Government provided the services, the crews, and the wagons to carry the company’s produce.

**Mr. MELLOY:** That is true. That was only for services rendered. It was not profit from the mineral resources coming to the State. It was payment for services rendered. If the company spent \$15,000,000 on services rendered it is not hard to imagine the profits that accrued to it over the same period.

We have a problem of unemployment in our country towns which is not being tackled by the Government, and the Budget does not provide any evidence that the Government is concerned with the situation. Every young man or young woman who leaves a country town because of lack of employment and goes to a city increases the problems of that city. The population of country



centres is depleted, as people cannot afford to keep children in the city while they themselves remain in the country. Parents are selling their homes in the country and going to the cities. That is not in the interests of Queensland, which is a primary-producing State, although we are trying to encourage secondary industries to come here. We cannot survive unless our primary industries are sustained and maintained, and we cannot sustain and maintain them without people in the country areas. When employment facilities for children are lacking in the country towns people will not stay there, and that adds to our problems.

**Mr. Chinchen:** How did you tackle the problem in your day?

**Mr. MELLOY:** I ask the hon. member again if he is available to make a speech. Apparently he is, but he is not game to make one.

We are faced with another problem with the increase in crime in this State. The Budget indicates that the strength of the Police Force is to be increased by 200 men over three years. Where will the men come from? The Police Force cannot get recruits. Every week the Commissioner appeals to young men to join the Police Force. The Government will find extreme difficulty in recruiting extra police. These are matters on which the Government wishes to make winning election points, but I do not see how it can carry them. The people will realise what the situation is.

The Budget is lacking in imagination. The Treasurer has budgeted for a small surplus but I think he is only coasting along. He is living in the hope that there will not be a drought next year, although there are indications that there might be—

**Mr. Chalk:** You hope there will be?

**Mr. MELLOY:** No, I am not hoping that there will be a drought. Far be it for me to wish any further troubles on the country people and the primary producers than they have at present in having a Country-Liberal Government. That is a big enough problem on its own.

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

**Mr. MELLOY:** There are two matters that I now wish to deal with. They are pertinent to the Department of Health, and I was hopeful that the Minister for Health would be in the Chamber. The first relates to the dental health of Queensland. In the first instance our concern should be for the young people of the State, yet they are the ones about whom the Government appears to be least concerned. The school dental service restricts itself to an examination of the teeth of school-children and then refers them either to their own dentist or to the dental clinic in that area. This service, even in the examination of children's teeth, falls far below what it should be. In Queensland we

have had a force of 21 school dental inspectors for the past 10 years. Although there has been a tremendous increase in the number of school-children, there has been no increase in the staff of the school dental service.

In Tasmania, which I visited recently, there is a school dental nurses' service. I do not propose to deal with that matter this evening because it is a rather involved subject and requires a good deal of explanation. The school dental nurses' service in Tasmania is an admirable set-up. The dental nurses have the right to treat the teeth of primary-school children, and they are doing a remarkable job, in distinct contrast to the service here, where no treatment is given, with the exception of cases of toothache and where no local dentist is available. What does the Government intend to do about our dental services?

I have photostat copies of three Press reports relating to the state of the teeth of the people of Australia. The first appeared in the "Telegraph" of 1 September, 1967, in which Sir John Walsh, Dean of the Dental Faculty at the Otago University, stated that Australian teeth were just left to rot. He said that a survey in South Australia, in particular, had shown that only one in 1,000 children was free of dental disease.

Further to that, in "The Courier-Mail" of 21 August, 1967, Mr. P. J. Hooton, chairman of the organising committee for the Dental Health Education Workshop Conference held in Australia last year, said that Australia's present standard of dental health was far below that of many other countries. There is a further indictment of the dental services available in this country.

Again, on 30 August Mr. L. P. Ryan, convener of the Dental Health Education Committee of Queensland, said that dental diseases were by far the most common in Australia. He said that more than 98 per cent. of the population suffered from, or had suffered from, dental decay alone. That is the present situation, which is very distressing and serious. The position is that the Government is not prepared to adopt measures that would alleviate the present situation in Queensland.

**Mr. Ahern:** Do you believe in fluoridation?

**Mr. MELLOY:** Yes. There is not provided in Queensland a dental clinic service that is available to all sections of the community. The dental profession will not provide a service that is adequate or within the reach of a large majority of the people of this State. Somewhere in between those who can afford to go to private dentists and those who attend dental clinics is a large proportion of the population which is receiving no dental treatment because incomes are too low to allow resort to private dentists and too high to provide eligibility for treatment at Government dental clinics. There are consequently many in the community who have very bad teeth and who are receiving no dental treatment.

It is also estimated from a survey made by the Australian Dental Association that 60 per cent. of the people of this State are in need of dentures at any given time. For some time I have been pressing the claims of the Dental Technicians' Association of Queensland for the right to deal with the public in the provision of dentures, as registered technicians do in Tasmania under a scheme which, it is acknowledged by the A.D.A. in that State, is functioning very successfully. To fill a need in this State, such a scheme must be introduced at some time in Queensland.

This proposal is being very strenuously opposed by members of the dental profession. They are attacking it on the ground that it is a threat to the health of the people. They claim that dental technicians are not conversant with mouth conditions; that they are not trained in biological, anatomical or physiological factors in relation to the mouth; and that they are not sufficiently trained to recognise pre-cancerous or other conditions of that nature in the mouth.

It is not the claim of the Queensland Dental Technicians' Association that any Tom, Dick or Harry should be allowed to engage in the construction of dentures for the general public. The association's proposal is that, in addition to the four years' apprenticeship that a dental technician serves, there should be an additional 12 months' training under suitable conditions, with members of the Australian Dental Association as lecturers, if necessary, during which those who sought registration as registered dental technicians would have the opportunity of acquiring the necessary qualifications for the treatment of conditions in the mouth.

We think that 12 months' chair-side training could be available to the dental technicians, who at the end of that period would pass a qualifying examination to ensure that they were capable of recognising all conditions of the mouth, treating conditions where necessary, and further, if necessary, referring the patient to a medical man, an oral surgeon, or any other properly qualified dentist.

We think, also, that the economic factor is a very important one. We believe that at present the public is being fleeced by most—I do not say "all"—members of the dental profession, placing the cost of dentistry in such a high category that it is not available to the ordinary citizen.

**Mr. W. D. Hewitt:** Do you believe that some of their equipment is unnecessary?

**Mr. MELLOY:** I should say—I have said it before—that some of their equipment is not used. It is there for show, to create an impression, and in many cases is not used.

On the question of the costs that are being inflicted upon the public by dentists, I have a very interesting article to draw to the attention of hon. members. It relates to the methods adopted by members of the dental profession to obtain very high fees. These methods are endorsed by the Australian

Dental Association, because I have with me a copy of the Queensland Dental Journal, the official organ of the Australian Dental Association in Queensland, in which the article appeared. It is the journal of January, 1954, and the article was written by a registered dentist, Mr. A. W. Rourke, who is a Bachelor of Dental Science, and is entitled "Psychology in Denture Practice". He makes several very interesting statements, mostly relative to fees, and I propose to quote from the article.

The first reference to which I draw attention is to consultations. Incidentally, many dentists are charging \$6 for a consultation at the present time, and, as I have pointed out before, that was unheard of years ago. If one went to a dentist, he examined one's mouth and quoted a fee for the work required; there was no fee for the consultation. But Mr. Rourke speaks of consultations and says—

"... the real difficulties may be psychological and not physical; it may take half an hour's conversation to assess one's chances of success, and if at the end of such a consultation one feels that failure is possible"—

I ask hon. members to listen to this—

"It is a good time to demand a Whacking Great Fee"—

this is written by one of our ethical Bachelors of Dental Science—

"which will have the effect of either getting rid of the patient, or ensuring that the harassed dentist will be amply rewarded for the arguments that lie ahead."

This is the official voice of the Australian Dental Association of Queensland, the journal published by it, and the article therefore must be endorsed by that body.

That gentleman goes on to say—

"I have toyed for years with the idea of confronting the female full-denture patient with a questionnaire which would reveal exactly what she expects of me, or perhaps better still, frighten her away altogether."

Then follow certain questions.

Question No. 1 is, "How old are you?" Question No. 2 is, "How old are you really?" Question No. 10 is, "Is your husband unfaithful?" Question No. 11 is, "If so, do you expect your new dentures to change his attitude?" Question No. 12 is, "Have you time to look at yourself in the mirror all day and worry about the view?" Question No. 14 is, "Are you rich?" Question No. 15 is, "Do you realise that these new dentures cannot improve your hipline, your bustline, or your bunions?"

He then goes on further to say—

"Be sure that you get a substantial deposit, no matter how well recommended the patient may be. She may be honest but she is still a woman with the right to change her mind so long as it costs nothing. Once the patient has paid half the fee, should she subsequently prove

difficult or impossible to satisfy, you can abruptly dismiss her with the assurance that you have done your best.

"Better to cut your losses and dismiss the patient with your best effort at half the fee."

Now we come to a very interesting part, where Mr. Rourke says—

"Before I finish this paper I think I should say a few words about fees. Take particular notice of the clothes the patient is wearing, and make indirect inquiries about the patient's business interests and observe the size of the diamonds."

That is the procedure to be adopted in assessing the fees.

He then says—

"Never be afraid to ask for a high fee. If the patient can't afford the fee she will quickly tell you and you can decide what fee she can afford.

"If she can afford the high fee, however, and you have had the hide to ask for it, your opinions will carry more weight.

"Never be afraid of losing a case because of a high fee."

Is that not an interesting quotation? Does it not make perfectly clear the attitude of the dental profession in relation to its patients and the fees it charges? I challenge the A.D.A. in Queensland, or in Australia for that matter, to come forward with an alternative plan to that which we have relative to the provision of dentures and that will satisfy the needs of the community and provide them with dentures at a reasonable fee. I challenge them to do that, although I know that they will not respond to the challenge. They refuse to reconsider the fees they are there to extract—not only teeth, but high fees—from the patients who attend them. These are the methods by which they assess their patients, and the quotation I have made from Mr. Rourke's article shows the disdain in which they hold them.

That is all I wish to say on that matter at this time. I think I have said sufficient to convince the Committee that there are unscrupulous people in the dental profession. I do not say that all of them are unscrupulous but most of them are, and unless someone is prepared to come forward with a scheme to provide dentures at a reasonable fee, there will always be 60 per cent. of the community in Queensland in need of dentures. I do not want the A.D.A. to come up with a scheme of dental health insurance, since this will only ensure that the dentist gets his fees. It will not provide one more dentist; it will not provide increased dental services; and it will not make the services available to the people who need them.

I challenge the Australian Dental Association to come up with something better than that. As a matter of fact, a dental insurance scheme would not work because it is an insurance that could be abused. A person

could join a dental insurance scheme, knowing that he would need a full set of dentures in 12 months' time. He would get the dentures and then drop out of the scheme. Under a medical scheme a person's needs are unpredictable—he does not know from day to day when he will require medical services—but denture needs are predictable and therefore a dental insurance scheme would not be practicable.

**Mr. Lee:** Wouldn't that extra year's training you asked for have the tendency to increase fees?

**Mr. MELLOY:** No, not at all.

**Mr. Ahern:** Who is going to sponsor that course?

**Mr. MELLOY:** The Government would have to sponsor it, through the university or the institute of technology.

**Mr. Porter:** And we get rid of dentists as they currently exist.

**Mr. MELLOY:** No. We cannot meet the needs of our dental service now.

**Mr. Porter:** You would do away with professional standards.

**Mr. MELLOY:** There would be an educational standard.

**Mr. Porter:** They would still be dental mechanics.

**Mr. MELLOY:** No. They would be specially trained dental prosthetists, in fact.

I wish to bring another matter to the notice of the Committee, and again I regret the absence of the Minister for Health. I cite the case of a person who was involved in a car accident in June of this year. He was injured in a head-on collision between his car and another, and was rendered unconscious for about 20 minutes. He recovered when he reached the hospital, at 7.15 p.m. on 28 June. He was examined by a doctor in the casualty department and had his nose treated for lacerations and had three stitches inserted. That is the sum of the examination that he received. He was told to return next morning to have his nose examined. As he was leaving, a nurse noticed some blood on his head and she called the doctor's attention to it. It was found that he had a gash on the back of his head and it required seven stitches. Yet he was being sent home with just three stitches in his nose. As a result, he left the casualty department at 10 past 12 in the morning, and was still in a state of shock. He was told to report again at 8 o'clock that same morning. This was the first "blue" the staff made, apart from not seeing the gash on his head that required seven stitches. This man was in a state of shock after a serious accident, and he should have been admitted to hospital to be kept under observation. When he was taken by his wife in the ambulance to

the hospital at 8 o'clock on the Saturday morning he complained of pains in his chest. He went to the casualty department as usual, but the staff there, having their eyes only on his nose—which is rather remarkable—sent him to the e.n.t. department, which entailed a long, uphill walk. He was in no condition to do that. However, he went to the e.n.t. department and had his nose looked at, and probably had his head looked at, and he was told to report back in four days' time to have the stitches removed. The next morning, which was a Sunday, he had occasion to call his own doctor because of the pain that he was suffering in his chest. His own doctor suspected pneumonia and gave him penicillin injections. He came again on the Monday and gave the man further penicillin injections. He called again on the Tuesday and realised that the man, who was complaining of severe pain, was very ill. He gave him another injection.

The doctor then took a good look at the man and suspected, because of the pain in his chest, that he had pneumonia. He suggested that he be admitted to hospital. The patient was taken to hospital by ambulance, but the doctor was a little doubtful about admitting him. Eventually he was admitted to Ward 1D, suffering from pneumonia. On the Wednesday, a physiotherapist massaged his chest and his back to remove the mucus which was building up in his chest.

**Mr. Porter:** For a pneumonia patient?

**Mr. MELLOY:** Yes. The physiotherapist gave him manipulative massage but he complained about the severe pain, and said that he could not tolerate it. He was then given a complete X-ray, which disclosed that he had three broken ribs and a broken breastbone, or sternum. That happened four days after he was first examined following the accident. After two visits to the hospital, it was not discovered that this man had three broken ribs and a broken breastbone.

**Mr. Hodges:** Which hospital was this?

**Mr. MELLOY:** The Royal Brisbane Hospital. It is such cases that are bringing our hospital services into disrepute. I do not lay any blame at the door of the doctors or the nurses.

**A Government Member:** Whom do you blame?

**Mr. MELLOY:** I attribute it to the shortage of doctors. This man said that the doctor who first examined him rushed in and examined him, and then rushed away to another patient. That is happening all the time. I have referred to other instances where people with broken legs have been sent away from the hospital.

**Mr. Porter:** They walked out?

**Mr. MELLOY:** Yes, they walked out. If the hon. member ever has a broken leg the first thing the doctors examine will be his head. They will have to put the breathalyser on him.

This trouble can be traced to the inadequate staff in our hospitals, particularly in casualty wards. It is most important to have an adequate staff in the casualty ward. Patients must have a comprehensive examination, which this man did not have. In his case all that they found was that his nose was lacerated, although he was suffering from a gash about 4 inches long on his head. He also had three broken ribs and a broken sternum, but nobody worried about it. They sent him home and said, "Let's hope for the best." If he had not been readmitted because of the pneumonia they may not have discovered the broken ribs for a week or so. This is what the Government is faced with in its hospital services. It was a sorry day for the people of Queensland when the A.L.P. went out of office. That would never have happened under a Labour Government.

If I have the time I will deal with some of the remarks made by the Minister for Health in his speech the other day.

**Mr. Hodges:** Why are you attacking the professions tonight?

**Mr. MELLOY:** Because the professions do not measure up to a proper standard and are therefore a menace to the community.

In his speech the other day the Minister dealt with the proposal put forward by the Leader of the Opposition for the establishment of peripheral hospitals. He quoted Professor McKeown, a British hospital authority, who said that the minimum area required for a 2,000-bed hospital was 100 acres. The Minister sought to use this as an argument in favour of large hospitals, but the professor was quoting the requirements for a large hospital and was not, as the Minister tried to imply, advocating large hospitals.

The professor advocated what he called a "balanced hospital" system. The proposal outlined by him, which we endorse, was that a balanced hospital embraces the following features—

"All types of patients to be cared for on the same site in approximately the proportions in which they feature in the total hospital population—that is to say, there is no such thing as specialist hospitals."

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! If the hon. member is quoting from a "Hansard" of this session, I draw his attention to Standing Orders and point out that he cannot do so.

**Mr. MELLOY:** As you will notice, Mr. Smith, I have copious notes.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** It is quite obvious that the hon. member has used copious notes throughout his speech. Apart from that, if it is a concluded debate the hon. member has no right to quote from it.

**Mr. Davies:** Most Government members read their speeches.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! I am addressing my remarks to the hon. member for Nudgee.

**Mr. Davies:** You are reflecting on our party.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member for Maryborough will be dealt with if he interjects any more.

The Standing Orders prohibit the hon. member for Nudgee from quoting from a concluded debate in this current session.

**Mr. MELLOY:** I shall endeavour to make my point without referring to it.

There is a tendency on the part of this Government to cry down the proposal put forward by the Leader of the Opposition. The Minister has stated that it is essential to have large hospitals in this community and that, for various reasons, peripheral hospitals would not be of any benefit. I am quite sure that the people of Wynnum do not agree with that statement. There is a dire need for a hospital at Wynnum. At present the hospital at Redcliffe, which could be classed as a peripheral hospital, is overflowing, which illustrates the demand for hospitals of a similar nature on the perimeter of this city.

The point made by the Leader of the Opposition was that we could use these hospitals as convalescent hospitals. The Minister denied this. He tried to make the point that at some time or another these hospitals would be classified as convalescent homes and would not attract the Commonwealth subsidy. We do not accept this. We feel that these hospitals would provide not only convalescent accommodation but also accommodation for those requiring treatment or surgical services, up to a limited stage.

I have based my speech on comments made by the Minister. I regret that it would be necessary for me to quote those comments to complete my argument on this matter.

**Mr. Bennett:** It is a shocking technicality that prevents you from doing so.

**Mr. MELLOY:** It is not what we expect from a legal mind, or from a gentleman in the chair.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member will withdraw his reflection on the Chair and apologise.

**Mr. MELLOY:** Did you ask me for an apology, Mr. Smith?

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** I instructed the hon. member to withdraw the remark and apologise.

**Mr. MELLOY:** I made a remark that you were a gentleman in the chair. Unfortunately, I withdraw that remark.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** If the hon. member wants to be dealt with, he will be. He will please withdraw the offensive remark, which was a reflection on the chair, and apologise.

**Mr. MELLOY:** I am quite prepared to withdraw the remark if I know which one you are referring to. I really mean that.

**Mr. Thackeray:** You've got him beaten. Carry on.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** If anyone is to be beaten, we will soon find out who it is. The hon. member for Nudgee was reflecting upon my insistence on his abiding by the rules of this House in the conduct of the Chamber. He should know—and it should not be for me to draw his attention to it—that he is not permitted to quote from a concluded debate in this session, and his remarks were a reflection on my insistence on obedience to those rules.

**Mr. MELLOY:** Whatever the remark was, I will, in deference to you, withdraw it.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.

**Mr. MELLOY:** I was going to deal with school dental nurses, but I shall reserve that matter for a later date in the session.

**Mr. McKECHNIE** (Carnarvon) (7.52 p.m.): I rise in this debate to support an excellent Budget that demonstrates the good business acumen that has been followed by the Government for the past 11 years, culminating in the Treasurer's presenting to the House a Budget of which we are all very proud. I know that this is of some concern to members opposite, because it took us 11 years to escape the dead hand of socialism. Development has over those years been such that we can now come forward with a progressive, soundly-based Budget.

The Budget brought down in New South Wales by the Government of that State is not as good as ours. That, however, is not the fault of that Government, as it has not been free of the shackles of socialism for as long as we have been in this State, and in due course it will reach the stage when it, too, can bring down a Budget similar to that of Queensland.

Admittedly, the seasons have swung in our favour and that has to some extent helped the situation, but essentially the present very happy situation stems from the basic business principles that the Government has followed over the years.

I am particularly happy because of budgetary allocations in two particular fields. They concern education and freights, and I shall deal with education first. The Budget provides for an increase of \$22,000,000 on the amount allocated for education last year. That is an increase of 20 per cent.

**Mr. Lee:** There was an increase last year, too.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** This would have been spectacular on its own, but, as the hon. member for Yeronga mentions, last year there was also an increase of 11½ per cent. over the previous year's allocation. We heard the Leader of the Opposition say earlier that this was a Budget brought down for specific purposes. It is in fact a continually improving Budget. As the hon. member for Yeronga has mentioned, there was an increase of 11½ per cent. last year which, with the increase of 20 per cent this year, means that the budgetary allocation for education has increased by 31½ per cent, or approximately a third, in the short space of two years.

The economic activity that has allowed the Treasurer to bring down such a favourable budget has made room for 850 additional teachers within the system, and that must effect a wonderful improvement in a situation that had already been improved considerably. In addition to making these improvements to the education system of the State—increasing the number of teachers, giving greater assistance to the institutes of technology, which are doing such a wonderful job, and decentralising tertiary education in the State—the Treasurer has been able to make provision for an increased payment to non-State schools. The secondary rate has been increased from \$15 to \$25, while the payment to primary non-State schools has increased from nothing to \$25 a pupil per annum. Bishop Brennan was at a social function that I attended in Stanthorpe last week, and he asked me to convey to the Government his appreciation of the assistance that had been rendered to the non-State schools in this Budget.

In spite of that, the Leader of the Opposition said today that he was doubtful whether it should have been done in this way. In fairness to him, I concede that he did not say he was against it. But he did say that he felt some apprehension about handing the money over to the independent schools to use in the way that they thought fit. In the same breath, he said that the Government should not in any way interfere in the affairs of local authorities.

Turning to freights, I remind hon. members that there has been a 5 per cent. reduction in rail freights on hay, livestock and general merchandise, and this involves every person living in the country areas of Queensland. The fact that the freight on general merchandise has been reduced will assist in improving the living standard of every man, woman and child in rural areas and, to a

lesser extent, in the cities, because the trade is both ways. A similar reduction of 5 per cent. will apply to timber, fruit, wool, and cotton.

At the same time, the Treasurer has seen fit to make a reduction in road transport fees, and I am very happy to see the reduction relative to the transport of livestock. Where the carrier is competing less than 50 per cent. with rail, the rate is reduced from 1.5c to 1c, and, more particularly, where the haulier is competing over 50 per cent. with rail, the reduction will be from 2c to 1.5c. The latter reduction will be greatly appreciated by primary producers and by hauliers, because it is a half a cent a ton mile on the cartage of livestock from centres generally 250 miles away from the various livestock markets. It will be of great assistance to all sections of the industry.

**Mr. Sullivan:** Five cents a mile on a 10-ton vehicle.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** Yes. It will be a considerable amount over a period of 12 months.

I turn now to wheat, and I will deal first with my own electorate. I assure hon. members that all the wheatgrowers in my electorate are extremely happy with the situation relative to rail freights as they will be from November, 1968.

**Mr. P. Wood:** All the wheatgrowers are happy?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** All the wheatgrowers in my area are extremely happy with the reduction in wheat freights. The lowest freight in my area would have been \$10.35 a ton on present freight rates.

**Mr. P. Wood:** Are you happy with wheat freights generally?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** I am very happy with my own wheat freight, and the wheat freights in my own area.

**Mr. P. Wood:** Are you happy with wheat freights generally?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** I will come to that story in a moment; I ask the hon. member to be patient. In my own particular area the freight at Inglewood at the moment is \$10.35, at Texas \$10.79, at Yelarbon \$10.86 and at Goondiwindi \$10.86. With the rates reduced to a maximum of \$9 how could we be otherwise than happy?

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** To show how growers could not be other than happy, let me analyse their position. I suppose most of the growers in those areas would have from 500 acres to 1,000 acres. Some have only a few acres but some have up to 6,000 acres. At 20 bushels an acre, which is more or less the Australian average at the moment,

the saving to a grower with 500 acres would be \$450 per annum. With 1,000 acres, at the same 20 bushel average, he would save \$950 per annum, so naturally, the growers in my area are particularly happy.

In 1967, under pooled freights, the growers in my area would have paid \$9.50; the present rate is \$10.86 and the new freight rate will be reduced to \$9.

I should like to congratulate the Queensland Grain Growers' Association on the excellent case they have presented to members of the Cabinet. It was well documented. They sought a reduction of up to 20 per cent. in rail freights and, by means of graphs, and facts reliably collated from many sources, they set out information to support their case. They asked for 20 per cent. and for a freight rate that would encourage—I ask hon. members to note this carefully—decentralisation and development. They are the three main items they sought in their case—20 per cent. reduction in freights, decentralisation and development.

Let us see what they got. All growers, irrespective of where they are, will pay 50c per ton less this year than they paid last year. Admittedly they achieved some of it themselves by doing away with the pooled freight rate. Some of those nearer the ports would have had their rate reduced by up to \$3.05. For instance some around Toowoomba would have got a reduction this year of \$3.05 per ton on the rate they paid last year.

The medium rate growers would not have achieved as much but, at the very least, they have a 50c per ton reduction and, looking at the story over all, to use the Treasurer's own figures, there is a reduction of \$1,000,000 in the amount of freight that wheat-growers will pay. I have worked it out at a little over 13 per cent. but I notice that the Treasurer, in a statement later, has calculated it at 12½ per cent. I should imagine that the variation would depend on the volume involved in the total saving of \$1,000,000. It is a considerable reduction in freight—\$1,000,000 to one industry. These reductions take the freight rate back to what it was many years ago, so that in effect many of the increases in costs in the past have been absorbed. In the period of office of this Government it has raised the freight rates only twice, whereas in the previous 10 years they were raised about 11 times, if my memory serves me correctly. They were raised nearly every year and twice in one particular year.

I turn now to the submissions made by the Queensland Grain Growers' Association, and I deal with the first submission that the association put forward.

The Treasurer announced that grains other than wheat will now be carried at the same rate as that applying to wheat. That in itself means a reduction of approximately 15 per

cent., particularly to the inner-area growers on the Eastern Downs who grow most of the other grains. The 15 per cent. reduction will be achieved by shifting these other grains at the same rate as that charged for wheat. That alteration would be prior to the other reduction, so that in effect the growers of other grains had already achieved a 15 per cent. reduction by the shifting of their rate to that charged for wheat. That was something that the grain-growers sought, and they have achieved it.

The second thing they sought was lower freights to assist the outer areas in the interests of decentralisation and development, as I stressed earlier. I would say that the grain-growers have achieved their objective in very substantial measure, possibly in a measure beyond their expectations. I should say that the reduction applying to the outer areas was beyond the hopes of the grain-growers. Take a grower at Dirranbandi. His freight rate was previously approximately \$14.25 and it will now be \$9. He has achieved approximately a 40 per cent. reduction in his freight rate. That reduction must encourage development in areas that are far removed from the coast, and it must assist decentralisation in the true sense of the word because it will encourage expansion in the areas west of Dalby and Goondiwindi.

A restriction is imposed in that on wheat grown beyond the present recognised areas the growers will not derive the benefit of such a reduced rate. I understand that this matter will be expounded in detail later on. Suffice it to say that in the wheat-growing areas situated farthest from the coast a maximum rate of \$9 will apply. This will provide wonderful assistance to those areas. Development and decentralisation have been achieved.

Let me turn now to the third submission in the association's case: increased production to achieve volume production so that grain can be carried at a cheaper rate. It is quite obvious that, if an industry can produce in huge volume, its product can be carried at cheaper freight rates. Increased quantities of wheat have been grown in the outer areas, and therefore volume production has been achieved where the freight concession is highest. It will be seen that by increased production we have achieved volume and have been successful in getting reduced freight rates. The Government met the needs in every way of these outer areas.

The anomaly in freights occurred where the freight rate rose sharply beyond 350 miles. Those hon. members who have studied the case, and can picture the graph, know that it flowed along at a decreasing rate per mile until it reached the 350-mile mark when it rose sharply. I presume that the previous Government's intention was to discourage the growing of wheat beyond 350 miles. I can only assume that, but I could be wrong. The grain-growers sought the removal of this anomaly, and here, again, they were 100

per cent. successful. It has been removed in toto; that problem has been solved completely.

Another matter raised related to the future of the St. George irrigation scheme. Those in the area felt it was somewhat in jeopardy because of high freight rates. They thought that lower rates should apply in areas such as St. George where irrigation is being used, and will be used, to a greater extent for heavy-volume wheat production. The rate from Thallon to Pinkenba is \$13.23 a ton. As from 1 November, like all other wheat and grain freights, it will be reduced to a maximum of \$9. There will be an improvement of \$4.23 a ton on the freight rate on wheat to be drawn from the St. George irrigation area. Here again, I believe that the excellent case presented by the Queensland Grain Growers' Association has achieved success.

The sixth concern was the plight of the growers in the medium districts. Those in the wheat industry are aware that pooled freight was based on an average mileage of 176. Admittedly those people will get the smallest reduction, but by their own actions they will get a reduction of at least 50c a ton. With the possibility of better seasons than we have had in the past 10 years we should get a greater volume of grain, and in the closer areas it is more a matter of grain generally than wheat. With greater volume there will be a possibility in future years of further consideration being given to the freight problems of these people. I base that statement on two grounds: firstly, the increasing volume must make it possible to haul wheat at a cheaper rate; secondly, I come back to my original statement, in which I said that the good business acumen and management of this Government—I pay special tribute to the Treasurer in this matter—will result in increasing economies in our railways and the State generally, and betterment of the income of the State. These two factors will help to achieve a greater degree of assistance for the inner growers who, at the present time, will receive a benefit of only about 50c a ton.

**Mr. Lee:** It is not a bad reduction.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** No, it is not a bad reduction, but as I said they have received the smallest reduction. They are the main ones to benefit from the 15% reduction in other grains.

The pooled freight structure has been under the control of the Wheat Board and the Wheat Board in Queensland is controlled essentially by the growers in the inner areas. They produce over 50 per cent. of the grain grown in the State but the outer areas are approaching that percentage with far fewer men employed. With greater acreages, the amount of wheat produced per human unit in the western areas is certainly far above that in the inner areas. Consequently, as it is one man one vote in these particular instances, the inner growers have the control of the industry within their power. It was

their decision that resulted in the elimination of the pooled freight system and in the institution of individual freights.

Over many years the pooled freight structure has worked as a rough type of justice. The inner areas paid more freight than they should and the outer areas, particularly the brigalow areas, provided the high-protein wheat, the wheat most sought after, which if sold separately would have been sold at a higher premium because of its high protein content.

Consequently, with outer growers providing the protein and the inner growers indirectly subsidising their freights, a rough type of justice was achieved.

That was wiped out with the individual freights that came into effect this year. But when they came in, the growers in the outer areas were reasonably satisfied—in fact they were rather hopeful—that they might do better out of it than the inner growers because they grew mainly high-protein wheat and expected to get premium rates on most of it. But the Wheat Board decided that it would make available for the protein-premium only wheat of prime hard quality. Consequently the outer growers, while growing high-protein wheat, which is normally pinched due to the marginal areas in which it is grown, had their best protein wheat eliminated. I can assure the Committee that the outer areas are not happy with the fact that they have been deprived of what they felt was justly theirs.

**Mr. Davies:** Couldn't the Minister send you along to the Grain Growers' Association to tell them this?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** I shall reply to the hon. member for Maryborough if I may. My own growers sent me along to the Queensland Wheat Growers' Association for some years. I have a lot of respect for the members of that association. I worked in harmony with them for many years, and have done of late, and expect to again. I respect their views and I am confident that they respect mine. In direct reply to the hon. member for Maryborough, I would be most happy to attend any meeting of the Grain Growers' Association because after all I am a member of that association, and very happily so. I pay a compliment to the ability of their President, Mr. Les Price.

The growers in the outer areas feel that they have not been treated fairly by the growers in the inner areas in that their f.a.q. wheat of high protein has been excluded even from testing for protein and consequently from payment of premium rates. This freight amelioration of the outer areas to a large extent compensated them for what they lost in regard to premiums.

**An Honourable Member:** Also the outer areas do not get as many crops, do they?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** There are many problems arising in the outer and the inner areas. There are compensations and detriments both ways. The inner growers are



certainly more sure of a crop every year, but they have higher expenses in rents, land tax, or rates than the other growers. The outer growers have the disadvantage of being far away from sources of supply, and therefore have to contend with the frustrating problems that arise when there is a mechanical breakdown and the part required has to be flown to the nearest town, which could be 20 or 30 miles away. And when they do arrive, the parts sometimes turn out to be the wrong ones. A lot of expense can be caused in this way to growers in outer areas.

The smaller growers in inner areas have been assisted by the fact that, in freight matters, all grains have been brought into line with wheat. As I pointed out earlier, this means a freight reduction of approximately 15 per cent. on canary seed, linseed, sorghum, and various other grains such as maize. This is of benefit to growers in the inner areas because they are the ones who are producing more varied grain crops. Growers on the eastern Downs, in particular, are growing less wheat and are going in for the higher-income crops, such as navy beans, where possible. Consequently any reduction in the freight rate of other grains will assist the growers in inner areas.

Of course, a minority of them already have the benefit of irrigation schemes on the coastal side. Quite a quantity of grain is now grown below Moogerah Dam, in the valley of Warrill Creek and the Fassifern District. On the eastern Downs, the Leslie Dam is now full, and there will be a considerable expansion of grain-growing there, particularly when Stage 2 of the project comes into effect, which will be within the foreseeable future. Consequently the inner growers will, by Government action, be able to diversify their activities still further into the various types of grain that are more profitable, and the 15 per cent. reduction in freight rates, bringing their crops into line with wheat, will be of great help to them.

The eighth submission was that high freights endanger orderly marketing. That has been so along the southern border. The new reduced rates will completely rectify the position, and the flow could be reversed.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** Do you really think that?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** I believe so, yes. At a freight rate of approximately \$10.80—

**Mr. O'Donnell:** How can they compete with road transport?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** The hon. member for Barcoo is on the wrong track. I am speaking of cross-the-border sales on railway transport, which is the normal thing in the Goondiwindi-Boggabilla area. Most of the grain that crosses from southern inland Queensland is carted by road to Boggabilla and railed to the ports of Newcastle and Sydney. The freight rate from Boggabilla to Newcastle is slightly higher than the rate

from Goondiwindi to Brisbane, so that in that area access to the port of Brisbane is cheaper than access to the New South Wales ports.

Under this scheme there will be a marked advantage in sending from Goondiwindi to Pinkenba instead of from Boggabilla to Newcastle, because the maximum \$9 rate will apply instead of the rate of approximately \$10.80 from the New South Wales station five miles away. Consequently New South Wales growers must give consideration to exporting through the port of Brisbane, which will be of benefit not only to the growers but also to the port of Brisbane and Queensland generally.

It has often been insinuated that wheat should not be sent interstate. But that is still orderly marketing, and, whether the wheat goes to New South Wales or Queensland, it is still handled by the Australian Wheat Board. I am not referring to overland operations and selling to merchants, as mentioned by the hon. member for Barcoo. I disapprove strongly of such actions. But where it is within the board's functions, and particularly where it is handled by the railways of each State, it is a legal and very good trade.

I believe that Queensland possibly will take wheat away from New South Wales. That will not be detrimental to New South Wales, because its railway system is bogged down with wheat. The year before last the New South Wales railways found it impossible to shift all the wheat in 12 months and there was a carry-over into January of the succeeding season. As hon. members will appreciate, that must have caused a real shemozzle in the facilities of that State. Because of drought, the New South Wales railways were able to handle all the wheat last year. However, if we get a good harvest in both States this year, I look forward not only to Queensland's accepting the wheat but also to its being of assistance to New South Wales in solving its haulage problem.

What of the future of wheat? There will be an increasing volume, and the grain-growers have achieved their objectives of decentralisation and development, two of the main planks of their case. The increase in volume will, of itself, tend to decrease freight rates, but it will also involve the State in the need to provide greater inland storage. I am a great believer in having reasonable storage as far west as wheat is grown. Having established silos as far west as possible, the Government should ensure that that wheat is the last to be shifted. In the event of drought, wheat would then be available on which no freight had been paid. In the drought in 1965, much of the wheat was railed as far east as Toowoomba—not necessarily to the seaboard—and to Gunnedah in New South Wales, and many of us bought it and had it carted back again on the same railway

from storage. Therefore, to assist the industry to solve its problems and to overcome some of the effects of drought, it is essential that the Government give whatever assistance it can for increased storage in the areas to which I have referred.

The installation of storage in western areas will assist growers by reducing costs, because it is much dearer in the long run to build one's own storage than to use proper storage constructed at a railway terminal. When wheat is stored on the farm, it is subject to weevils and all the other pests. Possibly more important is the fact that the grower does not get paid for the wheat till it is delivered to the Wheat Board. For these reasons, storage in distant areas is very important.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** But to what extent will the Wheat Board be able to continue doing that? Will it be able to accommodate the farmers completely?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** I hope so. It cannot at the moment, and it is absolutely essential for growers to provide on-the-farm storage. It is economic for them to do so because the wheat cannot be handled at the rail head, which makes storage very expensive. It is essential that the wheat go direct to the Australian Wheat Board, or to the State Wheat Board, which is its representative.

Growers are prepared—I have talked with many of them—to pay a heavier storage levy. It is quite small at the moment and only pays the interest on loans involved. I believe that it would be in the interests of the State to bring down legislation to permit a higher levy, and I am sure that 90-odd per cent. of growers would support such an idea. I think it was South Australia which introduced special legislation to allow higher contributions for the purpose of providing additional storage.

The amortisation of the amount of money owing on the 125 aluminium wagons purchased by the Railway Department at a cost of \$1,500,000 will have to be borne by the department for the time being. These trucks will last a long time and with the amortisation of the sum the Railway Department will be in a position to grant further help to these growers. Consequently, the future is very bright for the wheat industry. Marketing problems do exist overseas, but I do not wish to deal with them at this stage.

**Mr. Houston:** Are you happy to sell wheat to China?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** Yes, I am quite happy to sell wheat to China. I have had this question asked of me many times and I cannot see any difference between selling wheat to Red China and selling coal to another industrial country. It depends on which side of the fence you are on. In my case, I am quite happy to see trade existing throughout

the world. I am very happy to think that we have a good market for our wheat within China and, to a lesser extent, within Russia.

**Mr. Houston:** Do you think people from Australia should visit these countries?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** Diverting just to reply in general, after all, trade is the essential thing and we must not allow political biases to destroy trade throughout the world. Consequently, I think that the situation will work in favour of the wheat industry and I look forward to greater development throughout the wheat-growing area.

In conclusion, I should like to refer very briefly to a recent inspection that I made in the company of members of local authorities along the southern border. We visited the Glen Lyon Caves, in the Texas area. I know that this matter has been of considerable interest throughout the State. When I went to these caves I accepted the responsibility to explore every section that it was humanly possible to get into. It was a matter of wriggling into some, walking through others, stooping to get along in others—

**Mr. Bennett:** Snooping, did you say?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** Snooping on bats, if the hon. member likes. And although I leave myself vulnerable to hon. members opposite in saying it, even to crawling. We crawled as far as was humanly possible along various passageways.

**Mr. Houston:** Did you see any bats?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** In reply to the Leader of the Opposition, we did not see any bats but we did see the deposits built up over possibly tens of thousands of years. They have been there, and in many cases we crawled through water and bat guano, in the dark and cold, including one cave with foul air. Most of those caves have been denuded of stalactites and stalagmites and are very drab affairs indeed, but I concede that in one cave which we crawled down there were some stalactites and stalagmites and, in fairness, I would not like to see them lost. We had a good look at them and photographed some, and I think it would be possible to excavate or cut out these stalactites and stalagmites and bring them to the surface. If the Spelaeological Society felt so inclined, I would give myself a good chance of convincing the Minister in charge of Irrigation that he should build a grotto or an artificial cavern within the recreational area of the dam where these could be placed. At present they will be destroyed by vandals within a matter of months.

**An Opposition Member:** You must be joking.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** It was done on a larger scale in Egypt.

If the Spelaeological Society feels so strongly about saving them and having them brought to the surface, I will undertake to

approach the Minister for Conservation to have a suitable grotto or cave placed in the recreational area, where they could be kept under the eye of a caretaker and so not be destroyed by vandals. In their present position they will be destroyed in the very near future. I suggest quite genuinely to the society to give some consideration to my suggestion if it is concerned about preserving these stalactites and stalagmites.

**Mr. Houston:** Do you doubt their concern?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** It is a matter of putting it to the test. If any one of us feels strongly enough about something he will find ways and means of achieving it. If the members of the society are genuine, if they are not simply talking for the sake of talking but are interested and keen enough to raise money to bring these things to the surface, I put my suggestion to them for their genuine consideration.

I have great pleasure in supporting the Budget. It is one that we on this side of the Chamber are justly proud of. I congratulate the Treasurer on presenting such a Budget, and I look forward with confidence to the future of this State.

**Mr. BENNETT** (South Brisbane) (8.38 p.m.): Unlike the hon. member who has just spoken and others on the Government benches, I cannot see my way clear to congratulate the Treasurer on this deceitful Budget. It is obviously garnished for election purposes, but as an economically sound Budget it contains no real substance and does not give any good grounds for the complacency that has obviously pervaded the Government benches.

There is one thing that I concede to the Treasurer. He is something of a politician and he has been long enough in Parliament to know how to mislead the people of Queensland on pre-election eve. He has been doing it for such a long time in his electorate. He has now written that technique into his Budget, and feels sufficiently satisfied at this stage that it will mislead the people of Queensland into believing that this State is in a satisfactory condition. But if one looks at the various categories controlled by the respective "cabineteers", one finds that none of them is in a satisfactory position. The Treasurer himself is in the process of pledging further the State's economy to overseas financial interests. He continually embarks on trips overseas for that purpose, and overseas interests know that he is a very gullible Treasurer and they are able to gain strong grips on the economy of this State.

Turning to primary industries, I remind hon. members that a short time ago we heard the grain-growing industry mentioned and its status in Queensland's economy. The previous speaker, who spoke with his tongue in his cheek, knows very well that the grain-growers are very anxious about their

markets; they cannot find ready markets for their products. They are prepared to sell them to anybody in order to get rid of them, in spite of what Government members have said about certain international treaties and certain international visitations by leaders of various political groups, and in spite of what their Federal colleagues say on this. They are prepared to sacrifice their principles and to forget what they have said in the past when it comes to making a "quick quid" or getting themselves out of an embarrassing situation.

In the sugar industry, we have only to look at the Gibbs Report. I do not blame Mr. Justice Gibbs for the findings that were made. He made them on the evidence provided to the tribunal by the Government, which again tried at that stage to mislead the people of Queensland into believing that there was room for rapid expansion in the sugar industry. The findings of that commission have proved to be absolutely misleading. The premises on which the evidence was given were false and the results were unsatisfactory. Every sugar-farmer in Queensland has strong misgivings about what the Government did to shelve the responsibility of making a decision by appointing a commission which it thought would cover up the Government's failure to make a decision, which is what would have been done by a responsible Government in the interests of the sugar industry.

**Mr. Davies:** The Government must accept the blame.

**Mr. BENNETT:** Of course the Government must accept the blame. The Government produced inaccurate evidence to the tribunal. It wanted the tribunal to make a decision for which it should have been responsible without appointing any commission. The sugar industry is knocking at the knees, and no-one will have any confidence in its future until there is a change to a Government that will face reality and make decisions for itself, without requiring a buffer authority to shoulder its responsibility.

Turning to education—I could turn to any portfolio I cared to choose—I will comment on the unholy mess that education in this State is in. Today, someone on the Government benches said that there is a "brain drain" from Queensland. Of course there is. These people are not satisfied with the leadership they are getting from the Government. The Education Department is rocking and reeling with inefficiency and uncertainty because it cannot hold its leading brains. As a matter of fact, it cannot even train the young brains. At the end of last term no fewer than 30 first-year students either had to leave the training college or were dismissed because they were not receiving adequate training. They were 30 students who had passed last year's Senior examination. That clearly indicates that they had the necessary standard of intelligence; it

clearly proves that they were scholars of some calibre. It is obvious that something is wrong with the teachers' college in this State when 30 students have to leave. It is a damning indictment of any educational system when 30 students with Senior passes are dismissed peremptorily before completing their first year's studies at the teachers' college. That is indicative of a lack of enthusiasm in the teaching. It demonstrates that there is no inspiration for a large percentage of the students who qualify for admission to the college. The students are taken in late because the university delays giving results of examinations. Six or seven weeks elapse before scholarship cheques are paid, but at the same time the students are expected to buy expensive text books. Many students come down from the country and have to pay board. They have to borrow from relatives, or they cannot pay their board. That makes their living conditions, when they first leave home to enter their chosen career, very embarrassing and disappointing. As a result they get unsatisfactory ratings, and apparently the teaching at the college cannot help them make up lost ground if they do slip in the early stages of the year. This is all due to the mismanagement of the Department of Education. I do not wish to dwell on this subject now, because I will have a better opportunity to do so when we are discussing the education Estimates.

In my opinion, the Minister for Labour and Tourism is travelling around on silly safaris at the taxpayer's expense, entertaining himself and some of his Government back-bench colleagues in order to retain their support for him as a Cabinet Minister. At the same time, he disposes of Queensland's natural assets and habitats, which should be retained in the ownership of this State, by selling them to private enterprise to develop and perhaps despoil. That is what he spends his time doing. We see photographs of him cooking a steak for breakfast and being house-mistress to Government back-bench parliamentarians, and wonder whether that is the serious task of a responsible Cabinet Minister.

He has made many misleading statements about Karrala House. One has only to read last Sunday's Press to realise that what he told this Parliament was sheer deception. Is it any wonder that he has been relegated to the position of having to go walk-about throughout the State to relieve him of the obligation of making any decisions on responsible matters?

**Mr. Lee:** Are you mad that you weren't asked?

**Mr. BENNETT:** They do not ask serious-minded men who like to contribute something to this State. It is very often those who are prepared to play up in the back-blocks who are invited to those gatherings.

We heard from a senior member of the Cabinet a good deal about industrial development. For a long period he claimed

that this Government was making great progress. All of a sudden he had a trial behind closed doors, which of course is done so often by this Government. People are even charged behind doors with rape these days. The Government employed Star Chamber tactics, and, without giving a proper explanation, this former Minister was relegated to the back benches of the House. Then he started to tell the truth about his Cabinet colleagues and the decisions that were made by the Government. He clearly indicated that the rosy picture that he and his colleagues painted of this State's development when they were fellows in the Cabinet was not a true one. And he spoke as a former Minister for Industrial Development.

We can pass on to the Minister for Health. He had a lot to say at Westbrook last Sunday. There have been open days at Westbrook only since the Labour Party exposed the evils that existed there. He seems to think that because he has a chauffer-driven Cabinet car at his disposal, everybody who has not these facilities can journey to Toowoomba or Westbrook at the drop of a hat when they have their own obligations in their electorates and cities.

**Mrs. Jordan:** None of his Government colleagues were there.

**Mr. BENNETT:** None of his Government colleagues were there. But he had to be there. It would have been a damning indictment on the Minister in charge of the department if he had not been there. He had to be there and he cried sour grapes and whinged about everybody else who was not there instead of getting on with his job and saying that the Labour Party had done a good thing for Westbrook by exposing the anomalies that existed before the Westbrook inquiry was conducted.

**Mr. Lee:** The only thing wrong with Westbrook is that you are not in it.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I thought that the hon. member would make some reasonable contribution.

**An Opposition Member:** He does not even make good interjections.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I answered him so that his interjection will appear in "Hansard" and the people can see the standard of intelligence of some of the Government members.

Perhaps I should deal with the dissatisfaction in the nursing profession in this State. The nurses have got the brush-off from the Minister whenever they have made responsible and substantial submissions to him.

Incidentally, we do not have much time to discuss all of these very important matters. I was pleased to see my Leader and other colleagues in the Opposition oppose a fortnight's stand-down at this very vital stage in the life of this Parliament. I believe that an hour is completely inadequate for

any member to cover the whole range of governmental responsibility in these matters. We have to pass from one subject to another.

I have a moral obligation to deal with one matter tonight because I was, to some extent, personally involved. I spoke of the Budget, and of the deceptive indicia in it. In some cases, we like to quote "Hansard". I know that the Acting Chairman does not like us quoting from certain "Hansards".

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! It is not a question of what the Acting Chairman likes, but a question of the rules of the House.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I heard the Clerk of the Parliament put you wise on the rule, because at that stage you did not know it.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! I draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that the hon. member was not in the Chamber when the previous objection was taken.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I tell the Acting Chairman that that is completely untrue. Apparently he does not know who is in the Chamber when he is presiding in the chair. I am shocked to know that he sits there in a state of lethargy, comatose, and half asleep. I was here for the whole debate. "Hansard" will record my interjections during that stage when, to preserve his dignity, I tried to assist the Acting Chairman in his rulings. I was certainly here.

I spoke about previous comments made by some of the leading members of this Cabinet, not the least of whom is the Treasurer, who spoke with horror and dissatisfaction just a decade ago when there was any suggestion of liberalisation of the drinking or gambling laws. Yet he, as Treasurer, has done more than any other Minister in the history of this State has done to further liberalise gambling and drinking at week-ends. It was not a matter of his being hypocritical when he used to speak in such a manner as a member of the Opposition. He has done these things because he is prepared to get money at any cost. In spite of any principles involved, he has been the leader in the liberalisation of drinking and gambling laws purely to acquire revenue, and he has done this more than any other Cabinet Minister has done.

**Mr. Davies:** Now he has the full support of the Country Party Premier.

**Mr. BENNETT:** Exactly. The Premier has clearly indicated that he will go along with the Treasurer in his acquiring of extra money this year by further liberalisation of the liquor laws so that people can drink more, drive under the influence more often, and provide the Government with more revenue. The Budget tells that story.

**Mr. Hinze** interjected.

**Mr. BENNETT:** Anyone who cares to look through "Hansard" and through my public statements during the last 20 years

will not find any comment from me which suggests that I am a wouser, or ever have been. The point that I am making very forcibly is that the Treasurer and his Cabinet colleagues, both past and present, spoke in a fashion that led people to believe that they were horrified at any suggestion to extend gambling and drinking in this State. In spite of that, the Treasurer has done more than any other Minister to extend drinking in Queensland. He has given the people more opportunities to swill liquor down and pay taxes on their drinking at hotels and other places of amusement, and then when they go outside these places the Government acquires further revenue by "breathalysing" them and obtaining \$200 each from them in fines when they are on the way home. That is the attitude to which I do not subscribe. In spite of the principles that the Treasurer espoused previously, that is his policy now.

In the year 1966-67 the Treasurer further developed the opportunities to drink liquor to the extent that he was able to skim the froth off liquor-drinkers in the princely sum of \$4,333,165. In the financial year recently concluded he skimmed off even more—\$4,630,963—and this year he is going to surpass all records, because he expects to take \$4,800,000 from the liquor-drinkers.

**Mr. Murray:** That is at a low altitude. Just imagine what he would do at a high altitude!

**Mr. BENNETT:** Just imagine what he will do when the Liquor Act is amended! There is only one reason why that Act will be amended. I agree that there are good reasons for amending the Liquor Act—principle and policy and the drinking habits of the people of this State—but the Treasurer is just wiping all those aside and looking purely to the revenue that he will get. Although he says that the revenue will be \$4,800,000, when he twists the arm of the Minister for Justice relative to the amendments, the revenue from the liquor tax will be well over the \$5,000,000 mark.

Rather ironically, the Auditor-General's report shows that revenue from traffic taxation—that is, driving taxation—was \$1,103,260 in 1966-67, \$1,110,820 in 1967-68, and again this year there is to be a record. The Treasurer expects an intake of \$1,150,000. Every time the Treasurer wants more money in this State, he has a sock at the beer-drinkers. Then, when he taxes them and exhausts their pockets, he has a go at the motorists. Motorists are always good game for the Government.

Let us then turn to the gambling aspects of the policy of this Government. The intake from totalisator, betting and book-makers' turnover taxes was \$4,090,271 in 1966-67 and \$5,170,537 in 1967-68. This year there is a bit of a breakdown and the taxes have been dissected. From totalisator and betting taxes it is expected that receipts will be \$4,100,000 this year, and

it is expected that there will be an intake of \$1,700,000 from bookmakers' turnover tax.

So, in cold, hard, stark figures, the policy of the Government is recorded in the Treasurer's Budget, and it must be disappointing for the followers who adopted his rather abstemious statement when he was speaking as a member of the Opposition.

**Mr. Chinchin:** Do you think that those things should not be taxed?

**Mr. BENNETT:** I believe that a reasonable tax should be imposed in certain of those instances, and I believe that there certainly should be sanity in the policy and legislation relative to gambling and the liquor laws. Instead of that, of course, this Government wants to get revenue from gambling even though it may be illegal gambling. If a person is prepared to contribute to certain funds, he will not even be prosecuted. We saw that in Innisfail.

So far as the economy of the State is concerned, we have a Government that said it jealously regarded the co-operatives and the co-operative movement in Queensland. One of the best-founded co-operative societies, and at one stage one of the most successful, both financially and from the point of view of efficiency and service to the community, was the Poultry Farmers Co-operative Society Ltd. By letter dated 5 October, 1968, this society has told its shareholders that it is bankrupt and is going out of business, except for certain primary produce. Departmentally it can no longer function and it has made the important announcement that the shareholders can buy the last of its stock between Monday 14 October, 1968, and Saturday, 26 October, 1968, at less than 25 per cent. of cost. That goes to show how this Government has protected genuine commercial enterprises in this State.

**Mr. Ahern:** You do not think it would have anything to do with management?

**Mr. BENNETT:** I can only say that the management seems to have been satisfactory and very successful for a long period of years.

**Mr. Murray:** Seems to have been successful.

**Mr. BENNETT:** It was, according to its dividends and balance sheets, and its financial results. Of course, the Treasurer has invited and encouraged overseas interests to get a financial grip on the economy of this State and he allows big firms in the commercial field to take over and strangle any decent, genuine commercial enterprise in this city. This is one of the examples of that. This Government is not prepared to do one thing to preserve or protect them.

**Mr. Murray:** I do not think you have looked at this enterprise as closely as you normally do other matters in this Parliament.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I am well aware of the fact that the poultry farmers dealt mainly in local products, and one would think that a Government dominated by the Country Party would have protected an enterprise whose policy virtually was to preserve the rights of the man on the land relative to the commodities that he was required to buy. But this Government is prepared to throw these people to the wolves. It did nothing to protect them. On the contrary, it allowed big vested interests to come up from the South and steamroll them financially in the field of commercial activities. They had chains going throughout the length and breadth of this State that could annihilate them financially, just as before very long big overseas interests will annihilate some of our commercial ventures in this State.

Now, as a lawyer and a member of Parliament, I feel I cannot let go unnoticed a damnable and scandalous act in the Police Department that was levelled against a man who would and should be regarded, according to his history and record, as one of the best policemen in this State. I had occasion recently to appear in a very important police appeal in which two detectives, both very good ones, appealed against another well-known detective, Glen Hallahan. The detective for whom I appeared was Detective Redmond. I am not going into the merits of the appeal. I do not believe in doing what the Commissioner does because of sour grapes over the decision of an independent tribunal that acted properly according to the evidence.

The appeal of my client, Detective Redmond, was upheld. During the course of the appeal, among the many witnesses called by all parties and for all parties was Detective Senior Sergeant John Joseph Ryan. The Commissioner of Police indicated his splenetic vindictiveness when he came into the Press and adversely commented on the fair decision of a judicial tribunal in this State and furthermore spoke against the Government's legislation, and union policy, when he said that seniority should have gone out with the hurricane lamp. In so saying, he deceitfully misled the people of Queensland into believing that seniority is the only thing that is taken into consideration in police promotions, which is completely untrue; in fact, it is a deliberate lie. Many qualities and qualifications are to be taken into consideration. Under the Police Act the rule states that, all other things being equal, seniority shall prevail. The same rule applies in the Public Service. That is what the Government wants, and it seems to be a good policy. It has stood the test of time. It is what the State Service Union wants and what the Queensland Police Union wants. However, the Commissioner chose to deceive the people into believing that seniority is the only thing that is taken into consideration.

As I say, this is completely untrue. He showed his nature and attitude to this appeal by comments that he made. As I said,

one of the witnesses who gave evidence for Redmond, believing he did so conscientiously, was Detective Senior Sergeant John Joseph Ryan. This man has been victimised by the Commissioner of Police because he had the courage—he is a man of courage, and this State has acknowledged it—to give evidence and, as it were, to line up on the side of the appellant. Admittedly, it is hard both in the Public Service and in the Police Force to find anyone who has the courage to give honest evidence for an appellant. Ryan was prepared to do that. So were other senior sergeants and responsible and decent members of the Police Force, but I refer particularly to this man who has received commendations and awards for his bravery. After having been a plainclothes detective for 24 years he was quickly and smartly removed from the C. I. Branch by the Commissioner of Police, and it was made obvious to him by other senior officers that there was no real reasoning behind his move. Therefore, the only assumption is that he was moved because he gave evidence against the Commissioner's appointee.

Ryan qualified for the rank of commissioned officer in the examination in 1967. The Commissioner has said—it is quite untruthful—that this man has been put into uniform not as punishment but because he would be promoted in the near future. Because the Press were horrified at what had happened, the Commissioner made that veiled suggestion in an endeavour to exculpate himself at a time when he had absolutely no intention of promoting Ryan. It would have been ridiculous for the Commissioner to put Ryan into uniform and get him set up in senior sergeant's uniform if his honest intention was to promote him. Ryan, who has been decorated so much, has been put into uniform at a time when the number of unsolved crimes in this State has reached record proportions. Detectives will tell anyone that there are simply not enough men to deal with the many complaints that come in. The Government will agree that it has not sufficient numbers of men to go round and that housebreaking offences are regarded as pigeon-hole offences, to be dealt with when some detective gets time to deal with them.

One would have thought that this top-line detective would have been retained in plain clothes because of his skill and achievements and because he passed the necessary examinations for further promotion. He gained high passes in that examination, whereas another police officer of the same rank of detective senior sergeant failed. The man who failed to pass the exam, which Ryan passed so outstandingly, has been retained as a detective.

The explanation that Ryan is due for promotion is simply a lie. Why would any sensible Commissioner take a man who has been a successful detective for 24 years and put the taxpayers to the cost of fitting

him out in senior sergeant's uniform if he is about to be promoted to commissioned rank in the near future? It is just not true.

This man undertook a course of study in practical mercantile book-keeping. He is not just a tough detective who wins George Medals, although he has won two of them. He has studied, and he has worked in the fraud squad. Detectives in that squad have to investigate bank managers, accountants, solicitors and others who might defalcate in their trust accounts. They must be intelligent and knowledgeable detectives to investigate such crimes. Ryan studied practical mercantile book-keeping and qualified with a 97 per cent. pass.

There are not enough capable detectives in the fraud squad to investigate these offences. Incidentally, when Redmond won the appeal, evidence was given that he was skilled in fraud work. Immediately he won the appeal he was taken off the job and sent out on general duties. Ryan has engaged in many other avenues of study. He volunteered for Air Force service during the last world war, but the then Minister in charge of the department ruled that he could not leave the Police Department because his services were required. He was informed rather peremptorily in September of this year that his services as a detective were no longer required. The man in charge of the C.I. Branch referred to it as "bad news".

Obviously it is not in the interests of the Police Department, or in his own interests, that Ryan should be transferred. Nobody knows why he was transferred—nobody has been given a reason. He has not been charged with any breach of the Police Force rules or regulations nor has he been reprimanded, either officially or unofficially, for any behaviour breach. He is unlike others who have been retained in the detective squad after actually being found guilty of certain offences by a court. There is much that could be said as to why a man of this calibre should be retained in the C.I. Branch after 24 years' continuous service there. I can only conclude that victimisation is involved in his not being kept there. It is a sad and sorry happening for the morale and well-being of the Police Force that anyone should try to intimidate a policeman in this way.

In addition to his two George Medals (better known as the George Medal and bar), which were awarded by Her Majesty the Queen, and which no other policeman in this State has ever won—it will be a long time before anyone else does—Detective Ryan has earned six favourable records and four commendations during his service. The police rules formulated by the Government say that in any case where the service of a member of the Police Force is worthy of particular commendation but is not of such a nature as to warrant the payment of a reward, the Commissioner may grant a favourable

record which shall have due weight whenever the interests of the possessor are in any way involved. I have appeared in many police appeals, but I do not know of any other policeman in Queensland who has six favourable records and four commendations. There may be some who have as many, but I have not heard of them. If there are, they are very few in number.

That is how the Police Commissioner scorns the Government and thumbs his nose at it and says, "I don't give a damn if they are your rules and regulations". I should like to know what he has got on some members of Cabinet. Rule 66A says that in any case where the service of a member of the Police Force is worthy of commendation but is not of such a nature as to warrant the granting of a favourable record, the Commissioner may commend such member and such commendation shall have due weight when the interests of the possessor are in any way involved.

I do not know whether the Premier had left the State when this transfer was announced. If he had, the Minister acting for the Minister controlling the Police Department should have stopped the transfer immediately until he returned so that the matter could be properly investigated. If the Premier was still in this State, it was his moral and bounden obligation to stop the transfer until he had thoroughly investigated the matter, and in investigating it I hope that he would not ask the Commissioner to appoint one of his senior henchmen officers to investigate himself, because that type of investigation is completely unsatisfactory.

In the course of my career in appearing in appeals and hearing the evidence given in them, I have acquired certain information. Under the rules made pursuant to the Police Act, recommendations have to be made by the various district inspectors concerning each policeman from the junior constable up to the most senior man under him, setting out from time to time the positions for which his subordinate officers are most suitable. Of course, no officer makes those recommendations lightly because they are made statutorily and they are or should be acted upon by the top echelon of the Police Force, and they are acted upon by judicial tribunals from time to time when they become relevant and applicable.

The early recommendations made concerning Detective Senior Sergeant Ryan all say that he performed his duties in a satisfactory manner. As he became more senior in the Police Force, without exception every senior district officer under whom he worked recommended him as being most suitable for carrying out criminal investigation work. These recommendations were made by Inspectors Kearney, Harold (a former Commissioner), Selby, Quinn, Stolz, Sullivan and Lloyd. They are some of the big names in the history of the Police Force. Without

exception, every senior detective under whom Ryan worked recommended him for that position.

But in the interests of the Police Force, when we are considering the exigencies of modern times, more weight would be placed, perhaps, on the recommendations made by present-day senior officers, because they would make them knowing that the man himself has become more senior and they would be well conversant with and conscious of the obligations and requirements of a senior detective at the present time.

So I move on to refer to the recommendations made by no less an officer than the Commissioner's Inspector, who recently has been Acting Commissioner. On 7 January, 1963, in relation to Ryan, who has been relegated to uniform by the Commissioner, obviously in a disdainful way, Inspector Bauer said—

"Suitable Criminal Investigation Branch duties. An experienced and competent investigator, capable of handling any class of investigation."

Why would a man whom Bauer recommends along those lines be put into uniform to direct and control traffic? On 31 August, 1963, in keeping with his statutory obligations, in the compulsory printed report which he was supposed to submit on Ryan, Bauer said—

"Suitable Criminal Investigation Branch duties. An experienced and competent investigator, capable of handling any class of investigation."

Why would a man like that be put on to traffic duty? Incidentally, I am not denigrating the importance and necessity of traffic policemen. They are specially trained men who spend years of service in that particular branch and become skilled in their work. They certainly could not be transferred successfully to senior positions in the C. I. Branch.

Let me now pass to the man who has just retired and to whom donations were promptly given by members of the Government. I refer to Inspector Raetz, the man who was in charge of the Criminal Investigation Branch till recently. On 16 February, 1965, he said, in making recommendations on this man Ryan in the interests of the service—

"Suitable Criminal Investigation Branch duties. An experienced, loyal and very efficient investigator, capable of handling any class of investigation and particularly adept at investigating cases of false pretences and company fraud. Proficient in handling subordinates."

Three years later, on 22 January, 1968, Inspector Raetz made this recommendation in accordance with his statutory duties—

"Suitable for criminal investigation duties. A good all-round competent and efficient investigator—loyal and trustworthy. Capable of handling any type of investigation."



Detective Sergeant Ryan recently lectured trainee detectives at the school for these officers. The Commissioner himself obtained so much publicity for this school that one is led to believe that, as it was to be so efficient, it would have the best of lecturers. One person chosen to lecture there on the subjects of armed robbery, the emergency squad and processions was Detective Sergeant Ryan.

Two years ago, again with a fanfare of trumpets and a hail of great publicity, the Commissioner introduced another facet of police work when he said that the Queensland Police Force must have an emergency squad. This was to be composed of tough, skilled men who could be readily assembled and sent to any emergency in the city. This was at a time when the Commissioner was growing apprehensive of demonstrations and the influx of criminals from the South. Whom did he get to control this squad? None other than Inspector Bardwell and Detective Senior Sergeant Ryan. They were selected to go to Sydney to study the methods adopted by the police emergency squad in that State. Why would a detective be sent to Sydney to learn this special technique so that he could be jointly in control of the emergency squad if in due course he was to go to traffic duties in the uniformed section? I certainly do not believe that the announcement made by the Commissioner in explanation of this matter is "fair dinkum", or that he even believed it himself.

In the brief time that I still have at my disposal I wish to deal with a claim made by the Commissioner that there was really no gambling at Innisfail. I am summarising many of the comments that he made on recent events in that area. Again, of course, the matter was inquired into by Caesar investigating Caesar. Top echelon investigated top echelon, which is completely unsatisfactory. It is high time that some other member of the Public Service, or some independent responsible person such as an ombudsman, carried out this duty. That is policy of the Australian Labour Party, and I sincerely hope that the Law Reform Commission, which I advocated some time ago and on which I understand that you, Mr. Smith, have also made some remarks, will recommend that departmental officers not be investigated by fellow departmental officers.

In any case, I wish to read from a letter written by the Commissioner of Police to the then Inspector at Innisfail apropos of his claim that there was no gambling there. This letter was not written to Inspector Chandler, but to his predecessor. The Commissioner wrote—

"Some few months ago I advised you that I had information that an illegal game of 'troy' was being frequently played at Innisfail, but you assured me that such was very definitely not the case.

"I have now received information, which incidentally appears very definite, to the effect that a game of 'troy' is played quite

regularly each week at a so-called Greek Club operated by Con Kremastos (or some such name) at Innisfail."

Of course, the police got busy then and investigated Con Kremastos.

I see that some of the lights in the Chamber have gone out. That is typical of the Government. They have turned the lights out on me; they do not want to hear me. We will find no-one there when the lights go on.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. Murray:** They have put the spotlight on you.

**Mr. BENNETT:** It would not be the first time that the spotlight has been on me. It would be a good thing, too.

Could it be of some sinister significance that the Police Commissioner, by letter over his own personal signature—I vouch for that—writes to Innisfail and says that he has information ". . . which incidentally appears very definite, to the effect that a game of 'troy' is played quite regularly each week at a so-called Greek Club operated by Con Kremastos . . ." and specifically requests that a well-known gambler in the town, or, if not a well-known gambler, a well-known operator of a gaming house, be detected by the police, and that when the local police do detect him, the matter is then dropped with the approval of the Commissioner of Police? Is that without sinister significance? As a skilled lawyer, Mr. Smith, I leave you to your own logical inferences.

I wish to refer briefly to the debacle of the breathalyser tests at the moment.

**Mr. R. Jones:** It is of sinister significance that the lights have gone out on the Government side.

**Mr. BENNETT:** That is right. Hon. members opposite will never see the light of day again.

In relation to breathalyser tests, I assure you, Mr. Smith, that more motorists have been acquitted of charges under section 16 of the Traffic Act of driving a motor vehicle or being in charge of a motor vehicle under the influence of liquor than there have been in any other given period prior to the introduction of the legislation.

**Mr. Hinze:** Have you got figures to support that?

**Mr. BENNETT:** I could quote the case that I appeared in this morning. It was the easiest drink-driving case in which I have ever appeared. I refer to it colloquially as a drink-driving case; the charge was that of being under the influence of liquor in charge of a motor vehicle. It was just too easy for words to win, because neither the police nor the doctors had any real evidence to substantiate the charge as they would

have had prior to the introduction of the amending legislation relative to breathalyser tests.

**Mr. Ramsden:** You did not need much skill?

**Mr. BENNETT:** I am naturally skilful. I suppose any person equally skilful would have won it, also. One would need to have a certain amount of knowledge to win, but one has not to be very skilful to beat the legislation as it stands at the moment.

If a policeman wants to give a man a test on the alcotest, he does not give him what is termed a clinical test—he cannot, of course—such as the dropping of a key or the walk test; he does not make observations. He merely puts him on the alcotest bag. Incidentally, in the case this morning the sworn evidence of the arresting constable—he is a uniformed man—was that he had been instructed to hold a motorist for 20 minutes before putting him on the alcotest. This is something we were not told in Parliament when this legislation was going through.

I do not doubt the evidence that this man gave because he impressed me as one who gave honest evidence.

**Mr. Lee:** The Minister spelt that out.

**Mr. BENNETT:** They have to wait 20 minutes at the roadside before they blow in the bag. That is sworn evidence and he said he had been instructed to do that.

**Mr. Hughes:** You can refuse to take an alcotest at the roadside.

**Mr. BENNETT:** Admittedly, you can refuse but the hon. member knows what would happen if you did.

**Mr. Lickiss:** You tell us.

**Mr. BENNETT:** You would be taken along to the police station, as this man was. He was not taken forcibly in this particular case, but he was not even given the alcotest at the roadside. The constable said, "We can alcotest you in 20 minutes. Will you come along to the police station?" He said, "All right". The policeman got in his car and drove the motorist to the police station, and kept him there for 20 minutes. He walked in with him, side by side, in a friendly fashion. They had a social conversation. He said that the man spoke intelligently and sensibly. Then, after 20 minutes, the man blew into the bag and changed the colour of the crystals, so they had to ring a doctor. The doctor came along and put him on the breathalyser machine proper, and his reading was .15. Of course, under the relevant section there is no defence to the charge. If a motorist shows over .1 per cent. blood alcohol there is no defence, but the policeman does not charge

him straight out with being over .1 per cent. He has to charge him with being under the influence of liquor while in charge of a motor vehicle. There was hardly any evidence to support that charge. But he must be dealt with on that charge. He would have pleaded guilty to the lesser charge. That is absolutely true and no Minister can or will deny it. There is no provision in the section for a policeman to say, "Blow in the bag; blow in the breathalyser machine. Sorry, old man, you are over .1 per cent. We do not think you are under the influence of liquor in the terms of the section so we will just charge you with being over .1." They are not allowed to do that. They have to put the motorist on the major charge, and when this man came into court he had absolutely no defence, being .15. I am explaining this case because I appeared in it myself, but it is typical of many that have gone through since the legislation was introduced.

**Mr. Murray:** Did this happen this morning?

**Mr. BENNETT:** Yes. He was .15, and he had no defence to that charge. He would have had to plead guilty if he had been charged simply with being .15. But under this legislation he had to be charged with being in control of a motor vehicle while under the influence of liquor. The arresting constable really did not claim that he was under the influence of liquor. He claimed that he was in charge of a motor vehicle, as he was, and the arresting constable, although I cannot say what his real inclinations were, gave me the impression in the witness box that he would not for one moment have put him on the major charge if he could have put him on the lesser charge, of being .1 per cent. or more. But he had to put him on the major charge, and what happened? He had to pay a solicitor; he had to brief counsel; he had to take up the time of the court for the morning and there was clearly insufficient evidence to maintain the major charge. He was found not guilty of that, but he had to pay all the fees and was found guilty, as he must be, of being over .1 per cent.

**Mr. Ramsden:** Do you mean to say that there is no provision for him to be charged with having more than .1 per cent. blood alcohol?

**Mr. BENNETT:** There is absolutely no such provision in the legislation. There is no charge of being .1 per cent. or more. Being .1 per cent. or more is an offence but, in order to be convicted of that offence, a motorist has to be charged with being under the influence of liquor while in charge of a motor vehicle. If he is charged with the major offence he cannot say, "I will plead guilty to being .1 or more."

No court or prosecutor has the power to drop the charge, so that the defendant has to be charged with the major offence. Everybody has to go through the hoops; the court

day has to be allocated; and the defendant has to pay the costs. This is absolutely true, and I am quite certain that I am right. I can guarantee that no legal authority or member of the Government can dispute the truth of my statement.

Incidentally, instead of the Government having a police prosecutor it has now directed that Crown Prosecutors appear, and Mr. Dennis Galligan of the Crown Law Office appeared this morning. This takes up more time of the Crown Law Office and incurs more expense.

Under the Act the doctor's certificate can be tendered to say what the reading of the breathalyser was, and neither the defendant nor his counsel can object to the tendering of that certificate. The present policy of the Government and the Crown Law Office is that not only does the prosecutor tender the certificate, as he did this morning, but in addition the Crown insists on having the doctor subpoenaed. The doctor comes along and attends court for the professional witness's fee to say that he gave the certificate, which has already been tendered in evidence.

**Mr. Hughes:** That should not be necessary, but it has become necessary because barristers have challenged the validity of this document.

**Mr. BENNETT:** They cannot challenge the validity of the document, because it is ruled as being admissible. Incidentally, in this morning's case the document did not have the man's full name upon it, and I objected to it on that ground. But if it had contained the man's full name and proper particulars I could not have objected to its admissibility. Long before the doctor arrived it was admitted and accepted in evidence by the court, and Dr. Lynch, who is a very competent doctor, gave evidence that he did no clinical test. Because he did no clinical test he had made no notes of his examination, and because he had no notes of his examination he could not remember the case at all. He said that that certificate was his, and all that he could offer to the court was that the man showed .15 per cent. That was no help to the court at all. The court said that he showed .15, and nobody could dispute that. Perhaps a technician could find some defect in the machine. I am not suggesting that one could be found and I am not expecting that evidence will be produced of any defect, but the whole argument is not whether the man has .15 per cent. but whether he is under the influence of liquor. The prosecution did not seriously claim that he was, yet he was put to a day's expense in court to be convicted of the lesser offence.

(Time expired.)

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 9.39 p.m.