

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 17 OCTOBER 1968

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 17 OCTOBER, 1968

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

QUESTIONS

**DEVELOPMENTAL CONDITIONS FOR
MORETON ISLAND**

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

(1) In view of a recent report in *The Courier-Mail* over the name of the Minister for Labour and Tourism headed "Government to protect Moreton Island", and his statement that the State Government would not allow Brisbane's "unspoiled paradise"—Moreton Island—to be used for "get-rich-quick schemes", what protective measures have been taken by his Government for the preservation of the island?

(2) When will the report referred to in *The Courier-Mail* article on the future development of Moreton Island, which is being made by an official expert committee, be presented to the Government?

Answers:—

(1) "An area of 5,200 acres in the centre of Moreton Island has been set aside as a national park. Protection of the remainder of the island will be kept in view."

(2) "The report of the Committee set up by the Government to examine all aspects of developing Moreton Island is in course of preparation and it is expected that it will be available to the Government before the end of the year."

PREPARATION OF PLANS FOR SCHOOL BUILDINGS

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

(1) Are school parents and citizens' associations compelled to pay private architects and engineers to prepare plans and specifications for works and buildings proposed to be erected at schools?

(2) If so, as the works are usually a valuable addition to the school, which is Government property, why are these associations so imposed upon and why cannot the professional work be performed by Government officers?

Answers:—

(1) "To enable consideration to be given to approving of subsidy on any major proposal submitted by a parents and citizens' association for assistance under the School Improvement Subsidy Scheme, it is necessary for satisfactory plans and specifications to accompany the application. If it is necessary for the association to make a payment to an architect or engineer for the preparation of documents or for supervision, such charge is also eligible for a 50 per cent. subsidy."

(2) "As Government technical officers are fully engaged on projects regarded as a full State responsibility it is not possible for these officers to undertake the work in question."

SECURITY LIGHTING AT TOWNSVILLE HIGH SCHOOL

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

(1) Has advice been received by his Department that, on or about September 26, Townsville High School was broken into and a valuable typewriter, a .38 Smith and Wesson revolver, a starting pistol and \$175 in cash, the property of the parents and citizens' association, were stolen?

(2) If so, when is it proposed to install security lighting as was promised some time ago following representations made by the association and myself?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "The request for the installation of security lighting is under consideration in the Department of Works, but at this juncture, no indication can be given as to whether the project will be approved and, if approved, when it will be undertaken."

CLASSROOM VENTILATION, SOUTH TOWNSVILLE STATE SCHOOL

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

(1) Is he aware that some of the classrooms at the South Townsville school were built in the last century and are provided with cathedral-type windows, a mere nine inches wide, thus compelling teachers and pupils to work in stifling heat and semi-darkness?

(2) If so, while it is appreciated that these architectural anachronisms were inherited from the preceding Labour Government, is it proposed by this self-styled progressive Government to rectify this deplorable position and when?

Answers:—

(1) "Information available indicates that although improvements have been carried out to the classrooms in one wing, other rooms at the school require some improvements so that they will provide accommodation in accordance with present-day standards."

(2) "Action will be taken to request the Department of Works to prepare a plan and estimate of cost for the second stage of remodelling and improving classrooms at this school. When the estimate of cost is received, consideration will be given to approving of this work in relation to available finance. The Honourable Member will be advised of the action to be taken."

TENDERS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF OLD TOWN HALL SITE, BRISBANE

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

As the Local Government Act clearly prescribes that a contract shall be invalidated when its major requirements are violated—

(1) Is he aware that the Lord Mayor has publicly announced that Capital City Motels Pty. Ltd. has failed to honour the contract it entered into with Brisbane City Council in terms of lodging a ten per centum deposit within a prescribed time limit?

(2) What action will he take in relation to the Lord Mayor's apparent illegal decision to extend by one week the period in which a deposit may be lodged?

(3) Does not the present situation mean that Brisbane City Council is currently conducting further negotiations with Capital City Motels Pty. Ltd. on the basis of a contract now invalidated and, if so, will he take the necessary steps to protect the proper interests of the people of Brisbane and of other tenderers for this project?

Answers:—

(1) "I have read the newspaper report of the Council's meeting at which the matter was discussed."

(2) "The decision appears to have been made by resolution of the full Council."

(3) "There is no information in my Department relative to this matter."

NEW PRIMARY SCHOOL, WOODSTOCK; EXTENSIONS TO AYR HIGH SCHOOL

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

With reference to the statements contained in the Treasurer's Financial Statement, presented to Parliament on September 26, 1968, that a new primary school will be built at Woodstock and that major extensions will be built at Ayr High School, will he advise in as great detail as possible what the primary school for Woodstock will be composed of and what the major extensions at Ayr High School will include?

Answer:—

"The new State primary school at Woodstock will consist of two standard classrooms, plus the usual ancillary rooms. Plans are at present being prepared for the provision of the undermentioned additional accommodation at the Ayr State High School:—A senior science block; one chemistry laboratory and preparation room; one general purpose classroom; one staff room; one library-reading room."

ANTI-LITTER LEGISLATION

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

With reference to his Answer to my Question on August 27, relative to introducing legislation similar to the Victorian Act to Amend the Litter Act of 1964, No. 7608, and in view of statements made by many Local Authorities and by persons occupying positions of authority, including the Lord Mayor of Brisbane, that the litter problem cannot be dealt with effectively by Local Authorities, will he give further consideration to introducing legislation similar to the Victorian Act?

Answer:—

"The Victorian legislation is under examination. However, the Honourable Member will appreciate that the matter of introduction or otherwise of legislation is a matter of policy."

CONTROL OF SPY-PEN LISTENING DEVICE

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

(1) Has he noted or read reports of the alleged production in Melbourne of a spy-pen fitted with a minute super-speed drill and lenses?

(2) As this particular piece of equipment could be of immense benefit to spies and criminals and as the nation-wide marketing of it could only be prevented by all-States legislation, have any moves been made by him to raise the matter at the next meeting of Attorneys-General in the hope of achieving uniformity?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "The whole question of listening devices has already been discussed by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General and will be further discussed at the next meeting in Perth on October 31-November 1 next. This particular device was not brought to our notice until after the last meeting but it will almost certainly be discussed at the Perth meeting."

INCIDENCE OF AUTISM

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

(1) As autism is a distressing form of emotional disturbance in children and is a relatively recent clinical discovery, are there to his knowledge any known cases in this State?

(2) If cases are known to his Department, what form of treatment or help is available to autistic children here?

Answers:—

(1) "I am advised that this group of children probably represents several groups of illnesses manifesting much the same symptomatology. Autism is something of an euphemism and the underlying condition is that of a childhood psychosis or, in other words, a severely mentally ill child. In view of the foregoing it is difficult to arrive at any precise number of so-called autistic children."

(2) "The National Health and Medical Research Council has considered this condition on more than one occasion and has recommended that the facilities presently available for the treatment of other psychotic children be utilised for the care of this group."

RAILWAY SHEEP-TRUCKING YARDS,
JULIA CREEK

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

(1) Has he been informed of the cause of the collapse of a large portion of the sheep-trucking yards at Julia Creek recently?

(2) Was it the result of faulty workmanship or design?

(3) Are these yards now in a stock-proof condition? If so, what was the cost of the repairs and who was responsible for the cost involved?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) "Yes. I have written to the Honourable Member a letter which he should have received by now, outlining the arrangements made. The type of yards constructed at Julia Creek was not of standard railway design. This was done as an experiment which has not appeared to be successful."

ACCOMMODATION FOR FETTLERS, OORINDI

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

(1) Is he aware that fettlers at Oorindi are compelled to live in small, decrepit buildings which can only be described as sub-standard "kennels"?

(2) Will he take immediate action to provide accommodation comparable to that which is supplied for fettlers in the southern division of the Railway Department?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "There is at Oorindi accommodation for one married man and four standard designed single men's accommodation and two bondwood huts. Land has been resumed on the northern side of the line to which this accommodation is to be transferred. As the transfer of the accommodation to the northern side of the line is being carried out, necessary repairs to the buildings and the painting thereof will be effected."

EFFECT OF SUB-CONTRACTING ON
APPRENTICE INTAKE IN BUILDING
TRADE

Mr. Lonergan, pursuant to notice, asked
The Minister for Labour and Tourism,—

(1) Is he concerned with the effect that sub-contracting is having on the intake of apprentices to the building trade?

(2) Has he discussed the problem with the Minister for Works and Housing and, if not, why not?

Answer:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "Yes."

APPLICATIONS FOR FREEHOLD LAND
TENURE

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

(1) How many applications for freehold land have been received by his Department since August 27, 1957?

(2) How many have been finalised?

(3) How many of the applications have been for areas in excess of 3,000 acres?

(4) Have any applications been rejected? If so, how many and for what reasons?

Answers:—

(1) "15,561 applications."

(2) "13,927 applications."

(3) "Information not readily available."

(4) "Applications for conversion of tenure of 39 grazing selections have been rejected for the following reasons:— (a) Selection substantially in excess of a living area; (b) selection not reasonably improved having regard to its potential for economic development; (c) decision by the Land Court that public interests would be adversely affected by conversion of tenure."

LAND RECLAMATION, LINDUM, HEMMANT
AND LYTTON AREAS

Mr. Bromley for **Mr. Harris**, pursuant to
notice, asked The Treasurer,—

(1) What is the acreage of land reclaimed in the Lindum, Hemmant and Lytton areas?

(2) What area is being reclaimed at the present time, where is it situated and when is it anticipated that the reclamation will be completed?

(3) How much land is yet to be reclaimed in the areas?

(4) If damage has been occasioned to adjacent properties as the result of the reclamation, what properties, either freehold or leasehold, have been affected and who are the tenants of the properties?

Answers:—

(1) "No land is being reclaimed by the Crown in the Hemmant area. Approximately 60 acres have been reclaimed at Lytton between Lytton Road, Pritchard Street and Ampol Refinery."

(2) "An area of 150 acres (approximately) is under reclamation between Lytton Road and the Brisbane River (Clunie Flats) as filling material is available to the Harbours and Marine Department. The completion date is indefinite. A further five acres north of Pritchard Street is under reclamation and will be completed by the end of October."

(3) "A further 50 acres (approximately) of Clunie Flats and a further 373 acres bounded by Lytton, Sandy Camp, Haynes Road and Pritchard Street will be reclaimed."

(4) "There is no knowledge of any measurable damage to adjacent properties. Some minor banking up of salt water in low-lying areas along existing water courses to approximately 1 ft. above high-tide level has occurred."

PROCESSING BY FISH BOARD OF PRAWNS
FOR CRAIG MOSTYN & CO.

Mr. V. E. Jones for **Mr. Houghton**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Labour and Tourism,—

(1) How many pounds of prawns were processed by the Fish Board for Craig Mostyn & Co. in the year ended June 30, 1968?

(2) What was the cost to the company for the work?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "As the Fish Board trades on a competitive basis it is considered that the release of this information would be prejudicial to its future negotiations in relation to similar transactions."

OFFSET PRINTING MACHINES IN
GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

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

(1) How many Government Departments have installed small offset printing machines known by the trade name of "Multilith" and what are the names of the Departments?

(2) Do these Departments also have platemaking equipment installed in order to enable the production of pre-sensitized plates for the multilith machines?

(3) What is the award classification of the personnel who produce printed matter on the machines?

Answers:—

(1) "Excluding the Railway Department, 'Multilith' and 'Gestelith' offset duplicators are installed in eleven Government Departments and Sub-Departments. These are:—Education, Forestry, Industrial Development, Lands, Main Roads, Police, Premier's, Primary Industries, Queensland Government Tourist Bureau, State Government Insurance Office (Queensland) and State Stores."

(2) "Some Departments have copying machines capable of making metal masters using pre-sensitized plates. Other Departments can make paper masters on their Xerox copying machines in ten seconds."

(3) "The offset duplicators are generally operated by male assistants who are trained in the use of these machines as duplicators. Training of operators usually takes between two to five days. Male assistants are paid in accordance with the scale prescribed for male assistants in the Public Service Award (State)."

AMENITIES AT FISH MARKET, COLMSLIE

Mr. Bromley, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Labour and Tourism,—

(1) Are there any amenities at the new Fish Markets by way of showers and toilets? If not, will he immediately arrange to have them installed?

(2) Are refuelling facilities available for boats owned by fishermen? If not, when will they be established?

Answers:—

(1) "The main building at the new Metropolitan Fish Market provides 11 toilets, 3 urinals and 3 showers. The amenities building provides 12 toilets, 2 urinals and 13 showers. In all the complex provides 23 toilets, 5 urinals and 16 showers."

(2) "Negotiations are proceeding for the provision of refuelling facilities for boats owned by fishermen and these will be established as soon as possible after a satisfactory arrangement has been arrived at between the Fish Board and a fuel marketing company."

SALE OF IMPORTED FISH AT FISH
MARKET, COLMSLIE

Mr. Bromley, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Labour and Tourism,—

(1) Has any person been given a permit to sell imported fish at the Fish Market? If so, (a) who is the person, (b) what are the length of and the terms of the permit, (c) from what countries is the fish imported, (d) why is imported fish being sold there and (e) is the selling of imported fish adversely affecting local industry?

(2) Why has the Fish Board been by-passed in the sale of imported fish?

Answers:—

(1) "A permit to use the Metropolitan Fish Market for the delivery to buyers of imported fish has been issued by the Fish Board to P. A. Kingston Pty. Ltd., for a term of six months from August 12, 1968, the fee payable being \$1,000. The countries of origin of the fish are not stipulated in the permit nor are they known to the board. The permit was issued to enable the requirements of fish buyers to be met and the board recognised that, if the permit was not issued for delivery of the fish at Colmslie, the fish would, no doubt, be delivered elsewhere and thus the board would be deprived of the revenue obtained

by way of the permit fee. Fish has been imported into Australia for some years, and for the year ended June, 1968, the value of imports of marine produce was \$31,647,000. It is not within the province of my Department to control the importation of fish."

(2) "The prime function of the Fish Board is to have the management and control of the supply and marketing of locally produced fish and the handling and distribution of imported fish is not considered to be the responsibility of the Fish Board."

BOONDALL STATE SCHOOL GROUNDS

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

(1) Is any portion of the grounds of Boondall State School to be excised in the construction of the four-lane highway on Sandgate Road?

(2) As this would involve the school's tennis courts, will the courts be re-located at the Department's expense?

(3) When will the area be so affected?

Answers:—

(1) "My Department is unaware that portion of the grounds of the Boondall State School may be excised for road widening purposes associated with the proposed construction of a four-lane highway."

(2) "Funds for the replacement of the tennis courts will be provided if future road widening makes the re-location of these improvements necessary."

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

DEVELOPMENT OF ROMA STREET MARKET SITE

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

Further to his Answer to my Question on October 16,—

(1) Is he aware that a Question dealing with the legal status of land is one which would be appropriately directed to the Minister for Lands?

(2) Will he therefore direct his reply to my Question in terms of planning which comes within his Ministerial responsibilities?

Answers:—

The Answer to the Honourable Member's Question on the 16th was factual. However, in view of the further Question, I Answer as follows:—

(1) "In some instances it would be the Minister for Mines and Main Roads. In others it would be the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General or the Minister for Lands."

(2) "The policy of this Government in relation to the town planning of the City of Brisbane is expressed in *"The City of Brisbane Town Planning Acts, 1964 to 1967."*

ACQUISITION OF TOTAL CROP BY SUGAR BOARD

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the statement in *The Daily Mercury* of October 12, attributed to the Minister for Mines and Main Roads,—"I have been in constant touch with the members of the board who have been informed of the Government's wish that all cane offered in Queensland this year should be acquired and treated"?

(2) On what date was the Sugar Board informed of the wishes of the Government on the matter of the acquisition of the total crop?

(3) As the Sugar Board is only the agent of the Government, why has the Government not acted to implement its own decisions?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "I am not aware of the exact date, but I have knowledge that the Honourable the Premier, the Minister for Primary Industries and the Minister for Mines, Main Roads and Electricity met members of the Sugar Board in September and explained the full circumstances to them."

(3) "In terms of the annual Proclamation the percentage of third quota sugar to be acquired in each season is determinable by the Sugar Board in its sole discretion after taking into consideration the extent of available markets and any other relevant factors."

CLASSROOM ACCOMMODATION, VICTORIA PARK STATE SCHOOL, MACKAY

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

(1) Has representation been made to him by the chairman of the Mackay Branch of the Country Party relative to the shortage of schoolroom accommodation at the Victoria Park School, Mackay? If so, has consideration been given to such representation?

(2) Does the Government accept representations from Honourable Members of its own political party in preference to representations made by local members?

Answers:—

(1) "The Honourable Member for Mirani recently made representations to me in relation to the accommodation position at Victoria Park State School following enquiries he received from the President of the Mackay-Mirani-Whitsunday Electorate Council of the Queensland Country Party, and he was advised of the present position."

(2) "No. The answering of representations that are made in respect to any school problem does not imply any disregard of the standing and privileges of the member for the area. In any case the matter is dealt with on the basis of priorities determined according to needs."

ADDITIONAL CLASSROOMS, BALACLAVA STATE SCHOOL, CAIRNS

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

Has consideration been given to and funds allocated for the planning and construction of at least two additional permanent classrooms at Balaclava State School, Cairns, to alleviate increasing overcrowding and to accommodate the anticipated enrolment of the 1969 school year from the new and expanding suburbs?

Answer:—

"There has been no local request for the provision of additional classrooms at the Balaclava State School. However, the Regional Director of Education, Townsville, has been requested to investigate the accommodation position at this school and furnish a report thereon. Upon receipt of the Regional Director's report, consideration will be given to the need for providing additional permanent classrooms."

NET-FISHING LICENCES

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

(1) Has the Government taken any action to stop sports stores selling illegal-sized fishing nets?

(2) As no adequate research has been carried out, what is the Government's reason for cancelling the amateur net licence in Central Queensland?

(3) Should the local amateur have his licence cancelled, when the Federal Government grants permission to foreigners to use our territorial waters to take fish and study our coastline?

(4) (a) Does the Fisheries Act provide that fishing inspectors or patrol officers shall show their identification on contacting members of the public in the course of

their duties, (b) should the patrol officer's boat carry identification markings and (c) has a member of the public the right to ignore a person who cannot show immediate proof that he is a patrol officer?

Answers:—

(1) "No restrictions have been placed upon the sale of nets. Such action would be futile as nets can be purchased interstate. Furthermore, nets which are illegal when used for one purpose may be within the law when used for another."

(2) "Amateur net licences will not be renewed after January 1, 1969. This decision was made and announced three years ago and a reasonable period of time was allowed for existing nets to wear out. The reasons for the decision are as follows:—(a) Amateur netmen interfere with the skilled professional units by breaking up shoals of mullet in south Queensland preventing them reshooling, resulting in loss of fish; (b) The economic importance to the tourist industry of conserving sport fish throughout the State for angling; (c) Almost all objections by anglers to netting relate to the activities of amateur netmen. The Government is firmly of the opinion that it is in the best interests of the State to adopt a policy of netting for food and angling for sport and its policy in this regard is well accepted by the fishing industry and anglers generally."

(3) "I fail to see the slightest relationship between net fishing by amateurs in estuarine waters and negotiations between the Commonwealth and Japanese Governments following the introduction of the twelve-mile fishing limit. I should add that I know of no permission granted by the Commonwealth Government to foreigners to use our territorial waters to take fish."

(4) "(a) Patrol officers are required by the Department of Harbours and Marine to identify themselves when commencing any inspection or interview relating to any possible breach of the Fisheries or Queensland Marine Acts. (b) The Department of Harbours and Marine requires that vessels of the Queensland Boating Patrol carry markings prescribed by the Motor Boat and Motor Vessel Regulations. (c) The Honourable Member should know that it is not Ministerial practice to give an opinion on a matter of law in Answer to a Question."

COMPULSORY INSPECTION OF PRIVATE MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. Dean, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Labour and Tourism,—

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the report in *The Sunday Mail* of September 1, headed "Many people risk lives in death-trap cars"?

(2) In view of the serious allegations, will he consider compulsory checks for roadworthiness of all private and commercial vehicles and Government registration of mechanics for the purpose of ensuring proper car maintenance and, if not, why not?

Answers:—

(1) "I read the article."

(2) "Commercial vehicles in Queensland are subject to regular inspection by officers of my Department. For private vehicles, Queensland operates on the snap checking principle, by which all private vehicles are liable to inspection at any time. In the operation of these systems—
(a) Snap inspections are made of used car dealers' premises by motor vehicle inspectors of the Machinery Department;
(b) The Chief Inspector of Machinery may require any person to present his or her vehicle for inspection at any time;
(c) Officers of the Police Department may stop vehicles on the road and require obvious repairs to be effected, or require the owners to present the vehicle to the Chief Inspector of Machinery for a comprehensive inspection. The problem associated with the so-called sub-standard condition of private motor vehicles on the road is one which has exercised and continues to exercise the minds of authorities, not only in Queensland and other parts of the Commonwealth but also on a world scale. Officers of my Department continually seek information regarding the latest trends and standards of inspection. The consensus of opinion is that compulsory annual inspections of private vehicles is not the final answer. The abuse to which a private vehicle may be subject at the hands of an owner could render the vehicle unroadworthy within one month of inspection. Compulsory inspection carried out by other than a Government Department is open to so many abuses that some States in America have relinquished this system. A Government Authority can only compulsorily inspect on an economical basis where the concentration of population and motor vehicles is heavy. It would not be economically feasible in Queensland. It is felt that the present system of inspections do provide a most essential service and, with the appointment this year of additional Motor Vehicle Inspectors, this procedure is being intensified. The influence of unroadworthiness on the road toll is most difficult to determine, as the vehicle is usually so badly damaged that it is impossible to decide whether any fault in the vehicle was primarily responsible. At the present time, it is considered that the system operating in Queensland which, apart from compulsory inspection of all private motor vehicles, is more extensive than that operating elsewhere, is as effective as it is possible to make it, having regard to all relevant circumstances. In regard

to the Government registration of mechanics I would point out to the Honourable Member that Queensland is one of the few places in the world that conducts examinations for motor mechanics. My Department issues 'A' and 'B' Grade Motor Mechanics Certificates under the inspection of Machinery Acts. However, Government registration of mechanics, as suggested by the Honourable Member, presupposes as a corollary, that no person other than a registered mechanic could perform any work of a mechanical nature on a motor vehicle. I would finally point out that the Queensland Institute of Automotive Mechanical Engineers has made no representations to me for the Government registration of mechanics."

ELECTRIFICATION OF BRISBANE SUBURBAN RAILWAYS

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the sub-leader in *The Courier-Mail* of August 31, headed "Railways survey"?

(2) Has he read the report made by a former Labour Government for the electrification of Brisbane's railways? If so, does he intend to implement any of the valid findings of the report and, if not, why not?

Answer:—

"It has already been arranged that all reports, whether public or not, and which have been made in the last few years by the Railway Department or any other Department associated with public transport in Brisbane, will be brought to the notice of Messrs. Wilbur Smith and Associates for their public transport survey."

PROSECUTIONS FOR ILLEGAL DUMPING OF RUBBISH

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the report in *The Sunday Mail* of October 5, headed "They dump rubbish by the ton", and the statement that tons of illegally dumped rubbish litter Brisbane streets, river banks, and some parks?

(2) How many persons have been fined during the past twelve months for illegally dumping rubbish on road sides and what was the amount of each fine?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "This information cannot readily be obtained from Court records, without considerable work and expense which is not considered justified."

PAPERS

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

Reports—

Fish Board, for the year 1967-68.

North Queensland Fish Board, for the year 1967-68.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

The Harbours Acts, 1955 to 1968.

The Ambulance Services Act of 1967.

The Medical Acts, 1939 to 1966.

Tuberculosis Regulations under the Health Acts, 1937 to 1968.

FORM OF QUESTIONS

Mrs. JORDAN (Ipswich West) having given notice of questions—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! A section of the first question submitted by the hon. member for Ipswich West is out of order. It seeks an expression of opinion from the Minister. If she would like to consult me about it later on we will put it in order.

Mr. Houston interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! It seeks an expression of opinion.

Mr. Bennett: Why should Parliament's hands be tied?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for South Brisbane should know quite well the rules governing the asking of questions in this House. I intend to see that they are strictly applied.

Mr. Houston: Don't worry, they will be changed next year.

Mr. Bennett: We will give free expression.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for South Brisbane that they study the rules governing questions.

Mrs. Jordan: Shall I see you later on to ascertain what I should delete?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member does not have to delete anything. The question requires some slight alteration only. I have already asked the hon. member to see me about it later, when I shall be quite happy to discuss it with her.

Mr. GRAHAM (Mackay) proceeding to give notice of a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The question contains an inference that is out of order.

Mr. GRAHAM (Mackay) having completed giving notice of the same question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The question will have to be revised before it is in order.

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

HAJI YA'ACOB BIN MOHAMED, MINISTER OF STATE, GOVERNMENT OF SINGAPORE.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before calling on the Clerk to read the next Order of the Day, I would, unfortunately rather belatedly, like to extend a welcome to the Honourable Mr. Ya'acob, Minister of State in the Government of Singapore. I extend an apology to the honourable gentleman. We were not apprised in advance of his visit to Parliament House and, consequently, no-one met him at the door. However, our welcome to you, Mr. Ya'acob, although belated, is nevertheless sincere. We welcome you here and trust that your stay will be of benefit to you.

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

PETITION

DECLARATION OF TEXAS CAVE AREA AS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. SHERRINGTON (Salisbury) presented a petition from 4,232 electors praying that the Parliament of Queensland will postpone the construction of the Pike Creek Dam, which will inundate the Texas cave systems, until other economic alternatives are examined, and that, if other alternatives can be found, the Texas cave area be declared a national park.

Petition read and received.

SUPPLY

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT—
RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

(Mr. Carey, Albert, in the chair)

Debate resumed from 15 October (see p. 674) 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. PORTER (Toowong) (11.51 a.m.): The Committee is discussing a very good Budget, one that has not only received glowing comments in this State, but has also been the subject of considerable comment amongst other Governments and by other State Treasurers.

Mr. Hughes: And not much criticised by the Opposition.

Mr. PORTER: I think this is true. There has been very little criticism, a matter on which I will comment in a moment.

I think it has been a refreshing Budget and a stimulating one, and it has been presented in a refreshing way. In the previous day's debate on this Budget my colleague the hon. member for Chatsworth referred to the excellent new type of presentation of the Budget and associated documents. It is quite obvious that the Budget was so good that it took the Opposition somewhat

between wind and water, as it were, because it left them without a great deal to say, and the Opposition comments so far have been not exactly devastating.

The Leader of the Opposition gave a very verbose catalogue of minor items, almost as though he was delivering a test in fast reading. The hon. member for Barcoo became lost in a kind of maze of the perils he professed to see in the freeholding of land. The hon. member for Toowoomba East had nothing other than a rather peevish complaint about a lack of teachers, and from the hon. member for Nudgee we had false facts about false teeth. The hon. member for South Brisbane spent his time appearing to gamble with the liquor laws in order to prove that the Police Force had certain shortcomings.

Virtually every comment from the Opposition was notable for its lack of criticism of the Budget. Since there is nothing to answer in terms of criticism of the Budget—the Budget is so good that it speaks eloquently for itself—I propose to devote some little time to investigating, or trying to analyse, a problem which is very much the heart and root of any Budget presentation.

Mr. Walsh: It will be one-sided, for sure.

Mr. PORTER: I hope it will not be one-sided. I think, Mr. Carey, that all hon. members, even if they do not agree with some of the things I have said so far, will agree that we have arrived at a most unhappy—indeed, an explosive—stage in the relationships between the Commonwealth and the various State Parliaments. I think that, again, all of us will agree that even superficial consideration of this deterioration in a partnership concept between the Commonwealth and the States will convince us of the enormous importance of solving these particular problems. It is important not only in an economic sense, but also in a political one.

Hon. members may recall that in the first session of this Parliament in 1966 a private member's motion bearing on this topic was introduced—and very ably introduced—by the hon. member for Clayfield, and I was privileged to second it.

An Opposition Member: It was ably supported by the hon. member for Mourilyan.

Mr. PORTER: That is true. I think that we will find agreement on many of the points that I am going to make.

Nobody draws satisfaction from saying, "I told you so," but in the course of the debate on that particular motion I did express grave apprehension about the collision course that seemed to be undertaken by the Commonwealth and State partners. I said then that we seemed to be proceeding away from Federalism and towards unification by default. Because of this I ventured to predict that at some future date this would lead to quite dangerous political upheavals.

I think that the only forecasting error made was that the political turbulence has come a good deal sooner than was anticipated then.

My comments on the political instability that is generated by this kind of "pull devil, pull baker" relationship between the central and the State Governments seemed apropos because a Federal election was then in the offing and not very far away. Again I think that the comments made on this matter are timely, because, although we have been informed that a Federal election will not be held this year, it is reasonable to think that it is not too far away. Whereas the appearances could be maintained in 1966, I think that the deterioration in the partnership concept has now gone so far that it is very difficult to sweep all the evidence of its existence under the carpet. The very strong stands taken by Mr. Askin, the Premier of New South Wales, and Sir Henry Bolte, the Premier of Victoria, and of course the recent conference of State Premiers, all suggest that a very real impasse has been reached.

I feel that I have some small right to speak on this matter, because over the years I have taken considerable steps to have this problem and its significance recognised at top-level meetings of my own party and at Liberal Party conventions, and I played a role in eventually taking it to the Federal Liberal Council, with the result that there was an overwhelming decision to hold a conference of Federal Liberal leaders, both parliamentary and organisational. This, the late Mr. Harold Holt was very ready to do. Unfortunately, with his untimely death and all the pressures that accompanied this, and with the accession to office of Mr. Gorton, this conference has not taken place. Because of that, I feel that matters have substantially deteriorated. So my concern here is a deep and long-standing one.

I do not think that I have to make my own position in this matter any clearer than I have done in previous debates. I say unequivocally, as I have said before, that I am a Federalist, and I intend to remain one. I just cannot believe at this stage of Australia's development that this large, diverse continent will be better served by one unwieldy centralised Government in Canberra.

In this matter I agree with Sir Robert Menzies, who said in 1962—

"I myself am a Federalist. I don't wish to see unification in Australia. The division of power under a Federal system has a considerable relevance to the preservation of individual liberties in our community."

I entirely agree with this. I believe that Australia's proper development will come only from diversity and dissent and new ideas, and these will never filter down from the elite few at the top; they must come from the many up to the few. This is the lesson of all history.

I am one of those who have a very healthy regard for the wisdom of mass decisions and a very strong scepticism as to the capacity of elite experts. I can remember the late Mr. Forgan Smith saying in this Chamber, "Experts should be kept on tap and never on top." Maybe that is taking it a little too far, but nevertheless I firmly believe that any excess of centralism will be self-defeating and that the stronger the central authority, the weaker will be the flow of those necessary ideals.

I hope that nobody will construe this as an attack on any particular Government or person. It is rather foolish for us to believe that the game will be changed if we merely change some of the players. Of course it will not change. The basic problems of Federal-State relationships will remain the same, irrespective of the colour of the Government in Canberra or in any of the States. The popular pursuit of blaming the Federal Government for the whole of the present problem is unfair and incorrect. I can remember that when Sir Robert Menzies tried to give some taxing powers back to the States there was great reluctance to accept them.

Mr. Walsh interjected.

Mr. PORTER: I should think that, in some quarters, this reluctance might still remain. Let us not bewail the situation we are in and imagine that we played no part in creating it. I think it is said that ours is a permissive society, and I believe we have played a part in permitting this to happen.

Mr. Walsh interjected.

Mr. PORTER: I intend to deal with taxation later on, if the hon. member for Bundaberg will be a little patient.

I do not want to harp on Queensland's need for financial justice. There is no doubt that we could, and we should, get a better deal in terms of the annual tax and grants carve-up. To me, the issue is a much greater one than merely getting a bigger share of the cake. I believe that our financial improvement would be automatic if the Federal system was made to work in fact as well as in name. In other words, it is not a case of wanting a bigger share of the cake—we need another cake.

I do not think there is any need for me to dwell on the present imbalance of the financial relationships between the Commonwealth and State Governments, which has meant a steady erosion of State authority and power. We have come to the stage where partnership has become paternalism, and where equity has subsided into subservience. The picture is brought very sharply into focus when we remember that over the last five years the Commonwealth tax yield has increased by \$1,600 million, whilst the tax yield of all the States and all local authorities has risen by only \$300 million. In other words, the Commonwealth tax yield increase is more than fivefold that

of all the States and all local government. We must remember that this has happened in a period when there has been literally no increase whatsoever in the incidence of Federal taxation. But, to obtain their relatively modest increase, how the States have had to use the fiscal mailed fist! Every State has seen marked increases in various fields such as motor-cars, stamp duties, liquor, racing, estate duties, land tax, entertainment tax, poker machines (where they apply), turnover tax and so on. What is worse, the States know that unless a drastically new course is charted in the Federal-State relationship, this is only the beginning of a great upward spiral.

If we take our own Queensland case, our yield—not necessarily our rates—over the last seven years has risen by 50 per cent. in stamp duties, doubled with motor taxes, quadrupled with racing taxes, doubled with liquor taxes, and fees for various services have trebled. Yet the Commonwealth, with progressive income-tax rates tied to an inbuilt-revenue growth factor, does not have to bother about raising its rates and so perhaps upset its electors, who, incidentally, are our electors, too.

I think we can see the imbalance again, even more clearly, from another angle. In the 19 years since 1949 the Commonwealth total indebtedness has fallen, but in the same period, the total indebtedness of all the States has quadrupled.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: The Treasurer pointed out the other day that, if we offset the Commonwealth's indebtedness against its credits, in fact it would be in credit.

Mr. PORTER: That is quite correct. It would be in credit.

In Queensland's case, our indebtedness in the 19-year period has risen from \$288 million to over \$1,000 million, as is shown in the Financial Statement before us. Seen in percentage terms, from 1930 to 1946, the pre-uniform-taxation period, our indebtedness rose 18.8 per cent. But in the period 1946 to 1968, the uniform-taxation era, our indebtedness rose a massive 304.2 per cent.

This vastly changed picture as between the Commonwealth and the States is seen again if we look at the share of each in the total Australian indebtedness. In 1949 the States owed 37.4 per cent. of the total Australian indebtedness and the Commonwealth owed the lion's share of 62.5 per cent. By 1958, less than 10 years later, the position had altered to 56.16 per cent. for the States and only 43.9 per cent. for the Commonwealth. In 1967 the Commonwealth owed only 32.1 per cent. of all Australian indebtedness, while the States owed 67.8 per cent. In less than 20 years the situation has become totally reversed, which means, of course, that in 20 years the States' share of the Australian indebtedness has gone from 37.4 per cent.

to 67.8 per cent. and the Commonwealth's share has fallen from 62.5 per cent. to 32.1 per cent.

Mr. Walsh: The same position applies to local authorities.

Mr. PORTER: This is quite true. I mentioned that the local authorities share in this. This is part of the total indebtedness.

The vastly changed picture as between the Commonwealth and the States means that, as Australia grows—and I think this is the worst part of it—so the heavier will become the debt burden of the States and the lighter, in proportion, becomes the debt burden of the Commonwealth.

Most hon. members will know that Commonwealth reimbursement of the States, seen as a proportion of the total tax yield, has fallen in the past 10 years from 53 per cent. to 42 per cent., which means that, if Federal reimbursement of the States had kept pace with the tax yield, then the States, over the past 10 years, would have had an extra \$246,000,000 to spend.

So, whichever way one sees it, a picture emerges of such disparity that there is no wonder it is leading to desperate political situations. I think it is reasonable to say that duty charges on Commonwealth loans are becoming one of the fastest growing items in any State Budget. I suppose this inevitably paves the way for the type of attack on the Commonwealth Government that was made by Sir Henry Bolte when he dubbed it "the great Australian money-lender".

Let me repeat that this is no attack on any Government or any person. It is an attempt to analyse the situation rationally and objectively because I believe, as I said, no matter what political changes occur, the situation will be the same. For us to believe that all we want is an electoral change somewhere and all will be well is just fooling ourselves. There will be no change unless the situation is changed.

We must all recognise that current problems in this field are part of the price Australia has to pay for entering into an age of affluence. These are inescapable problems as we grow. It may well be said that the great achievement or phenomenon of the 20th century is technology. I doubt if it is, or even the development of the thermo-nuclear bomb, and it is certainly not the passing of colonialism, which some hail. I think the phenomenon of the 20th century is the growth of urbanisation.

I have often talked in this House of the era of change. Some hon. members might think I talk too much about it. But I believe it has to be repeated so that it will be understood and accepted, because one of the literal facts of life is that prosperity means that State responsibilities will inevitably outstrip their resources. In other words, the bigger, the wealthier and the more successful Australia becomes, the more responsibilities are thrust on the States and the more revenues accrue

to the Federal Government. This is the paradox of prosperity under the travesty of Federalism as we know it at present. To use the words that have been used of another country, the central Government gets the affluence whilst the State Governments get the effluent.

In simple terms, the change from a rural to an industrial economy means enormous development of present and new urban areas. This means that great stresses are imposed by the ravenous need for all sorts of services such as roads, water, power, sewerage, education, hospitals, police, outlets for leisure, and so on. Each single one of those is a State responsibility and a charge against State resources.

I do not think that any of us can console ourselves with the thought that these are short-term problems; that we are passing through a phase and, if we wait long enough, the difficulties will vanish and all will be well. Far from it. These are long-term and expanding problems which are increasing at almost a geometrical rate of progression. For instance, prosperity means more leisure. This means more motor-cars on the roads, and all the things that that connotes. People want to bring up their children in better homes and better surroundings, so they move in droves to the peripheries of the city. Parents also want their children to enjoy the fruits of education and to stay at school longer. That brings increased pressures in terms of more buildings, facilities, specialised equipment, staff and so on.

Believe me, these are no empty generalisations and no wild prediction of what might happen. These things are actually happening. Since 1957 expenditure on education has more than doubled, and hospital expenditure has increased by 150 per cent. The number of students spending two years at high school has more than doubled. To put it another way, 10 years ago only 18 per cent. of those eligible stayed for their fourth year in high school; today over 50 per cent. stay, and this percentage will increase as time passes.

Look at what has happened to our outer suburbs. There was a redistribution of State seats in 1960. When that was completed, Aspley, for instance, had just over 9,000 electors on the roll. Today it has nearly 20,000. The number of electors in Mt. Gravatt has increased from 11,000 to over 18,000. The number in Salisbury has increased from 11,000 to over 20,000, and in Mt. Coot-tha an enrolment of 10,000 has increased to over 17,000. We all know that this, too, is only the beginning.

I think it must be obvious that the aspirations generated by this new affluence are likely to be stultified unless the States are able to keep pace with the enormous demands imposed upon them by the phenomenon of galloping urbanisation. Already three-fifths of all Australians live in urban areas, and soon the number will be three-quarters. I do not want to argue whether this is a good or bad

thing; the simple point is that it exists. It is a 20th century world-wide phenomenon, and we can no more halt it than King Canute could in his day make the tide roll back. If anyone doubts the prognosis, let him bear this fact in mind: the 1935 census listed one worker in every four as engaged in rural activity, and the 1966 census listed one in 10 as engaged in such activity.

This problem of city growth has not suddenly been discovered. Of course it has not. It has been developing for quite some time and the world has entered the age of Megapolis, the super metropolis. Compared with other countries ours is at an early stage in this development, and in Queensland we are at an earlier stage than are most other States. This means that we have a better chance than most others have to do things in the right way. How we plan now, and the type of decisions that we make, will determine for generations to come the pattern of living for perhaps millions of urban citizens. I am quite sure that our decisions during the next few years will determine whether city living is to be gracious, pleasant, useful, and something that gives full rein to the proper aspirations of every citizen wanting a good life; or whether it will be cramped, noisy, frustrating and nerve-wracking. Are we going to have crowded cities in which the inanimates dominate the animates, in which things—particularly motor-cars—are regarded as more important than people? Urbanisation of that type will not permit families to blossom.

Mr. Hinze: Motor-cars are more important than people now, aren't they?

Mr. PORTER: They are indeed, and it is a great problem.

Mr. Hinze: Particularly on the Gold Coast.

Mr. PORTER: The hon. member for South Coast mentions the problem, and it is quite true that it exists to a considerable degree already. And it will get worse as time goes on unless, as I say, the States are able to keep pace with the demands that are being made on them—urbanisation's growing needs. For example, it has been estimated by experts that the freeway needs of Sydney and Melbourne at the moment are 560 miles; between them, they now have 6½ miles. Of course, there are no freeways in Brisbane.

The Police Force of every city is heavily understaffed, and I think it is agreed on all hands that the number of police is inadequate to cope with the growing menace of organised crime, which follows as day follows night the pressures of larger cities. Let us look at our own city rail service. It has not varied basically in the last 50 years. Hospital services eventually must move out to sprawling suburbs.

All our problems are those totally associated with growth. I wonder how many hon. members know that only Israel, in the whole world, has a more

explosive rate of population growth than has Australia? And our problems are aggravated, of course, by geography—by the fact that we must provide communications over vast distances—and they have been aggravated further in recent years by the necessary huge jump in defence expenditures.

Of course, there is nothing new in anything that I have said. This has been a development occurring since the end of the last war. But what is new is the fact that it is now accelerating and worsening at a terrifying rate. I have always believed that there is very little advantage in presenting the problems and merely analysing them—setting them out—unless one is also prepared to try to find useful answers. The problems of growth, as I see it, with their enormous demands upon resources, can be met in one of three ways. One can increase taxes (provide more money for the public sector), cut back the migrant intake (reduce pressures on development), or devise an entirely new concept of priorities for major capital projects.

Now, let us look at the first of these. What about enlarging taxation? Well, some advocate this. But over the last three years Commonwealth income tax has already risen from being 8 per cent. to 11 per cent. of personal incomes, and charges are constantly rising over the whole field—postage, telephones, power, rates, the field of State levies, and so on. Indeed, total tax is now well over 30 per cent. of personal incomes—in fact, it is 36.1 per cent.—and it has risen to that figure from 31 per cent. in five years; so that over one-third of all incomes today moves directly into the public sector, one way or another. Colin Clark always held that taking more than 23 to 24 per cent. of income into the public sector was directly and highly inflationary, because Government spending is not productive spending. At the present time it has gone up to 36.1 per cent; before long it will be nudging 40 per cent.

No-one will doubt that the economy is being constantly menaced by the possibility of inflation. Indeed, I venture to say that virtually all the problems—and they are great problems—that the primary industries are now facing are to the largest extent the result of the escalation of prices—the pressures of inflation. So I do not think anyone would want to see tax increases as an answer to our present problems. In any case, people are alarmed at the prospect of such increases, and that would have a political repercussion that I should imagine few Governments wish to face—unless, as some State Governments have been, they are forced into it.

In any case, as I say, to have more forced savings put into the sector of public expenditure means less savings in the voluntary sector, which is the area from which capital must be found for the private sector later on. This, of course, only provides the inflationary spiral with another giddy twist.

If we feel that we cannot increase taxes, should we cut down on our migrant intake? I doubt if this is acceptable; I think the influx of new peoples at a high rate is a kind of catalyst for our continuing economic expansion. In any case, I think the people of Australia look on a growing population rate as an article of faith, and certainly many of us look at the millions in the countries around us and believe that a high migrant intake is absolutely necessary because we are racing against time to inhabit this large, empty continent of ours. Population can well mean the survival of Australia within a few generations.

I suggest that this leaves us only with the third alternative, which is to try to devise a new concept of putting truly first things first, a new concept of priorities as to where we spend our money. This, I am afraid, calls for a considerable recasting of established and traditional ideas. Over past years Australia has known a traditional clash of rural and urban interests in this regard, and most economists think that the rural interests have generally prevailed. Certainly, many doubt if cities have had a fair crack of the whip and some wonder whether huge recurring deficits on big irrigation projects are indeed in our best national interests at this point of time. Many economists wonder whether we are still not trying to determine our capital-project priorities as though we were still living on the sheep's back. But what are the hard facts of life? This is the way it has to be looked at. As a percentage of the Australian gross national product, farm incomes over the last 10 years have fallen from 21.9 per cent. to 4.5 per cent., and we must remember that, as regards wool, the world production of acrylics, which is the staple fibre from which most artificial competition to wool is provided, has multiplied eightfold over the last eight years. Let us not draw too many conclusions from this, but equally, let us not delude ourselves as to the kind of world we are now living in and the kind of world it will be for at least several generations ahead.

Mr. Walsh: Did you refer to farm incomes?

Mr. PORTER: I am referring to farm incomes as a part of the gross national product, which I think is the true measure in terms of finance.

Imperative though it is to strike a proper and modern balance between rural and urban interests, to me this is not so imperative as radically amending the present Commonwealth-States financial relationships. Otherwise, Federalism, to which I am sure all on this side of the Committee, anyhow, are devoted, will die. It is already far advanced in galloping consumption; it falters along with wheezing and gasping breath. If ever the Federal system is to grow strong again, we must replace the

present crazy patchwork system of relationships with something that combines simplicity, clarity, equity, and, above all, sanity.

Believing that Australia desperately needs a truly Federal system, and equally believing that Federalism is already in dire straits, I offer a solution of the problems that I have posed. The solution is not new. I hasten to add that it is my own; it is not necessarily my party's, because, to the best of my knowledge, my party has not as yet come up with this form of solution. I feel that pressures are such that it does not have too much time before it has to come up with one.

Long years of operating in the top inside level, as it might be called, of a political organisation make me absolutely positive that if any changes in present Commonwealth-State relationships are to endure, if they are to withstand the sometimes parochial and sometimes political stands taken by State leaders who have no option but to keep a weather eye cocked on the next State election and perhaps make vehement demands which are more in their States' interests than in the national interest—if, in fact, we are to have changes which are changes in fact as well as in name—then I believe the changes must include transfer back to the States of some of the present Federal tax capacity.

Only in this way can we have viable, long-term prospects for Federal development. Anything else, any variant on the present system of aids or machinery for special grants—anything of that nature—will only continue the steady erosion of State authority and sovereignty and so make State Parliaments no more than mere agents of the central Government. Without hesitation, I recommend a change in the present tax structure as the only permanent method of restoring the present rather dilapidated structure of Commonwealth-State relationships.

Mr. Duggan: Without discussing the merits of your proposal, do you think (a) that the Federal party will offer it, and (b) that the State Premiers will accept it if it is offered?

Mr. PORTER: I believe there is every prospect that if it was offered the State Premiers would accept, and I believe, further, that there is a greater prospect of the central Government offering something. I certainly hope that it will.

Mr. Murray: Under pressure, by the States' recognition of this problem.

Mr. PORTER: I think under popular pressure as well. This is the thing that all of us in public office eventually tend to recognise, even if a little belatedly.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: It is important to recognise the fields of concession.

Mr. PORTER: I intend to show the field of tax in which I think this can happen, because this has a large bearing on the feasibility of any proposal to transfer taxing powers back to the States.

I certainly would not suggest that the States share in income tax. I know that this method, with its built-in revenue-growth factor, is favoured by many, but to me it seems most unlikely that the Commonwealth will ever cede anything in this field. After all, with company tax, the field of income tax is a vital tool in shaping the economic well-being of the nation. In all common sense, I think that we must concede that this is a role that a central Government must play, and in order to play it properly it must control income and company taxation. I do not think that any scheme to alter this is feasible on any ground, and I do not recommend it. Certainly I do not think we want any second bite at income tax for the States. Already Australia is one of the highest-taxed countries in the Western world, especially in the middle-income groups. I would have nothing to do with any proposal for a second go at income tax on behalf of the States.

Mr. Murray: You find it personally distasteful, in any case?

Mr. PORTER: Yes. I think that it is not only distasteful in a political sense but, in addition, it is irrational in an economic sense.

At this point of time, if the Federal Government wants to demonstrate that it is really concerned with the great and growing problems associated with Australian development, especially in this acute field of urbanisation, and show that it is concerned with more than spectacular big projects, then Canberra, right at this point of time, should take a bold, new step. It should join with the States, and not resist them, in devising a totally new financial structure which recognises the necessity for the States to have a revenue base that is tied to a growth factor. It seems sensible that to this end the States should give up all their rights under present uniform-tax arrangements. At one stroke this would end all the wrangling, all the arguments, all the horse-trading, and all the endless and inevitable dissatisfaction that flows from each Loan Council meeting and from each Premiers' Conference. If this were done, the Commonwealth Government would save about \$1,000 million in direct grants and another \$500 million in specific payments to the States for things like interest, sinking funds, education activities, Commonwealth aid road grants, and so on. The States, for their part, would agree never to touch in any way the income-tax or company-tax fields.

In return for the States' giving an absolute undertaking to get out of those fields the Commonwealth would agree to the States' having the right to levy sales tax, payroll tax, petrol tax and excise. On last year's accounts that would yield the States something in the nature of \$1,500 million, which

is almost identically the sum that the Commonwealth would save by not having to deal in grants.

Mr. Walsh: I cannot see the States taking that.

Mr. PORTER: I believe there is every prospect that the States will take it. I would certainly advocate it.

The States would then have revenues certainly no less than they have at the present time, but the eventual gain would be much greater because the States would have a return of sovereignty and they would also have an opportunity to obtain revenues tied to a growth factor. What is more, the taxation in each State would be in harmony with consumption and employment within its borders. I agree that there might well be a recognised interregnum period where less-developed States such as Queensland might need Commonwealth grants assistance. That would be needed to overcome current deficiencies but it could be tied to a formula of national development, in terms of contribution to export earnings and overseas funds. Queensland would not always need help and, one day I hope in the not so far distant future this will be one of the biggest and most prosperous and powerful States in the Commonwealth. I hope that we may then have a Federal system which will not hamstring us when our mineral, beef, and industrial programmes move into top gear.

The proposal I have made to permit the States to levy sales, excise and some other taxes in no sense threatens either people or companies with all the pernicious aspects of a dual-taxation system. I think it is the fear of dual taxation that makes people accept uniform taxation, even when they vaguely recognise the damage that it is doing to our Federal system.

Of course, some constitutional change would be required to permit the things I have mentioned to occur. Hon. members know that it could be done by agreement between the Commonwealth and the States. Sales, payroll, petrol and excise taxes are taxes not on persons but on consumption. I should like to mention in passing that, in my view, they should be imposed at the retail level rather than at the wholesale level. They should be shown as a component of the final cost so that the consumer knows the level of tax he is paying, just as he knows the level of his income tax. I can see no practical bar to this being done.

What I have proposed this morning is nothing new, and certainly it is not very revolutionary in today's context. I believe it is sensible, logical and feasible. It would still yield the Commonwealth two-thirds of its present revenues. It would free the Commonwealth from reimbursement and hand-outs to the States, except in a very limited way. But it would give the States sovereignty. It would give them control over revenues and it would give them revenues that were tied to growth. I think

it would enable the States to plan for meeting all the diverse growth responsibilities that are now falling their way. It certainly would not inhibit the Commonwealth in terms of discharging its defence or other vital responsibilities. Certainly, concurrent with any changes of this nature, I think there should be set up a formal council of State Governments, with a continuing professional secretariat, in order to ensure that not only does the Federal system work but that it keeps working in the right ways.

I have spent some time in stating what many would think are obvious problems, and I certainly would not expect anyone to challenge the problems. But I have proposed solutions, and I have no doubt that these are open to challenge. Certainly they are not easy or painless solutions, but I think we must grasp the nettle. We have reached the stage where the situation is so urgent that we must summon up all our courage, all our resolution and all our inspiration if we are to find proper remedies.

As at present, Federalism is dying and we are all helping to kill it. If we want it to live as a vital force—and in this young country of such diverse capacities and such vast distances we need a Federal system—then we have to do something positive about it. I believe that we have to stop giving lip-service to the concept of Federalism and then in fact acting treacherously to destroy it.

Only a totally new approach, only if the States have real sovereignty through utilising substantial taxing powers, only if State revenues are tied to some aspect of growth—and only then—can we hope to cope with the enormous problems of our times, which are inevitable as Australia grows bigger and stronger and as it changes in a changing world. Only in this way can we hope to help the States to stop falling further and further behind in meeting the mounting responsibilities that prosperity thrusts upon them. I venture to say that only in this way can we hope to give the overwhelming majority of Australians the type of environment they want and the type of environment to which their endeavours properly entitle them.

I conclude by saying that we are at an absolute cross-road in Australian history at the present time. Surely it is not too much to ask that we and others like us who have been elected to public office put aside our preoccupations with political supremacy, or even personal aggrandisement. We all want to be good Queenslanders, and, equally, we want to be good Australians. To this end I plead for some consideration of the case that I have made so that we and our successors can act on a big scale in the truly best interests of the Australia of today and of tomorrow.

Mr. NEWTON (Belmont) (12.37 p.m.): Let me preface my remarks on the Financial Statement by making some comment on the

many statements that have been made in this Chamber by the hon. member for Chatsworth concerning Vietnam, which he introduced in his maiden speech and on a number of other occasions, including his Budget speech, for political purposes.

It must be quite evident to the hon. member for Chatsworth that many hon. members on both sides of the Chamber could comment on the position in Vietnam. Many people who have not been involved in this theatre of war and are not likely to have their sons involved there have a good deal to say on this matter.

No doubt hon. members on both sides of the Chamber have fathers and brothers who were involved in World War I, quite a number of us were involved in World War II, and there are a number who already have their sons involved in Vietnam or are due to register and take part in a ballot. When we have a good look at the position we find that those who are mainly concerned about what is happening in Vietnam are the mothers and fathers whose sons have been called upon to serve in that theatre of war. I hope that the hon. member for Chatsworth is not called upon, like the hon. member for Norman and I, and possibly other hon. members, to visit a constituent whose son has made the supreme sacrifice as a National Serviceman. Let me assure hon. members that it is most unpleasant to be placed in the position of having to attend to such matters as the burial, the return of personal belongings, and the location of the will of a person who has made the supreme sacrifice. This is a responsibility which is more and more falling on State members, because, perhaps understandably, in some cases the Federal member, confronted with the result of his party's legislation, does no more than send a telegram of sympathy.

I now wish to refer to recent incidents in high schools. I have a son whose name has been in the ballot for National Service and another two who are liable for service in the next few years, and I am pleased to be able to say that when they were attending secondary school they were taught something of political history and politics generally and their relationship to theatres of war, including Vietnam.

Mr. Miller: Are you referring to the school staff or outsiders?

Mr. NEWTON: I am referring to ordinary classes in political history.

Mr. Miller: Conducted by staff?

Mr. NEWTON: Conducted by the staff of the school. I am not condemning them in any way. If education is to be worth while in this State, let there be no hiding of any facts. Let us tell the people what has happened in every theatre of war, including Korea and Vietnam. My sons attended the Wynnum High School and the Wynnum North High School—two different schools—and they are

fully aware, through matters that were raised at school, of the number of times on which nations have let down the people of Vietnam, irrespective of the side on which they were fighting. My sons realise probably as well as anybody who has made a study of this question that the Vietnam war will be a long, drawn-out fight because those on each side are determined on this occasion to fight for what they believe is best and not to continue to suffer as they have in the past.

That is the position that has been made known to students in secondary schools, and why shouldn't it be? After all, when a boy leaves secondary school he is 18 or 19 years old, and immediately he has to decide whether he should tie himself to a permanent job with the ballot for National Service hanging over his head. That is not an easy decision to make, and it is important for young people to know what is happening in Vietnam.

There is no doubt in my mind that the principals, deputy principals, and others concerned in high schools endeavour to do the best that they can, within their areas of control, in these matters. In the case of what happened the other day, it is the responsibility of the Police Department to deal, under the Traffic Act, with any person caught handing out literature outside school-grounds.

I now wish to deal with the Budget, which is the third presented by the present Treasurer. Some peculiar names have been given to Budgets over the years, and the present Treasurer has used several phrases to describe his. His first two were called "push ahead" Budgets, and the present one is a "march to progress" Budget.

That does not amaze hon. members on this side of the Chamber, because a Treasurer who introduces a Budget in a pre-election year never knows whether the Government of which he is a member will be returned to office to implement the proposals contained in that Budget. Unfortunately for the present Treasurer, on the political scene he has had a very stormy year inside his own party. As was indicated by the hon. member for Toowong, some new procedures have been adopted in the Budget. When I first entered this Chamber in 1960, the Treasurer's Financial Statement was presented to the parliament in a form similar to that of the present Budget, but it was printed on only the ordinary newsprint paper. Later a change was made and the Budget was printed as it would appear in "Hansard". Members of the Opposition at the time pointed out to the Government of the day that that was not a very good method, because it did not facilitate putting on the side of the paper notes or comments on certain aspects of the Budget. However, we were told that that had been done to save expense.

What do we find now? In bringing down his first two Budgets, the present Treasurer followed that pattern; but on this occasion, for some unknown reason, hon. members have been given a glossy document—a very costly document to print. It is printed on gloss paper and contains all the political propaganda that one would expect to find in a document that is really the first step in electioneering by the present Government.

Let me now deal with taxes and what has been done by Country-Liberal Governments since they have been in office compared with what was done by former Labour Governments. It is very interesting to make such a comparison because the Australian Labour Party has been charged with introducing many new taxation measures when it was the governing party in this State.

Members of the Opposition do not deny that a number of new taxes were imposed by Labour Governments; but let me compare the period of eight years from 1949 to 1957 under Labour with a similar period of eight years—from 1958 to 1966—under Tory Governments. What do we find? In the eight years of Labour Government only six new taxation measures were introduced into this Chamber, whereas in a similar period of eight years under Country-Liberal Governments no fewer than 19 new taxation measures were introduced.

Between 1949 and 1957, when Australian Labour Party Governments were in office in Queensland, the new taxation measures introduced were—

1949—Nil.

1950—Motor tax: from August, 1950, motor registration fees on new vehicles increased and from October, 1950, on renewals.

1951—Nil.

1952—Motor tax: from February and March, 1952, registration fees increased by approximately 50 per cent.; also from 1 October, 1952, change from driver's licence fee to driving fee.

1953—Nil.

1954—Nil.

1955—Liquor Tax: from 1 July, 1955, increase in various liquor licences and fees.

1956—Nil.

1957—Stamp Duty: from 1 January, 1957, increase in duty on cheques.

That covers the eight-year period prior to this Government's taking office. Dealing with the period after 1957, the following position obtained:—

1957—Land tax: for 1957-58 year, property revaluations made.

1958—Racing tax: from 8 November, 1958, stamp duty on betting tickets increased. Motor tax: from 3 October, 1958, driving fee increased.

1959—Stamp duty: from 26 November, 1959, duty imposed on certain transfers of Crown leaseholds; Stamp duty on various other items also increased.

1960—Nil.

1961—(The year following an election). Motor tax: from 1 April, 1961, transfer fees increased; Stamp duty: from 7 April, 1961, where Queensland-registered company carried insurance policies outside the State on properties inside it, stamp duty became payable on such policy.

1962—Racing tax: from 1 March, 1962, tax on betting turnover imposed on on-course bookmakers; off-course bookmakers licensed and turnover tax and stamp duty on betting tickets imposed; from 11 August, 1962, Totalisator Board established for off-course bets and turnover tax imposed; Liquor tax: from 1 January, 1962, liquor licence fee increased.

1963—Nil.

1964—Nil.

1965—Motor tax: from 29 April, 1965, driving fee increased; fee to be paid on initial issue of licence.

Coming now to the year following the 1966 election, we again find as many increases in taxation in the State as were imposed following the 1960 election, and I think that this is what the people of Queensland should look at. This Government has adopted the policy of introducing five or six new taxation measures immediately on being returned to office after an election. That has been done in the past, as records will show. Following the 1966 election there were increases in rail freights and fares, State transport fees, motor vehicle registration, stamp duty on workers' compensation, stamp duty on the registration of all motor vehicles, and in charges on private hospitals operating in the State. This Government has not been at all backward in imposing taxes on the people of Queensland.

Turning now to the present Budget, there are several noticeable omissions of items that were included in previous Budgets and the Opposition is concerned that no reference has been made to these matters. One of the most important is the omission of any amount to cover wage increases that will possibly take place in the State in the present financial year. When this Budget was being compiled an application had already been lodged in the Commonwealth court, and the Government and its officers would have been fully aware of this.

Since then a decision has been given in the Federal sphere, and an application has been lodged with the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission of Queensland. Past custom and practice clearly indicates that any adjustment that is made to the

Federal basic wage, which is now called the "total wage", is made to the State basic wage. Why does not the Government set aside a sum of money to cover such an adjustment and thus indicate to the people of Queensland, particularly workers under State awards and on fixed incomes, what it intends to do in this field? The Budget contains nothing on this matter. At least the previous Treasurer clearly indicated where his Government stood in the matter of wage increases to workers, even though he often used such expressions as "stay-put" Budget and "tighten the belt" Budget.

In other States, particularly in Victoria, a great deal is being done about setting up consumers' protection councils, but the Budget contains no mention of this very important matter. This, too, is tied up with the basic wage, and the establishment of such a council in this State is long overdue because nearly all price controls have been lifted and present indications are that landlords will ask the State Government to lift the little that remains of price control.

The Budget does not mention the important matter of redundancy. In the Address-in-Reply debate the hon. member for Ithaca spoke on this matter, so that the Government is fully aware of the redundancy that exists. The Budget contains no indication of the Government's attitude on it.

On the introduction of day-time training for apprentices at technical colleges, again the Budget is silent. It does not indicate whether the Government intends to implement fully its policy of day-time training or whether it is approaching the matter in a half-hearted manner.

I turn now to the very important matter of railway fares. Whilst the Treasurer grants certain concessions in rail freights, he makes no provision at all for concessions in fares paid by passengers on the State's railways. This fact does not surprise the Opposition, because the Government has clearly indicated its attitude of lack of concern for railway passengers. All that the Government is concerned about is long goods hauls and the freights charged for such hauls. It is quite content to let private bus operators cater for those people who would otherwise travel on trains. Surely to goodness the recent dispute between the Brisbane City Council and its tram and bus employees indicated to the Government that it should be responsible for the transport of people in the metropolitan area.

On many occasions members of the Opposition have advocated the electrification of the metropolitan railway system. We have indicated to the Government that it should have implemented this scheme when it took office in 1957. Brisbane is now a sprawling city, and when in the future a ring-rail system is provided in the metropolitan area the Government will have to pay double the amount that would presently be payable to resume the land.

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

Mr. NEWTON: I will now outline the finance that the 1966 taxation methods brought to the Government and the effect of the concessions contemplated in the present Budget. From the Treasurer's remarks when presenting the 1966 Financial Statement we understood that the increase in rail fares and freights was expected to yield an extra \$13,400,000 in the remaining period of 1966-67 and in 1967-68; transport fees were expected to yield an extra \$1,250,000; motor vehicle registration fees, an extra \$4,660,000; premiums on workers' compensation policies, an extra \$620,000; stamp duty on registration of motor vehicles, an extra \$3,000,000; and increased charges for private hospital beds, an extra \$1,250,000. If those increased charges were received by the Government it had an extra sum of \$24,180,000 available to it for the remainder of 1966-67 and for 1967-68. In one year the Government would have benefited by \$14,616,000.

On looking at the statements in the 1966 Budget, it will be seen from what the Treasurer indicated that from freight and transport fees the Government gained an extra \$9,150,000. The present concessions by way of rail freights, transport fees, weigh-bridge concessions and other relief measures will total \$3,550,000. I have no doubt that the present Budget document has been distributed throughout Queensland and that it has been taken to Tokyo, America and other places visited by the Treasurer. Doubtless the man on the land, who is represented by the Country Party, the major party in the coalition Government, will be looking very closely at it. It is well known that a number of meetings have already been held throughout the State to see just what advantages will be gained from the Budget. I am sure that after the 1966 election, following the taxation principles that were introduced by the coalition Government, numerous complaints came from the country people about freight increases.

As usual the main features are set out at the end of the Financial Statement and I will now examine them to see what concessions the Government is granting. Most of the main features of expenditure have been mentioned by the Opposition time and time again, particularly after the 1966 election. The main items of expenditure in the Budget are education, family assistance, hospitals, and matters concerning Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders. It does not surprise us that they are the main avenues of expenditure because, apart from what has been said by members of the Opposition, protests have come from the Queensland Teachers' Union, the Queensland Police Union and the State Service Union at the treatment they have received from this Government, particularly since the 1966 election.

Mr. Davies: The teachers had to threaten to strike.

Mr. NEWTON: That is true, and other people threatened that if they did not get some results they would take similar action.

Much has been said in this debate about the assistance that will be given to denominational schools. The way this matter has been bandied around the Chamber, one is led to believe that the people who have children attending State primary and secondary schools contribute nothing towards the education of their children. Let me point out one matter that the Government should investigate, namely, the general-purpose fees charged by State high schools to provide some of the materials used by students. It was indicated at a speech night that I attended recently that this fee would be increased to \$3 a year, and that this amount was low compared with what was charged by some high schools in the State.

Mr. Davies: They compel widows to pay it, and they threaten to take it out of the Children's Services Department allowance if it is not paid.

Mr. NEWTON: That is true.

It was indicated that there was a sliding scale under which a family man who had a number of children attending the same high school paid about 50c less. But it is still a burden. In addition, parents provide the materials necessary in the teaching of domestic science and manual training, and for other courses.

Mr. Davies: The poor children are made to pay for the rich.

Mr. NEWTON: This is the position, yet it is bandied around the Chamber that the parents who send their children to State primary and secondary schools contribute nothing at all.

I shall now deal with the amount set aside for a new syllabus. Again we see what we have witnessed many times in this Chamber—another change in the education syllabus. An amount has been allowed for this, but let us face the fact that when a new syllabus is introduced—it is stated that a new syllabus will be introduced for English, mathematics and social studies—if the textbooks are not readily available through the schools where the new syllabus will be introduced, the parents have to put their hands into their pockets again.

Mr. Sherrington: Most of the textbooks are printed in Hong Kong.

Mr. NEWTON: As is indicated by the hon. member for Salisbury, the textbooks are sometimes not even printed in Queensland.

Clerk-typists are to be provided in Class I primary schools, and I appeal to the Government to have enough foresight not to appoint junior clerk-typists to these positions.

As I have indicated previously, I should like to see the work in high schools shared more equally by the principal, the deputy

principal and the principal mistress. Take, for example, Cavendish Road State High School, which is in my electorate, with an intake of 1,660 pupils. It has one principal, one deputy principal and a principal mistress. It is not possible for the principal, let alone the deputy principal, to get out and supervise anything. As has been indicated by Opposition members previously, there should be a principal and a deputy principal for every 500 children in a State high school. This has become even more necessary since the Government transferred eighth grade to secondary schools.

Mr. Houston: Schools are too big for effective control.

Mr. NEWTON: That is true. We have even said to the Government that subject masters should be appointed in high schools to supervise the teaching of specific subjects, and, where they have diplomas or additional qualifications in those subjects, they should receive extra payment.

The Government is now going to pay the cost of school telephone rentals and official calls. This has been done only because the matter was raised by the Opposition years ago. In 1960 the Government introduced the payment of 50 per cent. of these costs and, because it is realised that the Opposition put forward something that was sound in principle and should have applied previously, the Government has now gone the whole distance.

Increased grants are to be made to the Creche and Kindergarten Association. For once I am agreeing with what the hon. member for Chatsworth had to say on this matter. Just recently, with Lady Cilento and the Leader of the Opposition, whose electorate adjoins mine, it was my pleasant duty to open a kindergarten at Tingalpa. Because of the high cost of living in this State today, the absence of price control, and an increase to 5½ per cent. in the interest rates on housing finance, women are being forced to go out to work to maintain their homes and families. Why, then, should not the Treasurer give some assistance in the Budget to those who do the wonderful work of the Creche and Kindergarten Association?

Mr. Miller: What is the biggest increase in the cost of housing?

Mr. NEWTON: The hon. member would want to interrupt me when I have such a lot to say.

Mr. Miller: You are talking about the cost of housing.

Mr. NEWTON: The increase in the cost of housing nowhere approximates the increase in repayments on housing loans as a result of the higher interest rates. On a loan from the Commonwealth Bank of \$7,000, the interest paid over 25 years at 5 per cent. amounts to \$5,276. That is the amount that

has to be paid in interest on the purchase of a new home by a young couple. If the interest rate increases to 5½ per cent., the same loan will cost an additional \$620. The monthly repayments will rise from \$41 to \$43, which is an increase of \$2. Do hon. members opposite say that is nothing? Where do they think these people find the extra money? The interest paid over 25 years amounts to 84 per cent., or almost as much again, of the original loan.

A Government Member: How much have land values risen?

Mr. NEWTON: I do not want to be sidetracked by interjections from hon. members on the other side.

The matter of family assistance has also been raised time and time again on this side of the Chamber, and it is about time that the Commonwealth Government faced up to its responsibilities. The Commonwealth Government has the taxing powers, and it should be providing the social services required throughout the Commonwealth. The State Government is, of course, called upon to do its share. If a family is living in a State rental home and the husband deserts his wife and family, the State faces up to its responsibilities by reducing the rent. For far too long has the Commonwealth Government refused to face up to its share of the responsibility in this matter.

Mr. Miller: Do you agree that the highest costs forced on young people today are those for which the Brisbane City Council is responsible?

Mr. NEWTON: I am not discussing the Brisbane City Council; I am at present discussing the Budget brought down by the Treasurer on behalf of the Government.

The Budget provides for the appointment of an additional 100 nursing sisters to hospitals throughout the State. Again the Government is years behind the times. That should have been done years ago. Where is it going to get 100 nursing sisters? It will probably find that they have all gone to the southern States. Why should they stay in a low-wage State such as Queensland?

Additional amounts are being allocated for hospitals—not before time. Hospital boards have approached the Opposition and pointed out that they have submitted budgets to cover their requirements, the pruning knife has been put through them, the amounts have been slashed, and they have had to exist as best they can. Because protests such as those have been made, the Government, through the Treasurer, has included in the Budget some provision to assist in overcoming the problem.

The Government also proposes to do something for the Police Force. Again it is not before time. Members of the Opposition have complained time and time again about the shortage of personnel and the conditions applying in the Queensland Police Force. But the Government has missed the main point.

It is not setting up new police districts or providing new police stations. As other hon. members on this side of the Chamber have indicated, the best way of overcoming many of the problems is to have local police stations staffed by police officers who know the problems of the area in which they are stationed, know when a stranger comes into the area, and know what to expect and what to do about it. Under the system now operating, in a number of suburbs, particularly on the south side of the river, if there is trouble after midnight it is necessary to wait till a patrol car comes out from Woolloomgatta police station.

Mr. Houston: Everything is done on the cheap.

Mr. NEWTON: It is a shocking state of affairs.

The Government cannot convince the Opposition that the Police Force and the Public Service unions are happy about the things to which I have referred. It is well known that the Police Force is not happy, and when the legislation relative to the Police Superannuation Fund is introduced into this Chamber it will be interesting to see just what the true position is.

Under the Budget, the Government is endeavouring to do something to hold State public servants in Queensland. The Opposition has no argument with that, because, as hon. members have indicated already during this debate, the State cannot afford to lose its employees. Action such as this should have been taken years ago. The Government is only waking up now, years too late.

I turn now to Aboriginal and Island Affairs. I agree with the sentiments expressed recently by the hon. member for South Coast relative to the appointment of a select parliamentary committee to consider the problems of Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders. There is no doubt in my mind about the need for such a committee. Thanks to the invitation extended to me by the Minister in charge of Aboriginal and Island Affairs at the time, I was recently a member of a parliamentary committee that made a trip to northern areas of the State. The committee was accompanied by the Director of Aboriginal and Island Affairs and the Under Secretary of the Minister's department. In talking to the people in those areas, I found that they said, "This is the fourth parliamentary delegation that has visited the Peninsula and the northern islands". It is well known that no delegation goes there in election years, and four or five years have now elapsed since the first delegation visited these people. They say that one of the first things they were told was that most of their housing problems would be solved within five years. They are losing faith in delegations that go through the areas saying things such as that and then doing nothing about them.

Mr. Miller: You can't say that nothing is being done.

Mr. NEWTON: The hon. member should wait a moment and not get on his high horse. I will use my ammunition; he can answer it later.

I do not wish to score politically on this. I make it quite clear that a parliamentary select committee should be one of the first bodies to deal with this problem. Under the 1955 legislation, which took away the normal rations previously supplied to these people, they are finding it very hard to live. There is no doubt that where the ration system is not applied it is almost impossible to discover the income of these people.

I am pleased that the hon. member is cocking his ear and taking notes. If he wants to, he can make his own contribution on this subject. We found that the standard of living of these people has been reduced. In most cases, they find they now have to live within their incomes. The only true estimation one can get of the income of these people is where they are on Commonwealth social services, such as age and invalid pensioners and people such as that. Otherwise, it is almost impossible to get a clear picture of what their income is.

On the question of housing, let me say that on a number of the islands that we visited we found three types of houses. Some modern homes were provided, but they were small in number. That is easy to understand when one considers the number of islands in the Torres Strait group on which these people are residing, and the number of areas on the mainland. Unfortunately, we found that where a modern home is provided it is not provided with a bathroom. We found laundries in outhouses and a community system for showering and bathing facilities. If we are to provide homes for these people, and if we believe in equality, let us provide for them what we are providing for our own people. On quite a number of the islands we found iron gunyahs. They are not very attractive and one can imagine what they would be like in hot weather. It is true that they cool off very quickly after the sun sets, but we should not forget that in these areas there are long, drawn-out days. One of the Aborigines who spoke to me asked, "Couldn't you get me one of these modern houses?" I said, "Look, I am up here with the delegation. What is your particular problem?" He said, "I am a married man with 13 children and I am sharing two palm houses".

These palm houses have walls built of palm with straw roofs. The straw is anything from 18 inches to 2 feet thick, and I was told that, depending on seasonal conditions, the life of these buildings is around two years, when the palm walls and straw roofs have to be replaced. Housing is one of their major problems.

Another problem, of course, is employment. The Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs is endeavouring to do what it can. It employs native personnel for administrative purposes, on Government boats, in sawmills and machinery shops, on the slipway at Thursday Island for lugger repairs, on road work, on timber hauling and in agriculture in all fields. In outside employment they are employed at the pearl culture station, on luggers and fishing boats, at the Thursday Island auxiliary hospital and mission aid posts and as teachers for the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs. But it was quite evident everywhere we went that much more needs to be done in finding employment for these people.

On the question of education, on the mainland the Education Department has faced up to its responsibilities and we saw some vast improvements on what exists in the islands. When we talk about temporary classroom accommodation, compared with any other place in the State Palm Island would be a shocker to any person in this Chamber. In this field, too, something should be done. On Thursday Island we found probably the most modern school in this State. However, we found that the water supply in quite a number of places, and particularly on Thursday Island, had reached a very low level. In a number of villages water is rationed from October through to the commencement of the wet season. The department has done a good job in trying to alleviate this problem. When water is available it is supplied to a needy township, but in order to conserve supplies the use of water has to be rationed and the supply is turned off for a certain period.

The matter of land for home-ownership has been raised quite often in recent months, and it was mentioned during the visit of the parliamentary delegation to the Torres Strait islands.

In many places we found that no electric power was available and that the people had to use hurricane lamps, power-pressure lights, fuel stoves, and kerosene refrigerators when they can be obtained. Possibly the department has the money to provide these amenities, but they are very hard to obtain. On some of the remote islands it is impossible to keep meat, such as turtle meat. It is not uncommon to see a turtle turned on its back on the beach but still alive. Nothing would be achieved by killing the turtle before its meat was required because no cold-storage facilities are available. So that eventually, when the turtle meat is needed, the turtle is killed and the meat is distributed around the island on the same day.

The social welfare of the Islanders has reached a very high level, and I pay great credit to the Mothers' Union and the various societies for young girls that function on many of the Torres Strait islands. Some of the societies have their own halls, and some have their own crockery with their insignias

printed on it. The main problem facing the womenfolk and young girls is the presence of alcohol on the islands. These societies realise that if the Islanders are to be assimilated they have to face up to problems such as alcohol. It is no use trying to solve some problems associated with assimilation and leaving the most important ones till last.

To sum up, let me say that many of the aspects of island life will be considered by the present Government, and they will certainly be considered by the Opposition after it becomes the Government at the 1969 election. One aspect to which I particularly refer is the fact that control at Cooktown and on Thursday Island is exercised by an administrator instead of by a local authority. This set-up needs to be seen to be believed. The appearance of both of these places indicates that this is a bad system and that it must be changed by the Government, irrespective of its political colour.

The party inspected sawmills at Bamaga and Yarrabah. There is no doubt that if those mills were modernised and used to their full capacity to treat the large quantity of timber that is available on the reserves, the housing problem could be quite easily overcome. The problem is not as difficult as one might imagine, because the Housing Commission implements a policy of pre-cutting houses at its sawmills. Two sawmills are established, ample supplies of timber are available, and an ample work-force is available, so there is no doubt that houses can be provided on the islands far cheaper than on the mainland. One difficulty facing the mills is the transport of the sawn timber to the islands. However, this difficulty can be overcome with the provision of modern barges and ships. I do not envisage anything like the "Melbidir". I see no reason why the Queensland Housing Commission should not face up to its responsibility of providing housing at some of the villages, and particularly on Thursday Island.

Mr. R. Jones: There was not one Housing Commission home anywhere.

Mr. NEWTON: That is right, and Thursday Island is the key to the Torres Strait islands group.

Mr. Tucker: Houses are built for overseas companies all over Queensland.

Mr. NEWTON: That is true. An answer to a question yesterday made it plain that we are building homes for any companies that come to Queensland, yet we are doing nothing for these people.

All matters affecting the health of these native people should be controlled by the Department of Health. The hospital at Thursday Island, for example, should be under its control. The Thursday Island hospital is an eye-opener. A modern operating theatre has been provided, as well as other new buildings, but unfortunately the old hospital building still stands. If a local authority controlled the area it would have been

condemned years ago. It is a pity that the nucleus of a new hospital has not been built at Thursday Island.

The problems of education are once again foremost in our minds. The Department of Education should take over all the educational responsibilities in the Torres Strait islands group. Transport is difficult, as the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha has pointed out. At present four Government-owned boats serve the area, but surely we can be modern in this field. As was pointed out during our tour, liaison should be established between the Commonwealth Government and the State Government so that a helicopter could be provided, not only for hospital services but also for other Government departments and thus provide a fast, modern means of transport.

The hon. member for South Coast said recently that Aboriginal reserves should be made more self-supporting. In our opinion the Departments of Primary Industries and Lands should provide assistance so that these people can get expert advice. We do not doubt that they could be self-supporting. They could earn much of the necessary finance and thus relieve considerably the strain on the Treasurer's purse in providing the things that are necessary for coloured people throughout the State and in the islands.

We must closely examine the release of land for home-ownership on the islands adjacent to Thursday Island. In the reply to a question asked by the hon. member for Cairns, it was pointed out that Thursday Island is the hub for the Torres Strait islands, and the people who live in the northern part of Cape York Peninsula, as far down as Bamaga and possibly further. If these people can save enough money or raise the finance, they should be able to build homes close to the centre where the best facilities are available, particularly educational facilities.

We must closely examine water conservation on Thursday Island to ensure that an adequate water supply is available for future development, and to meet the needs of the expected increase in population.

Another important matter is the bringing of people closer together, or the creating of suburbs such as we saw at Bamaga, Cowal Creek, New Mapoon, and another centre. There were four centres not far apart at which settlements have been created. Most of the people were happy but quite a number, who were used to living on the seafloor, were not happy. When a decision is made to shift a village from one place to another, a vote should be taken to ensure that ill-feeling is not created.

In the interests of assimilation, European foster-homes for Aborigines have been established throughout the State. These should also be set up and encouraged amongst Aboriginal people. This is being done at the present time. To my knowledge, quite a number of Aboriginal and Island children

have been adopted out to Europeans. But there is nothing wrong with encouraging this sort of thing amongst the Aborigines themselves. On Palm Island we saw quite a number of orphan boys being looked after in their section by Aboriginal parents—a wife and husband—and it was a credit to them. In the girls' section, the girls were being looked after by some other people.

These are only propositions that have been submitted. I hope that the Government will take them into consideration and that if ever a select committee is set up, which would be a good idea, its members could get their teeth into these things. There is no doubt in my mind that we could reach complete agreement on many of these matters.

Something that needs urgent attention is the position of girls who have completed their primary education. On Thursday Island there is a good secondary school. Accommodation is provided so that boys can attend that high school, and they have a place to which they can return at night. But that is not the position with girls. To show how enthusiastic some of the girls are, they are spending a third year in the eighth grade, wanting to learn, to know our ways, to become part of our community, and to fit in with the provisions of the legislation introduced by this Government.

In the short time left at my disposal I shall deal with the Contractors' and Workmen's Lien Act, which was repealed by this Government following the 1966 election. We pointed out to the Government at that time that there would be repercussions following the repeal of that Act. We were assured that there was nothing to worry about and that the Department of Labour and Tourism would watch the loss of wages and everything else. But by the time the Department of Labour and Tourism receives a complaint that certain people have been underpaid wages and leave entitlements, and catches up with the subcontractor or contractor concerned, the final payments have been made and, when the contractor is taken to court, he is sent to prison because he has failed not only to pay for materials he has purchased but also to pay his employees.

(Time expired.)

Mr. N. T. E. HEWITT (Mackenzie) (2.53 p.m.): Firstly, I pay a tribute and say farewell to quite a number of hon. members of this Parliament who have been good friends of mine for many years. They are Alf Muller and Eddie Beardmore of the Country Party, Arthur Coburn, Jack Duggan, who has served this Parliament faithfully and well for many years, "Johnno" Mann, Fred Graham, Jack Dufficy, Peter Byrne and, last but not least so far as I am concerned, Jim Donald. When I entered this House—I was the only member to win a seat in 1956—Jim Donald helped

me and showed me around the departments. Therefore, I pay him a tribute today, and, whether we on this side agree with him politically or not, we must admit that at all times he is a thorough gentleman.

That brings me to the astounding speech just delivered by the hon. member for Belmont, who accused the Government of not facing up to its responsibilities. If one looks back to what happened in the education field in the years prior to this Government's coming to office, one will see a very poor record. I say that in the full knowledge of the conditions that applied throughout the far-flung parts of the State. I have the honour to represent the area from Nebo in the north to Gayndah in the south, and when I became the member for Mackenzie there were in that entire area two secondary departments and no high schools. Today there are 12 secondary departments and two high schools in that area.

An examination of the education record in country areas shows that whereas in Labour's time there were 369 primary-school transport services and three secondary-school transport services in the State, there are today 805 primary-school services and 240 secondary-school services. Let us also look at the number of high schools and secondary departments. In Labour's day there were 39 high schools and 38 secondary departments, whereas today there are 101 high schools and 66 secondary departments. I do not know how people can get up in this Chamber and say some of the things that they do. In addition to the things that I have mentioned, there are now remote-area scholarships and allowances for people who bring their children to school bus services, and also the School of the Air, which provides education for children in far-flung areas. In the light of those developments, it is astounding to hear the criticism of education facilities in this State.

The Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs has also been criticised. I wish to have something to say about that department, because at least I can say that I have played my part in trying to do something for it. I have not come in here trying to be critical; I merely feel that I have done a job of work for it. When we became the Government in 1957, the late Dr. Noble visited Foleyvale, in the Duaranga district. I was with him on that occasion, and things there were deplorable. I made some remark, and Dr. Noble said to me, "Would you be interested in doing something to try to assist?" I agreed. In those days the income of the Aborigines in that part of Queensland amounted to \$12,218, and when I virtually ceased to work in conjunction with that department in January of this year I was able to boast that this year's income would be in the vicinity of \$250,000. I feel that what has been done there has been worth while.

We hear some members say that Aboriginal reserves should be made self-supporting. Hon. members opposite had the opportunity to do

that. They had a first-class property in the Duaranga district. Although the block was taken over from Balcomba station in 1946, the boundary still was not fenced in 1958, and the cattle of Wilson and McDouall were still running there. It is amazing to hear some of the criticisms offered in this Chamber.

I have taken the trouble to go to the north of Queensland, where 5,000,000 acres are tied up by the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs, and I say that it is the responsibility of the Government to continue making efforts to develop these areas and make them self-supporting. I do not disagree with the thoughts of the hon. member for Belmont in this matter, but let us not be critical of what has happened in the past. The record of hon. members opposite is a very sorry one. All that I am saying is that we should look to the future and try to do something for these people. It is no use coming here and being blindly critical without wanting to expose all the facts. Certainly that has not been done this afternoon.

There has also been talk of what the Government has done in the provision of hospital services. Let us consider the hospital at Emerald. It cost \$710,000, with a bed capacity far in excess of what was needed. But it was put there for political reasons, whilst the hospital at Augathella still had tin walls and was in a shocking condition. Theodore and many other places were denied hospitals. All I say to the hon. member is: do not come in here and play politics in that regard. He will not do himself any good by doing that.

Mr. Newton: I tried to keep politics out of it.

Mr. N. T. E. HEWITT: If the hon. member wants to be political, he should get his facts correct. He certainly did not do that in this debate.

The hon. member for Belmont spoke also about delegations that have been to North Queensland. I cannot even recall Labour Governments being interested in sending delegations to northern areas to have a look at the problems there. I have spent days in that area, flying around in a small aircraft, tripping around in jeeps, having a look and trying to do something useful. Unlike the hon. member, I have not come into the Chamber and tried to make political capital to the disadvantage of people who are trying to assist.

Mr. R. Jones: Eddie Wallis-Smith is doing a good job there.

Mr. N. T. E. HEWITT: If Eddie Wallis-Smith is doing a good job, I am not against him. Good luck to him, if he is. But hon. members opposite should not hold up their record in the past in the field of Aboriginal and Island affairs.

Mr. Tucker: Why don't you drop into your usual role and give the Government a send-off?

Mr. N. T. E. HEWITT: I have always been a free thinker in this Chamber; I shall continue to be a free thinker. I have always been prepared to say what I think, and I have a few suggestions to make later to the Government that I hope will be adopted. However, I do not want to come here only to make cheap political capital.

The Commonwealth Government has given some assistance by making available \$800,000 for housing, \$325,000 for education, and another \$325,000 for health. I believe that that will be for the good of the State. However, I do say—I want to be fair in this—that there is still much to be desired relative to the 5,000,000 acres of country that the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs holds. It is a very large tract of land, and the Government should be vitally interested in its development. It could provide a further avenue for Commonwealth Government assistance in a developmental scheme—perhaps a scheme similar to the brigalow land development scheme—and I make that suggestion to the Government. I do not know whether it would be practicable. As I said earlier, I have visited the area, so I am not making the suggestion without having been there. Naturally, it would be a long-range programme; the people are a long way away from being ready to be settled on the land.

Mr. Miller: The Commonwealth Government did come to the party.

Mr. N. T. E. HEWITT: I mentioned a short while ago that the Commonwealth had made available \$1,450,000 for housing, education, and health.

Mr. Newton interjected.

Mr. N. T. E. HEWITT: I say they could; but we have to be practical and sensible. I know something about the problems. I have dealt with the people; I have tried to make a go of it with them; I know their capabilities. I have shown what can be done by changing a \$12,218 income to one of \$250,000 at the end of June this year.

However, I believe that something can be done with the huge tract of land that is held by the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs in Queensland. I suggest to the Government that it should consider the question and possibly set up a committee to investigate it. I make that suggestion in the hope that it may assist the Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders.

Mr. Tucker: The Government would not accept it because you put it forward. You are offside.

Mr. N. T. E. HEWITT: I do not know whether I am offside. I may not be as offside as the hon. member thinks I am. There is one thing of which I am sure: I will be back here in 1969.

Many matters in the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs leave something to be desired. But we have come a long way, and I hope that we will continue that way,

as we shall if we keep the sound policy that has been enunciated by Pat Killoran, Lloyd McDonald, and others, with whom I had the honour to work while cattle adviser to the department and who, I believe, are doing their very best for these people. At the same time, I believe that if we come into this Chamber we should put forward suggestions even though they may not immediately be capable of implementation.

Getting away from that angle, I should like to say something relative to finance which again is tied up with development. I refer to the Agricultural Bank. This is a wonderful institution. It has done a tremendous amount. I do not suppose any other bank has been as good to the settlers over the years as the Agricultural Bank has, but I feel that the present limit of \$20,000, introduced in January, 1960, is not realistic today when we take into consideration increases in stock prices, improvements, machinery costs, and everything else. I ask the Treasurer to keep this in mind so that at some time in the not too far distant future he may see fit to increase the present limit and help those people who now find themselves in a plight.

Another matter that I want to raise is transport. I realise that the Treasurer has done a very good job in the Budget and has reduced transport fees in many ways. At the same time, I cannot help but feel that there are in the Transport Act many anomalies which are not good for the development of Queensland. In some cases, particularly, they react against certain areas.

In my own area, I take the case of cattle being transported from Planet Downs, which is some 67 miles from Springsure by road, and railed 201 miles to Rockhampton, compared with a distance of 96 miles by road to Duaringa and 64 miles to Rockhampton by rail. As hon. members can see, it is 268 miles from Planet Downs to Springsure by road and then by rail to Rockhampton, whereas it is 160 miles from Planet Downs to Rockhampton via Duaringa. This simply means that a settler is up for the full 20c because it is 67 miles to Springsure and therefore closer than it is to Duaringa. Such anomalies are not good. No-one can tell me that a settler will send cattle 67 miles by road to Springsure and then rail them 201 miles to Rockhampton when he can send them 160 miles by road. The time factor comes into it as well. If we stop to think, we soon realise that it takes about three or four times as long to go round by Springsure, Emerald and down to Gracemere.

This is one of the anomalies that we should try to correct. Not only is it an anomaly in that way but it is also anomalous when one realises that these people can transfer their cattle to Roma without the payment of any transport fees at all, because they are not running in competition with the railways. In other words, Rockhampton and Central Queensland generally are the losers as a result of this anomaly.

I draw attention to this anomaly because I regard it is a bad one. In addition, I instance the case of cattle being sold at Lonesome Creek and Nipan saleyards, which are 10 and 15 miles respectively from Theodore. They can be transported to Wandoan without attracting a permit fee, but cattle sold at Moura, which is a little more than 10 miles further away, attract the full permit fee. That is the logical and natural way for people buying cattle in that clean area to transport them. But because they are over the 25-mile limit they have to pay the full permit fee, whereas cattle sold at Nipan and Theodore, which is just 10 miles closer, attract no permit fee.

Then there is the case of cattle that are trucked from, say, Emerald, through to Baralaba. Take the instance of a trucker who has only one K wagon of cattle. The cattle can be transported to Rockhampton, but from Rockhampton to Baralaba and Theodore only three trains run each week, so that the cattle have to be offloaded and re-trucked and sent to Baralaba or Theodore. If they were offloaded at Duringa they could be taken across to Baralaba by road, a distance of only 45 miles or a one-hour run, and in my opinion no permit fee should be imposed in such circumstances. This is one of the anomalies that the Government should look at. It has crept in, and it should be corrected.

In addition, anomalies exist relative to companies like the Camboon Pastoral Co., which operates in the Theodore district. It shifts its cattle across to its property on the other side of Baralaba and it has to pay the full fee because of a railway line which runs from Theodore to Baralaba. It is not practicable for the company to transport its stock by rail. The company has to drive its cattle to Theodore, load them on the railway wagons, unload them at Baralaba, and then carry them by road to the other property. If it could carry them by road transport from one property to the other its operations would be made much more simple. This is another anomaly that the Government must look at.

I turn now to the carriage of lucerne hay. Everyone realises that this is a bulky product and that trucks cannot be loaded with it to anything like their full capacity. I believe that this product is purchased only when it is a necessity, in times of drought and as a protective measure. The rate for lucerne hay is 3c a ton-mile on the registered capacity of the vehicle. I feel that the carriage of this product should be free from the imposition of a permit fee. A semi-trailer cannot be loaded with baled lucerne hay to its registered capacity. In addition, the use of road transport to railhead and of rail transport back to road transport increases the cost because of the labour involved.

The permit fee on polythene piping is 1c a ton-mile, assessed on the registered load

capacity of the vehicle. It is impossible to shift this commodity by road because of its bulk and weight.

Building materials, such as bricks and Burnie board, can be carted from Strathpine or Dinmore to the Gold Coast for \$3 a load. To have this commodity transported by road from Rockhampton or Kalapa to the Bauhinia Downs area, near Moura, costs a permit fee of 3c a ton-mile on the registered capacity of the vehicle. This means that a permit fee of \$45 a ton is paid on a full load of 10 tons. This is the sort of problem that the Government should look at. While problems such as this exist there is little chance of achieving decentralisation.

Wheat for seed is grown in the Dawson Valley and is carted to Biloela for processing. It also attracts a fee of 3c a ton-mile. If it was transported by rail it would have to be carted from the grower to the railhead and then taken to Rannes and then to Biloela, where each grower's wheat and each variety is kept separate in a mesh silo in a large shed. A lot of care is required in the storage of this product, and under the present set-up it is almost impossible to perform these handling operations. This is the sort of problem—it may be a minor one—that affects people in certain areas of the State.

In my own electorate, with the development of the brigalow lands the limit of 350 miles poses a problem. With the advent of agriculture and improved pastures, people want to sell young cattle on the best possible market. Without a shadow of doubt the best possible market for vealer cattle is Cannon Hill. It is impossible to get a permit to shift them by road further than 350 miles. However, it is completely impracticable for them to load their cattle at Moura or Eidsvold, because of the travelling time involved. Everyone who is conversant with the industry knows that cattle—especially young cattle—cannot stand up to two or three days on rail. I suggest that if we cannot increase the 350-mile limit for all stock, we should at least provide that anyone shifting more than 26 or 28 head in a load is free to shift them beyond that distance. That would help decentralisation, and we should all be interested in doing something for decentralisation.

Anyone who knows my electorate realises that it has had the biggest increase in population of any country electorate. I am very pleased about that. A completely new township has been developed at Moura. Approximately 700 children attend the schools in the Moura-Banana area, compared with about 135 children four or five years ago. I am pleased that the Education Department has kept abreast of the growth in this area. We have a very good school with the necessary accommodation for the kiddies.

Only last Saturday I had the opportunity to open the new primary school at Blackwater. That brought back memories to me, because not many years ago the late

Director-General of Education, Sir Herbert Watkin, and I travelled through that area and visited the former Blackwater school. We found that there were 12 children on the roll, of whom nine were present. Last week when I opened the brand-new school—it is an attractive building in every way, with beautiful grounds, backed by a wonderful parents and citizens' association—I thought what a wonderful contrast it was to the old school. In fact, anyone who looks from the old school to the new school realises just what this Government has done to upgrade the schools in Queensland. I know that the Minister for Education came back from overseas with new ideas. I hope he puts some of them into effect, because we are all interested in the education of our kiddies.

Only recently I took part in the work of a small committee in raising \$100,000 for the Rockhampton Boys' Grammar School to enable it to accommodate a further 100 boarders at the start of the 1970 school year. I am pleased to say that we were able to raise that sum. I do not sit down idly doing nothing; I am prepared at all times to work for schools, whether they are independent schools or State schools. I have always tried to help with the education of our children.

Mr. Bennett: How many children attend the Blackwater school now?

Mr. N. T. E. HEWITT: About 160. It is really an eye-opener.

If hon. members have not seen Blackwater, it would do them good to go there. The new township has sewerage, kerbing and channelling, and bitumen right across the street. In addition, no matter what may be said by Opposition members about the Utah Development Co., it has played a major part in looking after its employees. The rent for the homes is \$13.68 a week, but the company has provided a subsidy so that anyone renting a home has to pay only \$5. In addition, the company is prepared to make available a translator, which will provide television for the people in the area. No doubt some of them are represented by the hon. member for Barcoo, so I do not think he will criticise the company on that score. Furthermore, the company made \$40 available to each tenant to buy whatever he requires for his garden, and it has made available all the soil needed for top dressing.

These are some of the things that should not be lost sight of. Utah has underwritten all the loans of the Daringa Shire Council for the financing of this project. A new swimming pool is to be built there, and the company is meeting the major part of its cost.

Mr. Bennett: Has it paid its rates?

Mr. N. T. E. HEWITT: As I said the other day, a legal man like the hon. member for South Brisbane would know that this

matter is to go before the court, and the court will determine what is right and what is wrong. That is all we expect, and that is all the company is asking. Mr. Long, the manager, has written to the "Central Queensland News", the "Rockhampton Morning Bulletin" and "The Courier-Mail" setting out the position. Do not let us have any humbug about this until we know where we are going, otherwise we will be just trying to make cheap political capital out of the matter and trying to deny a company that has done a lot of good. Until it is proved otherwise, do not let us look at it in that light.

Mr. Bennett: Aren't you supporting the local council?

Mr. N. T. E. HEWITT: I am supporting the Daringa Shire Council, and Utah has underwritten all its loans for Blackwater. It is not in my electorate and I do not know if the Labour member is supporting the council. They are some of the things that have happened.

Mr. Tucker: Why would the company be so mean?

Mr. N. T. E. HEWITT: How can the hon. member be so naive as to say that? I have related what the company is prepared to do, yet the hon. member asks how it can be so mean. The company has simply asked for a determination. If the hon. member was billed for \$40 that he did not think he owed, knowing him, he would not pay it. And I would not pay it either. He is entitled to go to court. If anyone should know that, it is the hon. member for South Brisbane. He has received some pretty tidy legal fees out of it over the years.

I thank the Health Department for what it has been able to do. In the very near future a new hospital will be built in Eidsvold. It is no use members of the Labour Party saying that this should have been done earlier, because this goes back to 1947. This is something that is needed. The Minister has assured me that tenders will be called soon, and I hope and trust that it will be a reality in the not far distant future. The life of the Eidsvold Hospital is just about finished.

I should now like to make a suggestion about nursing staff in Queensland hospitals, particularly country hospitals. All too frequently there is a severe shortage of trained nurses in public hospitals. It is suggested that trained nurses should be given full Public Service status and actually become members of the Queensland Public Service. As such they would be eligible for transfer to any hospital, as directed by the Director-General of Health or his deputy. This would enable the spread of available nurses over all the public hospitals in the State and would alleviate the position in some hospitals. For example, the large, popular coastal hospitals are being overstaffed, while some of the smaller country hospitals are unable

to get staff at all. The same procedure could be adopted for matrons as for clerks of the court, magistrates, etc. They would start off in a small hospital and gradually move up the scale until they were eligible for appointment to a large base hospital. In addition, nurses who remain in the profession until they retire could do so on a fair amount of superannuation instead of retiring on their own savings or the old-age pension. It is my considered opinion that more girls of the right calibre would be attracted to and kept in the nursing service if they were assured of the same status as school-teachers and other members of the Public Service. Those who wish to nurse in private hospitals or private homes could still do so outside the bounds of the Public Service.

I have made this plea before, and I do so again. Some thought should be given to it. Hospitals in country areas are always faced with staff problems. It is no use any of us being critical unless we can put forward something that is of advantage. I think that this is worthy of thought; it is a suggestion, and I leave it at that.

I should not like to finish my speech without saying something about the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission. Over the years I have had wonderful service from this department, and have presented it with many problems. We have been able to make adjustments in the Theodore and Moura substandard areas, even if we have not been able to do everything that we would like to do. I see that the Minister for Education and Cultural Activities is now in the Chamber. He was Minister for Lands during the time that I am now referring to, and he played a valuable part in making those readjustments. On behalf of those who were assisted in this way, I thank him very much. I am pleased to report that whereas those people were once virtually starving, they are today in a reasonably sound position. There is no thought among them of walking off their properties and not being able to sell, as there was 10 years ago. It gives a member a little heart when he is able to look back and say, "At least we have achieved something for the good of the people."

One thing that I have always said is that if the granting of additional areas is for the good of the State, it should be done. Let us not overlook additional areas at the expense of new settlement. What is needed is a prosperous community, with the people doing well. That is my attitude to land settlement and irrigation.

I also wish to give my thanks to Mr. Fred Haigh and members of his staff for the wonderful job that they have done on the Wuruma Dam project, near Eidsvold, which is nearly complete. It will be of very great benefit to people in the area below Eidsvold. I know that there will still be problems in

the Monto and Theodore areas, which were virtually without water two or three years ago because of dry seasons.

I urge the Government to continue investigating the possibility of erecting a small weir somewhere above the existing weir at Theodore to provide additional supplies of water to carry the area through bad seasons. I know that those in the Monto district are particularly keen to have an irrigation scheme, just as are those in many other parts of Queensland. All that I can say of Monto is that it is a wonderful district, with wonderful soil and a great potential, and it should be kept near the top of the list of priorities.

I entered the debate, firstly, to offer a few suggestions and, secondly, to be a little critical of the hon. member for Belmont. I also wanted to take the opportunity to more or less say farewell to hon. members who have served this Parliament faithfully and well over the years. Although I entered Parliament only in 1956, I will be, after the next election (I will be back, I hope), about the 14th most senior member. When we remember that there are 78 members in this Assembly, we realise just how many changes there have been.

In conclusion, I hope that I have contributed in some small way to the Budget debate.

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) (3.29 p.m.): It may be that the hon. member who has just resumed his seat was being prophetic when he said that he wanted to rise today to say farewell to members of this Assembly. I can assure him that we on this side of the Chamber are going to help, to the best of our ability, to make his prophecy come true. Those sentiments apply to many of his colleagues, too.

However, I do not enter the debate today to speak against the hon. member but to speak on the Budget. The Treasurer referred to the Budget as "Queensland's march to progress". That is a grand-sounding name, but it was received with a hollow laugh all over Queensland, and particularly in North Queensland. It was received in that way by Queenslanders who have become inured to hearing these high-sounding names and the use of high-flown phrases and titles by the Treasurer. It passed by without making any impact on the community generally. Phrases such as these, if I may use a small excerpt from Shakespeare, "full of sound and fury", signify nothing. They show what Queensland, particularly North Queensland, is to get.

My leader, in a very reasoned contribution yesterday, spoke on behalf of all Queenslanders when he dealt with the Budget. Let me speak today on behalf of that part of the State that the Government claims it is developing, North Queensland. You will notice, Mr. Dean, that I said "the Government claims".

The Treasurer dwelt at length on freight concessions in the Budget. Smacking his lips as he put across this story, he said, "Here is a juicy concession for the grain-growers of this State. Here is another one for the sugar-growers of this State." But what did the leaders of the grain-growers say after they had perused the Budget and looked into the supposed concession that had been given to them? They said it was an insult to the grain-growers of Queensland.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. TUCKER: Those are not my words; they are the words of the leaders of the grain-growers. Those men said it was an insult. They said it was only a crumb from the "crummy" Treasurer. How true that is! No-one was fooled by the Treasurer. I have no doubt that he said to Cabinet, and possibly to the Premier, in his usual flowery sort of fashion, "Hang the expense, Mr. Premier. Give the canary another seed." That is what it sounds like to the grain-growers and the other primary producers of Queensland. It is only a tiny seed. When it comes to doing anything about their troubles and trials—many hon. members in this Chamber today would be aware of the great trials and troubles of primary producers—

Mr. Lee interjected.

Mr. TUCKER: The Treasurer knew hours ago that I was to speak in this debate. He is here now.

Mr. Chalk: I do not run away.

Mr. TUCKER: I did not say that you do; but neither do I.

When these concessions are given, I say "Good luck" to the sugar-growers and to the grain-growers. I am not opposed to such concessions. Not a great deal of grain is grown in North Queensland. Maize is grown to some extent on the Atherton Tableland and some is grown in the Ingham-Burdekin area; sorghum is grown in the Bowen-Collinsville area and in some parts of the Burdekin area. Generally speaking, these concessions are going to other parts of Queensland; but I repeat that I am not arguing against them and that I say "Good luck" to those who benefit from them.

I am very glad to see that freight concessions on raw sugar have been given to the sugar-growers of Queensland.

Mr. Newbery: And 5 per cent. on cane.

Mr. TUCKER: I would be wrong if I said it was not a real concession. I am very glad that it has been given.

Mr. Newbery: Freight on some of the sugar is 10 percent. below what it was in 1957.

Mr. TUCKER: I am not going to slide off on that slant. I will argue sugar with the hon. member on another occasion. I am rather surprised that he has not been one of the first on his feet in this debate to plead the cause

or the sugar-growers. The person who has in fact pleaded the cause of the sugar-growers—I think he got the results recently—around the Mackay-Proserpine area is Dr. Rex Patterson. (Government laughter). Despite the laughter from hon. members opposite, I say that it was Dr. Rex Patterson who got to his feet and made the submissions that I believe turned the bolting horse and gave the people of the area the very real help that they needed. There are others in the Chamber who have had the opportunity on many occasions to get up and say their piece, but they have failed to do so.

Mr. Wharton: Tell us what Patterson did.

Mr. TUCKER: With due respect to the hon. member, when he is on his feet nobody knows what he says anyway. It would be far better for the sugar-growers, the orange-growers and others if he remained quiet. He is a dead loss, anyway.

I am very glad that we got this concession and help for the sugar industry. It is an industry that is very worried about its future. We know that at the present moment the Premier and the Deputy Prime Minister are overseas trying to do something for it. I hope that they succeed, because it is a good industry for North Queensland. I have no argument about the concessions; I am thankful for them.

Mr. Wharton: The Labour Party has no hope.

Mr. TUCKER: If the hon. member keeps going, I will let him have one right between the eyes. If the Government was genuine about the need for northern development—we hear this statement being made all the time—then I say that this Budget should have done something about the many anomalies within the railway freight tariff structure, especially in North Queensland. Both the Treasurer and the Minister for Transport well know that the anomalies of which I speak, and which have been brought to their notice on many occasions, militate against decentralisation and the development of the North. They are something of which every Northerner is vitally and painfully aware, yet there is not a word in the Budget about removing them or, in fact, giving any real concession to the far-flung areas in the North and the North-West of the State. In these areas the situation is not a happy one.

Mr. Ahern: What about the road tax on livestock?

Mr. TUCKER: I will deal with that on another occasion.

Does the Treasurer believe that because our numbers in North Queensland are small, he can afford to overlook us in a Budget that is designed to capture votes? In this Budget he has overlooked us completely when it comes to giving us some real benefit and to aid northern development.

The Minister for Transport, I believe, works on the principle of divide and conquer. The railways negotiate contracts in North

Queensland with some industries, but they are kept completely secret because it is claimed that they are confidential. These negotiated contracts are treated as top secret and we never know what they are. This is very bad in itself. On the one hand the railways treat one group of persons in one way, and others are treated in another. I have always been against that kind of sectional attitude.

The Treasurer is on record this morning as having said to his Caucus yesterday afternoon that he was against sectional legislation relative to Brisbane. I must say that I had a wry smile on my face when I read that in the Press this morning. I know that he, as a former Minister for Transport, and the present Minister for Transport are aware that these secretly negotiated contracts are entered into regularly in North Queensland.

It is claimed that actions speak louder than words. The actions of the Treasurer when he was Minister for Transport and those of the present Minister for Transport certainly are not in line with yesterday's statement of the Treasurer's that he is against sectional legislation.

The basis for these negotiated contracts appears to be, "What are you prepared to pay?" Apparently the Railway Department says, "What are we prepared to accept, and how badly do we want this contract?" There is no way in the world that these contracts can be understood, and they militate against the development of this State.

Mr. Ahern: They paid us \$15,000,000 in freight last year.

Mr. TUCKER: I will come to that in a moment. I thank the hon. member for interjecting. I remind him that North Queensland paid the bulk of that sum, and it was paid out in subsidies in southern Queensland. The hon. member should remember that fact when he raises this matter again. North Queensland received nothing in return for that payment. The hon. member has only helped to highlight my argument by interjecting.

To return to the point that I was making, I say that negotiated contracts appear to be a messy way of doing business. Why this veil of secrecy in these contracts?

The freight costs to public works projects in North Queensland are tremendous. Local authorities are hit by the freight costs on construction materials, drainage materials, sewerage materials, and materials for water reticulation and building. The northern local authorities are forced to pay high freight rates, and I looked in vain through the Budget to try to find the provision of some relief to the northern local authorities, which would assist in northern development.

This is not the first time that I have spoken about northern secondary industries. They lose out time and time again to southern

competitors because of the extremely favourable contract rates that are negotiated in Brisbane for goods forwarded to North Queensland. I point out that the concessions apply mostly to other parts of Queensland and not really to North Queensland in the strict sense of the term.

If the Treasurer had moved to alleviate the North's problem I would have been the first to say, "Thank you very much". Such a move would have been a real contribution to those people whom I represent. The hon. member for Landsborough laughs. This is not funny. If a secondary industry was established in his electorate and its operators came to him and showed how they were being maimed, or virtually murdered, by the freight concessions given to Brisbane industries, what would his reaction be? I hope that it would be like mine; that he would be on his feet fighting for concessions and pointing out what is happening in Queensland today.

If the Treasurer had offered freight concessions to the northern steel fabricators and other manufacturing businesses, that would have been a real contribution towards assisting the people who live in those remote areas. It would have improved the wealth of North Queensland and would have enabled that part of the State to attract other businesses.

Do we find anything like this in the Budget? The answer is a resounding "No!" There is nothing for North Queensland in the real sense of the term.

Has the Government taken any action on the recommendations of the Loder Report? Has it taken any worth-while action on those recommendations? Each of us knows that it has not. I am sure that Government members would have read the report. Everybody in North Queensland knows about it and that the Government has not taken any action on this very enlightening report on freight rates.

The report stated, amongst other things—

"The committee notes that the accounts of the Queensland Government Railway suggest that the northern section of the railways is, to a significant extent, subsidising the southern sections."

There is the committee's reply to the interjection that was made a few moments ago. It says that the northern section of the Railway Department is, to a significant extent, subsidising the southern section. Those are not my words; they are the words of the committee established to investigate this matter.

In the financial year 1966-67 railway profits from the Northern Division, in round figures, were \$6,000,000. The profit from the Central Division was \$4,000,000, but the Southern Division did not make a profit at all. On the contrary, it showed a loss of \$6,000,000.

I use those figures to reinforce what I said before. I know that the Treasurer will say, "We have all the railway administration in

the southern part of the State, and it must be looked after". However, these figures cannot be brushed lightly aside; they must make every thinking person stop and listen. If we make these profits in North Queensland, surely to goodness we are entitled to a piece of the cake when the Treasurer is handing out largesse as he has done in this pre-election Budget.

Mr. Ahern: What about Mt. Isa?

Mr. TUCKER: I will come to that.

We have not received in this Budget any real concessions to aid northern development and decentralisation. Freight rates in North Queensland appear to be conjured up by a madman. To say the least, they are confusing. We have privately negotiated contracts; we have unpublished freight rates; we have up to three different charges for the one commodity; we have such a hit-and-miss business that the clerk in charge does not quite know which rate to charge. We have no set system on how freights are arrived at in North Queensland. That is frustrating to everyone who uses the railways, and it is worrying to us in North Queensland.

Mr. R. Jones: One of the contractors "got into" the Government for \$40,000. The fraud squad is working on it now.

Mr. TUCKER: That could be true; I remember that the hon. member raised that matter.

The further north or west that people or firms are from Brisbane, the more heavily are they penalised by these rail freights. Yet they are the people who should be aided and helped if the Government was sincere in its efforts to encourage northern development. I believe the Government discourages development of the far-flung areas by its actions or, referring to the Budget, by its lack of action. The Budget contains nothing to help in this direction.

I will now read an extract from the address of the chairman of directors of Carlton & United Breweries Ltd., of Melbourne, which was delivered on 17 November, 1967—

"One serious problem affecting the expansion of our Central and North Queensland Breweries is the adverse Rail freights imposed by the Queensland Railways. The Queensland Government has a declared policy of decentralisation. In line with this policy, we operate provincial breweries at Cairns, Rockhampton and Toowoomba.

"In view of the Government's policy it would be natural to expect a provincial manufacturer to enjoy a per-ton-mile rail freight advantage. However the reverse applies. The imposition of higher rail freights on Country industries has placed us at a serious disadvantage compared with a competitor based in Brisbane and competing with our Country plants.

"For instance, our brewery in Cairns pays a one-third higher freight on a per-ton-mile basis than its Brisbane competitor to transport beer to the Mackay market centre. Our Rockhampton and Toowoomba plants also suffer similarly, with transport charges weighted heavily in favour of the Capital City Competitor.

"A more equitable arrangement of freight rates appears to be long overdue with ex-Brisbane rates being brought to parity with central and North Queensland rates. As pointed out in the Loder Report, these areas have for too long subsidised the losses of the Southern Queensland Rail operations."

I believe that all hon. members will agree that that is a scathing indictment of this Government's present policy and bears out the argument I put forward this afternoon. They are not my words; they are the words of a man who would not necessarily favour a Labour Government and they have a very true ring about them.

I will give other glaring examples, although I will not have the time to quote example after example. This is perhaps the most pertinent example. Electric-light poles used by the Cairns Regional Electricity Board can be landed in Cairns cheaper from Maryborough than from the Atherton Tableland, which is only 100 miles away. This is the type of anomaly that I refer to. Surely nobody would say that this is right. I believe that Schedule II or IIA applies, and these anomalies arise.

To rail cheese from Innisfail to Brisbane in a refrigerated car costs 6.9c a lb., whereas poultry railed from Brisbane to Innisfail in the same refrigerated car costs 4c a lb. I have many other instances, too numerous to mention this afternoon.

My speech on the steel fabricators of Townsville is on record, and I am sure that hon. members remember what I said on that matter. However, I remind them that on steel for the Townsville Army barracks, southern fabricators were given freight concessions which killed, or maimed, our engineering works in Townsville. They lost every contract. In fact, all our basic industries in the North suffered as a result of this freight concession given to southern fabricators. This is a very real thing for Townsville, and particularly North Queensland, because we need basic industries if we are to survive.

Many of the basic industries in the North today are sick. As a matter of fact, if it were not for Mount Isa Mines Limited all the basic industries in Townsville would now be virtually dead. Mount Isa Mines Limited is a perfect example of what Australian management will do to assist local areas. There is Australian management of Mount Isa Mines Limited, and those people go out of their way to assist industry in their own area. I pay a tribute to them for their preparedness to assist in this direction, which is more than the Government will do. This

company has, by its interest and help and the channelling to them of all possible work, kept some of Townsville's basic industries alive.

Mr. Inch: They also set up the subsidiary industry of copper refining in Townsville.

Mr. TUCKER: That is so. The copper refinery employs hundreds of men. At the moment, however, I am referring to the fact that Mount Isa Mines Limited is prepared to help northern industries and contractors by letting contracts locally. In many cases, that assistance is all that has kept industries alive. In passing, thinking back to my reference some weeks ago to the establishment of overseas companies in my area, I say that there should be more Australian participation in such companies, just as there is Australian participation in the management of the mine at Mount Isa.

Mr. Campbell: Where did the Mt. Isa company get its original capital?

Mr. TUCKER: I think the Minister knows that.

Mr. Hanlon: It was guaranteed by a State Labour Government.

Mr. Campbell: Be consistent.

Mr. TUCKER: I am glad the Minister for Industrial Development is present. I hope he will not leave during the next quarter of an hour, because I have something to say to him, too.

The Treasurer referred to "Queensland's march to progress". What fairy floss that is when looked at from a North Queensland point of view! The North is in urgent need of basic manufacturing businesses. Admittedly warehouses and shops are being built in Townsville, but they are not things that bring wealth and, finally, many employment opportunities. We must have basic industries now, and if those that are there are not going to be assisted but in fact killed by freight rates, northern development must stagnate.

Although there are warehouses in the North, the goods that they sell are manufactured in Brisbane and other centres in the South. They are brought to the North and put in warehouses in which employment is provided for some people, but when the goods are sold the money that they produce finds its way from North Queensland back to the South. That is why I say that basic manufacturing industries are needed in the North. As it is, much of the wealth of North Queensland drifts to the South, and I do not think that that is desirable.

Mr. Hodges: How do you think they get the goods there?

Mr. TUCKER: They freight them to North Queensland and the people pay through the nose for them because no-one can afford to make them in the North. If the concessions for which I ask were granted, basic industries would certainly be

established. We in the North do not want Townsville to be merely a service city for the next 50 years. It should be a manufacturing city, and that is what I strive for. We should have industries using raw materials and manufacturing articles—refrigerators for example—for the whole of the vast Northern Territory, North Queensland and New Guinea. There are many things that are now sent to the North, stored in warehouses, and then sold, that it should be possible to manufacture in the North. There is a great need for the raw material. Only by these means can North Queensland achieve true greatness, and in that direction lies real prosperity, true northern development, and full employment.

When I say "full employment", I mean that young people in North Queensland should be able to leave school and find work immediately. That does not happen now. It is sometimes five or six months before the young people can be placed in industry, and many women who wish to work cannot find jobs. Many people who have come to North Queensland as migrants say, "Where are the industries in which we can work? We can find work in industries down south; we cannot find it here." I am speaking, of course, of basic industries.

Instead of using sickening clichés such as "Queensland's march to progress", the Treasurer and the Minister for Industrial Development should be persuading B.H.P. to do something about the price of steel in North Queensland. I have asked in this Chamber before—I ask again today—that Townsville be included in the capital-cities steel price structure. B.H.P. is a huge company, well able to absorb the additional cost involved. If North Queensland is to progress, northern manufacturing industries must not be saddled with excess costs of raw materials and penalised by the granting of concessional freight rates to manufacturers in capital cities.

As far as North Queensland is concerned, the acid test of this Budget is: does it seek to make cheaper raw materials available in North Queensland, and does it seek to lift the freight burdens being carried by people and industries in the North? The Premier, the Cabinet and the Government give lip service to northern development, but nothing further is done.

I call for the appointment of an all-party inquiry into the present freight rates in North Queensland. They are inhibiting and preventing development, and there should be some way of showing to Cabinet, the Government, and Parliament as a whole, what is happening and what is being brought about by these freight rates.

The Minister for Industrial Development interjected a moment ago. I noticed that he quailed before Sir Ian McLennan, the managing director of B.H.P. I understand that the Minister had something to say to Sir Ian McLennan about the capital-cities

steel price structure and Sir Ian turned his thumb down and said, "No, you don't get it." Why? Because it would cost too much; somebody else would want a similar concession. The Minister shakes his head, but I say that Sir Ian McLennan said to him that he would not do it.

When we look at that huge concern, we see how easy it would be for it to absorb small concessions such as these. There is no real reason why the company should not be able to do something along these lines. Did the Minister for Industrial Development say to B.H.P., "You had better alter your marketing policy or my Government, or the Government in Canberra, will do something about it."? Did the Minister say that to Sir Ian McLennan, or did he just accept in a meek and mild sort of manner what Sir Ian said? Did he continue to fight on, or is B.H.P. so big that it is bigger than the Government of Queensland and bigger than the Government of Australia? The Minister knows what would flow from what I have asked relative to the capital-cities steel price and the effect that it would have on northern development. He would be completely aware of that. He is an intelligent man; I know that he understands these things. Did the Minister continue the fight, or did he accept without argument what the managing director said?

If that is the case, I ask: Who rules Queensland and Australia today? Do the Governments rule or does B.H.P., at least in regard to raw steel? Although the Minister shakes his head, I know that he made these representations and I also know what he said afterwards in North Queensland. He said, "There appears to be nothing further that I can do." I say to him that he and his colleagues hold the destiny of Queensland in their hands at the present time. Each time there is talk of a change of Government they laugh and say there is no hope of that. They claim that they are firmly in the saddle. Therefore, they hold the destiny of Queensland in their hands. However, the moment anybody comes to them with any problem and asks them to solve it, they have one weak try and then say, "There is nothing further we can do about it."

I think that is a very poor attitude. I look for fighters who will say, "If we don't get it this time, we will get it next time." There are ways and means. If one cannot succeed in a frontal attack, then one can attack from the rear. When I see this attitude of "There is nothing further we can do", again I ask: who is in charge of Queensland today? What sort of intestinal fortitude do Ministers have when one little answer like that completely knocks them down and deters them from doing anything further in the matter? The destiny of many hundreds of people—possibly thousands—rests on some of these things. Whether we move forward, whether we get what we want in the way of capital-city prices for steel in Townsville, which will allow our manufacturers to move ahead, to get big and solid work and employ

hundreds of men, rests in the Government's hands. This is what we ask for. But when we ask for the help of those who are in the driving seat today, all we get is this milk-and-water reply.

In a desperate attempt to do something about rail freights, the Townsville District Development Bureau some time ago sent Mr. Bonnett, M.H.R. for Herbert, to Brisbane as their emissary. My friends tell me that the Minister for Transport—I heard this through the grapevine—flatly refused to alter anything that Mr. Bonnett put forward. I believe that he regaled Mr. Bonnett—or so I am told—with some blurb about section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution, and being worried about southern fabricators and things like that, which, of course, have existed for 20 or 30 years. They are not something new.

Mr. Bonnett came down here and was going to do something about it. Tucker had failed; he had not been able to do anything. He was anti-Government. Let a member of the Government come down and he will get this all fixed up in five minutes. But Mr. Bonnett returned to the North a sadder and wiser man, and he declared, again so I am told, that the whole business stank to high heaven. Then, in typical Liberal manner—he is a Liberal member—he unloaded the whole thing onto the Country Party. He told his friends that this was a deal where some Country Party electorates got gains for returns to the Brisbane area. It is not that there are any Liberals in it, but that some Country Party electorates were getting gains for returns to the Brisbane area. This is what Mr. Bonnett said in Townsville. These things leak back whether hon. members opposite like it or not, and this is the way he unloaded the whole business onto the Country Party. If in fact any dealing at all is going on, I would look for the Minister for Transport and the Treasurer instead of looking for some of the members of the Country Party, whom this man tried to blame in his report on his trip to Brisbane.

I repeat that a great need exists for help in this direction. If northern industries could obtain these steel prices they could move ahead in the manufacturing field. If a proper freight structure was obtained with concessions, a big step forward could be made. But the Budget contains nothing along those lines, so that there is no way in the world the Treasurer will sell his Budget to me. There is no way in the world that I would believe the Treasurer is right when he talks about Queensland's "march to progress".

I turn now to another industry that is vital to northern development—the beef industry. Again the dilly-dallying and don't-care attitude of this Government has prevented the industry from moving forward. The Government has clearly demonstrated its dilly-dallying and don't-care attitude to the beef industry.

Beef is one of Australia's most valuable exports, and Queensland is the greatest meat-producing State in the Commonwealth. Northern development leans heavily on the

meat industry, and it provides a great source of employment in the North. Therefore, it is something that I hold dear. The Government has dilly-dallied and shilly-shallied to such an extent that the meat industry is being forced to impose a "voluntary" restriction of 25 per cent. on its exports to the United States of America. This has come as a great slap in the face to the manufacturers, meatworkers and small graziers in North Queensland. I know it will be said that this is a Commonwealth matter, but I believe that it is a State matter. Anything that occurs within the boundaries of this State should be the concern of the Queensland Government. If the North is to be developed, the meat trade must continue to be developed. Yet the Government sits like Micawber and waits for something to turn up. It is a voluntary restriction of 25 per cent., but it is still a restriction. Everybody says, "Sit tight; it will go over, and something will turn up."

Beef roads have been constructed criss-crossing the North to bring out the cattle, and now these restrictions are imposed on the meat trade. What a ludicrous situation the industry finds itself in. Millions of dollars have been spent on beef roads because it was said that we must increase output—that we must increase cattle production—as that was one way to further northern development. The roads have been provided mainly by the Commonwealth Government, but we now face restrictions. I do not know what will happen next year, but this is very real at the moment for North Queensland. The U.S.A. embargo could affect families of meatworkers. It could cause shorter working seasons in the meat industry, which I am greatly concerned about. Why should this voluntary restriction affect us? It is because we have become too dependent on the United States market. I now intend to quote some figures.

Mr. E. G. W. Wood: Where else could we sell?

Mr. TUCKER: I will come to that.

I will now quote some figures to show what I mean. They relate to beef and veal exports for the 11 months ended May, 1968—

Country	Tonnage	Percentage
United States, including Honolulu ..	178,314	77.2
United Kingdom ..	24,706	10.7
Japan ..	11,406	4.9
Canada ..	3,726	1.6
Okinawa ..	2,704	1.2
Malaysia, including Singapore and Borneo ..	2,194	1.0
Malta ..	1,446	0.6
New Guinea ..	1,151	0.5
All others ..	5,345	2.3
Total ..	230,992	100.0

No real attempt has been made to find markets in Asia, particularly South-east Asia. We have gone merrily ahead so that for the 11 months to the end of last year we were exporting 77.2 per cent. of our beef to the United States. I suspect that is because the American producers here, or a great number of them, are holding the market captive. It may be asked how we can export 77.2 per cent. of our total tonnage to the United States of America. The truth is that our first-grade, blue-ribbon meat is not taken by the United States as such. The American ranchers supply this market in the United States at high prices. They supply the steaks and the high-class cuts; that market is held by the American producers. Our blue-ribbon meat, which everyone who knows says is of the highest quality, has all the fat cut away. It is called denuded meat and the process is called "de-fatting". The denuded meat is then called third and fourth-grade meat. It is used in the hamburger trade and in other processed meats in the United States, although it is first-grade, blue-ribbon meat. It is heartbreaking to see what happens to it. It is not sold as first-grade meat in America because that market is held by the United States ranchers. It is called third and fourth-grade meat and is supplied to the United States hamburger trade. We should remember that many American cattlemen have in Queensland huge interests which are continually escalating.

What I have pointed out today must make us stop and think. Our meat is handled in that way and then downgraded for use as hamburger meat. If any hon. member does not believe me he should go down quietly to the wharf and speak to someone who knows. He will find that I am speaking the truth.

I am worried that the jobs of the meatworkers in the North will be affected by this 25 per cent. cut-back. I am concerned about our smaller graziers, who are making a contribution to northern development. Quite a number of them make a very real contribution, and they try very hard.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: They live on their stations.

Mr. TUCKER: That is right. They are not absentee landlords. They live on the stations and they work hard. I do not want to talk about the "big three", although we know who they are. We know that Sir William Gunn looked after scores of stations on behalf of absentee American landlords. If I had the time I would read a few of the statements he has made about some of these people. They would make hon. members' blood run cold, but I have not the time to read them.

I sound a note of warning. It is dangerous to put all our eggs into one basket, and judging by the percentage of our meat going to America, we are apparently doing just that. Rather should we be looking for markets in Asia, and more particularly

south-east Asia. We should sell our blue-ribbon, first-class meat there. My slogan is: I would much rather feed them than fight them. I say that Queensland is falling down on the job because it has not gone into that area. There have been fact-finding tours, but they are not getting to the core of this business. They are not looking for the markets that would be lucrative to our cattlemen. If they are lucrative to our cattlemen they are lucrative to the meatworkers, because they would mean a longer season and would consequently put more money into their pockets and into Townsville, Cairns and many other places in North Queensland. But the Government has fallen down on the job and has done nothing about it. It has not looked for that market. It has simply sat down and let this meat be down-graded to third and fourth grade for the hamburger trade in the United States of America.

I have some illuminating figures. The membership of the meatworkers' union in Queensland in 1969 was 11,260. By June, 1967, it had fallen by 25 per cent., to 8,617. In 1961 Vestveys, at Lake's Creek, Rockhampton, employed 1,188 men; in 1967 it employed 579. Swifts, at Alligator Creek in Townsville, employed 888 men in 1961. At its new works at Stuart it employed 308 men in 1966. That shows what the automated process has done. Production has risen, but there is less employment. When we talk of northern development we are talking not about a meatworks, but about people and bringing them to the North, keeping them there and giving them longer seasons. But that is not what is happening at the present time.

I have some other pertinent figures. Queensland meat production in 1966-67 totalled 368,658 tons. That tonnage was down for the second consecutive year and was the lowest for years. There were fewer cattle in Queensland in 1967 than in 1894. In 1965-66 Queensland lost 658,115 cattle and calves because there was no northern water-conservation scheme. The Budget provides for no northern water-conservation scheme in the strict sense of the word. Can we afford to suffer these losses year after year? Is it any wonder that I say that the beef industry is in a dangerously vulnerable position at present? The Government quibbles while northern development languishes. Here is a way the Government could be of assistance, but it sits back and allows our meat exports to be cut back by 25 per cent. The Government knows that the beef roads are not being fully used, but it is doing nothing about it.

In 1938-39 every man, woman and child in Australia ate 140.3 lb. of beef, whereas in 1966-67 every man, woman and child in Australia ate 85.9 lb., a fall of 40 per cent. per head in the consumption of beef. Why is this so? It is because prices go higher and higher and today meat is being priced off the table of the average person. In the past 11 years prices have doubled and, in some instances, trebled. I have not the time to quote the figures, but if any hon. member wants to dispute what I am saying I shall

show him the prices of beef then and now. In 11 years the price of some meats has doubled, and in some cases prices have trebled. That is why the industry is beginning to languish.

I believe that if price control on meat was introduced, the meat that is today being exported to the United States could be eaten by our own people. I have shown that there has been a fall of 40 per cent. in the consumption of meat. If the beef industry is to be assisted, there should be price control on the sale of beef "on the hoof", and price control on the sale of meat over the counter.

The big profits are not going to the small graziers. When cattle prices fall, there is never any decrease in the price of meat to the people. The middleman is the one who is raking off the huge profits. If hon. members opposite do not think that is true, let them go home and think about it. If graziers received fair prices they would not complain, and if the consumer had to pay fair prices he would eat twice as much as he does now. It is the meat operators who are today skimming the cream off the beef industry and slowly strangling it. If meat was available throughout Australia at the right price, the people would eat the meat that today has to be exported. In addition, new markets should be sought for meat.

The Commonwealth Development Bank should be more liberal in granting financial assistance to the small man. The bank is now very tough in its dealings, and no money is made available for restocking properties which have suffered substantial losses through drought conditions. Graziers in this position always have to restock at the top of the market, and they do not have the finance necessary for this.

Cattle should be sold on weight, not on sight. Fodder is bought by weight, not by sight.

Mr. Ahern: You can sell on weight if you like.

Mr. Chinchin: A lot are sold on weight.

Mr. TUCKER: I will agree that some are, but not a lot. They should all be sold on weight, and that could be done.

A Government Member: He can do that if he wants to.

Mr. TUCKER: No, he cannot. However, that is only one facet of what I am talking about.

Mr. Murray: If the rest of your speech is as inaccurate at that part of it, God help us.

Mr. TUCKER: Well, here is another thing that the hon. member for Clayfield, through the Liberal Party in the South, should be doing. If hon. members opposite wish to assist northern development they should do something about the Development Bank, which is today so hard on people who have suffered severe drought losses and are unable to obtain finance for restocking. It will be found that the big operators are taking over

the market today because, slowly but surely, the ordinary grazier is being pushed out by lack of finance. Some people come to me and say, "Why don't those fellows spread superphosphate over the land? If they do, it will carry a beast to three acres." On investigation I found that to spread superphosphate would cost \$10 an acre, which on even a small area would represent a huge sum. It is all very well to talk about these things, and I know that there are those around Townsville who would want to do it, but it is a question of finding the finance and the Development Bank does not make it available.

Mr. LICKISS (Mt. Coot-tha) (4.29 p.m.): I have much pleasure in supporting the Budget presented by the Treasurer, who at present is also the Acting Premier. As one who was somewhat critical of the format of previous Budgets, let me hasten to congratulate the Treasurer on the revised form and presentation of this Budget. Naturally its provisions, carefully formulated and presented, have made the task of the Opposition difficult indeed.

It is significant that the total opposition shown to the Budget to date has been a reluctant flag-waving ceremony performed without much enthusiasm. The Opposition, of course, has made the task of Government members somewhat difficult. There is no attack to ward off, and I am sure that the general acceptance and acclamation of the Budget by Queenslanders have been a sufficient indication to the Treasurer, making it unnecessary for Government members to eulogise it, speaker by speaker.

I take this opportunity, also, to congratulate Mr. Sewell, the Under Treasurer, and Mr. Hielscher, Assistant Under Secretary (Budget and Budgetary Control) on the part they have played in assisting the Treasurer in his task. Queensland is fortunate indeed to have such capable and dedicated officers.

I turn now to a matter that has already been aired in this Chamber during the Budget debate. I refer to the rather controversial matter of the report on milk supplies in South-east Queensland, particularly as it relates to the Brisbane milk market. The hon. member for South Coast, Mr. Hinze, and the hon. member for Barcoo, Mr. O'Donnell, commented on various matters relative to the report.

Hon. members will recall that this matter was raised in this Chamber in 1966 during a debate on Supply, and the speech that I made on that occasion begins on page 963 of Volume 243 (1966-67) of "Hansard". Some of the matters that I mentioned then have, I believe, equal application today. I dealt with the move for the introduction of another bottling set-up in the metropolitan area, and I said—

"Dealing with this particular issue, that is, Brisbane milk processing and distribution, I consider that the points I will raise

should be examined in great detail when any variation to the present milk marketing system is under consideration. These points are—

No other capital city has a lower retail milk price than Brisbane;

There is no place in Australia where the margin between the housewife's price for milk and the farmer's price is less: in other words, the farmer gets a higher percentage of the retail price of milk in Brisbane than in any other place in Australia."

Mr. Chinchen: Mr. O'Donnell made that point.

Mr. LICKISS: The hon. member for Barcoo made the point, and I believe that the hon. member for South Coast made it, also.

I referred to the often-used term "monopoly" and said—

"It may be said that the processing and distribution of milk in Brisbane is a monopoly. If so, it is a completely controlled monopoly, because the Brisbane Milk Board fixes the margin at which processors operate and also fixes the margin at which retail vendors operate. Operating costs are checked in great detail by a qualified cost accountant, formerly employed in the Queensland Prices Branch, and margins allowed by the Milk Board are based on these costs."

I went on to deal with the minimising of processing and distribution costs, and I referred also at that stage to the fact that the then existing plant was capable of processing 35 per cent. more milk than it was processing at that time.

Matters such as the need to construct depots as part of the over-all cost of distribution were also mentioned by me on that occasion.

Mr. Porter: It would be much better to refer to it as a utility service than as a company.

Mr. LICKISS: I think I did refer to it as such during that debate.

I went further on that occasion and dissected in some detail the cost of milk in the metropolitan area, and I think I should re-state that dissection in the current "Hansard"—

	Gallon
	c
Cost of milk	42.594
Cost of processing	11.464

Total	54.058
Selling Price	55.2
	(gazetted)
Margin	1.142c a gal.
	or
	.143c a pint.

At that stage the sale price through the retail outlets was 9c a pint, and it is 9c today.

I went further, because there was some criticism of the manufacturing or processing of the milk supply, to point out quite clearly that this factory was earning roughly 5 per cent. to 6 per cent. gross profit and between 3 per cent. and 4 per cent. net profit for the operation. I then said—

“I believe that, far from being criticised, this company, which is active in Queensland as a purely Queensland company, should be congratulated.”

What I said then is also applicable today.

Naturally—and I believe this is significant—this matter has been raised again in 1968 as a result of the so-called Ivers-Hamilton report. Actually, the matter has been of continuing interest to me and I have, to the best of my ability, researched those aspects of the report pertaining to the milk market, particularly as it relates to the Brisbane area. I am now engaged in further studies to bring up to date my research in relation to all matters encompassed by this report. I make no apology for what I am about to say relative to the report as it affects the Brisbane market.

I believe it is significant that in 1966 Cabinet decided to ask the Division of Marketing of the Department of Primary Industries to undertake a detailed research project and provide a report to Cabinet on the feasibility of extending the Brisbane milk district and servicing the expanded area. This Cabinet decision was the result of certain events which must be studied in their chronological sequence.

On 4 February, 1966, a body known as the Country Milk Co-operative Federation Ltd. lodged with the Brisbane Milk Board a formal application for a licence to permit it to process and market milk within the Brisbane milk district.

I think it is interesting to note the composition of the Country Milk Co-operative Federation Ltd., which comprised the following 10 co-operative associations:—

- The Caboolture Co-operative Association Ltd.
- The Downs Co-operative Dairy Association Ltd.
- The Warwick Co-operative Dairy Association Ltd.
- The Queensland Farmers Co-operative Association Ltd.
- South Coast Co-operative Dairy Association Ltd.
- Southbrook Co-operative Dairy Association Ltd.
- The Pittsworth Co-operative Dairy Association Ltd.
- Mt. Tyson Co-operative Dairy Association Ltd.
- The Logan and Albert Co-operative Dairy Association Ltd.
- The Maleny Co-operative Dairy Association Ltd.

It is further significant that, at the date of making application to the Brisbane Milk Board, all the above co-operative bodies were already supplying raw milk to the Brisbane milk market for processing in Brisbane's existing processing plants in terms of their respective factory quotas, determined by the Brisbane Milk Board.

This application was considered by the Brisbane Milk Board and refused under the Milk Supply Act on the grounds that the establishment of another plant in Brisbane was an “unnecessary agency,” and not calculated to benefit the public in any way, but rather was it likely to result in increased costs by destroying the general economic structure and ultimately leading to an increased price to the consumer.

This decision on the part of the Milk Board was the subject of an appeal under the Milk Supply Act to the Minister for Primary Industries, who in turn decided to refer the matter to Cabinet before making a decision. Cabinet appointed Mr. Whitaker to assist the Minister in dealing with the appeal and in due course he lodged his opinion upholding the decision of the Brisbane Milk Board, but suggested that there might be reason to look at the question of whether the Brisbane milk district should be extended. It was on this suggestion by Mr. Whitaker that Cabinet decided to call for a report which, after almost two years of waiting, has now been furnished.

Let me look at those matters on which there appears to be complete agreement. It is true that there is no need for additional pasteurising plant.

Based upon inquiries which I made two years ago when the co-operative's application was under consideration, I gained the impression that the system operating in Brisbane at that time was a highly developed, efficient operation, and saw much evidence to support this state of affairs. I was confident at the time that I had an accurate assessment of the situation, but I am more than happy now to learn from the contents of this report that the opinion which I had formed is now completely supported by the statements of the Director of Marketing in his summary report.

It would appear that this same report completely upholds the previous decision of the Brisbane Milk Board in refusing the application of the co-operative body for a wholesale licence to establish a new pasteurising plant in the Brisbane milk district. The first three paragraphs of the report are well worthy of special note. The first paragraph states that “the establishment of a further milk pasteurisation plant” within the Brisbane milk district “is not warranted and could lead to increased distribution costs and/or failure of the new plant.”

I look now at the efficiency of the present system. Apparently the efficiency of Brisbane's milk supply was found to be beyond criticism, because the second paragraph of

the report states that "the present system of milk distribution within the Brisbane milk district is efficient, and there can be no quarrel with it on the grounds of cost, quality, or service." There is, however, a suggestion that there may be some scope for the reduction of the transport cost of raw-milk supplies, but this statement should not be confused in any way as a criticism of the Brisbane system, for raw milk is normally carried by independent operators to the country depots or to the Brisbane factory and this is a matter which is really outside the control of the Brisbane processing factories, for they purchase their milk on a "delivered Brisbane price" basis.

I turn to the limited reasons advanced to support the case. The third paragraph states that, "despite the efficiency of the Brisbane system, there is a strong case on industry-economic and dairy-farmer-equity grounds for the admission of milk pasteurised outside the present Brisbane milk district for sale to consumers within the Brisbane milk district."

Up to the present time I have not had the opportunity of making a detailed study of the report in every aspect, but it would seem correct to say that the ground of industry economics has had very little attention, if any, within the survey report, and for this reason this statement must be received with great caution. The second ground which has been advanced, namely, dairy-farmer equity, seems to be the kernel of the whole problem, and this aspect invites much closer examination than any suggestion of industry economics, but the report does little to help, for it fails to clear the air at all and reveal what the true problem is.

Let us look at some of the prominent features of Brisbane's milk supply. I referred to many of these in a similar debate in 1966. According to the information which I have gathered, this city is in the very fortunate position of enjoying a public milk supply which is highlighted by the following features:—

- (1) It has the cheapest retail price of milk to consumers in any Australian capital city.
- (2) It has quality milk unsurpassed in any capital city in Australia. This is vouched for by State Government authorities.
- (3) It enjoys the highest consumption per capita of any of the capital cities, according to statistics available.
- (4) The current price structure is set on the lowest margin from farm price to consumer price applicable to any capital city in the Commonwealth, which, in effect, means that the producer is enjoying the highest percentage of the retail price as his return anywhere in any of the capital cities in Australia.

This, again, was mentioned by me in 1966.

Another matter that I then referred to was whether Brisbane had a wholesale milk monopoly. I believe it is quite incorrect to brand the system of wholesale milk distribution in Brisbane with the term "monopoly", because this is not at all my understanding of a monopoly.

Brisbane's only wholesale organisation is completely controlled as a public utility service, just the same as a gas or electricity supply is controlled. With milk, the control is exercised through the operations of the Brisbane Milk Board, which sets a buying price payable to the producer or country factory and fixes all prices at both wholesale and retail levels in respect of the commodity concerned.

Variations in the price structure in any respect must be recommended by the Brisbane Milk Board to the Minister for Primary Industries, and no alteration can be made without his consent. This is without doubt the tightest possible control which could possibly exist in guarding the public and producer interests. I would suggest that this state of affairs is little short of an economist's dream, if I can still remember my basic economic studies in years gone by.

This system has earned the commendation of, firstly, the Brisbane Milk Board when it dealt with the co-operative body's original application for a milk license in Brisbane, and it is now being further upheld and commended by the investigating committee on behalf of the Department of Primary Industries when it refers to our current system as being "efficient" in respect of "costs, quality and service". So, in fact, it really means that this current system in Brisbane, which I suggest is unfairly branded as a "monopoly" to excite some public reaction, has in fact no criticism to answer as the report gives a creditable acknowledgement of the manner in which Queensland United Foods Ltd., through its two subsidiaries, Pauls and Peters, discharges its duties both to the industry and to the public.

It therefore seems to me that there is some underlying reason for all the attention that is being directed to Brisbane's milk system. I think it is correct to say that it is bound up, not in the matter of treatment and distribution, but in the question of a struggle between the suppliers who are providing milk direct to the Brisbane plants under personal quotas allocated by the Brisbane Milk Board and the country factories representing suppliers who are supplying per medium of these bulk country factory quotas, also allocated by the board. If this is so, then why cloud the issue with all the wild-cat schemes for destroying the city's milk economy?

I will now look at the facts relating to the basis of supply. Let us set aside any concern for the question of the system of milk treatment and distribution in Brisbane for the time being and direct our attention to

this question of disagreement between two producer groups who supply the raw milk to the Brisbane processing plants.

The first sign of this breach was, I suggest, strongly evidenced in the original formation of the Country Milk Co-operative Federation Ltd. and its application to obtain a wholesale license in Brisbane to become a production and marketing body, content to destroy Brisbane's milk economy if necessary, so long as it captured for its producers a larger share of the Brisbane market than they already enjoyed through their Milk Board quotas. This could hardly be described as falling within the spirit of "co-operation" as between brother milk-producers.

Fortunately for Brisbane consumers this effort was not allowed to succeed, but failure at this point has never stopped this body of factories from pressing their case very strongly in all quarters, and I believe that the Minister for Primary Industries (the Honourable J. A. Row) has been particularly pressed in this two-year period not only by the representations on behalf of the co-operative group of companies but also by representatives of the Queensland Dairymen's Organisation, which is the statutory body looking after the affairs of dairy-farmers generally. This would seem to establish a pretty clear picture of strong conflict between these two producer groups.

I suggest that we pause to have a look at the quota system. According to some very preliminary research which I have done in this regard, it would appear that Brisbane's milk supply is regulated by the Brisbane Milk Board on the basis of quota milk, which amounts to 66,000 gallons a day. This quota of 66,000 gallons a day is divided as follows:—

	Gallons a day
Direct producers—46 per cent.	30,300
Country factories—54 per cent.	35,700
	<hr/>
	66,000

It would appear that these country factory interests are exerting great pressure, wherever possible, to get this 54 per cent. figure increased, which can only be at the expense of the direct suppliers. Milk which comes to the city for market milk purposes carries a price to the producer of 42.3c a gallon delivered Brisbane. This is also the price payable by Queensland United Foods Ltd. to the co-operative factories, who supply the country quota of 54 per cent. Direct producers, on a yearly basis, would send all their milk to the Brisbane processing plant, and of this total quantity approximately 68 per cent. would be paid for at market milk prices. The balance of 32 per cent. would be paid for at manufacturing rates, depending entirely upon the uses to which the milk was put by the Brisbane wholesale factory. Milk used for table cream production yields a slightly higher price than other manufacture milk.

On the other hand, in respect to those producers supplying country factories a lesser percentage of their supply to country factories would be paid for at market milk rates. Apart from sending to Brisbane under a factory quota, most of these country factories would use a quantity of milk for the production of bottled pasteurised milk for sale within their own franchise areas. Where this applies, a figure varying from 50 per cent. to 65 per cent. of producers' milk in these particular areas could be used for liquid purposes, and therefore would return to the producer a satisfactory price for this portion of his milk. However, in the case of those factories sending to the Brisbane market but not enjoying the privilege of a country franchise area to service with bottled pasteurised milk produced within their own factory, their percentage of milk intake which would reach the market-milk market might be as low as 35 per cent., although there is one factory in Maleny which, I understand, would get rid of only 10 per cent. of its milk into this particular field because it got only a small quota in recent years to make its initial entry into the Brisbane milk market.

It is this situation which I believe gives rise to the comment made within the department's report where it raises the question of dairy-farmer-equity grounds for the admission of milk pasteurised outside the present Brisbane milk district for sale to consumers within the Brisbane milk district. Obviously everyone is manoeuvring to get as much of the Brisbane liquid trade as possible, and is bringing pressure to bear wherever he thinks his cause may be advanced.

On the face of things it seems to me that this is the basic problem and this is a straight-out question of Government policy. It is not a matter of there being any necessity to risk the wrecking of Australia's most reliable and economic system of processing and distribution in any capital city merely to satisfy a producer disagreement, but of determining a policy for the future as to whether there is justification for some change in the quota policy as determined under the Milk Supply Act. I do not think that this problem is insurmountable.

Obviously there is a lot of deep research which should be done on this aspect to determine whether direct producers are unnecessarily favourably treated at the expense of country factories, or whether there is an industry background to this situation which requires assessment before offering any hasty opinion. I propose to seek as much background information on this matter as I can before I venture any opinion on this particular subject, and I will be pleased to set out in detail my findings. I believe this is a duty of all members.

I do know, however, from some of my inquiries of two years ago that some of the factories which are pressing for a larger share of the market today were the people who held out and refused to supply Brisbane

wholesalers for many, many years when milk was urgently wanted to satisfy Brisbane's increasing demand. Now having had a taste of the market milk economy today, with overseas export prices so depressed, they want to forget about their poor judgment of years gone by and push the more far-sighted people into the background. However, as I have stated, this is a subject which requires deep and close study before coming to any conclusions, and this is my proposed course of action in the near future.

After examining the report one might ask the question, "Who did in fact prepare this report?"

Mr. O'Donnell: I asked that and didn't get any answer, either.

Mr. LICKISS: I shall try to see if I can obtain the answer. I think it is quite clear who did prepare the report. I must state that I am more than ordinarily intrigued by one particular side of this whole report. Far too much criticism has been levelled at Messrs. Ivers and Hamilton. I do not criticise them in the least. I believe that the facts in the report and the recommendations do not gel at all. Publicly it has been stated that the report is the work of two officers of the Department of Primary Industries, namely, Messrs. Ivers and Hamilton. On page 5 the report reads as follows:—

"Messrs. Ivers and Hamilton have furnished a report on their investigations in Victoria and New South Wales and a draft interim report on their studies in South-Eastern Queensland. This latter report is in the 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."

This has an air of mystery about it to me.

Obviously, the published statement that it was the report of two officers of the Department of Primary Industries is quite incorrect. Mr. D. P. Lapidge is the Director of Marketing and this is his report, not the report of the two investigating officers at all. The summary report states that the investigating officers' report is being revised in respect of a number of aspects. Why is this so? Perhaps there has been conflict between the result of Ivers and Hamilton's investigation, and the report prepared for the Minister by Lapidge.

Is the revision of the report of these two investigators necessary to make the two coincide? Mr. Lapidge is Director of Marketing in the Department of Primary Industries. Both the Director-General of the department (Dr. J. M. Harvey) and the Deputy Director-General (Mr. A. A. Ross) are senior to Mr. Lapidge. Mr. Ross is chairman of the Brisbane Milk Board, which recommended to the Minister two years ago against the allowance of the co-operative group companies entering the Brisbane milk market and

destroying its economy. Dr. Harvey has been appointed to his post since the date of the original application by the co-operative group. But are these two senior officers of the department backing this report? I think that is a fair question. Or is it a case of both of these officers being avoided by the report coming direct from the Director of Marketing to Cabinet? I think that also is a fair question.

At least I believe that the report in its present form places the Deputy Director-General (Mr. Ross) in a most invidious position as chairman of the Brisbane Milk Board, for an employee of the department for whom he is responsible (Lapidge) is now in effect reporting that this co-operative movement should be permitted to enter the Brisbane milk market on farmer-equity grounds. Is this officer a person of experience within the milk industry and qualified to make such a report? If so, where did he gain his practical experience to support such a sweeping and far-reaching report?

It will be interesting to note in due course, when the Brisbane Milk Board files its comments with the Minister through its chairman (Mr. Ross), whether it supports the scheme or whether it remains unaltered in its views as previously expressed.

Up to the present stage I have confined my preliminary observations to that section of the report which refers to the Brisbane milk market. It will be well appreciated that the report, of course, goes beyond this point, and at the moment I am not prepared to make any statement as to whether this is merely a means and method of dressing up the general concentrated attack on the Brisbane milk market or whether it is a genuine attempt to bring forth for the benefit of the dairy industry in Queensland a constructive suggestion for its improvement.

This requires a lot of deep investigation and close study, particularly in respect to the operations of the Butter Marketing Board and the Cheese Marketing Board, as well as of the Brisbane Milk Board. All of these boards seem to have a specialist role to play in the orderly marketing of dairy products in this State and in seeking export opportunities for the benefit of the dairy industry, and whether this could or could not be assisted by one common authority is difficult to say at this point.

For the moment, it is difficult to understand the suggestion in the report that a Queensland dairy products board is needed, for there is already a Queensland Dairy Products Stabilisation Board, constituted under State legislation, which comprises representation of the Butter Marketing Board, the Cheese Marketing Board, and the Queensland Dairymen's Organisation; but I will not take my comment past this point at the moment.

Once again I should like to say that it is my intention to go much more deeply into all aspects of the report, and I propose

to comment on them in more detail when I have completed my research. I do feel, however, that in the meantime the whole vital question should be treated with the greatest caution, for, apart from general public interest in the question, there are some very important aspects that must be taken into account. I have already placed some of them before the Committee.

In my early consideration of this report, I will invite attention to the following points of political significance—

(1) Can we as a Government support any move which runs the risk of—

(a) taking away Brisbane's unique position in respect to having the cheapest milk in Australia, or

(b) becoming involved in a system of operation which, if it does not increase the price of milk, means a lowering of the price to producers to stand up to the competitive element in the city trade?

(2) Allow ourselves to become involved in either of the above two situations merely to settle a fight between milk-producer factions?

This is one matter that has not been mentioned in the report, but which I believe is significant. Has it ever occurred to anyone that a company like Queensland United Foods Ltd., after having given a performance over the years that has won full recognition after the closest investigation, and stands with a high reputation as a Queensland company supporting this State and its producers in a most loyal way, will reach a point of asking what it has to do to merit Government and State support?

Without this question being satisfactorily answered, I forecast that the wrong move on the part of the Government, merely to answer a pressure group of suppliers, could force this loyal Queensland company to doubt the wisdom of its present allegiance to this State and its producers.

The obvious answer to protecting interests in Brisbane (if we are going to permit the erosion of the Brisbane milk market by the co-operative movement and restrict Queensland United Foods Ltd. from trading in the co-operative company's areas) is to go over the border and use section 92, and bring all the milk that they want into Brisbane, and, for that matter, into any franchise area if they process and pack it over the border. Before we know where we are, we will have the greatest problem of all time on our hands and this Government will get the greatest possible adverse reaction for ever allowing such a development to take place.

Let me now draw attention to the abundance of milk available in the Northern Rivers area of New South Wales, and the inability of this area to get its milk into the Sydney milk market. What a perfect answer to their problem it would be if we forced Queensland United Foods Ltd. over the border! I think this vital aspect is well

worthy of consideration, for the Director of Marketing has not given it any thought in bringing forward this scheme for revising Brisbane's current successful milk operation.

I am not prepared to see the consuming public, or the producers, or the distributors and processors, thrown to the wolves. I believe that very careful consideration must be given to all aspects of this report and, whilst I am not one for pigeon-holing reports, if I could find a dusty one which would never be opened, that is where I would put this report.

Let me conclude on this matter by asking: what, in fact, are we arguing about? If all the milk that went into the milk market in the whole of Queensland was assessed, this would amount to 18 per cent. of the total production. Eighty-two per cent. of the milk produced in this State does not go into the milk market. What we are saying is that by this type of move we will improve the situation of the dairying industry. This is ridiculous. It is a fight between the "haves" and the "have-nots", and nothing more. I believe it is an industry matter and should be kept at that level.

Again I repeat: if I have anything to do with it I will not see the Brisbane consumers, the Brisbane distributors and processors, or the producers, thrown to the wolves by any ill-conceived, precipitant action.

I wish now to deal with another matter which has concerned me this week and which, in my opinion, should concern all hon. members. I believe that hon. members will have observed the question and answer and the redirection of the question and answer between the Minister for Local Government and myself. I feel sure that all hon. members can see quite clearly that my original question dealt with planning and that the Minister either deliberately or inadvertently avoided the issue.

The hon. member for Toowoomba East raised this matter of answers to questions by Ministers, and, if I might say so, after the treatment that has been meted out to me this week I have some sympathy for him. I do not intend to tolerate this type of situation, however.

To retain the record in "Hansard", I propose to read the questions and answers.

My question to the Minister for Local Government was—

"(1), Has his attention been drawn to 'The Courier-Mail' of October 14, wherein it was stated that tenders with proposed plans have been called and submitted for a section of the Roma Street area known as the old markets site?

"(2) Are the plans part of an integrated plan for the development or re-development of the Brisbane inner-city area?

"(3) Has the area been tentatively set aside as a site for an Arts Centre and, if so, will the present proposals conflict with that purpose?

"(4) Has any other site been set aside for an Arts Centre under the Town Plan and, if so, where is it located?"

"(5) As a co-ordinated plan for the re-development of the Roma Street area generally could make possible the desirable separation of people and traffic known not to be possible in piece-meal development, will he intervene where necessary to ensure the proper integrated development of this and other parts of Queensland's capital?"

"(6) Does the Government accept that it has an over-riding responsibility to ensure the adequate planning of our capital?"

To that question I received the following answer:—

"(1 to 6) The land in question is a reserve for park under the control of the Brisbane City Council as trustee."

So I saw fit to redirect the question, and I now record that redirection. Again the question was directed to the Minister for Local Government. It reads—

"Further to his Answer to my Question on October 16—

(1) Is he aware that a Question dealing with the legal status of land is one which would be appropriately directed to the Minister for Lands?

(2) Will he therefore direct his reply to my Question in terms of planning, which comes within his Ministerial responsibilities."

I received the following answer:—

"The answer to the hon. member's question on the 16th was factual. However, in view of the further question (in fact, it was the same question) I answer as follows:—

(1) In some instances it would be the Minister for Mines and Main Roads; in others it would be the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General or the Minister for Lands.

(2) The policy of this Government in relation to the town planning of the City of Brisbane is expressed in the City of Brisbane Town Planning Act, 1964 to 1967."

I now wish to deal with the question, in respect of which apparently the Minister went to some ends to prove that my statement on a matter dealing with the legal status of land would not be a matter appropriately directed to the Minister for Lands. I say to the hon. gentleman that either he has been badly advised or he has had very little experience in this particular matter. The public plans of the State are held in the Lands Department, and any initial inquiry in relation to the legal status of land should be made to the Lands Department or the Minister for Lands not only in Queensland but also in every other State. I throw this back at the Minister and ask him either to get his advice from a more

reliable source or to make some inquiries from his fellow Ministers. The point is that being told that the land is reserved does not in any way answer the question. If, on looking at Brisbane's city square, I were to have asked a question about its planning, would I have been told by the hon. gentleman that it was part of Albert Street? Let me say to the hon. gentleman that land status has very little to do with the initial planning. Planning can come first and, through the statutes that have been enacted by this Government, the legal status of land can be varied to make it comply with the planning needs.

I took the trouble today to get a lithograph cut of the area known as the old Roma Street markets site. I happen to know that in 1965 part of the area then known as the markets site was, by "Government Gazette", placed under the control of the Brisbane City Council. If my information is correct, in 1968—that is, this year—the old police station site was, by "Government Gazette", also placed under the control of the Brisbane City Council. That area is now set aside for park purposes. I remind the Chamber that the whole of the area known as the Roma Street area was the subject of a very comprehensive plan for redevelopment. In that plan, the so-called market site was, amongst other purposes, set aside as an art centre. I believe that I was well within my rights in asking the Minister if the site can still be used for that purpose or if another site has been allocated. Apparently the Minister did not know or his advisers could not inform him, or he was not prepared to say.

This valuable piece of real estate should be developed for the benefit of the citizens of the City of Brisbane in an integrated plan. This plan has already been evolved. It met with the approbation not only of the Brisbane City Council, the State Government and the general populace, but also of the planning experts who viewed it. To use the land in the manner envisaged by the Lord Mayor is to liken its use as a cabbage patch in relation to its optimum use.

The most disconcerting part of all this is that we call ourselves a democracy, yet we appear to support a complete dictatorship in the form of the Lord Mayor in the Brisbane City Council. I am getting a bit sick of it. I do not think it is good enough. The attitude of the Lord Mayor in relation to the tendering by Capital City Motels Pty. Ltd. certainly warrants an investigation. That is not a concern of mine at the moment so much as it is of one of my colleagues. Nevertheless, I am concerned.

If I am to interpret the Minister's meaning in his answer to my question it must be to assess that this Government does not accept an overriding responsibility for the planning and development of the capital city of this State.

Mr. Porter: If that were so, it would make us unique in Australia. That can hardly be so.

Mr. LICKISS: That would be true. Every other State Government has an overriding responsibility not only to its capital city but to the planning of the whole of the State. I am therefore forced into a position where I, as a citizen of Brisbane, representing some 18,000 or 19,000 constituents, and vitally interested in my city, have to put forward a suggestion that may enable the development of this redundant area of Brisbane for the benefit of the citizens.

I recommend that a corporation be established by statute to develop the Roma Street market site and its environs as a matter of urgency in the interests of the welfare of this city, and that this Government-sponsored corporation be given statutory powers to arrange for the planning, development and acquisition of lands and to recommend the alienation of such lands on such terms and conditions as will enable the proper integrated development of the area so affected.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. LICKISS: That illustrates the ignorance of the hon. gentleman. This is a Government-sponsored corporation.

I am reluctant to make this recommendation, but I believe that somehow we must get Brisbane off the deck. I do not think we can afford to have a redundant area in the heart of our city. Therefore, I hope that the Government will give very serious consideration to the establishment of a corporation for the development of the Roma Street market site and its environs.

Mr. Porter: What you propose is in fact being done by the New South Wales Government in The Rocks area of Sydney.

Mr. LICKISS: That is true. The hon. gentleman knows full well that the New South Wales Government at the moment proposes to develop The Rocks area in this manner.

I have said that I am reluctant to make this recommendation. I do so only because we have not a properly constituted planning authority to cope with town and regional planning for the State of Queensland. This is another matter. I feel sure that when the substance of my private member's motion on this matter is aired in this Chamber I will gain the support not only of Government members but also, in a large measure, of Opposition members. Certain hon. members have come to me privately and stated that they fully support this. I believe that when this matter is debated the argument will be so convincing that the Government will take this vital and necessary step to ensure the future planning of Queensland not only on a town basis but on a regional basis as well, and in co-operation with the local authorities.

Mr. HARRIS (Wynnum) (5.23 p.m.): I do not propose to elaborate on the Budget. I feel that the silence of Government members and the contributions of the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and their parliamentary colleagues have amply illustrated the State's dissatisfaction, particularly as the Budget is referred to as a "get-up-and-go" Budget.

Having listened with some interest to the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha, I have no doubt of his sincerity. I know he has the interests of the City of Brisbane at heart. However, like many of my colleagues, I fully appreciate that, as members of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland, we owe a duty to our constituents, and we are quite prepared to leave the running of the Brisbane City Council in the capable hands of our Lord Mayor. Up to the present time he has not required the assistance of any State members of Parliament to pull the Brisbane City Council out of the rut it was in for so many years. I appreciate the interest displayed by the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha. He is justly entitled to every assistance his colleagues can give him to rectify this problem.

On a recent visit to New South Wales I had the opportunity of inspecting some of the trousers made for officers of the New South Wales Police Department. Comparing them with the garments that our police officers are expected to wear, I am astounded that our Police Department can get recruits. How can men be expected to go on the high-ways and byways dressed as they are now?

Mr. Miller: This is in New South Wales?

Mr. HARRIS: I am referring now, as I said previously, to the trousers of Queensland police officers. Hon. members opposite are endeavouring to interject on a subject with which I doubt whether any of them are at all conversant.

I shall explain why I brought this matter forward. The belt loops on the trousers that these unfortunate men are forced to wear are seven great lumps of material spread unevenly round the waistband of the trousers, to hold a belt which is 3½ inches wide. The loops are 1 inch too large for the belt. The trousers of the New South Wales uniform have three loops; I might mention that they are what is known as flap loops. (In fact, they remind me of the flapping tongues of some hon. members opposite.) The flap loops are attached to the trousers by chrome press-studs. Why it has not been possible to incorporate them in the Queensland garments, I do not know. That has been suggested on many occasions.

The New South Wales police officers each carry a pistol and handcuffs on the belt. In the way in which they are presently made, the belt loops on the trousers worn by Queensland police officers would not support the weight of a pistol and handcuffs. I sincerely recommend that urgent consideration be given to altering these garments in

an endeavour to make them look more tidy and become more serviceable for the purpose for which they are made.

Mr. Newton: Do you think tunnel loops might hold?

Mr. HARRIS: A tunnel loop would be quite serviceable, but it would not be possible to attach anything to it.

I should now like to draw attention to the uniforms of railwaymen. It is all very well for some people to sit back in their armchairs and spacious, luxurious lounge suites when other unfortunate people are humiliated by having to wear shocking uniforms made in a style dating back to 1914. Not only is the style of the uniform unsuitable for Queensland's climate, but the material used would, I venture to say, be used only in this State. I doubt whether it is even on sale in any other State. The Victorian Police Force is using a fine fox serge made in Australia by Australians for Australian police officers.

I was surprised to see that no further progress has been made in modifying these uniforms after 12 months of investigation by a board which was set up by the Government. In the first place, I understand that the board was to consist of a union official, a qualified manufacturing tailor, a member of the Stores Board, assisted by the clerk in charge of the uniform section. Apparently that board was not satisfactory to either the Commissioner for Railways or the Minister for Transport.

It was very soon changed, and the board now consists of the firm of Stuart Adams, tailors and mercers. In answer to a question that I asked in this Chamber, I was informed that they were engaged by the Commissioner for the purpose of designing suitable railway uniforms and advising the department concerning the class of materials.

This matter has been discussed thoroughly in the Chamber on many occasions. Samples of the materials available have been submitted; different styles have been suggested. Now a strange firm, which probably has never been heard of in Queensland, has been given the responsibility of modifying railway uniforms. It is suggested that Mr. Adams has had 32 years' experience in the trade and Mr. Struthers 30 years' experience. Admittedly, being qualified clothing manufacturers, they should know something about the matter.

Let us hope that it is not very long before some action is taken to modify railway uniforms. How long are people who are working in the varying temperatures of Queensland to be asked to wear the present uncomfortable uniforms? They are wearing them now only because the Government has not sufficient interest in railway employees to give them the consideration to which they are justly entitled. Until the Opposition can instil into the mind of the Government the

need for a change, I do not think that railway employees will be very satisfied with the conditions under which they are working.

I should like to mention one or two points relative to the tramways strike that occurred recently. If the Government had given effect to some of the suggestions made over the years by my parliamentary colleagues, the effects of the strike would not have been half as drastic as they were. I refer particularly to the electrification of Brisbane's suburban railways. There is no need for me to reiterate what has happened in that field.

Admittedly the railways did a good job in carrying people in the Brisbane area during the tram and bus strike. But what action has the Government taken since it realised that the railway system provides a very efficient means of transporting people in the metropolitan area, and in the State generally?

Let us give a little thought not only to metropolitan rail travellers but also to interstate rail travellers. I admit that the accommodation on the New South Wales interstate train is very good. But the conditions under which people going south travel and the facilities available on their arrival are vastly different from those experienced by travellers when they arrive at the South Brisbane interstate rail terminal. A visitor alighting for the first time at the South Brisbane rail terminal is completely lost. He has to collect his luggage, carry it out onto the street, and then carry it another 30 yards before he comes to a stairway leading to the ground floor.

There are 27 steps in this stairway, and on arriving at the ground floor the traveller still has another 30 yards to walk before he gets to the most dingy cloakroom of, I should say, any railway station in the Commonwealth of Australia. This station has been built for 30-odd years. Why in the name of good fortune can't the cloakroom be brought up to the level of the footpath for the convenience of the travelling public? Not only do the people have to suffer that humiliation but, having deposited their luggage in the cloakroom they then have to go back up to the top before they can get a taxi to get to their destination.

This is something to which the Government should give urgent consideration. It is about time that the railways throughout Queensland were given a complete brush up, not only with respect to uniforms but throughout the entire system. I suggest that the Minister for Transport, not the Commissioner, should take a firm stand in the matter and endeavour to assist the employees of the Railway Department, the travelling public and the people generally so that our railway services might be viewed in a light comparable with those in New South Wales and Victoria.

I should like now to deal with something more important to me than the South Brisbane Railway Station. I know that the

Minister will endeavour to do something about the station, the uniforms and benefits to the workers. I refer particularly to the Wynnum waterfront and the jetties on it. I believe that about 80 years ago a wooden jetty was built at Wynnum Central. Over the years it got to a stage where it was dangerous and this Government, in its wisdom, removed it and erected an excellent concrete and brick jetty. Unfortunately, this jetty has been wrongly constructed in that it is the wrong shape. It has dangerous sloping sides and no railings, it protrudes out into shallow water and it is of no value to the boating fraternity. They cannot use it to take on or discharge passengers or goods.

Seeing that this jetty has been built in that way, I suggest that the engineers of the Department of Harbours and Marine might give serious consideration to building a platform at its end in order to make it available to the people for boating purposes. In addition, it would not be nearly so dangerous. I mention the danger angle in this, because quite recently there was a near fatality on the water. A boat that was operated by a stranger to our district sailed straight into the jetty. This man was hoping that he could land a patient. Not only did he not arrive at the jetty because of the low tide, but he was fouled on the bottom and the patient was approximately an hour and a-half late in getting medical attention. I sincerely hope that the Minister concerned will give this matter some urgent consideration.

For some considerable time the boating fraternity at Wynnum has suffered many disadvantages that could have been overcome by a little co-operation and assistance from the Government. One of the main disadvantages is the Wynnum boat ramp. I am led to believe that on Saturdays and Sundays it is used by at least 300 units comprising boats and trailers, and on weekdays by between 50 and 60 units. Statistics have shown that for each boat ramp that is continually used an area of 4 acres is required for car-parking facilities alone. I fully realise that the provision of parking facilities near boat ramps is not the responsibility of the State Government, but I suggest that if the Government builds more ramps in the Wynnum district it should give urgent consideration to parking facilities.

A second ramp has been constructed at the boat harbour, and I am led to believe that last week-end 370 boats used that ramp. In this case, too, the parking facilities provided are inadequate. However, the Government has endeavoured to provide adequate facilities.

I refer now to the Manly boat harbour. Quite recently another vessel was added to the fleet that carries passengers in the area. This new vessel is called the "Mini Munya", and it runs between Manly and Dunwich at the week-ends. It carries 60 passengers

and it draws 4 feet 3 inches. The Government claims that the entrance to the harbour is 6 feet deep at low water, but this is completely wrong and it is misleading to visiting yachtsmen.

Mr. Davies: Mr. Carey, we cannot hear the hon. member because of conversation among Government members.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Carey) Order!

Mr. HARRIS: I can quite understand Government members talking among themselves. They are not interested in the boating fraternity. I would venture to say that the reason why they are not interested in boating is that half of them get sick going over Victoria Bridge in the tram, so there is no likelihood of their coming to Wynnum to put up with the troubles that we have down there.

Several teams from the Department of Harbours and Marine have taken soundings at the entrance to the harbour, and they still claim that there is a depth of 6 feet of water. The "Mini Munya" draws only 4 feet 3 inches, yet it scrapes the bottom. Some vessels down there are 50 to 60 feet long, and they have to wait outside the harbour until there is enough water to enter it. If the department provides misleading information like that to the boating fraternity, I suggest that further action be taken so that there will be less chance of fatalities in the future.

[Sitting suspended from 5.45 to 7.30 p.m.]

Mr. HARRIS: As you are no doubt aware, Mr. Smith, there has been a vast increase in the number of boating enthusiasts in the last few years, particularly in the Wynnum district, and since the construction of the concrete ramp it has been seriously congested. Whilst I appreciate the department's action in providing the ramp for the boating fraternity, I strongly urge that the time has come for doubling its width. I make this plea not merely on behalf of a few people in the Wynnum district, but for people throughout the metropolitan area who wish to use a ramp in my electorate. Unfortunately, one very prominent marine businessman in Wynnum has had to abandon boat and engine demonstrations in Wynnum Creek. Silting is so bad that at low water the ramp is dangerous, and new vessels that he is trying to sell, risk severe damage. That is a tragedy from a business point of view. Quite recently the same business proprietor was taking out a party in a motor launch at low tide—he launched at Wynnum Creek—and after travelling 100 yards he tore off the propeller on an obstacle. I hope that the Minister will give serious consideration to the dredging of Wynnum Creek at the earliest opportunity.

There are 54 mooring pens in the Manly boat harbour. They are completed and in use, but the harbour is so inadequate that

at least 50 or 60 applications are lodged with the department for mooring accommodation. The value of the boats presently in the pens is about \$1,250,000. Hon. members will readily understand why the boats that are moored—some of them illegally—in the Manly boat harbour require a security system controlled by the Department of Harbours and Marine. Recently the Metropolitan Security Service was commissioned to provide security cover for these boats. Although it was paid \$6,000 for this coverage it was not worth a crumpet. There was more vandalism and damage to the yachts and launches in the Manly boat harbour while the M.S.S. was patrolling the area than there has been since then. Until quite recently these vessels had very good security coverage but owing to lack of foresight by the Department of Harbours and Marine boatowners have been forced to look after their own vessels, not only during heavy winds but also at other times to prevent vandalism.

Until quite recently a departmental employee was paid the princely sum of \$15 a week to look after these boats. At present, at the end of the Manly boat harbour the boating fraternity is reasonably well catered for by a store which handles food supplies, fishing gear, petrol, oil, water and spare parts. On several occasions this store has been broken into, simply because of the lack of foresight of the department in failing to provide some form of security.

At the present time the Department of Harbours and Marine is reclaiming an area adjacent to the existing Manly boat jetty. For hon. members who are not familiar with the construction of the harbour, I have a map with me showing exactly where this reclamation work will take place. I understand that the dredges started work this morning.

If hon. members visualise 50 launches and yachts inside the harbour, together with quite a number of yachts moored outside the harbour, they can imagine how many rowing boats or dinghies, call them what they like, would be around the place. The only area in which these dinghies could be moored with a certain amount of safety was on the northern side of the jetty. For some unknown reason the department has decided to reclaim that area, forcing these people to leave their dinghies at least half a mile away from their yachts and walk that distance to their dinghies. Then the department will say that, after the reclamation has been completed, extra ramps and extra moorings will be provided for these dinghies. But what is the reason or purpose in allowing these dinghies to be moored out in the open sea in Waterloo Bay, which is what will happen when this reclamation work is completed.

At present the dredge is reclaiming this land. The area being dredged will be used only for one specific purpose. As most hon. members know, in January the dragon

class world titles—the Prince Philip Cup—will be held in Waterloo Bay. Certain conditions apply. One of them is that once a vessel has been conditioned and placed in the water it must remain in the water until after the event, irrespective of when it was placed in the water.

At the moment there are no facilities for mooring the ordinary yacht-class vessel or launch owned by the general public or the boating fraternity in the metropolitan area. But because this cup is being competed for, and no doubt because pressure has been applied by the Royal Queensland Yacht Club, the Government has suddenly decided to find the money to provide another 40 moorings suitable for these yachts. Admittedly, after these visitors have gone to their various homes the moorings will become available to those people who are fortunate enough to have sufficient political influence to get them.

I should like to know whose ridiculous idea it was to reclaim this enclosed area, which is the only area available for the mooring of dinghies. The boating fraternity generally will experience undue and unnecessary inconvenience from now till the completion of the boat ramps and pens. From the time that it has taken to build the boat harbour to its present stage, it can readily be seen that it will be many years before the rest of the work is completed.

It is also interesting to know that efforts are being made to have approximately \$1,000,000 made available for the Peninsula. Sometimes I wonder why the Manly project is not finished.

Mr. Lee: Which Peninsula?

Mr. HARRIS: At some time or other we have all concerned ourselves greatly with safety not only on the roads but on the water. I think that members generally realise that those who use the roads abide by the provisions of the Traffic Act. There are rules to be followed on the water, too, but there is one difference between those rules and the ones governing road traffic. All provisions of the Traffic Act must be observed. In relation to movement on the water, I point out that at present quite a number of 44-gallon drums, welded together in pairs with cone-shaped tops, are used as marker buoys by the Royal Queensland Yacht Club. These buoys carry no lights, and they are a positive danger to all vessels in the Waterloo Bay area. I hesitate to think of the tragedy that could occur if one of these unusual and illegal buoys was hit at night-time by a launch with a number of small children aboard. Nothing is done about them, but if a person who owns a boat of any size or description moors it illegally in the Manly boat harbour he is subjected to a fine. The Royal Queensland Yacht Club, however, can get away with the dangerous practice of mooring unlit marker buoys.

Having endeavoured to point out what the Treasurer has failed to do in my electorate, I should now like to make a suggestion with which I feel sure the financiers of Queen Street will agree. I refer to the possibility of shortening the distance between the Pile Light and the open sea. I think that all would agree that there is merit in any suggestion that would have the effect of lowering costs, whether they be in manufacturing, transport, or other fields. Any person who studies a chart of the Moreton Bay area, whether he be a professional sailor or someone with just a natural interest in shipping, will see at once that if a passage for ships was cut through the southern part of Moreton Island, which is probably the narrowest part of it, there would be a considerable saving in the distance to be travelled by ships before they reach the sea. The island is only a mile wide there, and I am led to believe on reasonably good authority that this part of the island consists only of sand. If a passage was cut through there, it would save an amazing amount of time. From the cutting to the Pile Light there would be a saving of about 25 miles both inward and outward—in other words, perhaps 55 miles would be saved in 81 miles.

On many occasions representatives of the shipping industry have complained about the costs of handling cargo, and representatives of the Department of Harbours and Marine have said that their complaints were unfounded. Never once has anyone made the suggestion that the distance from the open sea to the mouth of the Brisbane River should be shortened. That is a practical possibility, and I ask that serious consideration be given to it. The channel would be suitable not only for ordinary craft but also for deep-draughted vessels. The vessels that would benefit most would be those going to or coming from New Zealand, the Pacific islands, or southern ports.

Mr. Chinchin: Are they happy to pay for it?

Mr. HARRIS: Mention has been made of the cost. I have here a newspaper cutting that I received quite recently, and I think the gentleman referred to in it, Mr. Baillie, would have a reasonably good idea of what he is talking about.

Mr. Ramsden: A very good bloke.

Mr. HARRIS: Mr. Baillie is general manager of Brisbane Wharves and Wool Dumping Pty. Ltd. and president of the Brisbane Development Association. I fully agree with the hon. member for Merthyr when he says that he is a good bloke, because I have had the privilege of meeting him personally and discussing certain matters with him. He made this prediction at one of the two seminars held at the City Hall as part of National Export Week. I am labouring this point in order to bring home to the Government and to the public generally that the Government is not pulling

its weight in connection with sea transport and cargo containerisation. The newspaper article says—

“Mr. Baillie said it had been estimated that internal and external transport and handling charges accounted for an average of one-third of the cost of producing and selling manufactured goods on the export market.”

No matter what hon. members opposite may say, if that one-third can be reduced by even a fraction there is a possibility that the people generally will benefit somewhere along the line. He is reported to have said—

“Quite dramatic changes were taking place in all forms of transport.

“In sea transport, the trend was towards bigger and bigger bulk carriers for such products as coal, fertiliser, grain, and oil.” I think we are fully aware of that.

He continued—

“If Brisbane was to be the bulk grain export port for wheat and other grains grown in Southern Queensland and Northern New South Wales, then the river in the Pinkenba area would have to be deepened to about 35 feet at high tide to accommodate bulk carriers of 35,000 to 40,000 tons.”

The sea lane that I have mentioned has a natural depth of 35 to 40 feet at low tide.

I heard one interjector say, “What about the cost?” After a few years the cost would be negligible in the over-all cost of transport.

Mr. Baillie is then reported to have said—

“Another major development was container cargo. The first regular container ships would start visiting Brisbane in March-April of next year, and it was expected that almost all trade through the Port of Brisbane would be container cargo to a marked degree by mid 1971.”

What provision has the Government made to receive these vessels, if the whole system is to be containerised by 1971?

The article continues—

“The main port area would be concentrated around Hamilton, where it would generate an estimated 67 per cent. increase in commercial truck movement by 1971.”

If traffic in the area is going to be increased by another 67 per cent, one can imagine the chaos there will be in the Hamilton area.

To continue—

“Further congestion would be caused in the area by the tremendous increase in air cargo and passengers from the expected introduction of jumbo jet services in about 1972. It would appear that the Gateway Bridge at the mouth of the river must be constructed by 1972-73 if Kingsford Smith Drive is not to become a complete bottleneck.”

Again I say, what provision has been made?

Reading further—

"Mr. Baillie said that with the use of bigger bulk carriers, heavy industries might extend to Moreton Bay where they would be more readily accessible to big ships."

This completely meets my wishes relative to a shorter sea-lane from the open seas to the Hamilton Reach.

In another Press clipping that I have here the question is asked, "Is Brisbane lagging as a major port?" It is very obvious that it is but we still cannot get the Department of Harbours and Marine to agree to our suggestion. Neither can the shipping industry, because it has been clashing with the department for years over exactly the same thing.

This article, by John Atherton, asks—

"Is Brisbane lagging behind in its role as one of the Southern Hemisphere's major ports, which each year handles more than 5,000,000 tons of cargo?"

Further on he relates two recent incidents which, in his words, "fanned new fire into an old conflict that mostly smoulders rather than flares." He says—

"One was a passenger-packed tourist ship refused permission to enter port because of safety factors; the other a disabled freighter unable to lay-up here because of insufficient berth depth."

Just imagine a loaded passenger vessel not being permitted to enter our port! Think of the revenue alone that we are losing simply because we have not the foresight to provide the facilities necessary for overseas passenger transport. Brisbane is not a passenger terminal, and until we get a passenger terminal here we can kiss goodbye to passenger traffic from overseas.

Mr. Ramsden: The wharfies killed Brisbane many years ago.

Mr. HARRIS: I appreciate the interest that Government members have taken. They realise that I am right in these things.

I should now like to mention one other matter in connection with the Budget with which I am not happy. I refer to the conditions under which local police in the Wynnum area have to work. This has been mentioned on many occasions. We have a good court-house at Wynnum but the police officers are working under primitive conditions. We have been endeavouring for some time to get more young men to become interested in the Police Force. The first thing I think we should do is give present police officers the conditions to which they are entitled. The Minister knows the conditions under which the police in Wynnum are working. I think he realises that they are shocking, but when the matter has been brought to his notice he has said that the old court-house, which was built in 1864, is quite suitable to cope with any overcrowding in the Police Department. I have mentioned previously in this Chamber that the condition of this building is a danger to the public. The stairs have fallen down and

the railings have crashed. Those are the conditions under which the police officers at Wynnum work. I request the Government to give urgent consideration to the erection of a new police station in the Wynnum district.

On many occasions hon. members have spoken about safety measures, but in this year of 1968 many unsafe level crossings exist in my electorate. Officers of the Railway Department admit that each day approximately 50 trains traverse these crossings, which are situated on highways; yet the electors in my electorate cannot get any satisfaction from the department in the provision of safety measures at the crossings. The lack of safety measures is a matter of great concern to my electors, because they are denied immediate medical attention owing to the lack of a hospital in the Wynnum district. Fifty-five thousand people live in the district, yet no hospital is provided for them. Some small consideration should be given to the installation of safe level crossings, particularly when the cost of the installation of one crossing is \$5,000. Surely a human life is worth much more than that.

I have listened with some interest to the interjections by the hon. member for Merthyr. I know that he is as interested in the safety of the public as he is in the interests of the fire brigade employees. I know also that on many occasions he has urged the provision of a river crossing to link the northern and southern banks of the lower reaches of the Brisbane River. I do not care what form the crossing takes—whether it be under, over or through the river—as long as he gets one. If the hon. member would be more precise and more constructive in his interjections when members of the Opposition are endeavouring to encourage the Government to do something, I would agree most heartily with what he had to say.

Mr. HOUGHTON (Redcliffe) (7.59 p.m.): I should like to speak on the Budget that has been presented by the Treasurer and to offer my heartiest congratulations to him on his presentation of it. I believe that this is the first occasion on which a document of this nature has been presented to this Chamber, and the Treasurer and his officers are to be complimented on their fine efforts in producing it. I hope that it will be the fore-runner of many such documents from this and other departments. The Budget is very illuminating and explicit in its presentation of the financial structure of this State. The Treasurer has called it his "March to Progress" Budget. I entirely agree that it is, and I should think that hon. members opposite would readily agree that the development and planning instituted by this Government over the past nine or 10 years have now borne fruit. The Budget illustrates many aspects of governmental policy that will be of great benefit to the people of this great State.

The other day the Leader of the Opposition read a dirge for about an hour or two. It was nothing but a screed prepared by somebody else. He read it word for word and, after listening to him, I was satisfied he would make a good living crying at wakes. He did nothing but cry about the faults of the Government. He had not one constructive suggestion to make. Obviously, the Budget is so good as to leave him absolutely lost for ideas. No doubt he has the poll jitters and he has every right to feel that way. The State is now reaping great benefits from the excellent work that has been performed. We are very fortunate in this State in that we have had excellent Treasurers of the calibre of the Honourable Gordon Chalk and Sir Thomas Hiley.

Mr. O'Donnell: Go back.

Mr. HOUGHTON: I will go back and say that Ted Walsh, the hon. member for Bundaberg, did quite a good job.

Mr. O'Donnell: Go back even further.

Mr. HOUGHTON: The hon. member does not want me to tell him about things that could have been done, and should have been done, when Labour occupied the Treasury benches.

The Treasurer and his departmental officers have presented us with thorough submissions.

Mr. Bennett: You have said that four or five times; get into the guts of it.

Mr. HOUGHTON: If the hon. member would only sit quietly he would hear. The larrikin barrister from South Brisbane has made his first appearance for about a month. If he just sits quietly he will hear something that will benefit him.

Mr. Bennett: At least I do not cheat them in real estate like you do.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HOUGHTON: Mr. Smith, I have listened to the Opposition's objections to the Budget. First, the Leader of the Opposition viciously attacked the land tax concessions, and claimed that no benefit would accrue from them. He said that they would be completely absorbed by increased valuations. I am sure that everyone on this side of the Chamber readily agrees that valuations have been increased, but salaries have been increased as well. Land valuations and the cost of all commodities have increased proportionately. The Government has therefore seen fit to keep increasing the concessions.

Mr. O'Donnell: That is ridiculous. Land values have increased by 200 or 300 per cent. I think you should sit down.

Mr. HOUGHTON: If the hon. member for Barcoo would only get out in the West and see what is going on instead of living under the Town Hall clock as he does—

Mr. O'Donnell: You do not know what I do.

Mr. HOUGHTON: As a matter of fact I do know what the hon. member does. He spends all his time under the Town Hall clock with the other stooges in the Opposition. That is the trouble. If he were to go out west he would not know where Barcoo is. Without the electric light on at night he would get lost going out there.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! Hon. members will desist from making personal reflections; they are highly disorderly.

Mr. HOUGHTON: One aspect of the Budget touched a tender spot of the Opposition. I refer to education. I believe this Government can be very proud of its record in this field. I have the honour to represent the City of Redcliffe. It was the Labour Government that denied the city a secondary school, and it was not until there was a change of government that we could even get one.

An Opposition Member: Oh!

Mr. HOUGHTON: It is on record, and I shall produce it if the hon. member desires, that the Labour Party, a couple of weeks before each election day, through the C.P.S. office, would put a dozer on the ground over there and let the people think that it was going to build a school. Today we have an education system equal to anything in the Commonwealth, so Opposition members cannot talk to me about the assistance the Labour Government gave the people of the City of Redcliffe in the provision of educational facilities. Today we have two of the best high schools in Australia. They are equal to anything in the Commonwealth. In addition we have denominational secondary schools such as De La Salle College and Soubirous College which are doing excellent work.

Mr. Bennett: What is the Government doing to help them?

Mr. HOUGHTON: The Labour Government did not do anything when it was in office, whereas we are doing something now. We are assisting them now. The Labour Government was not game to do anything. It sat and hoped that things would sort themselves out. The Government has had the courage to give assistance to those schools. This does not apply only to secondary schools. We have an opportunity school, a kindergarten and a subnormal school.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. HOUGHTON: I know what the hon. member is thinking. I hope that he is assisting everybody to carry out the good work. Nobody can get into trouble for thinking. We enjoy educational facilities that are second to none. The Government has every reason to be proud of its record. We have done a good deal. I admit that much remains to be done. The same vim and vigour we have

displayed in tackling other problems in the past will be apparent in the future as we face up to education responsibilities.

Mr. Bennett: Why are all the teachers going to Canada?

Mr. HOUGHTON: In reply to that interjection, bear in mind that the bus driver, whom the Labour Party was trying to sack in Brisbane for the sake of a lousy \$15 or \$16 a week, gets \$125 a week in Canada. If the like-with-like principle is applied to conditions in Canada—

Mr. Houston interjected.

Mr. HOUGHTON: I can speak from experience because I have a daughter who has recently been teaching in Canada. She did not go over there as a teacher. She has been teaching since her marriage. She keeps me up to date on what is happening there.

Mr. Bennett interjected.

Mr. HOUGHTON: The hon. member for South Brisbane would like to read anybody's letters and then he would have them up for defamation or something else. No doubt he would like to read some of my letters. As a matter of fact, I do not get letters in Braille which are the only ones he could read.

This Government is budgeting for a capital expenditure of some \$85,000,000 on education. That is a typical example of what we are doing and will continue to do.

Mr. R. Jones: Should be more of it. I agree with you.

Mr. HOUGHTON: It is very nice to know that the hon. member agrees. Furthermore, this Government has agreed to spend a further \$29,000,000 on buildings and equipment.

Mr. R. Jones: I am all with you. There should be a better wage level for all employees.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Cairns will please remain silent. The hon. member for Redcliffe is speaking.

Mr. HOUGHTON: Thank you, Mr. Smith. I am quite sure that all will agree that the budgetary provisions for education facilities will benefit many people in this State. Although hon. members opposite may have to appear to disagree, I feel that in their own hearts they know that in our democratic way of life the better the education system, the higher will be the standard of living enjoyed. Even though benefits may not be apparent immediately, the future will show the great importance of the action now being taken by the Government.

It was said that the Education Department was being used to solicit votes, and also for propaganda purposes. My youngest daughter is in the teaching profession, too, and on occasions she has to visit a near-by school. I make no qualms about saying that

in all walks of life and in all professions, the legal profession, the medical profession, and every other field, there will be the good and the bad. On going to this school on one occasion my daughter was greeted by a long-haired fellow of about 25 years of age. Admittedly he was not wearing a ribbon, although I do not know whether he took his lunch in a handbag. Incidentally, I believe he is a member of the Young Labour organisation. The first thing this fellow said to the assembled youngsters was, "You b-----s better look out for yourselves today". These are the people whom hon. members opposite support at the Foco Club and other clubs. They are the dills whom they support. Here in my hand I have a Foco Club pamphlet.

Mr. O'Donnell interjected.

Mr. HOUGHTON: The hon. member wants nothing to do with them, yet he marched down the street with them on Labour Day.

Mr. O'Donnell: That's a lie.

Mr. HOUGHTON: If the hon. member did not march down the street with them, he is on the ticket with them, anyway.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I rise to a point of order. I ask that that statement be withdrawn.

Mr. HOUGHTON: I will withdraw it, Mr. Smith.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out that the hon. member for Barcoo has not indicated on what grounds he wants the statement withdrawn. When he does that, I shall give a ruling.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I ask that it be withdrawn because it is completely untrue.

Mr. HOUGHTON: I will withdraw it, but, if the hon. member was not marching, there was someone like him marching and I understand his name was Donald.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I ask that that be withdrawn. I happened to be in Emerald on Labour Day.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: There is no requirement for that to be withdrawn.

Mr. HOUGHTON: These are things that all people realise. The amusing part about it is that when hon. members opposite are taxed with these things they claim they have no affinity at all with these people.

Mr. R. Jones interjected.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I have already spoken to the hon. member for Cairns. His conduct is grossly disorderly, and if he continues in this strain I shall have no hesitation in naming him.

Mr. HOUGHTON: I know that these things are disturbing to hon. members opposite who do not want to acknowledge their association with these people. However, we must face up to the cold, hard facts as we see them today. I point out that the people who are throwing the stones are the ones who are responsible for the distribution of the document I have here. It came to me from a very reputable family in the City of Redcliffe who went to the Foco Club.

Mr. Chinchen: What is the document?

Mr. HOUGHTON: A newsletter of some sort. It would be from one of the Trades Hall mob—the Comms.

Mr. O'Donnell: The same old lies.

Mr. HOUGHTON: One must be realistic about this. Hon. members opposite say that they have no truck with these people. Why is it that they support all the rabble-rousers, the people who sit on the road and have to be removed by the police with the aid of a fork-lift truck, and say that they have to be handled with kid gloves?

Mr. O'Donnell: Are you addressing your remarks to me?

Mr. HOUGHTON: If the cap fits, wear it!

Mr. O'Donnell: The cap does not fit me.

Mr. Davies: Tell us about the tramways in Redcliffe.

Mr. HOUGHTON: I think that the hon. member for Maryborough has been run over by a tram. He should just sit quietly.

There is always a hue and cry from the Opposition when one produces documents of this sort. They do not like it, and they take umbrage. People such as these should be removed from the Department of Education.

If hon. members opposite want to know what the hon. member for Norman said, he accused Mr. Don Cameron, the young Liberal member for Griffiths in the Federal Parliament, in these terms—

"I want to say, without any fear or doubt at all, to the House and to Mr. Cameron and his stooges, that the place he refers to as the Foco Club is not what he claims. I want to say that Mr. Cameron is a liar and a coward for saying this sort of thing in the Federal House. It is known out in his electorate, of course, that young people are frightened to be alone with this man. As far as I can see—and it is well known—there is one thing he likes better than going on a 'trip'. He is well known for this sort of thing. As a matter of fact, his campaign director and many of his supporters . . ."

and so on.

With all due respect to everybody in this Chamber, I ask: how long have we to tolerate this sort of snide instrumentality supported by a political organisation which puts forth

this filth in an endeavour to indoctrinate the minds of school children? I say sincerely that, although I do not agree with the hon. member for South Brisbane from time to time, I give him full marks for the action that he took recently relative to the distribution of literature of this type. Scurrilous literature has been distributed, and I do not think that any fair-minded citizen would subscribe to it. I do not want my children to read this tripe, this hash. I would prefer to let them read the book that the hon. member for Gregory referred to, "My Brother Jack".

Mr. Bennett: It is not Wally Rae's book.

Mr. HOUGHTON: He had a lot to say about it. I have not had the opportunity of reading it.

Mr. Davies: What about the photo with the hammer and sickle over Parliament House?

Mr. HOUGHTON: The hon. member's name was on it.

Mr. Bennett: Now talk about Craig Mostyn Pty. Ltd. You have been asking a lot of questions about it and getting the brush-off. Now is your chance to say something.

Mr. HOUGHTON: There are some matters in the fishing and prawning industries that concern me greatly. I claim that I do know a little about it even though other members of this Chamber may not know much about it. This industry, I should say, is in a lamentable condition and must be given assistance by the Federal Government as well as the State Government. Even in this morning's Press there was a report of two Russian vessels fishing in Gulf waters. Before long there will be not two but 22, and I charge my own Government, together with the Federal Government, with the responsibility for doing something about it. There has been an exodus of prawners from the Moreton Bay area to northern waters around Bowen and Mackay, and they have prospered. Some of them intended to go up into the Gulf waters but they decided to remain around Mackay and Townsville and they are reaping an abundant prawn harvest. Previously the boats were not operating there. I feel that the sea-food industry has tremendous potential, particularly the prawning industry. It is one that I think should be exploited fully. To get some idea of the value of food that could be obtained from the sea by this and many other countries, we can multiply by 5 the production from land, as the area of the sea is five times that of the world land mass.

I had the opportunity recently of travelling to the East and I could not but realise the amount that is taken from the sea by Eastern countries. We are lagging and flagging in making use of food that can be taken from the sea.

Mr. Bennett: Why did your Government allow the whaling station to go out of business?

Mr. HOUGHTON: There are no whales here. As a matter of fact I have spent as much time in the Bay as any other member of this Parliament and I do not think I have seen a whale in the Bay or around the Cape for at least two years. They have been exterminated by Russian whalers before reaching this area.

When we see what has been done in the prawning and fishing industries in other countries such as Japan that have to look for food, we realise that we have lagged, and lagged badly, and the time is fast approaching when we have to do something about this.

Mr. O'Donnell: Don't you think the fishing industry is catering for the present demand?

Mr. HOUGHTON: Not in all aspects.

Mr. O'Donnell: What aspects is it lagging in?

Mr. HOUGHTON: As a matter of fact, I should say that a great deal of frozen fish such as the hon. member enjoyed this evening, could be exported, but it is not taken. As an example take the crayfish industry in West Australia. In the last three or four years it has been developed into an industry worth millions of dollars. And prawns are so prolific in the Gulf that they can be seen stirring up the mud.

Mr. Sherrington: Like members of the Liberal Party, you can see them stirring mud.

Mr. HOUGHTON: The mud does not stick like that thrown by some of the political parties. The prawns are so prolific I am told, that prawners can take 3,000 lb. in one "dig" in half-an-hour. That is a tremendous haul.

Mr. O'Donnell: Where would you get a market for them?

Mr. HOUGHTON: They can find a market anywhere in the East if they are prepared to handle them. The problems up there are labour and the availability of water. Shortage of water is affecting the industry, particularly in the Gulf country. I hope the time is near when these bases at Weipa, Karumba, and around Groote Eylandt, will be established and we will be able to meet the demand. It is very disturbing to pick up a newspaper in the morning and read that two Russian vessels are already in there and the season is only about to start.

Mr. R. Jones: We've been telling you about this for five years.

Mr. HOUGHTON: The other day I asked the Treasurer a question about a Japanese vessel off Cape Moreton. I have no doubt that the Japanese are moving into these waters. The State Government has instituted a boating patrol, but it will not be able to operate at great distances from the coast,

and in the Gulf of Carpentaria the long distances involved will beat it. I am concerned about the preservation of prawning grounds particularly in the Gulf of Carpentaria, and, unless something is done very soon, foreigners will exploit these waters and denude them.

Fortunately Australia is not faced with a food shortage problem such as exists in other countries.

Mr. Bennett: Do you go along with the idea of allowing foreign agents to import fish through the Fish Board?

Mr. HOUGHTON: It all comes back to the question of the hon. member for Barcoo whether we are meeting the needs? We are not. If we could produce and package a commodity of the same standard and condition as that imported from overseas, I should say that there would be a job for every fisherman along the seaboard of this country. I firmly believe that to take advantage of the wealth that can be procured from the seafood industry we have to look at all aspects of it on an over-all basis.

The Department of Harbours and Marine has set up an experimental station at Deception Bay, and already proof has been obtained that the mangrove banks around Moreton Bay are the places where prawns and fish breed. A premium of something like \$3,000 an acre has been put on the mangrove areas as a result of this discovery.

I know that the hon. member for Salisbury is very concerned about pollution caused by oil and dredging. If dredging is necessary it should be allowed only on the basis that sanctuaries and breeding grounds are preserved.

Everybody will agree that the pollution of streams is a problem of great magnitude. I mention the Pine Rivers, with which I am very conversant. A few years ago a fisherman could catch an abundance of fish in those rivers, but today very few fish can be caught because of the tremendous pollution that has occurred in those streams. In Japan and other countries the streams are absolutely jet black and stagnant. The water in them is worse than the water that pours out at Luggage Point. If a great extent of industrial development is allowed then the fishing industry is in for a pretty torrid time.

I know that the typical person who operates a fishing vessel is an excellent type, but there are some people who will tip their rubbish and petrol into the water. They become the gypsies of the sea. The typical fisherman is a good character. I do not deny fishermen the wealth that they obtain from the sea because they have to face up to all sorts of adverse conditions. But I believe that the time is fast approaching when regulations need to be issued to cover the registration of vessels. Queensland vessels cannot be registered in New South Wales, but New South Wales vessels can

come into Moreton Bay and apparently take over the waters of the Bay. I ask the Treasurer to have a close look at this matter because I think that some restriction should be imposed on licences granted to fishing vessels, particularly those that can operate outside Cape Moreton. The draught and length of vessels that operate in the waters of Moreton Bay should also be regulated.

While I am referring briefly to the prawning industry, and while the Treasurer is here, I should like to point out that the Moreton Bay Boat Club has done excellent work in conjunction with the police in rescue work. The club has asked me to see if a couple of wrecks can be placed in the vicinity of their base at Tangalooma. The previous Treasurer, Sir Thomas Hiley, had a couple of wrecks placed at Bulwer Island and Tangalooma but the club has asked that some more be placed in the Tangalooma area, parallel to the beach, to provide shelter with a reasonable safe anchorage during the westerlies. If the Treasurer can give favourable consideration to this request I am sure a reasonable anchorage will be provided. I know that there have been two or three nasty incidents there and that some boats have been wrecked in the vicinity of the Tangalooma base.

We have an excellent Police Force at Redcliffe under the leadership of Sub-Inspector Banks. He is doing an excellent job, but, like many other police stations, Redcliffe is short staffed. Our worst problem at present is that the Police Force and the clerk of the court and his staff are in the one building. The City of Redcliffe has a fixed population of 30,000 but, with itinerant people and tourists, the population rises to 50,000 or even 100,000. An extra traffic patrol officer is badly needed, and a new court-house is essential so that the police can take over all the space presently used by the clerk of the court and his staff, the court-house and other officials in the building. I have no doubt that when the Police Force is expanded, as has been announced, our needs will be satisfied. The people of Redcliffe firmly believe that the Government should give urgent consideration to these matters.

Mr. Bennett: Tell us about Craig Mostyn.

Mr. HOUGHTON: I will at the appropriate time, but I will tell the story in my own way.

I congratulate the Treasurer on his Budget and I am sure that the people of Queensland realise, as he does, that this is a "march of progress" Budget. The only people with poll jitters are the members of the A.L.P.

Mr. RAMSDEN (Merthyr) (8.34 p.m.): I bemoan the absence of members of the Opposition as much as the hon. member for Wynnum bemoans the silence of those on this side of the Chamber.

I congratulate the Treasurer and the Government on the presentation of this Budget. So far as I can see, this is the first time that the State has balanced its books since we came to office in 1957. This is highly commendable. Having made the point that this is the best Budget introduced by the Government since 1957—

Mr. O'Donnell: That would not be any criterion.

Mr. RAMSDEN: That is right, it would not be. Nevertheless, despite all the bemoanings of the Opposition, the Treasurer has produced a balanced Budget which has, to use the words of the hon. member for Redcliffe, given to the Opposition election jitters.

The speech from the Leader of the Opposition when he opened the attack on the Government in this debate was a very far cry from what we heard in the days of the hon. member for Toowoomba West. I am sure that he must have hung his head and wondered where the A.L.P. had gone.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I try to help. I felt sorry for him. He sat there with his head in his hands and I am sure he was wondering when the Leader of his party would sit down.

There are a number of matters I want to touch on tonight, two of them quite seriously. I draw the attention of the Committee to what I consider to be a grave injustice that is being perpetrated upon a certain class of people. In the first place, I want to talk about the powers given to the Commissioner for Transport under the Transport Act. I well remember that when the present Treasurer was Minister for Transport and we were having violent arguments with the border-hoppers, it was suggested that we had to give to the Commissioner for Transport powers which in fact made him almost the Czar of all the Russias. We were told at the time that we were giving him powers which virtually made him a czar because there would be no right of appeal against those powers. I am quite certain that when we gave him those powers we thought that he would use them justly, tempered with some degree of mercy and consideration.

I bring to the attention of the Committee a case which has so annoyed me that I think it is time it was made public.

Mr. O'Donnell: What are you talking about, Sam?

Mr. RAMSDEN: If the hon. member listened carefully he would know that I am talking about the powers given to the Commissioner for Transport.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I will "do him over" next.

I do not know whether it is realised that the Commissioner for Transport has power to issue or cancel a taxi-driver's licence without

there being any right of appeal. I notice the Treasurer squirm and say, "Oh." I hope that by the time I finish he will squirm a little more.

An Opposition Member: You did not see him slip the cotton-wool into his ears.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I am not interested in that, because even if he has cotton-wool in his ears he can still read.

The point I am making is that there should be some right of appeal against a decision to take away the living of any citizen. The case I am bringing before the notice of the Committee concerns a taxi-driver whose application for renewal of his licence was refused. A fortnight before his licence was due for renewal he received from the Commissioner for Transport a note saying that it was not intended to renew his licence. He brought the note to me, and I took it to the Minister.

Mr. Houston: Which one—the Treasurer or the Minister for Transport?

Mr. RAMSDEN: The present Minister for Transport. I took it to him and asked what could be done about it. He reminded me that in the hands of the Commissioner for Transport was this inherent power that had been given to him in the Transport Act.

With this knowledge, I saw the Commissioner for Transport in the Minister's presence.

Mr. Houston: Did you "front" him?

Mr. RAMSDEN: I "fronted" him and asked him if he would reconsider his decision, because the man concerned was a New Australian who had earned his living for some 24 years by driving vehicles and, until he came to Queensland and worked as a taxi-driver, had an unblemished traffic record. Despite that, the Commissioner for Transport said, "I will not do anything about it. I am going to refuse to renew the licence."

Mr. P. Wood: What reasons were given?

Mr. RAMSDEN: His traffic record. I am "levelling" with the Committee on this matter, because it is a serious one.

Mr. Hanson: The Commissioner is a fair man.

Mr. RAMSDEN: If he is fair, I am a blackfellow. Let me say that this taxi-driver had not been called upon by the police to show cause why his licence should not be cancelled. The police had not interfered with him, yet at the whim of the Commissioner for Transport his licence was cancelled and he was out of work.

I raised this point with the Commissioner for Transport and asked, "If this man's driving record is so bad that it justifies your cancelling his licence, how is it that the Commissioner of Police or the Superintendent

of Traffic has not called upon him to show cause why his driving licence should not be cancelled?" It is a remarkable thing that just one month after he lost his taxi licence the Commissioner of Police or his delegate, the Superintendent of Traffic, asked him to show cause why his driving licence should not be cancelled.

Mr. Houston: Do you think there was a bit of collusion?

Mr. RAMSDEN: I am certain there was a bit of collusion. I would not speak in this way if I did not believe what I was saying. I say without a shadow of doubt that if I had not queried the power of the Commissioner for Transport to cancel his taxi licence when the police had not issued a show-cause notice, nothing would have happened.

Mr. P. Wood: Are you saying that he was further victimised?

Mr. RAMSDEN: I shall speak in my own way; the hon. member can listen.

When I was approached again by this man and shown his show-cause notice, I wrote to the Premier, who was then the Minister in charge of the Police Force, and asked him whether he, in that capacity, would make available to me the record which was the cause of the issuing of the show-cause notice. In reply I received a remarkable letter which I want to place on record. I am one who does not believe that the Government should defend public servants whether they be right or wrong.

Mr. P. Wood: Is this a letter from the Premier?

Mr. RAMSDEN: It is a letter from the Minister in charge of police. It is dated 29 February, 1968, and I shall leave out the name of the gentleman concerned. It reads—

"Dear Mr. Ramsden,

"With further reference to your letter of 23rd February, 1968, concerning Mr. (So-and-so of such-and-such an address), I wish to advise that I have discussed this matter with the Commissioner of Police and am unable to accede to your request to make available to you a copy of the traffic history of Mr. (So-and-so). This will be outlined to him during the hearing before a Superintendent of Traffic at the Traffic Branch, Brisbane, tomorrow.

"I am sorry I cannot assist you in this connection."

To my mind, the seriousness of this business is that on two occasions I have been refused access to this document—the first time by the Commissioner for Transport, on the grounds that it was a privileged document belonging to the police and that, therefore, I could not see it—

Mr. Houston: But that was in front of the Minister.

Mr. RAMSDEN: Yes, that was in front of the Minister. Secondly, I was refused access to it, on the advice of the Commissioner of Police, by the Minister in charge of Police. That concerns me, because on the first occasion I had been told that I could not have it because it was a privileged document. If that was so, I suppose it was fair enough; but God forbid that we start taking away from people, on the evidence of a privileged document, their livelihood and their licence to a livelihood.

Mr. Houston: That is what you are doing through your legislation.

Mr. RAMSDEN: This legislation, to put the Leader of the Opposition in the picture, is legislation that has never been altered since the days of Labour Governments.

Mr. Houston: It is your application of the legislation.

Mr. RAMSDEN: Governments both past and present share the blame for this. It is a matter of administration.

Mr. Houston: It is the privileged document that is the problem.

Mr. RAMSDEN: It is not a privileged document. If the Leader of the Opposition will only be quiet and listen, I will make my speech in my own way.

Mr. Houston: I am just trying to help.

Mr. RAMSDEN: The hon. gentleman is not a help; he is a hindrance. Even trying to explain things to him does not help.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. RAMSDEN: I went with this gentleman because (a), as I said, he was a New Australian, and (b) I wanted to make certain that his English was properly understood and that he properly understood what was happening, and I found that the document had suddenly ceased to be privileged. Although we could not get it three or four days previously to find out what it was all about, the senior sergeant who heard the case, if I may use that term, raised no objection to my making what are called, in parliamentary terms, copious notes of various things in that document. I submit that you, Mr. Smith, as a lawyer, would know that if this was a privileged document I would have been prevented from making notes of the document as the matter proceeded.

However, the most shocking part related to the points system. My understanding of the points system is that it goes back for a period of two years. Am I right?

Mr. Houston: We have told you many times that that is not so.

Mr. RAMSDEN: That is my understanding of it. If the Minister thinks that I am wrong, I hope he will tell me so, because

I am basing the whole of my case on the fact that I have been told that the points system goes back over two years.

Mr. Davies: We were only trying to help.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I would rather stay in the Liberal Party and be without the hon. member's help.

When we appeared, the thing that shocked me was that the document that had caused the refusal of the issue of a taxi licence, the same document which was being used one month later as evidence in show-cause proceedings, went back to 3 May, 1964. It went right up to 26 January, 1968.

The Minister for Transport will well recall this because, at the interview in the Commissioner's office to which I refer, the document shown to me was a foolscap sheet on which were listed so-called traffic offences. This was the document that I could not see at that time because it was privileged. But it was also the document that I did see subsequently at the show-cause hearing, and many of the entries, which make a very long list, relate to incidents for which this man could not be blamed. For instance, here is one—

"Brunswick Street. An accident".

Then it goes on to say—

"Contributory cause was from the person who came in from the side, forcing the front car to brake without warning."

In other words, this fellow stopped and blocked the lane, but it is on his card. There are four of these happenings for none of which he was to blame, but they are still shown on his paper.

We went through all these things, and some of them are very minor when one considers them. It is all very well to say that a man was speeding. Say he was speeding on Kingsford Smith Drive and was caught in a radar trap and fined \$10 or \$20. I think the speed is irrelevant. It is not so much the speed at which he is travelling that is important, but, the time of day and the circumstances. Is it in peak-traffic, or at 3 o'clock in the morning when he is the only driver on the road? What was the reason for it?

In every case that he was speeding he was doing so at the request of the person who hired him—"Get me to the airport on time. I have to catch a plane." In one case it was a pilot of an aircraft who had to take off. When the driver was pulled up and the pilot tried to explain the situation, he was told to mind his own business. He was told, "I'm talking to the driver." In this particular instance the pilot was decent enough to give the taxi-driver what he thought would be the cost of the fine. That is all right, but on many occasions, because of his own personal commitments and because, by the time he paid out on these commitments, he had virtually bread and butter to live on and no jam, he didn't worry about disputing these things even though he wanted to. There were quite a few of these. He had a right to go into

court and argue them but he did not want to do that, for two reasons. One was that it costs money, and the second was that he would have lost another day's work as a taxi-driver. He is not an owner-driver; he is driving for someone else. All these things add up and, when he gets to nine points under the system and he explains this, the senior sergeant says, "I am sorry if you didn't dispute it but that is your fault. After all, this was you and you were fined. That's it."

I suppose one could say that we learn from experience and this fellow was philosophical enough to say, "All right, we learn." But, in future I feel—and I might say this as a warning to the public—that if anyone thinks he is right, he should not sit on it because it is going to cost him his two or three points, and nine points do not take long to mount up when they come this way.

This man said, "All right, in future this is what I will do." I then made a discovery. One would expect that, having been called on to show cause and having got a suspension—in this case it was only a matter of six weeks so it could not have been a very serious matter after all—and having lost his licence, in all fairness a line would be drawn across the page and the authorities would say, "At this point of time he lost his licence for six weeks," and that from there on they would start counting again.

I made some inquiries about this and found that this is not so. I found from my inquiries, which I made fairly assiduously, that the Superintendent of Traffic has a discretionary power to give or not to give consideration to previous offences following the suspension of a licence.

I cannot think of anything more damnable than that. I want the same law for everybody. I do not want the Superintendent of Traffic to have discretionary powers. I do not want him to count all my previous offences if he does not like the colour of my socks but, if he likes the colour of the socks worn by the Leader of the Opposition, to be able to say, "All right, we will rule you off from the time you lost your last licence." I think that a discretionary power of that sort is wrong.

Mr. Houston: But you supported it a while ago in debating other Bills.

Mr. RAMSDEN: No, I did not.

Mr. Houston: Of course you did. Look at the breath tests.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I do wish that the Leader of the Opposition would not try to make political capital out of this.

Mr. Houston: I am not. All you are doing now is crying about something we told you years ago was going to happen.

Mr. RAMSDEN: All I am trying to do now is to protect the ordinary working man on whom the Leader of the Opposition is trying to pass a political buck to this Government.

Mr. Houston: It is not a political buck at all. We told you it would happen and we divided the House on it.

Mr. RAMSDEN: The Leader of the Opposition told me nothing. The Government has inherited this regulation.

Mr. Houston: No, you haven't. What about on-the-spot fines?

Mr. RAMSDEN: This is not an on-the-spot fine; this is a show-cause, and it has been the practice for many a long year—and in Labour's day, too.

Mr. Houston: It is your legislation. The points system is yours.

Mr. RAMSDEN: No public servant, whoever he might be, should have the power to take away a man's living without any public hearing or without his right to legal representation or to appeal. In addition to this, one man, endowed with all the weaknesses of humanity—pride, arrogance and lack of pity or concern—was given the right to hold out on the restoration of a licence merely at his own whim.

As you know, Mr. Smith, there has been a long-accepted principle in our system of justice that it is better that 99 guilty men should go free than that one innocent man should suffer. Because of that principle I am justified in saying what I have said here tonight. I hope that the Government will take some note of the maladministration of the powers to govern over man. I am right in what I have said. This man had received this cancellation, and despite the fact that he was said to be a danger on the road, and despite the fact that a month previously the Commissioner for Transport had cancelled his licence to drive a taxi, and despite the fact that he had been called upon to show cause and it had been announced that he would lose his licence for six weeks, another fortnight elapsed before his licence was taken from him. The licence was not taken from him until a fortnight after the suspension. What a menace he must have been! As soon as it was taken he lodged an appeal, on my advice, in the Magistrates Court.

The justification for my statements tonight can be found in the fact that the magistrate upheld his appeal. If any person who is asked to show cause thinks his cause is just I advise him not simply to accept it and say, "Well, I will have a suspension". After the things I have seen, my advice to everybody who is called upon to show cause is to take up the time of a magistrate in lodging an appeal. Now turn to another matter.

Mr. Davies: Which Minister is it this time?

Mr. RAMSDEN: There is no Minister. I only "do" one Minister a session.

I support what the hon. member for Wynnum said, except about the trousers. Quite a long time ago I tried to deal with traffic in the City of Brisbane.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I was encouraged by the hon. member for Wynnum. I was encouraged, spurred on and inspired when I heard that he backed me in my suggestion.

In 1964 I made a very determined effort to relieve the traffic congestion on Kingsford Smith Drive—

Mr. Sherrington: Why don't you go and dig the tunnel yourself? We will all get a bit of peace then.

Mr. RAMSDEN: If I could dig a tunnel big enough to hold the hon. member I would willingly start it.

I tried to relieve the traffic congestion in Kingsford Smith Drive, Breakfast Creek Bridge, the Valley and the Story Bridge. At that time, after meeting the top echelon of Dutch consortium, I pleaded with the Government to have an adequate feasibility study carried out at a cost of about \$200,000. I suggested that Nedeco should do this study. For the benefit of those who do not know, Nedeco is short for "Netherlands Engineering Consultants". This company is experienced in the complexity of tunnelling, and all the interested companies advised me that if Nedeco made a feasibility study its decision would be accepted by any world-wide engineering firm. What is more, it is experienced in feasibility studies for both tunnels and bridges. Instead of accepting my advice on this matter the Government proceeded to produce tender documents prepared by the Co-ordinator-General's Department, and they were issued in December, 1964. As soon as I studied those documents I knew that not one tender—

A Government Member: It is like the city council.

Mr. RAMSDEN: Yes, it is like the city council.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Carey): Order! Will the hon. member kindly address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. Smith: I believe the bridge is better than a tunnel.

Mr. RAMSDEN: Mr. Carey, I would much rather you put the hon. member for Windsor back in the chair. I could then make my point.

As soon as I studied this document I knew that not one tender would be received. Indeed, I may have won £1 from the Treasurer on a bet.

Mr. Chalk: I paid up.

Mr. RAMSDEN: It was the Treasurer, and he paid me. I would have remembered if he hadn't.

Not only did I make the bet, but I backed it up by making a public forecast in this Chamber, which is recorded in "Hansard", that not one tender would be received. Subsequent to my moving a motion later in the joint party room, in July, 1966, the Government commissioned Wilbur Smith and Associates to make what was called a preliminary feasibility investigation. I said at the time, and I repeat, that this was a rather remarkable thing to do because, as I have already put on record in "Hansard", Wilbur Smith himself told me, in the presence of a committee of the Brisbane Development Association, that he was not competent to do such a feasibility study. Despite Wilbur Smith's own confession of his inability to do the job, not only was he commissioned to do it, but he actually accepted it. To get out of the difficulty he engaged Maunsell and Partners, of 277 William Street, Melbourne, to act as structural consultants.

I have already recorded in "Hansard" the weaknesses in this preliminary feasibility investigation. Let me read just one such weakness in that study. Wilbur Smith's letter of 29 July, 1966, addressed to Sir James Holt, the Co-ordinator-General, was printed as a foreword in that report, and states, among other things—

"Findings are based to a large extent on a special analysis of basic data compiled during the Brisbane Transportation Study. This information was supplemented and updated by additional investigations into economic activity within the area to be directly served by the new facilities.

"Based on engineering design and cost studies, a bridge has been recommended as the most suitable form of structure."

How any experienced firm of consulting engineers could come to this dogmatic solution in the light of the report issued I am at a loss to understand, as indeed were the companies whose business it was to make a profit for their shareholders. Once again not one tender was received to construct it, unless we count the only one submitted, which was to build a bridge at the full cost of the Government. How could any company come to the party when the feasibility study stated that the geology of the crossing and approach areas and the soil conditions likely to be encountered were still to be discussed.

This further disquieting comment appears on page 25 of the report—

"As yet a borehole investigation of the bridge or tunnel line has not been carried out, and the following description of foundation conditions is the result of assessing data available from other structures in the area, together with a geophysical survey of the lower Brisbane

River carried out by the Bureau of Mineral Resources. This information provides a picture which is consistent with the known geology of the area, but it must be emphasised that the nature, depth, and strength of the materials lying below the surface must be carefully investigated. Due to the nature of this report, the structural foundations envisaged may be subject to reappraisal in the light of a thorough bore-hole investigation of the site."

And so it goes on.

It therefore becomes quite obvious to me why no tenders were received. This was not a final feasibility study. In its own words, it says that more research and investigation have to be done.

Another reason for the lack of tenders was the impossible terms placed on the use of the facility if it was to be a tunnel. Clause 5 of the original tender documents, on page C8, reads—

"Provided further that the following classes of vehicles shall be prohibited from using a tunnel, namely:—

- (a) vehicles having a load or cargo—
 - (i) inflammable liquids giving off inflammable vapours at temperatures of less than 150° Fahrenheit;
 - (ii) corrosive or noxious substances or inflammable substances other than liquids, and materials classed as explosives;
 - (iii) compressed or liquefied gasses and dissolved acetylene;
 - (iv) cylinders suitable for the conveyance of compressed or liquefied gas;
 - (v) loose or baled hay, straw or other similar combustible material, unless completely and effectively covered with a tarpaulin or similar covering to the satisfaction of an authorised officer of the owner;
 - (vi) Radioactive materials except in small quantities and in approved containers."

The initial survey that I had conducted on the use of a prospective tunnel, before I ever raised the matter in this Chamber, showed at that time that if a tunnel had existed then there would have been a minimum of 7,000 vehicles a day using it from two industries and one factory, and one of the two industries was the petrol and oil industry, in which a large number of vehicles operate in the lower reaches of the river. But this was one of the industries which was almost completely forbidden usage of the tunnel, so in one fell swoop the economic feasibility was reduced by probably two-thirds. No wonder no tenders were received.

The same restrictions were to be imposed as are applied by the Port of New York Authority and the by-laws governing the Clyde Tunnel in the city of Glasgow. In a letter that I received from the Chief

Engineer of the Co-ordinator-General's Department on 18 December, 1964, it is stated—

"In addition, the undermentioned are enclosed for your interest.

1. Rules and Regulations Governing the Transportation of Explosives and other Dangerous Articles—The Port of New York Authority.

2. By-laws for the Regulation, Control and Protection of the Clyde Tunnel and of Persons using same and for the Management, Regulation, Direction and Control of Traffic using the Tunnel—The Corporation of the City of Glasgow."

Those two documents are very interesting.

Mr. Sherrington: I will take your word for it.

Mr. RAMSDEN: Thank you very much. The hon. member is the first one on his side of the Chamber who has ever done that. The Glasgow regulations apply, as I stated, to the Clyde Tunnel. An interesting thing about the Port of New York Authority is that the prohibitions inserted in the tender document applying to a tunnel also are applied by the Port of New York Authority to bridges. In other words, the impression given when tender documents were being discussed here was that it was far too dangerous to have volatile goods transported through a tunnel. When we see the rules and regulations governing the transportation of explosives and other dangerous articles in the Port of New York, we see that included in the prohibition are the Lincoln Tunnel, the Holland Tunnel, the George Washington Bridge (upper level, lower level, and expressway), the Bayonne Bridge, the Goethals Bridge, and the Outerbridge Crossing. In other words, everywhere in the Port of New York carting of highly volatile substances is prohibited.

At the time when I spoke on this matter, I had already been guaranteed that a sum of up to A\$26,000,000 would be invested by a Dutch consortium, subject to a feasibility study being carried out by a reputable world-wide authority. I advised the Government to ask Nedeco to do this study. If that had been done, I can assure the House that at least three, and possibly four, firms would have tendered to build and finance such a facility, and I can assure the House that the tunnel would now have been operating.

In "The Courier-Mail" of 10 July, 1968, under the heading, "Finance is 'key' to crossings", this appeared—

"Brisbane Town Planner Dr. Karl Langer yesterday advocated a bridge or tunnel 'as soon as possible' for a lower reach of the Brisbane River.

"But it all depends on the availability of finance," he said."

In 1964 the finance was available, subject to a feasibility study being carried out by Nedeco.

I remind the Committee of what "The Road Ahead", the official journal of the R.A.C.Q., had to say in July, 1964. Under the general heading "Case for traffic ferry, bridge, and tunnel crossing", Mr. B. N. Berry, B.E., M.I.E.(Australia), Consultant in Traffic Engineering to R.A.C.Q., said, amongst other things—

"Press on with tunnel scheme

"Let us then make full use of the ferry service, but press on also with a tunnel scheme. A feasibility study should begin now for the tunnel which is needed to:—

Develop a route to link the Pacific Highway and the Bruce Highway.

Take the standard-gauge railway to the Port of Brisbane and link it with the Port of Fremantle.

Enable waste lands in the lower Brisbane River to be developed.

"Australian consultants, contractors and finance can handle such a project. If foreign aid is needed, let it be brought in as secondary to Australian prime interests.

"In the meantime, a vehicle ferry is a step towards the provision of more facilities for crossing the Brisbane River."

Had the Government heeded the advice that I gave it in 1964, the tunnel could now be operating. That may seem an idle statement; but let me assure you, Mr. Carey, that it is not. I have in my hand a document put out by the Water Research Foundation of Australia, News Letter No. 64, issued in April, 1968. On page 3 it gives a list of Dutch tunnels that takes up the whole page. It says—

"As a result of the tremendous growth of road traffic in Holland, tunnel building has been an accelerated activity since World War II. The following is a list of tunnels completed or under construction—"

Mr. Sherrington: You are wasting your talents here. Why don't you go to Holland?

Mr. RAMSDEN: It is obvious that I am wasting my talents here, but I hope that the hon. member will listen. One day he will be the leader of his party and, when that happens, I might join him.

Since I spoke on this subject in 1964, the following tunnels have been built in Holland:—

Year of completion	Location
1966	Coen Tunnel, from Amsterdam to Zaandam under the North Sea Canal.
1966	Schiphol Tunnel, Amsterdam, under the airfield's main runway.
1967	Benelux Tunnel, Vlaardingen, under the Nieuwe Maas.

1967 .. Metro Tunnel, Rotterdam, underground railway under the Nieuwe Maas.

1968 .. Ij Tunnel, Amsterdam, under the river Ij.

1969 .. Heinoord Tunnel, Barendrecht, under the Oude Maas river.

While I have been speaking of one simple tunnel in Brisbane, a small impoverished country such as Holland has built six tunnels.

Mr. P. Wood: It is not an impoverished country by any means.

Mr. RAMSDEN: It is impoverished by our standards.

Mr. P. Wood: Don't you believe it!

Mr. RAMSDEN: I have been there.

Mr. P. Wood: I have been there, too.

Mr. RAMSDEN: Well, the hon. member's idea of impoverishment is different from mine.

Mr. Sherrington: What Government have they in Holland?

Mr. RAMSDEN: I should not like to say.

Only a week or so ago, Mr. Brian Baillie—when my good friend from Wynnun, Mr. Harris, was speaking, I said, "He is a good fellow."—stressed the pressing need for a crossing for the lower reaches of the Brisbane River as a matter of urgency to relieve the intolerable burden on Kingsford Smith Drive, a road which is so dangerous for pedestrians to cross that I have received a petition seeking safety for these people.

I am quite sure that we have followed the wrong trail when we have so completely set our minds on the freeway system, which will largely cater for private cars and express buses. We have seen the city thrown into chaos by the recent tram and bus strike. Following the settlement of that strike, services have been cut back because many members of the public have learnt to live without buses and trams and have found for themselves alternative forms of transport.

Thus, the position is further aggravated by the influx of even more private transport and a lessening of public transport. What I should like to know is when we will get a traffic authority, either a State or a local authority, that will have the courage to plan for a three or four-year calculated loss in order to win back the travelling public to public transport. I consider that the only way to win back public support is to make public transport as convenient, as clean and as cheap as, or cheaper than, private transport. When we have done that, we will be somewhere along the way.

Mr. Sherrington: Why did you oppose the electrification of the railways?

Mr. RAMSDEN: I am sorry that the hon. member has never been in Government. If he had, he would realise that

the back-bencher is a very humble member of society. I can see no virtue in cutting back on services, which only encourages more searching for alternative travel. If an authority, whether it be a Government or a local authority, was prepared to give fast, clean, regular and cheap transport service, and is prepared to run at a loss for some two or three years until it has won back public support, then I believe we could save many millions on implementing free-ways which would not then be so urgently required.

I am certain that the City of Brisbane should be concentrating on rapid electric transit instead of scrapping \$4,000,000 worth of tramway system. After all, experience has shown that it is not the tram which delays the traffic but the parked private car, which obstructs the roadway.

For many years, in the United States of America, many people have experienced the need for more rapid rail-transport systems. They know that the only cure for the many transportation problems associated with their expanding cities is this rapid-transit system. As populations grow, cities become more densely populated and many cities, as is Brisbane, are being restricted in area. The only answer is to erect taller office buildings and departmental stores.

However, with the growth of the city work-force, the transportation problems of any city grow proportionately. Unless public transport—swift, regular, clean and cheap—is provided, more and more parking space is needed, and will be needed, for the ever-growing number of private cars flowing into the city. This needs more and more car parks and thus the never-ending "dog chasing its own tail" affair has to start over again. As the building of new roads continues, the city will gradually become enveloped in a maze of concrete clover-leaves and freeways. Los Angeles is a perfect example of this, and I believe that we can learn from the United States of America. Since the early 1960's, many expressways and multi-lane highways have been built both in the United States and in Australia, and all this has led to more and more traffic being brought into the cities, with their parking problems developing and buildings being pulled down to make room for more and more parking stations. In St. Louis there are almost 300 parking lots, with more on the way to bring about the demolition of yet more buildings. Air pollution increases, and motor-car insurance rates rise to cover the greater risk inherent in the larger influx of city traffic.

Most cities of Australia—and certainly Brisbane—are simply following the same progressive pattern as that followed in the United States of America some years ago. The people of the United States are now realising the folly of their ways. Many years of research and study have found a cure in the development of balanced, integrated transport systems. These systems consist of

highly efficient, speedy, electric transits which service the centre of the city from places relatively short distances away.

I suggest to the Government that the members of the new Wilbur Smith Public Transport Survey be asked, amongst other things, to look at the possibilities of establishing a circular rail service in this capital. This will necessitate the joining of South Brisbane Station to Roma Street or Central Station so that one could do a city circle just as conveniently in Brisbane as one can do it in Sydney, from Hornsby to Sydney via the western suburbs, then over the Sydney Harbour Bridge, and back on the North Shore line to Hornsby. Each station on a system such as that should have its own parking area into which commuters could drive to join the public transport service. If we were to pour the same amount of money into that rapid-transport system as that being poured into a luxurious city highway system, we would serve the community better. Where this is done, commuters are influenced towards leaving their cars at, or catching feeder buses to, their respective rail terminals. In comfort, without the actual hazard that accompanies a driver each time he takes his car on the road, the commuter travels to work without building up further traffic and parking problems. A rapid electric rail-transit system is economical and does not use as much land or disrupt the people as much as expressways do.

Mr. P. Wood: That is what the hon. member for Toowoomba West was trying to do 12 years ago.

Mr. RAMSDEN: From what the Minister for Transport tells me, the hon. member for Toowoomba West did not do much about it. I understand that there was not even a letter on the file about it.

The sooner a project such as this is started, and the sooner it is undertaken, the less it will cost in the long run.

Finally, might I say that I am glad to see the Minister for Health in the Chamber.

Mr. P. Wood: Are you going to have a go at him?

Mr. RAMSDEN: No, not at all. I never have a go at the Ministers. Actually, I am going to compliment him. I am in one of those humours.

Mr. P. Wood: He will appreciate that.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I hope so.

I want to express the appreciation not only of myself and my committee but also of the parents of multiple-handicapped children to the Minister for the consideration and help he has given to the Multiple Handicapped Association of Queensland over the past six years. I think I owe it to the association to say that only six years ago a small group of parents, who had nowhere to turn and whose children were not acceptable to any existing organisation, tried with

some degree of despair to find out what could be done for these children. They started off as an association, and after the first 12 months of thinking and planning they established for the next 12 months what could be called a child-minding centre. They had nowhere to meet and had no money. They knew they had a problem, but they did not know how to solve it. Eventually the Brisbane Caledonian Society and Burns Club made a room in its clubhouse at Kangaroo Point available to them.

Every Friday morning the parents of multiple-handicapped children were able to leave their children in the care of one parent. That relieved them from caring for the afflicted child so that they could attend to their normal shopping needs or whatever else had to be done. In due course we approached the then Minister for Health, the late Dr. Harry Noble who, incidentally, was patron of the society. With his help we appointed a permanent qualified teacher named Ian McDonald, who was trained under the State education system. He did not leave us to go to Canada to get more money. He came to us because he was a dedicated man, even though we could not offer him what he would ultimately earn in the department. He was a trained school-teacher with a certificate in the teaching and training of subnormal children, and he also held a certificate in the teaching of the deaf. With those qualifications he set out to equip and man a school. It was not long after that that we suffered the loss of Dr. Noble. Our relationship with his successor, Mr. Tooth, has been most cordial. I am very grateful—and I want to state this publicly—to him for the help we have received. With his aid we now have a school with a staff of four. We have a nursing sister and two office staff.

Mr. Davies: You need to have one Minister on your side.

Mr. RAMSDEN: That is right.

Mr. Sherrington: You think he is a much better type than the Minister for Transport.

Mr. RAMSDEN: We are talking about two different subjects. They are both very excellent gentlemen.

Mr. Sherrington: That is not what you were saying a minute ago.

Mr. RAMSDEN: Yes, I was saying that about the Minister for Transport. The hon. member was not listening.

Mr. Davies: You were attacking a public servant.

Mr. RAMSDEN: That is what I was doing; the hon. member has said it.

In all seriousness, I thank the Minister for Health sincerely for the encouragement and assistance he has given to the association in the past few years.

I conclude my speech by once again saying that the people of Queensland have a great deal to be thankful for to this Government in producing a Budget such as this in its eleventh year in office.

Mr. DEAN (Sandgate) (9.33 p.m.): At the outset, I wish to make it quite clear that at this hour of the evening I do not intend to delve very deeply into the financial structure of the State because I believe that my leader in replying to the Treasurer's Financial Statement gave a full and comprehensive survey of the Opposition's feelings, and his personal beliefs, about the financial commitments of the State. Most importantly, he pointed out the role that the Commonwealth should play by making extra finance available to the State Government to carry on the various State instrumentalities. A lengthy dissertation by me on the financial affairs of the State would therefore be redundant, and would amount merely to repetition. And in this place we know that that can be boring and tedious. If I happen to stray a little I hope I do not go too far and find myself being accused of that very serious offence.

It would take far longer than the time I have at my disposal to deal with the taxing powers of the States and other matters of grave importance and problems of great magnitude, so, like my colleagues on this side of the Committee, I am satisfied to support my Leader's contribution. He certainly fulfilled our requirements in that direction. I am quite happy to leave it to my Leader and Deputy Leader to expound our full policy and point out what we will do next year when we become the Government of Queensland and once again implement Labour policy which was so happily accepted for 25 years prior to this administration coming into office.

In the Estimates of Expenditure and the Financial Statement presented by the Treasurer different matters appeal to different members. We all have our particular leanings and peculiarities in that regard. One particular section under the heading of Premier and Department of State Development that interests me greatly is the Queensland Civil Defence Organisation. Many hon. members in this Chamber know only too well my contributions over the years directed to awakening the Government to its responsibilities in this very important matter. I do not want hon. members to misconstrue my remarks or think I am suggesting at this stage that we are going to war tomorrow or that we will be attacked or should prepare ourselves for war. The civil defence organisation in other parts of Australia, particularly New South Wales, plays a most important part these days in civil government and, in times of peace, in emergencies such as floods and fires. When any such emergency arises, this great instrumentality in New South Wales can be swung into action within a matter of minutes. As my colleague the hon. member for Salisbury prompts me—I feel sure all hon.

members know this without being told—that organisation was instituted by a Labour Government in New South Wales, and I am pleased to say that the present Government gives it its full blessing and gives the director full support in his administration of the wonderful organisation he has under his control.

I have asked many Queensland people if they are prepared in any way to meet any emergency that arises, such as the disastrous floods that inundated the low-lying parts of Brisbane and other parts of the State 18 months or two years ago, and caused a great amount of distress. All they could say was that they would call on the police. The people seem to call on the police these days to help them out of any difficulty. It is the responsibility of this Government to educate the people that it is most important, in an emergency, not to panic. Panic is one of the greatest evils in times of emergency or distress. People panic when they do not know what to do, and the result is a great deal of extra damage.

Great Britain set a fine example during the last war. Because the people were trained in civil defence matters there was no panic when they were subjected to the heavy air raids that took place. From memory, the number of people killed there was quite small compared with the number killed in the various German cities such as Dresden where 125,000 people died in one night of heavy and concentrated bombing. During the whole of the bombing of Britain, only 50,000 people out of 60,000,000 were lost. That was achieved only through the preparedness and foresight of the Government at that time in having a civil defence organisation in first-class working order and capable of being sent into action at a minute's notice. I again appeal to the Government to increase the amount of money made available for civil defence in this State. The amount of \$25,750 allocated for this purpose during the coming financial year is quite inadequate.

Mr. Hughes: Do you think that the existing civil defence organisation should itself arrange to conduct mock tests?

Mr. DEAN: I think that the Civil Defence Organisation would be able to do a lot more if the Government encouraged it and directed it on a firmer policy basis. It is for the Government to lay down a policy for the organisation. I am casting no reflections on the director or staff of the organisation, because I know that they can work only at the direction of the Government and in accordance with its policy. If they were encouraged to do as the hon. member for Kurilpa suggests, they would do it, but they cannot do it when the Government adopts a pinch-penny attitude towards them. I am not attacking those in the administration of the Civil Defence Organisation in any way at all because I know that they are men of ability and the highest calibre who could quite easily rise to the occasion. If they had the wherewithal to do so, they could move to all places throughout

the State and set up branches of the Civil Defence Organisation and thereby give full protection to people in provincial cities and towns as well as in Brisbane.

Some months ago it was my privilege to visit Darwin. Whilst moving through that city with my colleague the hon. member for Tablelands, who went there with me, I remarked to him on the very prominent notices on certain homes advising the presence of an air-raid warden and stating that this was an air-raid warden's district. I found that the people of Darwin were very alert in this matter. They had no doubt learnt a lesson from their experiences during the last war and did not intend to be caught again as they were then.

Training of the civilian population is just as important as having an efficient Civil Defence Organisation. In this matter I make my appeal more to Government members than to the Executive. I do not exactly blame the Premier or the Executive of the Government. I believe that it is up to the rank-and-file Government members to take an interest in this matter in the Government caucus. Although they may not like my use of that word, it has become common to use it when referring to meetings of Government members. It was once a convenient word used to describe only our party meetings. It is up to Government members to bring this matter before their leaders in their party meetings to see that the State is adequately protected not necessarily in the case of war only, which I hope never happens, but in times of civil or national emergency such as floods or fires.

Time limitations make it impossible to deal in detail with the Budget. I should now like to deal with something in my electorate which naturally is of close interest to me. I refer to the inadequate police facilities in the Sandgate area. I pay a high compliment to the senior sergeant at Sandgate, Senior Sergeant Freeman, and his staff. They have to work in an antiquated, old-fashioned police house at the side of a modern Police Court, and this makes it difficult for them to carry out efficiently the functions of the Police Force. Sandgate is only 12 miles from the G.P.O., and feels the full weight of increasing road traffic and congestion and—the most tragic thing of all—increased road fatalities.

More accidents are taking place each day and each week because of the increasing number of vehicles on the highways. This, in turn, makes more work for the Police Force, and police officers are finding it very difficult to do their work in the building in which they are now housed. It is a distressing experience to see the plainclothes men questioning people in an old building in which nobody can have any privacy. Passers by can see the questioning going on, and that is unfair to the person being questioned and to the police officer. It does not allow the policeman to do his duty properly. I think that the

Government should make money available to enable the police station at Sandgate to be brought up to the standard of the Magistrates Court.

There is one very distressing and sorrowful matter that I think I should raise in this debate. I am glad to see that the Minister for Health, is in the Chamber, because I made a special request to his department relative to the lack of mortuary facilities in the Sandgate electorate. From time to time fatal road accidents occur, and on one occasion three people were killed on the road within a matter of hours and another one died at a public function. Until the necessary identification was made, bodies had to be left on the back veranda of the police station and an ambulance was used to hold another till they could all be removed to the city morgue. I made investigations and found that there was a large modern and hygienic mortuary at Eventide, and both the police and the officials at Eventide were quite happy about its being used in an emergency such as the one that I have mentioned. It would be much more humane to the relatives of the deceased persons to put the bodies there. The relatives of the man who died at the public function had to go to the police station and identify him in a cell. There was nowhere else that he could be put, but it was distressing to the relatives, who felt that a kind of stigma was placed on the man by his being placed in a cell.

Adequate provision for a mortuary at the Sandgate Police Station could be made at no great expense to the Government, and I do not see why the Eventide Mortuary could not be used in cases of emergency. On some other occasion three or four people could die suddenly, and the responsibility is on the police officers to ensure that all the requirements of the law are met and that the relatives are notified.

The scope of this debate is very wide and enables one to deal with all departments. Under the heading "Treasurer", I now come to a matter that is very close to me and of great concern to the people of Sandgate. I refer to the boat harbour that we have been trying for many years to have completed in the Cabbage Tree Creek area.

Some very good reclamation work has been carried out in low-lying areas on the banks of Cabbage Tree Creek, but the work has not been carried any further. I was told 12 months ago that a large sum of money had been withdrawn and the major part of it transferred to the Redcliffe peninsula. I am not casting any reflection on anyone in Redcliffe or upon the hon. member for Redcliffe. However, if money was allocated to Sandgate, I think it would be only fair to allow it to remain there for the completion of the boat harbour.

Cabbage Tree Creek is not used only for recreational purposes. A very large prawning fleet operates out of it into Bramble Bay, a small part of Moreton Bay. This is an

industry to which we should give some recognition, because it is one in which many people are employed. Proximity to the bay makes this area very handy to these trawlers. They do not have to travel far to the prawning grounds to secure their catches and return to the Fish Board depot. Incidentally, dealing again with an amenity that is not very good, part of the prawning fleet's activities is to store its prawn catches until the main transport brings them to the Fish Board for sale. Their storage facilities consist only of a tin shed, which is not adequate for the requirements of this wonderful industry. I have mentioned this before not only on behalf of the industrial activity in the area but also on behalf of the large boating fraternity of Brisbane which comes to Sandgate because it is so close to the city. It is close to the fishing grounds in the bay and much more accessible than travelling all the way down the river for an hour or two before reaching the fishing grounds or some of the islands that people like to visit at the week-ends. I again ask for further consideration to be given to the boat harbour at Sandgate which has been so long promised and in regard to which so much work has been done.

Another matter that I feel I should raise at this stage of the debate comes under the heading of education and cultural activities. It is the Queensland Conservatorium of Music. For how long are we going to put up with the conditions under which the Director and his staff have to work at the moment? I feel that the Conservatorium has reached its capacity so far as students are concerned. There has been a great influx of students over the last few years, not only for singing tuition but also for instrumental tuition, and I think the Government should be looking for another suitable structure to house the Queensland Conservatorium of Music.

Mr. Davies: The Labour Government commenced it.

Mr. DEAN: As the hon. member for Maryborough points out, the Labour Party did inaugurate this Conservatorium in the old South Brisbane Town Hall. It is an old, ornate building with some architectural beauty, but it is not suitable for this purpose. Its acoustic qualities are not what they should be for teaching. Of course, at that time it was better than nothing. I remember when the Government of the day set up the Conservatorium; it was looked upon only as a temporary measure. The idea was to get the project off the ground and start a conservatorium of music in this State because we were lagging very badly in our cultural activity, particularly in the teaching of music.

I think that the time has arrived, with the State now increasing in population at a rapid rate and with increased demands being made on the conservatorium for higher training, for either a new building or a

re-building on the present site. Certainly some relief should be given to the Director and his staff in the great inconvenience under which they are working.

While I am dealing with education, I think it would be only right and proper and fair if I paid a compliment not only to the principals and head teachers of our schools and their staffs, but also to the various parents and citizens' associations. I often wonder how much longer the Government will impose upon, how much more responsibility it will shelve onto, and how many increased demands it will make upon school parents and citizens' associations. Every time I go to a school committee meeting by invitation—I get many invitations and go to all committee meetings in my area—I am astounded and feel rather ashamed when I hear the requirements that the department makes of the committees to provide amenities in these schools—such things as structural alterations, the financing of equipment such as graders, grass-cutters and so on, the providing of sporting equipment and even the preparing of recreation grounds.

Of course, the Government says that it will pay subsidies to the associations, but I do not think that it is fair to expect them to carry the heavy responsibility of developing school-grounds and buying equipment. The sole responsibility for this should rest on the State school system. We have always been led to believe that the State school system is a free educational system. But it is certainly far from free education. The parents are paying taxation and are also paying an indirect tax by giving money from their own pockets and by helping at fetes and running functions and concerts to raise money to buy equipment.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr. DEAN: The provision of tennis courts and football fields is the full responsibility of the Government if it is going to run a State school educational system.

I refer particularly to the Sandgate State High School. For some time a sum of money has been allocated to the construction of an assembly hall at that school. We were informed only last week that it would not be built in this financial year but it would be on the list after June of next year. This is a great disappointment not only to the parents and citizens' association but also to the high-school principal. The construction of the assembly hall is very important to the school because it has an enrolment of 1,500 students. It is required not only for the school's recreational activities but also for the cultural side of secondary education. I think the school was told that it was eighth on the list, so there is no guarantee that the assembly hall will be provided next year. If the Government is returned to office it

may change its policy and place the Sandgate State High School further down the list. At this stage I make a plea, and also a protest, to the Government to go ahead and build the assembly hall in this financial year.

I know that all hon. members will support me in paying a compliment to the staff of the State hospitals for the great work that they are performing. I will not go deeply into this matter because time would not allow me to do real justice to the efforts of the staff in carrying out their work in the State hospitals. I often visit the Royal Brisbane Hospital to call on patients and to try to help them in many ways, and I have found that the nurses, sisters, doctors, and other staff, are dedicated people who work under conditions that they should not be required to tolerate. I hope that extra money can be allocated to make the conditions of the staff and the patients much happier.

I often visit the Princess Alexandra Hospital, too, and again I compliment the medical staff, nursing staff and domestic staff at that hospital. I think that they deserve our highest commendation.

While I am dealing with the Department of Health, I should like to pay a compliment to my old friend and colleague, Mr. Clark, the Director of the Department of Children's Services. I have had the privilege of serving with him on many committees over the years, and I know only too well the calibre of this man and the dedication that he applies to his job. Over the years he has been a very faithful servant of the Department of Health, and he has performed a magnificent job as Director of Children's Services. He has followed in the footsteps of Mr. Smith, but I think that Mr. Clark has far greater problems, brought about of course by modern conditions and increased population, than those confronting Mr. Smith. I compliment Mr. Clark and his staff for the great work they are doing for the unfortunate children of this State.

I have said before that many of these unfortunate children should not be in the plight they are in. They would not be if their parents faced up to their responsibilities. I am wondering when some legislation will be introduced to deal with parents who are not carrying out their obligations to their children.

The time has long passed when parents should not be permitted to run around enjoying themselves while letting someone else take the responsibility of doing what they should be doing as parents. No-one else can do what a parent can do for a child in the way of providing the correct home environment. The Nudgee Orphanage used to be in my electorate, and some years ago I spoke to the Mother Superior, who said to me, "We have no orphans in our home. They all have parents, but the parents refuse to be responsible for them. We try

to take the place of a mother or father but it is quite impossible, although we do a good job." Everyone knows that they do a good job, but they cannot take a mother's place or provide a home environment. I pay Mr. Clark and the staff of the Children's Services Department a special compliment for the wonderful work they are doing.

While I am dealing with the Department of Health, I must mention another matter of grave importance in my electorate concerning the inadequacy of the Sandgate medical clinic. It has a very good location but the clinic building has long outlived its useful stage—it is very old. The dental clinic is on the top floor and the medical clinic is on the first floor. Dr. Richards and her staff work under very adverse conditions and the patients have to wait for treatment in very uncomfortable conditions, especially in winter-time or during inclement weather. Many old people suffer great inconvenience whilst waiting for medical treatment.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! There is too much audible conversation coming from all benches, including the Ministerial benches.

Mr. DEAN: I now want to draw attention to the state of Eventide Home at Sandgate. It should have been rebuilt many years ago, although the patching-up and painting work is marvellous. I think many of the buildings are being held together with paint. Many are being kept in reasonable repair but they are only wooden structures, a residue of the R.A.A.F. transport station of the war years. The time is fast approaching when the Government will be forced to put into operation plans for Sandgate that have been in existence for a long time. The location is all right, but the present buildings are not serviceable. The staff does a mighty job. The manager, Mr. Kelleher, Mr. Sullivan, and all the staff who work in the home give the inmates first-class service. Although it could be said that some of the buildings are in a reasonable condition, in these modern days when we hear so much about geriatrics we should put some of the theories into practice by building a new Eventide Home for the old people who have done so much for the State. Many of the conditions that we enjoy today are attributable to the efforts of the aged people who are spending the evening of their lives at this home.

From what I have read in the Press, it seems that we will later have more scope to discuss liquor reform. Apparently we have to read "The Courier-Mail" to get an idea of legislation that is to be introduced. We have to wait to see what the newspapers tell us about current legislation. I am totally opposed to further amendments of the Liquor Act. To open hotels on

Sundays and to allow all-day trading would be most tragic. That is a move that is afoot now.

The Methodist Church has just finished its annual conference in this city, and in the deliberations the great fear in the hearts and minds of the delegates was that the Government is about to embark upon another amendment to the Liquor Act to open hotels on Sundays. The \$100 question being asked is: who made these requests? Who is requesting this amendment of the Liquor Act to allow more liberalisation in the sale of alcohol to the community? That is what we want to know. We would be quite satisfied, to a certain extent, if we could find out who is really instigating this move or is pushing the Government to amend the Liquor Act.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: The A.L.P. wants it.

Mr. DEAN: If that is so, it is the first time that this coalition Government has taken any notice of anything that the A.L.P. wants. I have not known the Government to seek our guidance on anything else.

No doubt hon. members have received a copy of the document that I have here. I know they are getting plenty of correspondence, and I am the person who instigated it. I can assure you, Mr. Smith, that the powers that be are absolutely sick and tired of this messing around with the Liquor Act.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. DEAN: I know that this subject is a hot one.

Government Members interjected.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask hon. members to listen in silence to the hon. member who is speaking. He is entitled to that courtesy.

Mr. DEAN: A recent survey was made of city publicans and very few intimated that they were in favour of all-day Sunday trading. A Press article that I have here reads—

"Only 20 per cent. of Brisbane hoteliers, and even fewer of their employees, favour relaxation of Sunday liquor trading laws.

"Many licensees doubt they could economically operate bars or lounges on Sunday, others don't want to lose their one day off in a 72-hour bar-trade week."

I again ask the Minister for Justice who administers this Act: where are the requests coming from for the amendment of the Liquor Act at the moment? That is what we want to know. If the breweries or beer barons are asking for it, why is the Minister yielding to them? Why is he yielding to their demands to liberalise the sale of alcohol in the community by opening hotels on Sundays?

There is plenty of evidence in the daily Press that fatal accidents are happening every day. We have irrefutable evidence.

"The Courier-Mail" of 12 September, 1968, reads—

"More than half the drivers killed in fatal road accidents in Brisbane have a breathalyser reading in excess of .1, an extensive medical survey has found.

"And, in 80 per cent. of fatal single vehicle accidents, the drivers have this level.

"The survey has found that about 40 per cent. of drivers taken to hospital as the result of traffic accidents in Brisbane have blood alcohol levels of .05 or greater."

All this is being published and placed before the Minister, yet he intends to go ahead and amend the Liquor Act to allow for more liberalisation in the sale of alcohol to the community.

An article in the "Telegraph" of 11 September, 1968, reads—

"Eighty per cent. of drivers killed in single vehicle accidents in the Brisbane area have a blood alcohol level in excess of .1 per cent.

"Dr. K. G. Jamieson, of Royal Brisbane Hospital, says this in the latest issue of the Medical Journal of Australia.

"His article also says that:

Fifty per cent. of drivers killed in all road accidents have a similar blood alcohol level.

"About 40 per cent. of injured drivers taken to hospitals have a blood alcohol level of .05 per cent. or more."

Can we not be guided by the experts? I should like to know who is asking for these alterations. There is no doubt that they are coming. Portents of future legislation always appear in the daily Press. One heading was, "Government talk soon on liquor reform". I do not know whether Government members discussed this matter yesterday afternoon, but on 26 September the Press stated—

"The Justice Minister (Dr. Delamothe) will make detailed submissions on liquor law amendments to a meeting of Government members in three weeks' time.

"The Government parties then will decide whether to amend the Liquor Acts this year or defer action until after the State election next year."

I have a right to express my views, and I express them not only here but in other places. We could discuss the liquor question all night.

Mr. Sherrington: Does the Minister himself train on "Bundy" rum?

Mr. DEAN: I remind the Minister that appearing in a ridiculous outfit at a Bundaberg convention advertising Bundaberg rum did not do him any good. I was disgusted, as many other people were, when that photograph appeared in the paper.

I should now like to make some comments on the Justice Department and the Boggo Road gaol. It is not in my electorate, but this is a fairly wide debate and members seem to have sufficient licence to discuss things that cannot ordinarily be dealt with. When I was a member of the Brisbane City Council many years ago we were told that the gaol on Annerley Road was to be moved because of the residential development taking place in that area. Annerley is a good suburb, close to the city and with a very good aspect. But what do we find? In the last two or three years extensive additions and alterations have been made to the gaol, which makes it appear that it will be there forever. I have many friends in that area who also think that, and who are bitterly disappointed about it. It is rather strange that the Government should change its policy in this matter, because in the early stages of its administration the Government said that the gaol would be moved from the city to a country area which would provide opportunities for a little more landscaping and additional gaol activities. The gaol should not be in the centre of a densely populated residential area.

This debate also gives me the opportunity to raise another matter that has been referred to in the Chamber today, namely, the traffic problem. As one who travels from his electorate to the city every day and has to grind through heavy traffic in Lutwyche Road and other main roads, I am wondering, as many other motorists are wondering, how long it will be before there is another arterial road system or bypass roads to the city. The ordinary motorist is fed up with the inconvenience that he has to suffer every day, his great losses mechanically, and the damage to his health. Many health problems of today are caused by the anxieties and pressures of driving motor-cars in traffic.

I make a plea to the Government to speed up the provision of a good system of roads and public highways so that the public transport system can function effectively. Despite what has been said today about Mr. Manning and his staff, I think that they do a wonderful job in the conditions under which they work at present. As a matter of fact, Mr. Manning does not deserve the attack made on him, and I feel that, if they read of it, many people will be disappointed.

I shall content myself with making that contribution, and I look forward to the Government's implementing some of my suggestions.

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.