

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 22 OCTOBER 1968

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 22 OCTOBER, 1968

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

QUESTIONS

SECURITY LIGHTING AT TOWNSVILLE HIGH SCHOOL

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

Further to the Answer by the Minister for Education to my Question on October 17, when will security lighting be installed at Townsville High School?

Answer:—

"It is not the practice to provide security lighting to schools and funds are not available for this purpose. No action to install security lighting at the Townsville State High School is proposed to be taken by the Department of Works. Police patrols regularly visit the locality of the Townsville State High School."

ESTABLISHMENT OF SUBURBAN OUT-PATIENT CENTRES, TOWNSVILLE

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

Has provision been made or will it be made for the decentralisation of hospital facilities in Townsville, such as, initially, the establishment of out-patient centres in the more populous suburban areas? If so, will he fully inform the House on the matter?

Answer:—

"The matter of establishments of further outpatients' centres in Townsville is one for consideration, in the first instance, by the Townsville Hospitals Board. The Honourable Member will be aware that at the present time a project costing approximately \$14 million is nearing completion in the grounds of the Townsville Hospital, incorporating the most modern facilities for the conduct of casualty and outpatient services. The extent to which these new facilities will meet present and future demands for outpatients' services in Townsville will need to be assessed fully over a period of time before considering any further proposals for an extension of these services."

FIRE ESCAPE, MAGISTRATES COURT BUILDING, BRISBANE

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to an article in *The Courier-Mail* of September 13, 1968, about the fire escape to the Magistrates Court building being sealed off, thus causing a fire trap?

(2) Did he look carefully at the accompanying photograph showing the locked and bolted door at the bottom of the fire escape leading from four courts on the top floor of the Brisbane Magistrates Court building and also showing strong wire mesh enclosing the verandas, which would impede rescue work?

(3) Will not prisoners be trapped, as suggested in the article, in the neighbouring watch-house building?

(4) As one of the rooms on the top floor of this building is about to house the Supreme Court library, only recently threatened by fire, what action will he take to have the fire escape made accessible?

(5) Why is the first escape locked and bolted, leaving all the people in the four courts in a potential fire trap and in a century-old building that is a fire hazard and has no lift?

(6) Who has the keys to the fire escape?

(7) Would it be the man who is supposed to sound the alarm in relation to any fires in the Supreme Court?

(8) What fire-escape regulations are involved and, if there are any, are they being observed?

(9) Will he appoint a permanent caretaker to safeguard the building and its occupants against the tragedy of a possible fire such as occurred in the Supreme Court?

Answer:—

(1 to 9) "My attention was drawn to the article in *The Courier-Mail* of September 13, 1968, concerning the Brisbane Magistrates Court Building. This building is not a fire trap and fire regulations are observed. The veranda partitioning and wire mesh enclosure to verandas of the building are necessary security provisions against prisoners attempting to escape, and keys to the locked doors in the veranda partitions are in the custody of the Officer-in-Charge of the Watchhouse. When such partition doors are locked, fire escape egress from the building upper floor levels is available by two staircases other than that shown in the photograph published with the newspaper article in question. Prisoners in the adjoining watchhouse would not be trapped in the event of fire. The appointment of a permanent caretaker to the Magistrates Courts Building as a precaution against fire is not warranted."

ALLEGED DISTRIBUTION OF PORNOGRAPHIC PHOTOGRAPHS

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to recent articles in newspapers claiming that pornographic photographs are shown to organised gatherings in different parts of Brisbane?

(2) Has a complaint been made that the photographs are being sold to school-boy cadets in camp for Army training?

(3) Will he investigate the allegation that the photographs are being distributed by a commissioned officer of the Royal Australian Army?

(4) Is the proprietor of an Ampol service station also engaged in this type of conduct?

(5) Are the men who peddle the photographs in Brisbane receiving the films and slides from a Chinaman, Peter Young, in Sydney?

(6) Are the prints of the pornographic photographs being distributed to high-school children through a green-grocer?

(7) Have Customs officials searched any places in Brisbane and found unlawful films?

(8) Will he have inquiries made from Customs officers as to what evidence they have and why prosecutions have not been launched?

(9) Will the police inspect and investigate Victoria Barracks following allegations that an Army officer and also an Army public relations officer are printing obscene pictures there?

(10) Has the drug squad taken action to investigate matters of this nature as drugs appear to be peddled in association with the presentation of the films?

(11) Have some of the questionable films, prints and slides been brought from Vietnam through the agency of returning Army personnel?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "No."

(3) "This allegation is being investigated."

(4) "I have no knowledge of any such person being engaged in this type of conduct."

(5) "The identity of the person or persons alleged to be engaged in the distribution of this material is unknown."

(6) "No evidence has been obtained of the distribution of pornographic photographs to high-school children through a greengrocer."

(7) "The activities of members of the Customs Department do not come within the jurisdiction of this Government."

(8) "No."

(9) "The Police Department has not received any complaint that an Army officer and also an Army public relations officer are printing obscene pictures at Victoria Barracks."

(10) "Inquiries have failed to establish that drugs are being peddled in Queensland in association with the presentation of pornographic films."

(11) "No evidence has been obtained by the Police Department to substantiate this allegation."

One could infer from the nature of this Question that the Honourable Member is in possession of certain information which might be of value to the police in their inquiries. If such is the case, I now invite him to make available to me any details which could possibly be of assistance in these investigations."

BREATHALYSER TESTS OF MOTORISTS INVOLVED IN NIGHT-TIME ACCIDENTS

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

(1) Is he aware of the Commissioner's administrative memorandum No. 35/68 of August 13, instructing police officers that all traffic accident reports in future in respect of accidents occurring between 6 p.m. on one day and 2 a.m. the following day are to include information as to whether the person had a breathalyser test?

(2) Is he also aware of a memorandum of August 20, directed by Inspector Edwin P. Chandler to all police in Innisfail Police District requesting all drivers of vehicles involved in road accidents occurring between 6 p.m. on one day and 2 a.m. on the following day to have a breathalyser test?

(3) Is this in keeping with the pronouncements made by the Minister and other members of Cabinet?

(4) If so, what action is proposed against persons involved in accidents at times other than between 6 p.m. and 2 a.m.?

Answer:—

(1 to 4) "The Police Commissioner's administrative memorandum No. 35/68 of August 13, 1968, did not instruct the action referred to. It simply directed the assembly of data in relation to accidents occurring between 6 p.m. on the one day and 2 a.m. on the following day as a project to assess the use of the Alcotests in relation to accidents occurring between those times. However, an instruction purely for statistical purposes has been issued directing that all traffic-accident reports, and this is irrespective of the times of the accidents, indicate therein whether a breathalyser test or the supply of a specimen of blood or a refusal to supply breath or blood followed the accident. Inspector Chandler's memorandum of August 20, 1968, was not directed to all police in the Innisfail Police District and did not use the phrase 'breathalyser test', nor is there a breathalyser in the Innisfail Police District. However, a certain direction in

that memorandum that a request is to be made of the drivers of all vehicles involved in road accidents between 6 p.m. on the one day and 2 a.m. on the following day, in effect, to submit to an Alcotest is contrary to a prior direction of the Police Commissioner, and action is in hand to correct this. Past practice of investigating all traffic accidents on the same basis, irrespective of the time of the accident, will continue."

TENDERS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF OLD TOWN HALL SITE, BRISBANE

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

As my previous Question to him asked for an investigation into all the circumstances related to the negotiations between Brisbane City Council and Capital City Motels Pty. Ltd., and as his Answer indicated only that he had no information before him to warrant an inquiry, is he prepared to make an investigation into the matter rather than merely wait for information to come to him?

Answer:—

"If the Honourable Member or any other person is in a position to submit to me information relative to the particular matter I would be pleased to examine any such submission."

HOUSING COMMISSION HOUSES FOR COMPANY AND GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

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

(1) During each of the past five years, how many houses have been constructed and in what locations for each of the companies listed in his Answer to my Question on October 16?

(2) How many houses have been built during the past five years for Government employees serving outside the metropolitan area?

Answers:—

(1) "Houses for Industry; 5 year period —July 1, 1963 to June 30, 1968—

Company, etc.	Location	63-4	64-5	65-6	66-7	67-8	Total
Central Queensland Salt Industries Limited	Bajool		5		4		9
Agricultural Requirements Pty. Ltd.	Biloela	1					1
Amagraz Limited	Biloela	14	15	8			37
J. Holland & Co. Pty. Ltd.	Biloela	1					1
Riley Dodds (Aust.) Pty. Ltd.	Biloela	1					1
Thiess, Peabody, Mitsui Coal Pty. Ltd.	Biloela	9	4		2	1	16
	Moura	6	35	29	20		90
Utah Development Co.	Blackwater				30	50	80
Clyde Engineering Co. Pty. Ltd.	Lawnton		1				1
Press Etchings Pty. Ltd.	Brisbane		2				2
Underwood (Aust.) Sales Pty. Ltd.	Buderim	5					5
Napier Brothers Limited	Dalby	1	10	1			12
Hyne & Son Pty. Ltd.	Dingo			1			1
Titanium and Zirconium Industries Pty. Ltd.	Dunwich				3	2	5
Consolidated Rutile Limited	Dunwich				1	4	5
Smorgens Overseas Pty. Ltd.	Emerald	1					1
Mullers Industries Pty. Ltd.	Gatton						
Haughton Sugar Co. Ltd.	Giru			4			4
Queensland Alumina Limited	Gladstone		92	102	113	45	352
Murphyores Incorporated Pty. Ltd.	Gladstone				5		5
Martin Reed Electric	Ingham				1		1
Western Air Navigation Limited	Longreach		1				1
Union Oil Development Corporation	Moonie				2		2
Wilson Hart & Co.	Moura		1		2		3
	Theodore		4		1		5
Thiess Callide Coal Pty. Ltd.	Biloela	1			2		3
Mount Isa Mines Limited	Mount Isa			1			1
Bush Pilots Airways Limited	Mount Isa	12		49	25	1	87
South Burnett Meatworks Co-operative Association Limited	Mount Isa	1					1
	Murgon	3			3		6
Tancred Brothers Pty. Ltd.	Pentland	15				2	17
Proserpine Co-operative Milling Association Limited	Proserpine				2		2
Morris Woollen Mills Pty. Ltd.	Redbank			2		3	5
Central Queensland Fabrications Pty. Ltd.	Rockhampton			3	1		4
Defiance Milling Co. Pty. Ltd.	Rockhampton				2		2
Queensland Co-operative Milling Association Limited	Rockhampton			6			6
Roma Meatworks Pty. Ltd.	Roma	1	3				4
Titanium Alloy Manufacturing Co.	Tin Can Bay		3	17			20
Toowoomba Foundry Pty. Ltd.	Toowoomba			1			1
	Biloela	1	3	37		11	52
	Blackwater					1	1
Capricornia Regional Electricity Board	Clermont	1					1
	Gladstone					1	1
	Wowan	1					1
Central Western Regional Electricity Board	Barcaldine	1					1
Mackay Regional Electricity Board	Mackay			1			1
Northern Electric Authority	Collinsville					18	18
T.A.A.	Charters Towers	1					1
	Mount Isa	2					2
Wheat Board	Biloela					1	1
	Miles	1					1
Cotton Board	Cecil Plains				2		2
		80	179	264	223	140	886

(2) "119 houses and units through the Queensland Housing Commission and 297 through the Department of Works under the Scheme for provision of Official Residences for Public Servants."

ELECTRICAL TRADESMEN, RAILWAY DEPARTMENT

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

(1) Are any country railway depot staffs below strength in electrical tradesmen?

(2) Is overtime being worked to the extent of two men covering three shifts?

(3) Is outside industry draining electrical tradesmen from the Railway Department?

(4) Has the shortage of electrical tradesmen resulted in a curtailment of maintenance and service work on diesel-electric locomotives?

(5) What are the numbers of apprentices and electrical tradesmen, respectively, at Redbank Railway Workshops?

Answer:—

(1 to 5) "The staff in many grades in country areas fluctuates, and this occurs particularly during the months of seasonal employment. The movement of staff is not peculiar to the Railway Department. The locomotives of the Department have been and are being maintained in proper operational state. There are 29 electrical apprentices employed in the Redbank Workshops."

HOUSING COMMISSION HOUSES FOR SERVICE PERSONNEL

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

(1) How many houses have been built by the Queensland Housing Commission for the Commonwealth Government for the use of service personnel in each of the years ended June 30, 1964 to 1968, inclusive?

(2) What was the cost of the houses, including the land, in each year?

(3) Are any of the houses at any time transferred to civilian use?

(4) In the event of the occupants of any of the houses being discharged or retired from the Services, is their tenancy continued in a civilian capacity? If so, are rents re-assessed and on what basis?

Answers:—

(1) "Houses were provided as follows—1963-64, 203; 1964-65, 140; 1965-66, 166; 1966-67, 132; 1967-68, 161."

(2) "1963-64, \$1,483,498; 1964-65, \$1,050,667; 1965-66, \$1,322,730; 1966-67, \$1,167,104; 1967-68, \$1,574,013."

(3) "In a very limited number of cases where the service concerned did not have a serving member immediately available the house was accepted by the Commission and let to a civilian and a replacement house was provided to the service at a subsequent date when required."

(4) "No."

ALLOCATION OF COMMONWEALTH GRANT FOR SCHOOL LIBRARIES

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

(1) Has the Commonwealth Government made arrangements for and has consideration been given by his Government to the listing of priority for distribution of the Commonwealth grant for school libraries in Queensland?

(2) If so, what schools in Cairns and the Far North will be included in the scheme for new library buildings in the near future and when will the libraries be in operation?

(3) If not, when will he be able to outline details of the scheme?

Answers:—

(1) "The Commonwealth Government advised that it intended to establish a committee to advise on standards and conditions relating to the Commonwealth Grants for libraries in secondary schools. My Department is waiting for further details before proceeding with plans for the allocation of the grant."

(2) "It is likely that all State secondary schools will receive a grant for the purchase of books; the provision of library buildings will be spread over a number of years; no priority list has yet been prepared."

(3) "It is anticipated that by the time the Commonwealth money becomes available in January, 1969, a definite policy regarding its expenditure will have been formulated."

OVERLOADING OF RAILWAY WAGONS UNDER CONTRACT RATES TO NORTH QUEENSLAND

Mr. R. Jones, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

(1) Further to my Questions to the Minister for Transport on December 6, 1967, March 20 and August 22, 1968 concerning overloading of railway wagons under contract rates to North Queensland, has his attention been drawn to subsequent Press reports in *The Cairns Post* and *The Courier-Mail* of September 21 headed "Railway Freight Report"—"Fraud Squad Rail Check" stating "\$40,000 claimed on concessions between Brisbane and Cairns for merchandise which did not exist"?

(2) Does the report made by the Commissioner of Police following investigation by the C.I.B. fraud squad support or refute the foregoing?

(3) Has any decision been arrived at and/or have recommendations been made? If not, when will the matter be determined?

Answers:—

(1) "My attention has been drawn to an article headed 'Fraud Squad Rail Check' in *The Courier-Mail* newspaper of September 21, 1968."

(2 and 3) "The matter is still under investigation."

TOBACCO PRICE SCHEDULE

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

Has any change been made in the tobacco price schedule for the 1969 selling season? If not, will he, in order to be prepared for the next sales, have an investigation made to ascertain if there are any anomalies in the present schedule?

Answer:—

"No. The matter is one for the Australian Tobacco Board, on which the growers, manufacturers and Commonwealth and relevant State Departments of Agriculture and Primary Industries are represented."

ENTOMOLOGIST, ATHERTON TABLELAND

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

(1) Further to my Question on October 19, 1967, in view of the urgent need for the services of an entomologist at Atherton and as there has been no replacement for the officer transferred from Atherton, have any appointments been made since that date and, if so, when was the first appointment made?

(2) When will the present appointee take up duties at Atherton?

Answers:—

(1) "Five entomologists have been appointed to the Investigations and Extension Section of the Entomology Branch of my Department since this matter was previously raised. All were to fill vacancies. The first of these appointments was made in January of this year to fill a vacancy for work towards which industry was contributing financially. Two appointees were females. The two other appointments were made from overseas. One of the appointees declined to take up duty. There are still two vacancies in this Section for entomologists."

(2) "It was impossible to find an appointee suitable for the Atherton position and this gap could be filled only by transfer

of an experienced entomologist from another centre within the Department. This transfer was made some time ago and the officer concerned will be commencing duty in Atherton this week."

WIDENING OF SEALED PAVEMENT, KENNEDY HIGHWAY

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

(1) Is he aware that the last three sealed sections completed on the Kennedy Highway between Mt. Garnet and 40 Mile Scrub have widths varying down to eight feet?

(2) As heavy, fast traffic now uses the road and as the edges of the sealed section are constantly carrying the traffic, will he consider increasing the width of the sealed sections in future road works on this important highway?

Answers:—

(1) "Bitumen surfaced pavements 12 feet wide were constructed on the section between Mt. Garnet and the 40 Mile Scrub, and, although some edge wear is occurring under traffic, every effort is made to prevent fretting of bitumen edges by regular maintenance within the resources available."

(2) "Anticipated traffic volumes for some time ahead are taken into account when pavement widths are being established, and this factor will continue to be kept in mind in the design of future works on the Kennedy Highway."

PAPERS

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

Reports—

Department of Harbours and Marine, for the year 1967-68.

Commissioner of Main Roads, for the year 1967-68.

Council of the Queensland Institute of Medical Research, for the year 1967-68.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

The Forestry Acts, 1959 to 1964.

The City of Brisbane Acts, 1924 to 1967.

The Dairy Produce Acts, 1920 to 1963.

The Milk Supply Acts, 1952 to 1961.

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

The Wheat Pool Acts, 1920 to 1957.

Regulations under—

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

The Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Acts, 1962 to 1966.

FORM OF QUESTION

Mr. W. D. HEWITT (Chatsworth) having given notice of a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The latter part of the question calls for an expression of opinion, and I shall have to examine it.

DAYS ALLOTTED TO SUPPLY

Hon. G. W. W. CHALK (Lockyer—Acting Premier): I move—

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

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT—
RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

(Mr. Carey, Albert, in the chair)

Debate resumed from 17 October (see p. 763) 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. HUGHES (Kurilpa) (11.34 a.m.): This is probably Queensland's most important Budget, and it is undoubtedly, in my view, and in the view of Government members as well as the majority of Opposition members, the best Budget ever introduced in Queensland. This is obvious from the lack of opposition to it.

Mr. Hanson: Oh, no!

Mr. HUGHES: If the hon. member for Port Curtis, who was not present to hear it, read the speech of the Leader of the Opposition he would know that the only criticism levelled at the Treasurer and the Government concerned the need to paint a few railway wagons and carriages and clear some railway lines of grass and weed growth. That virtually was his only opposition to the Budget.

This is the third Budget brought down by the Treasurer, and undoubtedly it is the best of the three. In drawing up his earlier Budgets, he had to contend with problems of droughts, increased freights and taxation, and many ills that beset the State. He had also to pick up the backlog of work that was the Government's legacy from past administrations, particularly in the field of capital works such as school buildings, police stations and hospitals. It reflects great credit on the Treasurer that he has been able to husband funds and, I believe, through his innate wisdom, bring the State through those trials and times of financial crisis.

Mr. Hanson: Husbanded the funds of the State and at the same time increasing taxation.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member speaks about increasing taxation. When Labour Governments were in office in Queensland, they drove companies out of this State. Queensland was the Cinderella of the Australian States. Labour taxed the companies out of the State; they had no morale and were given no incentive to remain here. Queensland languished until its position became pathetic. The hon. member speaks of increases in taxation. I remind him that Labour Governments increased rail freights nine times in nine years. That is on record and cannot be disproved.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: I ask the hon. member for Port Curtis to accept the true position that Queensland was the Cinderella State, and in those days it rightly deserved to be known as that. Since then, of course, Country-Liberal Governments have been able to take stock of the needs of Queensland, tap its mineral reserves and exploit its natural resources, and overcome to a large extent the problems associated with the effect of world-market prices on sugar, tobacco, dairy products, and many other rural products. It took a businesslike Government, a Government with virility and a sense of purpose, to shake off the dust surrounding Weipa and get the bauxite industry under way and have established the alumina project, which has meant so much to Queensland, and Gladstone in particular. Townsville is the fastest-growing city in Australia, and Gladstone would come a very close second. I remind the Committee that that development is occurring in an area in which the hon. member for Port Curtis bewails the fact that the Government has not done the best that money and brains should have enabled it to do.

I say that the Treasurer has done a very good job during the years of financial stringency. Every fair-minded hon. member will agree that a few years ago the State experienced the worst drought in its history, which had a devastating effect upon Queensland's economy. However, during those years of financial trial and crisis the Treasurer was able to maintain the State's free hospital

system, keep the State's education system operating and effect improvements in it, and carry out other works and services. He piloted the State through those troubled waters in a way that brought great credit to himself and to the Government and won the approbation of the citizens of Queensland.

The Budget that the Committee is now considering is creditable and significant because it sets a precedent for continued progress. It provides for expansion in all fields of Government service and endeavour; it also—this is unique in the field of government—remits taxes and lightens the financial burden on everyone in the community.

Mr. Newton: So it ought to, after imposing 20 increases in the last nine years.

Mr. HUGHES: It ought to, because the Treasurer has been able to husband the funds of the State and bring down a Budget providing, on the one hand, for continued progress and, on the other hand, for a remission of taxes to people in all sections of the community, who thus benefit. The people of Queensland are getting the best of both worlds.

Mr. Newton interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: I challenge the hon. member for Belmont to name any Government in the history of Queensland—for that matter, in the history of Australia—that has not only reduced but in some instances waived taxation during its term of office. That is what this Budget purports to do, with the approval of this Chamber. There will be a testing time for hon. members opposite. Are they prepared to allow the citizens of this State to benefit by reduced rail freights, which will assist primary producers? Will they let the people of this State benefit by reduced land tax and succession and probate duties, and reductions in other fields of taxation? If they intend to do so, they will vote with the Government for the passage of this Budget in its entirety. As I say, it is undoubtedly Queensland's best Budget yet. This shows that the Treasurer is not unmindful of the pressures and problems in the community.

It is also significant that there has been little or no opposition to this Budget. As I said previously, the only real opposition that I found in the utterances of the Leader of the Opposition was that we should splash some paint around on some of our carriages and clear our railway tracks of weeds and burr.

There are many aspects of this Budget that call for consideration, but two of them in particular, namely, education and hospitals, are matters that deal very personally and vitally with the needs of the people. These are vital community services, and I propose to deal at some length with the question of education because I believe it is the most vital of community services. The future, the faith, the fortunes, the progress and the well-being of this country are in the hands of young

people. We see many typical examples of these in the gallery this morning, and in our primary and secondary schools. This country, great as it is, will become still greater through an education system of which these youngsters may avail themselves in order to befit themselves for life, and I believe it is the responsibility of Governments to be aware of the needs that exist and to provide for them to the fullest possible extent.

Mr. Newton: What are you doing about problems at the Kuraby State School?

Mr. HUGHES: Various Labour members in this Parliament ask questions and make submissions and applications for improvements to schools in their electorates. We all do this, and, in most cases, I believe we get what we ask for. In fact, one has only to ask the hon. member for Barcoo to be told just how much he has received from this Government in the past year or two.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: He is embarrassed at being a member of the Opposition.

Mr. HUGHES: As my colleague from Chatsworth says, the hon. member for Barcoo is embarrassed at being a member of the Opposition. His is one vote that we can surely count on. Probably the only complaint he has is that he would like some more attention paid to one of his State schools. That was the only opposition I heard in his speech.

Mr. O'Donnell: And a new police station and court-house.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member will then have everything; not a blade of grass will be out of place, or a thing wrong.

I believe that this question of education impinges not only on the financial ability of the Government to sponsor and conduct it but also on its responsibility to raise it to a standard even higher than at present. The increase in expenditure on education last year was 11.39 per cent. and this has been exceeded in this Budget, which brings the increase to 32 per cent. This is a very important aspect because, if we want to consider the matter by comparison, in 1958-59, the year after this Government came to office, from Consolidated Revenue \$27,700,000 was expended on education. In 1967-68 we are budgeting for almost \$74,000,000 from Consolidated Revenue, and \$12,000,000 is to come from Trust and Special Funds.

Generally speaking, I think that hon. members will agree that the huge increases in expenditure on education from the appropriation last year of \$71,000,000 to an appropriation this year of \$85,100,000, show the Government's awareness of the need to escalate our financing in education to provide its facilities to the fullest extent. The needs not only of State primary and secondary schools but also of the non-State schools demand attention. Non-State schools have been given

their due consideration by the Government in introducing a new subsidy by which it will provide to them an allowance of \$25 per annum for each non-State primary school student. At secondary level the allowance will be increased by \$10, from \$15 to \$25.

At the commencement of the 1969 school year these payments will cost the Government \$1,700,000, of which \$1,133,000 will be met during the first two terms that are encompassed by this Budget. In addition, textbook allowances have been raised. The allowance for Grades 8 and 9 will be increased from \$4 to \$10, and for Grade 10 from \$6 to \$10, and for Senior from \$20 to \$40. This will cost the Government an extra \$2,000,000, in addition to which a further \$2,000,000 will be provided to meet the cost of extras and other services.

These figures are very significant, and they bear some scrutiny because they not only show the demand made by education but also highlight the need in this technological era, and in a world that has become computerised, to educate our young children to a greater extent so that they may be able to befit themselves with the ability to carry out these tasks, vocations and professions in later life.

The Government recognises the need of non-State schools in particular. I have been pleased to champion their cause ever since my election to this Chamber. In fact, my maiden speech was on this subject; it called for aid and interest-free loans. The cause of non-State schools has suffered trial and tribulation, and now at last it is receiving worth-while recognition. I am therefore pleased and proud to be able to commend and support the document that is being debated today and these increases and new allowances that it is proposed to pay to the non-State schools.

Mr. Mann: You will be endorsed after that remark.

Mr. HUGHES: I was endorsed, unopposed, some time ago, and I have always been a champion of the requirements of non-State schools.

I express my thanks to the many people who have assisted me by supplying information and statistics that enabled me to advance and argue the case for such subsidies. I am gratified by the fact that, whilst I have battled for the needs of State schools, I have not done so at the expense of non-State schools. Over the years I have often harboured the view that to a great extent the needs of the State schools have been met at the expense of those who pay for their children's education at the non-State schools.

Mr. Newton: What about the part played by the parents and citizens' associations? Are you saying that they have done nothing?

Mr. HUGHES: No, I am not suggesting that at all. The hon. member misinterprets everything I say. I fully recognise with the greatest commendation and gratitude the tremendous work that is done by parents and citizens' associations and parents and friends' associations. Without them the schools would not be equipped with many of their necessary aids and materials.

I am a member of more than one of these associations. At one school in particular when we require reading books the department provides a subsidy on only 10 books, although there may be 30 children in the class. We have to raise the money to buy the extra 20, which is an anomaly. I appreciate the tremendous value of the work done by members of the community in assisting the schools through the P. & C. associations and the P. & F. associations. Without these associations there would be a greater lack of teaching aids, which would make the role of the teachers ever so much harder than at present.

I know the trials and tribulations associated with gaining recognition for non-State schools, and I express my thanks to the many people who have assisted me in championing their cause. I am extremely gratified to know, after battling for State-school needs which have been met, that this has not been done at the expense of non-State schools. In arguing their case behind the scenes—in the party room, in public places, and on the floor of this Chamber—I have been instrumental in gaining a justifiable recognition of the needs of non-State schools. I pay a sincere tribute to the Treasurer on his honest, sincere and realistic attitude in recognising their needs, and I also thank my colleagues for their support.

The 1968-69 Budget marks a pinnacle of success in financing education in Queensland. There are many ways in which we can explore the educational requirements of our State, and I propose to deal with one or two aspects of it more specifically. The appropriation from Consolidated Revenue alone has been increased from \$71,000,000 to \$85,100,000, an increase of almost 20 per cent. Another \$12,500,000 is to come from Trust and Special Funds. I therefore believe that the Treasurer should be showered with the praise and compliments that he richly deserves.

One matter which is the cause of grave concern to many parents stems from departmental action and financial considerations. It crops up year by year throughout the State. I refer particularly to the frequency of change in textbooks or reference books at the secondary level, and to the lack of any worth-while uniformity between school and school. To amplify that remark, as many hon. members know, or should know if they are in touch with their electorates, which I believe they are, on both sides of the Chamber, parents are concerned and burdened with the high cost

of textbooks each year. They have to replace, almost entirely, the textbooks for student sons and daughters each year. So many books cannot be passed on the following year from one child to the next. To a lesser degree a problem arises when a family moves its place of abode during a school term. This happens in a move from one town to another, or even from one suburb to another, such as from Mitchelton to Belmont or from Sandgate to Yeronga. Name any suburb at all. This problem arises as between cities, towns and suburbs. Whilst it is not a major problem, to some extent it places a burden on the family because, having shifted the place of abode and enrolled school-children at another school, it is invariably found that new textbooks are required for the remaining terms of the school year.

This comes about, of course, because head-teachers—I am speaking now of secondary-school head-teachers—in about September or October confer with the teachers at the school, who recommend certain books. Eventually a list is made of the school-books required by that school for the following year. But it is done as an individual matter, with no liaison with other areas or schools—entirely separately and singly, and associated only with one particular school. At times there are radical changes in some schools. This creates a financial hardship on many citizens, especially those on little more than the basic wage—those who do not have a very large take-home pay—who have rent to pay and also have a number of children at school.

What is the answer to this problem? And it is quite a problem to these people. We can say that textbooks can be standardised for a period of three to five years, where applicable. This would reduce costs considerably. Of course, there are arguments against this. I think it is proper that we should analyse these situations. If textbooks were standardised for all State schools we would have the teachers up in arms. They would object and say that we are being too restrictive, that we are not allowing the child to broaden his scope of education and view, that we are not allowing for the exploratory mind, and that, within the confines of those channels, our form of education will be restricted to those textbooks. There is validity in that argument. It would not allow the broadest expression in education and teachers would object to being tied down.

At present teachers can, and I believe sometimes do, refuse to teach from a book that is set or appears in the book list. If they do, and elect to teach from a book of their own choosing, they have to stand up to examination. Their view may be right, but they would need to be good teachers with confidence in their own ability and point of view.

Mr. O'Donnell: The point is that certain basic books, such as those on German and French, could be standardised.

Mr. HUGHES: True. There are certain basic books that could be standardised. This would allow a latitude for the teachers to bring in to play not only their own personalities but also their own ideas on teaching. They could almost be called "impact" teachers with their own ideas. This happens to some extent in England, where there are impact-type teachers who introduce somewhat radical changes. By this method we could either prove or disprove whether this is better for the education of the student. On the other hand, if changes are not made a charge could be levelled, and undoubtedly substantiated, that we are not keeping up with the times—with new ideas and methods.

Obviously we cannot restrict our field, flow and vision in education. If we did this to any extent, a charge could be levelled that the education system in this State is becoming outdated and outmoded.

Therefore, while it may be desirable to reduce the cost to the parent—and I agree with this—there must of necessity be some change which, I believe, need apply to only a few of the textbooks, as the hon. member for Barcoo pointed out.

Basic textbooks could be standardised, but the choice of others could be left to teachers in their efforts to develop exploratory minds and widen the vision and ability of students. The use of standard textbooks would make it possible to issue reprints of amendments in certain sections only, which would considerably reduce the cost of a change in set books.

As no doubt most hon. members know, the books used in primary schools for social studies and English have not been changed for about 20 years, which is going too far the other way. Although I am all in favour of some form of standardisation, it can be taken too far. The books being used at present in primary schools in the subjects of English and social studies have not been changed for so long that they are out of date, particularly in the case of social studies.

Mr. Walsh: The present Government has been in office for 11 years.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, we have. I have said in previous speeches that, whilst the Government has been able to cope with the tidal wave of students resulting from the increased birth-rate in the immediate post-war years, this has not been done without some failings. Whilst the Government has done a tremendous job in providing buildings, equipment and teachers, and Queensland has at present a good system of education, let us see if it contains any anomalies or weaknesses that can be removed in order to make it even better.

I agree with the hon. member for Bundaberg that one thing that could be improved is the position of books in secondary schools. Teachers make recommendations on textbooks to be used in schools, and the public can be excused for laying the blame for the cost of textbook changes at the door of the teachers. Many teachers with whom I have discussed this matter say, "Yes, we can be blamed for this, but we want the best in education, and we cannot get that by strict standardisation of textbooks."

Mr. O'Donnell: Don't you think the Commonwealth Government should supply basic textbooks throughout Australia?

Mr. HUGHES: I believe there is a case for Commonwealth action along those lines. In Guatemala, Panama and many other Central American countries that is done, as I shall show later, by a central agency. I believe that the Commonwealth Government should accept this responsibility.

The Government must take the initiative in this matter, and I suggest that consideration be given to issuing to all secondary-school students a spring-back binder, with a hard plastic or p.v.c. cover, for keeping in loose-leaf form notes on various subjects which would be supplied to students. This would take the place of bound and covered textbooks, and when amendments were necessary they could be supplied free by the Government for insertion in the binder. After all, although it is said that education in Queensland is free, it is not free; it is merely free tuition. Where amendments were printed, they could be supplied at a cost of only a few cents. Merely because one chapter has been rewritten, children would then not have to jettison a whole book that they are required to study in the following year; they would have to amend only the relative chapter.

I have here a book entitled "Social Mathematics for Grades 9 and 10", which is written by Kidston. In it are mentioned telephone charges, postal rates, and so on. Undoubtedly those rates will change in the future, but the fact that they change will not alter the basic content of 85 per cent. of the book. However, if such a change is made, the children in the next year's class may be required to buy a completely new book containing the amended rates. Although 85 or 90 per cent. of the text is unchanged, they have to obtain a new book in order to get one that is up to date.

Mr. O'Donnell: Those charges would be out of date now.

Mr. HUGHES: No, these are not out of date. This book is current.

Mr. O'Donnell: They could be out of date.

Mr. HUGHES: They are not out of date, because it is almost a new book. When the manuscript of this book was ready to go to Press, some of the postal charges were changed and corrections in the charges were made in the galley proofs. They were made just in time, before the book was printed. If

they had not been, the book could have been virtually out of date before it was printed. That is one example of how only a small change may be required. Standardisation of size is another matter that could well be considered, but I shall not go into that question to any extent at the moment.

There is in operation in some schools a system of hiring books out. It operates in some of the other Australian States, and it also is used in some high schools in Queensland, but not generally. It is not fostered by the department; it seems to be left to the decision of the individual principal. There are divergent views on its desirability. One view is that a child should own his own textbooks and keep them, so that any notations made over the years are in the book and are his property and he can refer back to them. On the other hand, until a system of making textbooks available to students completely free of charge can be implemented, I believe that hiring of books should be practised in every school in the State. Provision should be made in the education Vote for a budgetary allowance by the department to enable a principal to buy books for hiring out.

Take the case of a child leaving a school in Townsville and entering a school in Brisbane. At Townsville he could pass in his books, which could be purchased at a nominal sum, and then he could come to Brisbane and buy at the school, again for a nominal sum, the books that he required here. A system such as that would have to be instituted to enable books to be hired out, and I believe that provision should be made in the education Vote for the payment of book allowances to principals until such time as the Government can overcome the problems arising from transfers.

Children in Grade 9 have to read nine novels during the year, which may cost a parent up to \$6 or \$7. Because of the impact of television and radio, I believe that it is necessary to encourage children to read. Reading must be encouraged for its own sake. However, parents say, "I will pay \$6 or \$7 this year. Next year you will change the books and those in use this year will be of no further use to my child who will be in that grade next year." A hiring charge of 50c to 70c for the use of all books would, I believe, serve the purpose. This would provide the immediate short-term answer.

On the question of textbooks at schools, to obtain some form of uniformity and possible standardisation I believe that a board or commission should be set up to lay down guide-lines. I shall go into that point in more detail shortly. The department or the board may never be able to direct that such-and-such a textbook be used. As I said earlier, a teacher now can refuse to teach from such a textbook. In such case, the teacher has to stand up to inspection but he has this right and teachers exercise it. As one teacher, in discussing this question with me, said, "If a better book comes out I

want to use it. I do not see why a child should put up with inferior books, despite the cost." This is the attitude, probably rightly so from an educationists point of view—it is an individual matter—but the parent pays. This is becoming so much of a burden to so many parents that it is now causing the Government to look at the matter very seriously with a view to implementing a system of free textbooks to all students.

Mr. O'Donnell: The department does approve of certain textbooks and those, as far as I understand it, are listed.

Mr. HUGHES: I know; there is a list that is sent out. It is printed in the journal.

Mr. Porter: It is too restricted.

Mr. HUGHES: Although wide, to some extent it is restricted in many fields, but one still gets the variation from school to school. I believe that this does not solve the problem. A teacher might find, from his own investigation through bookstores and through reading book reviews in the Press, and so on, that there is a better book available and he decides that that is the one he wants to teach from.

Mr. Porter: We must move more and more towards library centres at schools.

Mr. HUGHES: Obviously we should. This question of school libraries is of tremendous importance, and too little is said and done about it. From a study I have made, I find that in England, in a recent publication—I think it is dated 1968—the Central Advisory Council on Education disclosed after investigation that 1,800 school libraries each had 4,000 to 5,000 volumes. Is there a school in Queensland that can claim to have anything like that? We must, as the hon. member for Toowong says, move towards this end.

I do not see why a child should put up with inferior books, in spite of the cost. This seems to be the question. Although I think that most teachers concede that the information in reference books is generally the same, the method of presentation is different. With uniformity or some form of standardisation, education may still be good provided there is a latitude in the use of additional books and a hire-out system. But I believe that this is only a temporary stop-gap towards the ultimate end which we should have of the Government providing completely free all textbooks to children at schools, and amassing very worth-while, representative and informative reference libraries. Parents and children would then, of course, get the best of both worlds.

Dealing further with the question of textbooks, let us look at what happens in other countries. In New Zealand, since 1945 textbooks have been supplied free in primary and intermediate schools. There is the free

issue of other publications to primary and secondary schools, and the development of libraries also represents a saving to parents. Even then, if there is a rare case of hardship with some specific school book or requisite, special assistance is available.

In Tasmania there is a sale-stock system and free textbooks in necessitous circumstances. In addition, children may purchase books through teachers at considerably reduced prices. Even some time ago this cost \$47,424. As far back as 1956, according to a report of the Commonwealth Office of Education on the provision of books and materials by State and Commonwealth educational authorities, New South Wales had a book-hiring system. We do not have anything like this in Queensland except as an individual decision of a school. We in Queensland have no departmental system for hiring textbooks. Wherever one looks the same thing applies. In Western Australia certain requisites are supplied. In New South Wales primary textbooks are provided at all State and non-State schools, and in South Australia textbooks are supplied free to children of deceased ex-servicemen.

Speaking about Central America as I was a few moments ago, in Panama over 5,500,000 textbooks have been printed for free use in public schools in five Central American republics and Panama, under an Alliance for Progress project that was inaugurated in 1963. The Regional Textbook Programme observes its third anniversary in June of this year. This programme began as the first major step towards the implementation of a directive issued to the organisation of Central American States to standardise primary education in the region comprising Guatemala, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Honduras, Costa Rica and Panama.

In the past three years 5,444,000 copies of 12 textbooks have been published for 1,300,000 children and 58,400 teachers in the first four grades of the region's public schools. Included are texts on reading, language, mathematics, social studies and science. In addition, approximately 150,000 copies of seven teachers' guides for orientation purposes have been published. The headquarters for the multi-lateral project is the Central American Regional Textbook Centre in Guatemala City. Each book and guide is prepared at the centre by a team of writers representing all of the countries.

As I will be speaking about a board or commission, I point out that this could be one of its functions. The Minister of Education of each country designates his country's representative in each team and pays his salary and the costs of warehousing and distributing the books. The regional office for Central America and Panama finances the operations of the centre and pays the cost of supervision of the centre, paper, and printing of the pilot edition. The A.I.D. missions finance the cost of paper and printing by commercial firms in the respective countries.

The philosophy behind the programme is simple and plain: "Every child is entitled to an equal opportunity for an education—the child in the remotest hamlet of our countryside as well as the child in the capital city."

The textbooks that were provided were modest paperback editions with large and clear type, and colour illustrations reflecting the life in the Central American region. The books varied in size from 40 to 352 pages. They were so well received that the non-public schools—non-State schools, as we would call them—requested the use of the books. A total of 2,750,000 textbooks and teacher guides are now in the process of publication, and approximately 11,500,000 are expected to be in circulation when the eight-year programme ends in 1970. By then all pupils and teachers in all subjects taught in the six grades of the region's public schools are expected to be supplied with free textbooks. Currently the region's schools have an enrolment of about 1,500,000 pupils, 68,000 teachers, and 17,000 teacher-trainers and supervisory personnel. An important auxiliary benefit of the project is the training of Central American specialists in the curriculum development and in writing design and production of textbooks.

All this is being done in Central American countries, which at times we look at askance and say that we are ahead of them in development, progress and enlightenment. Yet in education those countries are leading the way.

In England there is provision for payment of a capitation allowance. The education authorities issue their textbooks, but it is on the basis of a capitation allowance paid to local education authorities, ranging in the counties and county boroughs from 20s. to 120s.

Why should Queensland lag behind? I believe that the Government should concentrate on education with all the virility at its command and with effective purpose.

The State has problems associated with class sizes. Too often if a teacher is away on sick leave classes have to double up. I know that a short time ago a pool of teachers was established by the late Premier, Mr. Pizzey, but it is so small at district and local level that it is not effective in meeting the demands and needs that are placed upon it. I believe that this pool of teachers should be enlarged because we get many "drop outs" and people who resign to get married. I believe that the principal of each primary and secondary school should be able to enlist from within the area surrounding his school the aid of a teacher for a day or two, or for as long as the need requires. Of course, the teacher would have to be approved by the department before he or she could be included in the pool. This system applies in England, where many teachers work for, say, 2/10ths, 7/10ths or 9/10ths teaching time per week.

Mr. Newton: Do you think we would have any trouble in getting them here?

Mr. HUGHES: Not at all! I believe we would get them and I believe that we should make use of their talents. As they have been trained, why should we let their talents waste away?

Where would we find in the commercial world somebody going home sick and another typist or clerk doing that person's work as well? Why should we accept that in our schools? Teaching is an individual matter; it is more or less a challenge to the teacher of a child. It is a personal matter. On these grounds we should provide a pool of married teachers in each area, with a budgetary allowance, through the department, to the head-teachers of each school permitting them to employ part-time teachers as the demand dictates.

Mr. Melloy: I raised that matter last year by way of question directed to the Minister for Education, who told me that all available married women were employed by the department.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member raised a different question altogether. Many school authorities in England have succeeded in attracting back to work women teachers who resigned after marriage and I believe that the more we get to return, the better.

I now refer to the report of the Central Advisory Council for Education, which was ordered to be made by the Minister for Education in England. It stated that the schools to which more married women were returning were often those near their own homes, and that many people consider teachers' aides should be provided in certain schools in the ratio of 1 to every two infant or junior classes. In England there is a system, which time will not permit me to go into, of teacher and nursery aides in the schools, and the form of training is set out in the recommendation. There are the aides, as well as full-time and part-time teachers.

The English report stated—

"In the twelve months up to February 1966, the numbers of qualified married women teachers returning to teach full-time was about 3,400, approximately the same number as in the previous 12 months. There was, however, a net increase of nearly 5,000 part-time teachers in the same period. Local education authorities have long been readier to employ these teachers in secondary schools, because they fitted into the structure of specialist teaching, particularly in short subjects. In 1962 two-thirds of the primary schools still had none, and almost another 30 per cent. had only one or two part-time teachers."

Hon. members can see how this requirement escalated after implementation.

The report continues—

"The average primary school employed only 0.9 of a part-time teacher for one day a week. By February 1966, 17,373 teachers were employed part-time in

primary schools (the full-time equivalent of 8,189 teachers), compared with 18,330 in secondary schools (the full-time equivalent of 9,032)."

The employment of married women teachers, both full-time and part-time, can strengthen our schools. They should be welcomed, as they will form part of the educational pattern. I suggest that the department should identify and employ immobile married women teachers.

I now come to the matter of the board or commission of which I spoke. We should establish a permanent education advisory board or commission with the function of considering all aspects of education at primary and secondary levels, covering syllabuses, textbooks, teacher employment, in-service training and a host of other subject matters that I will not specifically detail. They cover all matters associated with or affecting our schools and the education of children.

Mr. Newton: Do you want parent and union representation on such a board?

Mr. HUGHES: I will answer that question. I believe that the board should recommend to the Minister for Education, and report to Parliament. Representatives of such a board should come from the Department of Education, parents and citizens' associations, parents and friends' associations, the Queensland Teachers' Union, other teacher associations, the Council of Schools Organisations, and certain community organisations and academics.

Mr. Newton: What are the community organisations you have in mind outside the parents and citizens' organisations?

Mr. HUGHES: Certainly not some that are more than doubtful, such as pseudo academic anti democratic organisations, with which the hon. member may have association and with which I have not.

I believe that a permanent secretariat and office accommodation should be provided by the Government. This body should be given wide reference with every aid and facility; it should be unfettered by the Government, have no Government interference, be permanently established, and report to Parliament. This board or commission would completely review the existing situations or anomalies.

As an example, two years ago the department introduced a new syllabus for mathematics, but there are still no books. I understand that Mr. Zagami, the head-teacher at Moorooka State School, brought out a series of maths. books as an aid. The teachers to whom I have spoken have said that his books are a good guide, but I understand that certain inspectors in our schools say they should not be used.

Mr. Newton: He is one of the best head-teachers in Queensland.

Mr. HUGHES: That may be.

Many of the teachers say that his books are a good guide, although there are some

errors in them, that the examples go too deeply, and that some are too difficult. But as a rule they admit that they are a good guide. As against that, there are many teachers who have told me that the inspectors have said that Zagami's books are not to be used in the schools.

The existing maths. book is out of date. It still deals with £ s. d. The social studies book is 20 years out of date. The English book is 20 years behind—nothing has been done about it since 1940. It is admitted that the department published two introductory maths. syllabuses to aid teachers, but still there is nothing for the children. The children studying the new maths. system go to high school in 1970 and they will experience a good deal of difficulty. There is no in-teacher training. The teachers are not versed in the matter. I understand that the teachers from the colleges have insufficient training in this new method. There is a need to study the "streaming" of children and school methods. Here is another example. Children at the Southport High School move around from period to period while the teachers stay in the classrooms to use their aids.

There is a good deal of work and investigation for a board or commission to do. Apart from reviewing the syllabuses, it must look at reference books or textbooks, teaching methods, and children's books, of which there are 3,000 new ones printed every year in England. Somebody should do homework and research on these. I believe that this would also be a duty of a permanent board. The board should look into refresher courses and the establishment of a pool of mobile and immobile local married teachers. The board or commission could evaluate the trends and methods in education in Australia and overseas; it should carry out research into standards and methods national and international; it should initiate innovations in the curriculum and the syllabus; and it should study and research the use and effect of various teaching aids and methods, including television and libraries, as well as music, art, reading and language laboratories. We need this very much and we have not got it. Until something like this is brought into being we will languish somewhat apathetically from day to day, allowing the present situation to continue for the remainder of this year and for next year. Quite a number of people are concerned at these problems, and among them I pay tribute to Mr. Graham Gorrie, of the Council of Schools Organisation, for his clear thinking.

Mr. O'Donnell: Are you suggesting that the Director-General of Education is not au fait with the problem?

Mr. HUGHES: I am suggesting that the problem is too big for one man and that we should have a commission on which he and his advisers should sit. The board would properly initiate and implement broad, far-reaching and correct patterns.

I am solidly and unequivocally for the best in education, and we should teach from world-standard books. We cannot have the best unless we do this. The problems of the teacher must be recognised, and he must be elevated in his professional status. The scope of education must be broadened and not restricted. If full effect is given to those things results will be produced that are not only worth while and necessary but are also of economic and social importance. This is beyond the means of the ordinary Mr. and Mrs. Citizen, and I therefore believe that it is vital and urgent for the Government to meet this need to the fullest and in the most practical way. As I said earlier, teaching is a personal encounter between the teacher and the student.

Mr. O'Donnell: You could hardly describe it as an "encounter".

Mr. HUGHES: Perhaps my choice of words could be challenged. I mean this in the nicer, finer sense. Let me say, then, that it is a personal matter between teacher and student, regardless of the number in the class. Let the position of the teacher be improved, and give him adequate recompense, greater facilities, and more in-service training. After leaving college, teachers are now sent to schools, and there they stay. Although they may occasionally attend a seminar lasting one or two days, there is no real system of in-service or refresher training. Refresher courses are needed every five to seven years. Petty and irksome restrictions should be removed from the teaching service, and there should be implemented a system of teacher exchange and recruitment between Australia and overseas countries. We are not alone in losing teachers to Canada. We lose them, of course, mainly because of the salaries paid elsewhere. In England, 47 of every 100 teachers leave the profession after three years, and after six years only 30 of the 100 remain. This shows that the loss of teachers is not confined to Queensland. I believe that there should be evolved by the Government, through the board that I recommend, a system of recruitment of, and exchange with, teachers from overseas. With modern means of communication Australia is today very close to Asian countries and I believe it is necessary to have Asian teachers teaching their languages here and Australian teachers teaching our language in Asia.

It is, of course, necessary to remove financial restrictions on the provision of textbooks and educational aids. The burden should be lifted from the citizens and placed fairly and squarely where it belongs, which is on the State Government. It is obvious that we need to recast our ideas on education, shed our apathy, probe world trends with ingenuity and initiative, and introduce new and additional methods. This, of course, has a price, and it may well be asked, "Is this something that we can afford?" I ask in return, "Is it something that we can afford not to do?"

This is a challenging matter. In this computerised world of 1968, with the advances in science and technology that are ahead of

us, we cannot afford to amble along in a pathetic way with a system of education which was good enough for you and me. We must and can achieve this without burdening the parent financially.

(Time expired.)

Mr. DONALD (Ipswich East) (12.34 p.m.): I tender my sincere thanks to the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Nev. Hewitt) for the way in which he wished me a happy and contented retirement, and for the wonderful tribute that he paid me the other day. I can assure hon. members that his action was very sincerely appreciated.

When introducing his Budget, the Treasurer spoke very well indeed, at great length and at times very convincingly. However, the contributions from members on this side of the Chamber have certainly taken the shine off many of his points. There has been some agitation and discontent among the people of Australia, particularly those of Queensland, who claim that we are over-governed. It is true that there are here the three different forms of government, that is, the national Parliament, the State Parliaments, and the local authorities.

I do not think for a moment that any serious-minded citizen of the Commonwealth would advocate the abolition of the Commonwealth, or national, Government. In the 68 years that it has been in existence it has proved beyond any doubt its advantages. It has seen Australia grow into a nation whose words and actions are approved at every international council on which it is represented. We have proved to the world that we can not only govern as a nation but also, in some respects, stand unassisted as a nation. It would be folly, I think, to attempt to interfere with or abolish our national Government.

I believe, too, that any attempt to do away with State Governments would be opposed. Organisations would be built up everywhere advocating State rights; there would be State-righters everywhere, and they would have some justification for their attitude.

Perhaps my first thoughts of politics were when—I was a very small boy at the time—two sulkies with men in them came to and drove away from my home, the Red-bank Inn. On the sulkies were the words "Home rule for Queensland", and I asked my mother what those words meant, what the men were talking about, and what the slogan on the sulkies meant. She told me then that an election was being held to see whether the States would agree to the formation of a Commonwealth Government. I do not think it is necessary to add that the gentlemen in those sulkies were good old Irishmen.

Local government—there are 131 local governments in Queensland—is a form of government that comes closer to the people than does any other, and I do not think we could do without it. In fact, I think that local governments ought to have more power

than they have and receive more financial assistance than they are now getting. Many men who are members of local governments in Queensland not only give their time and leisure but also, in many instances, make financial sacrifices to serve the people whom they represent. They are not confined to one local government; they are to be found throughout the State of Queensland; and they do an excellent job under tremendous difficulties.

People argue, of course, that size and population make them think that we are over-governed. On size, I think they have very little argument to support them; on population, they may have some. In December, 1967, the estimated population of Australia—of course, one can get the correct population only at the time of a census—was 11,928,889. The area of Australia, as I think all hon. members know, is approximately 3,000,000 square miles—2,967,909 to be exact. The area of Queensland is 667,000 square miles, and its population at 31 March, 1968, was estimated at 1,725,709. That represents 14.44 per cent. of Australian population.

There are in Australia 13 Houses of Parliament, two Federal and 11 State. Again people ask, "Are they essential?" To that question I would answer, "No, they are not all essential. Quite a number of them are not." In the first place, the Federal Senate is not essential, and it is the policy of the Australian Labour Party that the Senate should be abolished. We believe that it could be abolished without interfering with the efficiency of the Government. There are Legislative Councils in each of the Australian States other than Queensland. Of course, many people in North Queensland and in the northern portion of New South Wales are agitating and struggling for at least an additional two Houses of Parliament. If they got the new States they want—I am not going to say the request is not worthy, or that they should not get them—that would give us, in all probability, an additional four Houses of Parliament. I think I can say that fairly confidently.

The experience in Queensland shows the futility of the other States pursuing a system consisting of an Upper House as well as a Legislative Assembly. Queensland's Upper House was abolished on 23 March, 1922—46 years ago. During those 46 years, non-Labour Governments have been in office for 14 years and no attempt has been made to re-establish the Upper House in Queensland. Therefore, I can also say truthfully that all the dreadful things that it was said would happen when Queensland abolished the Upper House have not happened, and, if we in Queensland have governed as efficiently as the other States and the Commonwealth—I do not think one member of this Chamber would say we have not, and I do not think Queenslanders would think they are governed less efficiently than the other States—that is the proof of the pudding and is the

strongest case we can make against unnecessarily burdening the people with a second Chamber. That is the proof we have had—14 years of non-Labour Governments, who fought the Labour Party during the move for abolition and did their best to prevent it, yet no move has been made to re-establish the Upper House. Some people are doing their best to prevent the abolition of the Upper House in the other States of the Commonwealth now. If we could do it in Queensland and if our form of government and our legislation is as good as that in the other States, that is proof that there is no need for a revisory Chamber.

Let us look also at the franchises that the other States adopt for their Legislative Councils. It is true that Western Australia and Victoria—if I am not correct I am close to it—use a common roll and their requirements to vote for the Upper House are the same as for the Legislative Assembly. In New South Wales the members of the Upper House are elected by the combined vote of the two Houses of Parliament, the Lower and the Upper, and this brings about the position where, when there is a change of Government, the Upper House is often in command until someone retires or dies, and then by its predominance of members in the Lower House the Government can, although sometimes it cannot, appoint whom it likes to the Upper House.

In South Australia and Tasmania there is a restricted form of franchise. One has either to be a property-owner or the tenant of a house in order to vote. Therefore, I think that the arguments in respect of Upper Houses are predominantly in favour of their abolition as unnecessary.

Mr. Porter: There is no move in any other State for the abolition of the Upper House.

Mr. DONALD: There was in New South Wales. The move failed by a vote of only one or, I think, two, because two Government members refused to vote themselves out of office. That is quite different from what the position was in Queensland. When the Upper House in Queensland was abolished 46 years ago, members of the Government quite happily voted themselves out of office because, like true Labour men, they put the State and the people before their own personal gain. If it has not happened in New South Wales, it is because two men refused to act in that way.

It is very doubtful if uniform taxation legislation—the War-time Arrangement Act I think is its proper name—introduced by the Curtin Government in the early 1940's, has been as favourable to the States as was claimed by some people when it was introduced. It was introduced for the duration of the war and for 12 months thereafter. All the States opposed it, as did Mr. Menzies, although he did nothing to repeal it during the many years that he was Prime Minister of Australia.

The passing of time has proved that the fears expressed by the late Mr. Forgan Smith were fully justified, and that his views on legislation have been, to some extent, vindicated. Whilst it is admitted that the Commonwealth Government's commitments have increased tremendously since Federation, and particularly over the last 30 or 40 years, it must also be conceded that the commitments of the States have increased tremendously, perhaps even to a greater extent. In the main, our primary industries are the responsibility of the States and play a very important part in the nation's overseas trade balances. However, in spite of the Commonwealth's belated assistance in the building of beef roads, the States have to find the bulk of the finance needed to open up new areas and settle people thereon, to improve production methods, to make water available, and to provide rail and road transport and harbour and wharfage facilities. The States incur considerable expense in meeting the cost of hospitals, housing, medical care and attention, and education, in addition to attracting new industries.

Local authorities, too, are assisted by the State Governments. A growing and urgent need exists for the Commonwealth Government to assist local authorities financially to a much greater extent than it is at present. The increased wealth produced by efforts and expenditure within the States by local authorities, public bodies and State Governments brings financial benefit to the Commonwealth Government. Every increase in salaries and wages granted by the appropriate bodies to meet increases in the cost of living adds to the revenue of the Commonwealth Government. Hon. members know this, for they are aware of the fact that the Commonwealth Government receives a much greater proportion of their increased travelling allowances than they themselves do.

We all wish that the Treasurer will succeed in winning a better deal for the State when he meets the representatives of the other States and the Commonwealth in conference at Canberra in the near future. I hope that at the conference that was mentioned in this morning's Press, at which all State non-Labour Premiers are meeting representatives of the Commonwealth Government, the Treasurer will, with his usual vigour and loyalty, refuse to be browbeaten by those at the head of his political party in the Federal sphere and will see that justice is done to the State of Queensland. We wish him well.

In answering my question relative to the security measures adopted at the Supreme Court, the Treasury Building, the Executive Building and Parliament House, the Minister for Works and Housing said that he was satisfied that the security measures provided at the Treasury Building and the Executive Building were adequate. I have no idea of the efficiency of the security measures at those buildings, but, as the Minister is

satisfied that they are adequate, I am prepared to accept his assurance on the matter. However, I think I could be pardoned for thinking that in both those buildings are kept valuable documents and records, which, if destroyed, could not be replaced without great difficulty. Valuable equipment, furnishings, and fixtures, too, are installed in those buildings. I am sure that before the fire occurred at the Supreme Court, everyone thought that that building was one of the most secure in Brisbane against any act of violence, sabotage, vandalism or robbery, and that the security measures employed at that building were such that no unauthorised person could enter it unnoticed. Yet someone walked into the building unnoticed and unchallenged, searched for and found a piece of paper and a pen, wrote a message on the paper and planted it in a conspicuous place, then kindled a fire, and left the building again without being noticed and challenged. As a result of that act, extensive damage was done to the building and its contents, causing considerable inconvenience and personal loss.

Quite apart from the extensive damage done to the building and the fittings, substantial losses were suffered by those who had their offices in the building. One gentleman who is well known to many of us in this Chamber, who gave us pleasure whenever he spoke here during the days when he was a member of this assembly, lost a very valuable collection of books and documents that he had built up over the years, portion of which may not be replaceable. These books and documents could be correctly described as his tools of trade, which adds greatly to his loss. I feel, therefore, that the Government should consider some compensation for those who suffered such a grievous loss in this fire.

Perhaps the Government has given attention to this matter. If not, I honestly think it is worthy of serious consideration. I know from personal experience that if a tradesman loses his kit of tools in a fire, or it is damaged in any way, he is compensated either by his employer or by an insurance company. I do not know what the position is at the Supreme Court, but I feel keenly on this matter. If a man loses his tools of trade he should be compensated; he should not have to bear personally the burden of the loss.

I said that I did not know what security existed in the Treasury Building and the Executive Building. However, I agree wholeheartedly with the views expressed by the hon. member for Bundaberg during his speech in the Address-in-Reply debate. This is what he said—

"In this matter the Government, apart from Parliament House itself, can take some steps. We have just had a tragic fire in the Supreme Court, and, from what

I can gather from my own inquiries, security was just as loose there as it is here."

He then mentioned the considerable damage that could be done by vandals to the Parliamentary Library and the Chamber itself. He said that in his opinion security is becoming looser and looser to the extent that it is merely a token word. He said, "Let us learn a lesson from the fire at the Supreme Court and see if security can be tightened up." His warning is timely. I trust that it will be given attention and that some action will be taken without undue delay. We cannot afford to neglect giving this old building and its contents the protection they deserve. It is not hard to visualise the damage that could be done to this building and its contents, and the following inconvenience, if a firebug happened to gain entrance.

Although the Estimates of the Department of Education are to be discussed this session, I must take the opportunity afforded by this debate to speak on the very important subject of education. For some unexplained reason there is, unfortunately, a great deal of unrest among students and teachers. It is not confined to Queensland or Australia—it is world-wide. However, I have no desire to speak about what is happening elsewhere, so that I will confine my remarks to our own State. There are problems in the primary, secondary and tertiary branches of our educational system. Discontent exists amongst the teachers in the three levels of education. Never before have the teachers protested so vigorously, and with such determination, as in the last two years. University students have demonstrated to the extent of blocking traffic in the streets and clashing with members of the Police Force. Quite recently, following disorderly behaviour in the school-grounds, a secondary head-master found it necessary to send all the boys attending his school home for a day.

There must be some reason for these protestations and demonstrations. It is the duty of the Government to find the cause, and to remove it, in the interests of our teachers, the pupils and students generally, and the State of Queensland. It is probable that Australian men and women, as teachers and parents and citizens, spend more energy in doing something about our schools than about any other single social objective. Improvement in education is one good cause in which there is little ground for charging our citizens with apathy.

Expressed in man-power, the service given by members of parents and citizens' associations to the Department of Education, to education generally, and to secondary schools in Queensland, is impressive. I cannot emphasise that too strongly. Unfortunately, in terms of effectiveness it is less than satisfying to those taking part. Much of the pressure is channelled towards increasing financial aid. The increases needed are of an order quite

beyond the capacity of State treasuries, and the Federal ostrich has steadily refused to remove its head from the sand.

Parents spend considerable resources of time and money obtaining, for impoverished schools, essentials that public authorities should provide. All this effort is accompanied by the suspicion that even if the Commonwealth Government were to treat our Education Department much more generously than it has in the past, the problem of the schools and of the children's future would not be miraculously solved.

Let us be quite clear on this point. Massive investment of national resources in providing buildings, teachers and equipment, is the indispensable base upon which educational advance depends; not a mere financial shot in the arm, not a juggling of allocations between a number of hungry social services, and not a boost at the points here and there where the strongest pressure groups operate, but a deliberate and substantial reversal of national priorities.

This will take place only when it is conceded that the responsibility for thinking, planning and finance, though not necessarily administration and control, must be accepted at the national level, and I emphasise the words, "not necessarily administration and control, must be accepted at the national level."

Though pressure to change the status of education in the national life must be intensified rather than relaxed, the questions "Education for what, and of what kind?" cannot await the outcome. There is no such thing as an educational vacuum while new patterns are postponed or undrawn and a school generation, firmly moulded in the old, is projected annually into society as inexorably as the year's crop of babies.

Questions about the nature, quality and aim of education are important to all of us, particularly the members of the A.L.P. The Labour movement throughout Australia has been pre-occupied almost wholly with increasing the quantity of education. Here sometimes we are questioned whether that is the right attitude or not. I should like to emphasise that, if education is good, more education is better.

What are the needs of the Australian citizen of the future? If we regard him as he was described by Mr. Justice Higgins, if my memory serves me right, 61 years ago, as a human being living in a civilised community, what knowledge, skill, training and experience must he have to enter fully into the world to enjoy to the full its richness and variety, to become its master and ultimately transform it?

In Australian conditions here and now, what is the useful new and what is the useless old? What can be done and where can a start be made? I humbly suggest that the national resources of money and man-power must be invested in education on a scale that will enable the fullest development

under modern conditions of the whole school population. The aim must be full equality of educational opportunity and the elimination of all financial and social barriers to it. This implies a common school at all levels and a common form of curriculum to a much higher standard than it is at present in our primary State, combined with an abundant opportunity for specialisation at an age that is educationally desirable.

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

Mr. DONALD: We are a dangerously uneducated community, and a frontal attack must be made on wastage in education. Its main sources are the division of children into "hopefuls" and "no-hopers"; discrimination in education opportunities which inhibits good teaching and makes the progress of learning an elimination contest; lack of confidence on the part of some parents and teachers in the schools' educational purpose and values; and a serious underestimation of the pupil's capacity, going hand in hand with a failure to cultivate intellectual disciplines. The content of education must be thoroughly and constantly reviewed in relation, on the one hand, to the needs of the world of atomic energy, automation, mass communication and closer international relationships and, on the other hand, to the development of a sense of continuity of human experience.

The central role of public education in Queensland must be reinforced and defended. Its character must be secular, and it must hold fast to the spirit of scientific inquiry. Education is a profession, and its practice an art and skill. Those practising it have an obligation to examine and to criticise and to improve teaching content, methods and techniques, and they must be encouraged and helped to do so. The community must not only throw its weight into raising the status of education, but it must also participate more and more in shaping educational aims and helping schools realise them. There is a widespread public concern about education. There is also a widespread general good will towards it, and a readiness to make it work better.

Much effort has been made, and is still being made, to link the Australian Labour Party with the Communist Party. This is unfortunate for, as I have said in this Chamber before, the strongest safeguard against Communism in Queensland and Australia, or in any other country, is a strong and virile Labour Party, so those people who are engaging in these tactics are hindering and also injuring not only the cause of democracy but also the democrats in every community.

We of the Australian Labour Party recognise that socialism is a philosophy of life. It rests on the belief that spiritual, cultural and economic well-being can be greatly advanced by a reorganisation of the social and economic systems. Our chief objection to the present system arises from its economic defects; the inequitable distribution

of wealth and income, recurrent depressions and mass unemployment, the exploitation of consumers by monopolistic practices, and waste, are the outstanding features of the capitalist system throughout the world.

However, the case for socialism does not rest on economic objections alone. The political power arising from the ownership of wealth stultifies political democracy. This has been demonstrated on many occasions, particularly when the Labour Party has been in office. I use the word "office" deliberately because the Labour Party has never been in "power". Socialism is a science, not a dream, as its opponents contend. It is not a product of envy and hate and, like all sciences, is founded on facts and not some personal feelings such as detestation and greed. Socialists are imbued with a great love of mankind, and it is because love and not hate is enthroned in their hearts that they have dedicated their lives to a movement which aims to bring justice and happiness to all people.

Many opponents of socialism are fond of telling Socialists to practise what they preach. These people have never studied socialism, and have little or no knowledge of economics. If they had, they would know that it is impossible for anyone to practise an economic system, or a phase of that system, when another economic system rules society.

How could an advocate of socialism prevent unemployment, overthrow the present social order, produce for use and not for profit, or secure the full social product of his labour to the worker? If the objectors to socialism can explain how socialists can practise control of industry by the people, production for use and not for profit, and full employment, under the present social system, they will bestow a blessing on society. For instance, take the case of a traveller, returning from a trip overseas, who believes in free trade. Could he practise what he preaches by telling the Customs officer that he is a free-trader, that he does not believe in having to pay duty on the goods he is importing?

Much has been written about monopoly in the United States of America and about anti-trust laws there. No doubt monopoly is a very significant feature of American industry. But even the most secure of American monopolies would feel that it was in paradise if it came to Australia; indeed, many of them are coming here and remaining here.

The relatively small population of Australia means that the production of important commodities must be in the hands of one, two or three firms if modern large-scale methods are to be used. Low-density population means that local markets all over Australia are easily dominated by one or two large local firms. Under those conditions, a large degree of monopoly is inevitable. This means that, whatever virtue these companies may have, they all have an interest in raising prices higher than necessary and

in restricting output. Australia has hardly made even a pretence of controlling its business monopolies.

It might seem that the importance of monopoly is exaggerated, as only in a small number of industries can one point to the domination of production by a single firm. True, some of the most important are among these; but they are not the whole of industry. However, neither are they the whole of monopoly.

There are a number of cases in which two or three firms dominate an industry. Superficially, these firms appear to be competitive; but all experience shows that it is very easy for a few firms, either tacitly or directly, to fix the prices and restrict the output of their product—and that, in fact, they almost invariably do.

Competition, when it occurs, takes the form not of price reductions but of advertising, travelling salesmen, frills, and special services. The tremendous expenditure on advertising and salesmanship in the modern world is an extremely important by-product of the monopolistic price-fixing policy. For this the customer pays. Some advertising, of course, is socially necessary, in that it provides information about existing and new products. It must be recognised, also, that newspaper and radio entertainment would cost much more if it were not for the contribution of advertising towards its cost, but an enormous waste of resources still remains.

Even when there are many firms in an industry, they still do not compete vigorously with one another. They usually form themselves into trade associations to further their common interests. One of these interests is to raise prices, with its inevitable consequence of restriction of production.

Mr. Porter: Is the hon. gentleman advocating that we eliminate advertising?

Mr. DONALD: I am telling the hon. member. Retail trade associations are more likely to enlist the support of manufacturers in price fixation. The most readily identifiable example of these practices is the large number of branded products that sell at fixed prices. By rules against price-cutting, codes of fair competition, standards of professional ethics or more tacit understandings, competition is curtailed.

One common fallacy in discussion on monopoly is its identification with large-scale production. In fact, through the growth of trade associations, monopoly has spread throughout Australia and it embraces both large and small firms. All these tendencies are actuated by the well-known phenomenon of interlocking directorates and ownership of firms. Monopoly thus raises prices, restricts output and wastes resources in selling costs. This is a major charge that socialists make against the modern capitalist economy. Apologists claim that monopoly could be controlled by the State and its worse evils prevented without the abandonment of capitalism itself.

Among the remedies advanced are publicity on the activities of monopolists, control of prices, limitation of advertising expenditure, legal action to forbid unfair practices used to crush potential competitors, and the breaking up of large concerns into smaller ones. By such means, it is argued, competition might be developed and the evils of monopoly eliminated without any fundamental change in the economic system. This, of course, is a fallacy. There are ample reasons why such methods should be tried in a country such as Australia, where monopoly is so widespread. But there is little evidence that private enterprise is willing to pay more than lip service to such ideas. In any case, how successful would these policies be? Publicity requires the co-operation of the Press and the monopolistic capitalist Press, with its natural sympathy and often close links with other monopolistic industries, would be extremely unwilling to help.

It is said that control of prices would do good. However, the experience of price control for the different purpose of preventing inflation, both during and after the war, demonstrates that effective price control of every single commodity produced by private industry presents considerable difficulties. Experience also shows that monopolists, by threats to withhold production, are able to dictate favourable prices. The breaking up of large monopolies could, and possibly would, involve loss of efficiency in some industries. Experience in the United States of America reveals that even when large industries are broken up it is almost impossible to prevent trade associations from meeting informally to determine prices, allocate market quotas and organise methods of discrimination between different classes of consumers. At times some monopolies seem essential and necessary to the working of the capitalist system.

Under capitalism, economic progress depends upon the willingness of businessmen to initiate new enterprises and to try out new products and methods of production. The establishment of a new enterprise requires capital expenditure and also involves in some cases, considerable risks. Consequently, businessmen will undertake new enterprises only if the expected profits are proportionate to the risks to be undertaken. In practice, this means that they often require a monopoly for a reasonably long time. If there is no expectation of monopoly, there will be no enterprise.

Prevention of monopoly of this kind by Government control would therefore check economic progress under the capitalist system. Some monopoly, therefore, seems to be fundamental to the working of capitalism itself. It might seem foolish to object to monopolies which aid economic progress.

All private monopolies, however, have an interest in raising prices and restricting output, whether or not they are associated with economic progress. Once established, such monopolies seek to maintain themselves by

every means in their power. Entry of new firms into the industry is prevented. Patents are bought up to prevent competition. In a socialist economy it would be possible to enjoy the benefits of economic progress without the disadvantage of private monopoly.

It is often argued, as if something profound and decisive were being said, that socialisation would merely mean the substitution of Government for private monopoly. This is merely to play upon the word "monopoly". There is all the difference in the world between a monopoly run privately for the purpose of a maximum private profit and a monopoly operated by the community in the interests of the community, even on the absurd assumption that a socialised industry would resist output and charge monopoly prices just as private industry would. At least the monopoly profits would accrue to the community in the form of reduced prices for something else, or reduced taxation, and would not be to the advantage of any private individual or group. However, prices in a socialist society would be determined on whatever principle is believed to be in the best interests of the community. For example, prices might be equal to the cost of production, appropriately defined. Provided that the efficiency of public enterprise is no less than that of private enterprise, it is certain that under public enterprise prices would be lower and output higher than they would be under private monopolies.

This proviso, of course, is of vital importance. It would be possible for a defender of capitalism to admit all that has been said and yet prefer private ownership of industry. He might feel that all the socialised industries would be less efficiently run than private industry, and that this loss of efficiency might be so great as to outweigh the gain from the elimination of private monopolies. This view is often advanced simply because the seriousness of monopoly is not recognised or appreciated. In many cases it rests on their irrational prejudice against public enterprise.

Newspaper columnists maliciously point out the petty shortcomings of public enterprises, from the delay in the delivery of letters to the discourtesy of tram and bus conductors and public servants. The uncritical reader is likely to accept the hidden suggestion that such things are a normal feature of public enterprise. How easy it would be to write similar columns enumerating cases of rude shop assistants, errors in invoicing, and so on, in private business. Of course, these matters are not emphasised in the Press, to which private enterprise is sacrosanct. We tend to overlook them. We have so much more contact with government that we are more likely to be conscious of its mistakes than of those committed by a single private firm.

If we are prepared to cast prejudice aside, I think we can all agree that not all private enterprises are efficient and not all Government enterprises inefficient. The true position

is that some public concerns are highly efficient while others may be less efficient. Whilst some Australian industries are highly efficient, some are notoriously inefficient. There are all degrees of efficiency in both public and private enterprises, and there is no decisive balance in favour of private ownership. It is sometimes claimed that the desire to obtain maximum profits gives private enterprise a continual interest in increasing efficiency, and that in any case competition forces firms to be efficient, since inefficient firms, unable to meet competition, would go bankrupt.

Admittedly, these considerations often help to increase efficiency under capitalism, but that they are not effective is indicated by the survival of many inefficient firms and industries. Lack of ability, ignorance and sheer laziness may all prevent the profit motive from having its full effect. We have seen that competition is often conspicuous by its absence. A fact that must not be overlooked is that monopolistic organisations have to fix prices to suit the least efficient firms in order to obtain their support. That is something that should not be forgotten. Those who exaggerate the effectiveness of efficiency under capitalism usually underestimate the importance of efficiency under socialism. Socialised industries would have their own method of maintaining efficiency. Under capitalism, firms maintain strict secrecy about their cost of production and they have every reason to withhold technical knowledge from their rivals.

Under socialism, the efficiency of all productive units could be constantly compared. All technical knowledge would be at the disposal of every unit. Where necessary, less-efficient units could be brought up to standard by expert managerial and technical assistance. There is no reason why socialised firms should not be induced to compete vigorously with one another by giving monetary and prestige incentives to managers and workers. Under socialism, monetary incentives to acquire special training and to qualify for and seek advancement could still be used.

Above all, the socialist society would have an invaluable advantage arising from the increased morale of all employed in industry. Technicians and professional workers would no longer feel frustrated by having to do anti-social work for the sake of private profit, involving concentration or appearance at the expense of quality, adulteration of products, and suppression of technical advance. Production of workers would be stimulated by the knowledge that the benefits of increased production accrued directly to the community without having to go through the sieve of monopoly profits, by freedom from the fear of unemployment, by confidence in the fairness of income distribution and by their own enhanced status in industry.

Today, a large proportion of workers have lost confidence in the economic system. Undoubtedly that retards production under

capitalism. Under socialism, not only could this lost confidence be restored and production be increased, but powerful motives of community service might be developed. Every textbook on economics discusses the circumstances in which it is desirable that public utilities and, perhaps, other industries, be nationalised within the framework of capitalism. Many people are in favour of nationalisation of monopolies and interpreting monopolies as confined to large single-firm industries, believing that such a policy involves no fundamental change in the present economic system.

Socialism involves much more than nationalisation of particular industries for particular purposes. Socialists aim at a change in the character of the economy from one in which industry is mainly privately owned to one in which industry is mainly owned by the community. Full employment cannot be maintained, nor can monopolistic restrictions on production be eliminated, without public ownership of very much more than a few key industries and public utilities. Socialism embraces no less than the planning of industry as a whole to achieve community objectives relating to employment, production and distribution.

A comparison of the relevant efficiency of the individual industries under private and public enterprise does not do justice to the case of socialism. The enormous advantage which the socialist society possesses of being able to prevent depression and to organise industry for the community's advantage relegates this question to a secondary order of importance. The ability to continually transfer resources and new forms of production which the society possesses would enable it to maintain permanent full employment. Permanent full employment and the means used under socialism to achieve it would result, in turn, in an expansion of production uninterrupted by periodic depressions, a steady increase in production of old types of products and a steady flow of new types of products. A socialist society would encourage increased production in a way impossible under capitalism, by an organisation of community-owned industries undreamt of by those who merely want to nationalise a few industries and leave the greater part of private enterprise untouched.

One of the motives which, from the beginning, has led men to socialism has been the revolt against the gross inequality of income under capitalism. Fairer distribution is still an important part of the case for socialism. Under socialism, incomes would be distributed more fairly than is possible under capitalism. Certain types of property and monopoly income would be gradually eliminated. However, socialists recognise that some financial incentives will be necessary, and that these will give rise to inequality. It is unlikely that people will undertake long courses of training to acquire special skill, work hard to achieve promotion, undertake work of a specially difficult

or dangerous character, or accept great responsibility, without financial incentive. Inequality arising from this need will be kept within moderate limits by greater equality of education and other opportunities which will come into being with the elimination of class privileges. Moral objections to inequality will lose much of their force when inequality arises solely from differences in work done and not from property ownership.

Democratic socialists believe that the use of undemocratic methods to achieve socialism is undesirable, unnecessary, and, indeed, impossible in Australia and in other countries with an established tradition of parliamentary freedom. They are also convinced that democratic socialism can function within the framework of existing parliamentary institutions, with full safeguards for fundamental political liberties traditionally associated with the idea of democracy.

The case for democratic socialism therefore implies firstly that socialism is to be attained by established parliamentary methods; secondly, included in the idea of democracy is respect for the belief in the importance of the individual. Democratic socialists are determined to preserve fundamental personal freedoms such as the freedom of speech, worship, written criticism, assembly and association. Those who reject the democratic method of achieving socialism do so either on the ground that it could not succeed at all or that it could not be instituted quickly enough.

It is argued that in our capitalist society all key positions of political power are held by those who own the industries of the country. It is considered that their interests would always be able to block socialist legislation and so to obstruct its execution. Therefore it is urged that only the use of force could wrest control of industry from the present owners.

The democratic method of introducing socialism is not only a method that works; it is also the surest and the best. History has shown that people do not make revolutions unless they are goaded into revolt by sheer despair caused by intolerable suffering and oppression. But capitalism in Australia today, we can be sure, will never be so foolish as to allow these traditions of revolutionary socialism to occur.

Last week the Trade Union Congress discussed automation. I think it was 14 years ago, possibly more, that I first mentioned automation in this Chamber, and I think I shall conclude my Budget speech by saying a few words on automation, because I feel it is still necessary to do so. I firmly believe also that some knowledge of industrial history is very helpful in providing the answer to automation and how it will affect our social and economic life.

Industrial history is the story of man's labour with tools and mechanical and power appliances for the satisfaction of his wants. When we speak of the industrial revolution

we mean that great transformation that has been brought about during the past 200 years by discoveries and inventions which have altered fundamentally all the methods of production and distribution of the means of life, and consequently revolutionised all the economic functions of society.

Man, who through the long centuries had toiled with his hands, aided by crude implements to wrest a pitiful subsistence from nature, suddenly discovered that the blind forces against which he had been struggling could be harnessed to do his work. Through the countless ages humanity has been the helpless prey of the vulture element, consumed by fire, drowned by flood, struck down by lightning, frozen in winter storms, and eliminated by pestilence and famine. So man's first action was defensive; he sharpened a piece of wood, polished a flint, kindled a flame; thus industrial history was begun.

Yet the thousands of years that elapsed from the primeval down to the 18th century did not produce as many mechanical, technical and scientific triumphs as have been brought forth in the last two centuries. Not since the Industrial Revolution of the 18th century has industry witnessed such far-reaching changes in the method of production as those following the development of automatic-control devices, which have made automation possible. There can be no doubt that robots and automation are threatening to revolutionise the gadget age as did the spinning wheel the industrial age, when hand weavers feared for their jobs and their futures.

It is the opinion of many that automation will displace many workers from industry, thereby causing widespread unemployment. If that is so, it will be necessary for Governments to cushion the effect of automation when it is introduced into industry. It is true that automation in a mild way has been creeping into our daily lives ever since push-buttons and gadgets took the place of physical exertion. As we watch a bulldozer, a grader, or an excavator at work on an irrigation, main road, railway, or building construction job, it is not difficult to visualise the number of semi-skilled and unskilled workers whose services are no longer required on that type of project. The same position is found in the printing industry, where linotype machines have displaced hundreds of hand-setters.

And so it goes on throughout industry generally. The answer, of course, is firstly that no-one would want to return to the pick and shovel or to hand-setting, and secondly, that for every navy, hand-setter, or unskilled or semi-skilled worker put out of employment, many more technicians have been employed in the manufacture of earth-moving, printing and other machinery, the use of which has been encouraged by the cheaper cost of production.

Thus it is that progress is encouraged, and workmen graduate from the drudgery of antiquity to the status of technical and

engineering experts at a higher rate of remuneration and under improved working conditions that formerly were not economically possible.

Naturally the worker fears what will happen during the transition period, covering the stage during which the unskilled worker is trained and acquires the necessary skill and knowledge to become an expert technician. It is the responsibility and the first duty of all Governments to insist that the welfare of any displaced employee be safeguarded, even if it means a charge on the wealthy companies that are experimenting with automation discoveries.

Another vital social problem arising from automation is the utilisation of the extra leisure time made available by the reduction of the working week so that society can obtain the greatest possible benefit. Workers must not be left in a position where they will have plenty of time on their hands with nowhere to go and nothing to do. That would not benefit the individual, the race or the nation. It will be the duty of Governments, therefore, to provide opportunities for the technical and cultural advancement of the people by making available technical education facilities to enable ambitious young men and women to qualify for positions superior to those filled by the unskilled. For those who desire cultural subjects, a conservatorium of music, among other things, should be established.

A still shorter working week, which would be made possible by the extension of automation to more and more industries, will call for greater facilities, both cultural and technical, to enable all who so desire to qualify for the highest posts their country can offer.

Even from a sordid, selfish standpoint, the dividend-chasing investor will need to provide his employees with higher salaries not for their benefit but to ensure a healthy consumer fund for the effective purchase of more goods and commodities produced by the newest devices. Accordingly, it will be in the interests of the investor's own profits and dividends that any unemployment pools traceable to automation be ended as early as possible. The application of automatic productive techniques in industry and their possible consequences for the working people should have the closest attention of all, particularly members of the Labour Party and the trade union movement.

Automation has been described as a curse, but is such a pessimistic view justified? If automation is properly handled, need such an attitude be adopted towards what after all is only a logical adaptation of power, other than human labour, to industry, which presents no problem of itself entirely new?

Automation promises a very real possibility of removing much that is monotonous and back-breaking from factory work, and I believe that on this ground alone it should win the support of the trade union movement.

If by some process the energy stored in coal could be obtained without asking men to go underground and engaged in what must be regarded as a dangerous and very strenuous occupation, it would be much better for all those employed underground and for many engaged on the surface in the coal-mining industry. Indeed it would be to the benefit of mankind generally, because it would eliminate for all time the dreadful disasters that occur all too frequently.

Fears are frequently expressed that automation will give rise to widespread unemployment and economic depression, but the people who express such fears have seldom stopped to consider the full impact of greater industrial efficiency on the economy as a whole, nor have they assessed or visualised clearly all the implications and possibilities for the working people in a more advanced society.

(Time expired.)

Mr. AHERN (Landsborough) (2.49 p.m.): I should like to take this opportunity of congratulating both the Treasurer and the Government on the Budget which was brought down on 26 September. I feel that it was a triumph over the years of deficit budgeting in financing the development of the State which has now made possible such an excellent Budget.

Although some of the contributions by hon. members opposite have been irrelevant to the matters contained in the Budget, I am pleased to see that the general attitude of the Opposition has been to support rather than criticise the general outlines of the Budget.

Often this year the Opposition has been highly critical in this Chamber of certain aspects of the mineral development in Queensland. I say to hon. members opposite that if they inspected the Budget documents they would see that the amount returned to the Government in royalties on mining interests was \$2,627,000, and that the freight paid on exports from Mt. Isa and Moura amounted to about \$15,000,000. Of that sum, only \$8,500,000 was required to meet debt redemptions on those projects, and I submit that they have been very profitable operations from the point of view of the State and are the reason why the Treasurer has been able to present such a good Budget to Parliament during this session.

That development has financed substantial increases in expenditure on education and has allowed substantial expansion in the field of State aid to independent schools, which was very warmly received and very richly deserved. It also allowed, for the first time in history, substantial freight concessions to be made. Some sections of the sugar industry in Queensland are paying less in freight on their product now than they did during the days of Labour administrations.

I believe that the freight concessions that were afforded to primary industries, and also to secondary industries, in Queensland were

fair and equitable. The 5 per cent. rail-freight remission was greatly appreciated in my electorate, particularly by people engaged in the pineapple and citrus industries, and the 50 per cent. remission of road tax on live-stock was also very warmly received, as, indeed, were the concessions relative to land tax and succession duties.

The concessions granted show that the Government recognises the problems that primary producers are facing today, and the Budget has been a genuine endeavour, in the context of tight State financing, to afford some relief to the primary producers caught in a cost-price squeeze.

I believe that the concessions given to the grain industry and the wheat industry were particularly fair. On this season's crop, every grower will be paying 50c a ton less than he did last year, and this alone represents more than the 5 per cent. relief afforded to other industries in the State. It represents a substantial contribution—\$1,000,000—to a single industry, and such a concession may not have been given if a Government of a different political colour had been in office in Queensland.

Concessions to the wheat industry averaged about 12½ per cent., and I believe that they have corrected most of the anomalies and have provided a sound basis for the future expansion of the industry. I repeat that I believe that the concessions to the wheat industry and the grain industry were both fair and reasonable. The objections to them were unfair and unreasonable.

Mr. P. Wood: Tell that to the wheat industry.

Mr. AHERN: That is just what I am doing. I believe that the concessions will be accepted by a wide spectrum of the growers in the industry.

In his Financial Statement the Treasurer referred to an appropriation of \$500,000 to consider ways and means of improving the salary scales of senior officers of the Public Service. I think he said that it would go towards correcting anomalies in the salary scales of the more senior technical and professional officers. I commend the Treasurer on two grounds for making such an allocation: firstly, for recognising that the problem exists; secondly, for acting so positively to solve it. This appropriation of \$500,000 will have particular reference to senior officers in the Department of Primary Industries, and I should like to take a little time to develop that point.

Our primary industries in Queensland—in the subtropical area of this continent—are expanding in the fields of technology and productivity at a rate that is often not realised by members of the general community. Much of the credit for this rapid expansion goes to Governments of this political colour in both State and Federal spheres.

A reference to Table 12 of the Tables appended to the Treasurer's Financial Statement will reveal that the expenditure by the Department of Primary Industries from Consolidated Revenue has shown an increase of around 100 per cent. since 1957. I am not saying that this is sufficient, but the increase has been substantial and significant. Further, the activities of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation in Queensland have been substantially expanded. This has been due mainly to Federal Government sponsorship by a dollar-for-dollar subsidy to primary industry to finance research into farm production problems.

In addition, the growth of private companies in this State in the fields of research and extension is very significant and very important so far as the future is concerned. They have substantially increased their operations over the past few years, and this again is in many ways to the credit of this Government. The first one worthy of note is Austral-Pacific Fertilizers Ltd., which is at present expanding its personnel and general activities at a very dramatic rate. This \$30,000,000 fertiliser complex at the mouth of the Brisbane River has been substantially under the sponsorship of this State Government. It was brought about only because of the move to bring a gas pipeline from the Roma gas field.

My own area has seen Austral-Pacific Fertilizers Ltd. substantially expanding its facilities to service a big fertiliser outlet in Queensland. A.C.F. & Shirleys Fertilizers Ltd. has been established for a considerably longer time, and this company also has expanded with the assistance of this State Government.

Looking into the future, as possibly we must in these things, we must take cognisance of the new phosphate deposits that have been discovered near Mt. Isa and Cloncurry, in North-west Queensland. The deposits at Lady Annie will have a very big impact on the future development of Queensland. At the present time Queensland only uses 2 per cent. of Australia's superphosphate supplies but, with the activities of the Department of Primary Industries, the C.S.I.R.O. and many private companies, this proportion will substantially increase in the next few years.

With increases in technology over the last couple of years, the activities of chemical companies have also expanded considerably in servicing rural industries. The activities of seed companies also have been substantially expanded. They have themselves extended their business and adopted the practice of employing their own extension and research personnel. This is good. Further, we have a new concept of private agricultural consultants being introduced into the Queensland farm situation, and this procedure must increase in the future.

It has been shown that, as the result of all this consolidated effort by all of the interests involved, Queensland's beef-carrying capacity can be increased from 6,000,000 head to 20,000,000 head by the turn of the century. Within the dairying industry, research has shown that what was thought to be a climatic disadvantage to the industry in Queensland has turned out in fact to be a climatic advantage. This Government has provided incentives to the dairying industry to sponsor the planning of improved pasture species. What has this done? It has tied up a lot of extension personnel who were engaged in general agricultural work. In future, this one scheme alone will create a great demand on the services of the Department of Primary Industries to provide the personnel to service it.

This is but one aspect of the services that are provided to the dairying industry. This expansion of research effort applies to many aspects of primary industries. It has been particularly valuable to the pineapple industry, the tobacco industry and the small-crops industry generally. The upshot of all of this development is that a strong demand has been made for personnel qualified in all the technologies associated with the rural industries. This demand will certainly continue, and at an ever-accelerating rate.

Two points have emerged from this set of circumstances. The first is that there exists an over-all shortage of people who have qualified to university level in all the sciences. This could have a serious effect on Queensland's rural industries. A mere 65 students were enrolled in agricultural science at the university this year, and this number is not substantially higher than the enrolment at the university when I attended it several years ago. The Australian Institute of Agricultural Scientists, both in Queensland and on the national scale, has realised the importance of agricultural science in the future and has launched a campaign to enlist more scientists into the field of education and specifically into the agricultural science faculties at the university. I believe that private companies will have to play a bigger part in the future training of agricultural scientists, otherwise we will be severely inhibited and our primary industries will not be able to expand as quickly as technology will allow them.

The Department of Primary Industries is losing many of its experienced officers to private industry, particularly to the fertiliser and seed companies and to management-consultant firms. This is very serious, specifically in the classes of agrostologists, agronomists and economists. Something will have to be done about this problem in the future.

The fact is that when graduates begin their careers in the department, in private industry and in the C.S.I.R.O. they are paid roughly the same rates of pay, but as they gain more experience and go forward in their respective fields promotions can be obtained much more quickly outside the department than within it. Outside of the department the salary

scales go higher, and better and more flexible opportunities are presented. The department suffers a disadvantage when compared with the C.S.I.R.O. and private industry. Interestingly enough, it suffers a disadvantage too, when compared with similar departments in other States.

Let me give the Chamber an analogy. A principal scientist working with the C.S.I.R.O. is on a salary scale roughly equated with that of the Divisional Director in the Department of Primary Industries; yet a principal scientist in the C.S.I.R.O. has further opportunities to proceed to higher positions in the course of his employment. Those positions attract salary scales that are \$1,000 higher than the salary of the principal scientist. The Divisional Director in the Department of Primary Industries has almost reached the top position. In other States, Industrial Commissions have recognised the status of scientists in the community when fixing salaries. The Queensland Industrial Commission has not done so. The fact is that to have research personnel working under a Public Service Award is an anachronism in itself. The Department of Primary Industries lacks flexibility in its more senior salaried scales and is finding it very difficult to compete with the C.S.I.R.O. and private industry. Therefore, I submit to the Treasurer, that the officers on the senior salary scale richly deserve some of the \$500,000 appropriation in the Budget.

At the present time the Department of Primary Industries finds itself training scientists for private industry. Surely that is not desirable. This problem will take time to correct. Scientists must be trained in the situation as it exists here in Queensland. We cannot say, "We will appoint more scientists overnight". Their education takes years. This is a serious situation, and it is one that must be dealt with at the present time. It is serious because there are positions available in the Department of Primary Industries which cannot be filled at the moment with the proper personnel. If the salary position is improved I am sure the department will play a more effective role in the future of Queensland's rural industries.

It is very important that Queensland does not lag in increased investment in technology. Recently I read a research paper which had particular pertinence to the Queensland situation. It compared the situation in the United States with the Australian situation and evaluated the efficiency in our agricultural production with that of the United States. The comparison was made on the basis of the agricultural production per labour unit between 1930 and 1959. In Australia during that period there was an increase of 91 per cent. In the United States, there was an increase of 216 per cent. That is amazing in itself, but when we look at the Australian situation we see that of the 91 per cent. half was produced by increasing capital invest-

ment—that is, mechanisation and so on—and half by increased investment in technology and management. In the United States, of the 216 per cent. only one-seventh was attributable to increased capital investment, the remaining six-sevenths being attributable to management and technology improvements. Therefore, compared with the United States, from which we have to learn as much as we can, we have a long way to go in the fields of technology and management. We cannot afford to lose our technical officers in any way. Indeed, we need more of them; we cannot afford to sustain a net loss.

On Friday, 11 October, the Prime Minister, Mr. Gorton, speaking in Sydney, announced the winners of this year's export awards. One of the winners of an export award was the Buderim Ginger Growers' Co-operative Ltd. which, as many hon. members know, is an industry with its processing unit in my electorate. Most of the growers are also in my electorate. This was an honour in itself, for such a small industry to gain such an important award. All of our primary industries are today experiencing problems in exporting overseas on vicious world markets, and I congratulate the managing director, Mr. Geoff Schrapnel, and the industry on its export achievement. At the present time 35 per cent. of the production is exported. First-quality ginger is being exported to the United Kingdom, the United States, New Zealand, Canada, Holland, Malaysia, Singapore, South Africa and Germany. The industry has shown its confidence in its future by engaging in a \$250,000 expansion programme. This has been commenced, and more land is being allocated for expanded production in the coming year. I am sure that this industry has a bright future.

During my election campaign members of the Opposition accused the Government of not assisting decentralised industry and of not providing any employment in the electorate of Landsborough. This, of course, like many other statements made by members of the Opposition during the campaign, was grossly untrue. At present the ginger factory employs 135 people on a permanent basis. The decision to expand the acreage by 35 per cent. this year has been taken by the management, and the managing director has told me that it is imperative for the industry to expand its production again next year for the export field.

It is interesting to note some of the challenges that this industry has faced and some of the assistance that it has been given by this Government. Guarantees for building finance have been provided for the factory from its initial stages. In 1960 the Tariff Board recommended that the 10d. protection to this industry, by way of tariff, be removed, saying that the industry was not worthy of protection in the Australian national situation. On one of the rare occasions in Australian history, the Federal Government chose to reject the report of the Tariff Board and to establish as Government

policy that the ginger industry should expand in the future. It has grown until today it is exporting 35 per cent. of output, thus earning valuable export exchange for this country.

Before this period the industry had been plagued with all sorts of set-backs by way of disease in plant and seed, drought and gross shortages of seed. The State Government has given the industry very valuable assistance by way of crop finance as follows:—

				\$
1968	350,000
1967	355,000
1966	300,000
1965	260,000
1964	260,000

This was in addition to the amount given by way of crop finance for the growing of rosellas and strawberries in this area.

Mr. Miller: This is the Government's policy of decentralisation.

Mr. AHERN: Yes, and now the expanding future of the industry is assured.

I should like to make a couple of points on the future of this industry. As the industry grows larger, as it promises to do, more extensive irrigation facilities must be made available because the industry leaders—and I agree with them wholeheartedly in this—will not allow expansion into areas where irrigation is not absolutely certain.

As the industry grows it will deserve a greater research contribution from both State and Federal Governments. This industry is providing a great deal of employment, it is making a valuable contribution to the economy of this State, and towards the export-earning capacity of this country as a nation. It is therefore worthy of a greater research contribution from both State and Federal Governments, and I look forward to its receiving such in the future.

If we are to be genuine about decentralisation of industry and balanced development—and I think that we on this side of the Chamber are—we must do all in our power to provide services to remote areas. An incentive has been provided in the past by way of Commonwealth Aid Roads grants to people living in rural areas. It was implicit in this agreement that some 40 per cent. of the money had to be spent on rural roads. The formula is to be reviewed in June, 1969. At a conference in New South Wales that I attended recently, I was astounded to hear that there were pressures in the southern capitals of this country, who are trying to have the formula reviewed to the extent of having only 30 per cent. of the allocation spent on rural roads; in other words, they want the formula altered from 60/40 to 70/30.

I believe that this would be a vicious blow to the cause of decentralisation. I, for one, am not prepared to accept blindly the principle that accelerating urbanisation in

this country is absolutely unavoidable. I feel that we must take the initiative to provide people in country areas with services so that they will stay there. I feel that this incentive has been given in the past, and we must not countenance taking it away in the future. Country local authorities cannot afford any diminution of this assistance. I believe that, if the present formula continues, local authorities can expect some growth in this Commonwealth aid.

Mr. Hanlon: The tying-up of goods in city traffic leads in the long run to increased costs for primary producers.

Mr. AHERN: I think the hon. member may have some trouble in establishing that. It appears that there are moves in the South not to recommend an increase in the amount of Commonwealth aid for road construction, but in fact to endeavour to have it reduced. That would be a very bad thing for the vast areas of this State. I can assure the Committee that I shall be doing all that I can to resist vigorously any change in the present formula, and I should like to submit to those in a position of responsibility on this side of the Chamber that, when the agreement comes up for renewal in 1969, they press for the continuation of the scheme as it is now.

During this debate four or five speakers have referred to the report on the marketing of milk in South-east Queensland. Although it was not my intention to say anything on this subject in the present debate, in the light of some statements that have been made there are a couple of points that I should like to make. This report, known as the Ivers-Hamilton Report, was requested by Cabinet, and it was released by the Division of Marketing of the Department of Primary Industries. It was the result of research by two officers of the department named Ivers and Hamilton. Their capacity to conduct such an investigation has been questioned, both inside and outside this Chamber. I want to place on record that I think they are two competent officers, and I should like to congratulate them on their approach to a very difficult and controversial problem. I believe that the report will, if nothing else, provide a basis for discussion of the marketing arrangements for the dairying industry in the whole of the south-eastern area of Queensland. This industry is undergoing great changes in its technology, and the passage of time has produced some anomalies in the present marketing situation. If it does nothing else, the report provides an opportunity for the airing of the problems of the industry in an effort to see if its arrangements need to be changed to meet the present situation in Queensland.

The report deals with three questions which are vital to the milk industry in South-east Queensland. Firstly, it deals with franchises to deliver milk to the metropolitan market and other markets in South-east Queensland. I do not propose in this debate to consider this matter in any detail, as I feel that the

matter is basically one for decision by the industry itself. I believe that the industry will do that.

Secondly, the report suggests that the milk quotas at present supplied by direct suppliers be closed after they have all increased to an economic standard. For two reasons, that, to me, is a sound suggestion. In the first place, it is sound because of its benefit to the factory suppliers. I suppose that would be obvious to all. Despite the comments already made in this debate, particularly by the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha, I believe that a sound case exists for the implementation of this proposal.

Mr. Porter: I think Mr. Lickiss said it would only be taken from some direct suppliers and given to others. Is that what you are trying to answer?

Mr. AHERN: I shall go on and endeavour to answer the suggestions made by Mr. Lickiss. That is indeed what he did say. The future of this industry in South-east Queensland needs close consideration, particularly the position of direct suppliers. In early 1951 there were 1,322 direct suppliers to Queensland United Foods Ltd. Last year there were 507 and at present there are 454, or one-third of the number that there were in 1951. The present number of 454 still enjoy 46 per cent. of a substantially growing market, which is increasing annually at the rate of 1,800 to 2,000 gallons a day. This small section of the industry—454 of these suppliers—is still sharing 46 per cent. of a growing market.

Now, country factories are paying about 25c a gallon for manufacturing milk at present, and export price conditions threaten to lower the price that they are now in a position to pay; yet the direct suppliers are being paid 42.3c a gallon for the quota milk in Brisbane. I believe that country factories are asking only that they should share to a greater degree in the growth of this market, and I submit that it is fair that they should do so because of the prevailing export price conditions. To offset those conditions, they should share more in the growth of the Brisbane market, and that is the proposal outlined in the report.

I believe, also, that direct suppliers would benefit significantly from such a procedure in comparison with the present quota arrangements—this is not often realised either by experts in the industry or by outside observers—because it would decrease their implicit cost of production. If hon. members do not believe my submissions in this respect, I refer them to Research Bulletin No. 6 published by the University of Sydney, which is entitled "Fresh Milk Marketing in New South Wales" and is an economic analysis of the Milk Board's individual quota scheme by Mr. Parish and Mr. Kerdipibule, of the University of Sydney, who evaluated the operation of the New South Wales Milk Board from its inception to the present time. It is a genuine endeavour to put the economic

rule over the various decisions that have been taken over the years relative to the milk-marketing set-up in New South Wales.

There is no similar economic analysis in Queensland; but, although the situations in New South Wales and Queensland are not quite parallel, I believe that if one studies the report, one will see in it several points that are pertinent to the situation in Queensland. The suggestion embodied in item 14 of the conclusions of the Ivers-Hamilton report was implemented in New South Wales in 1962, and although, as I said, the situations are not quite parallel, it is interesting to compare the results.

The problem is that at present direct suppliers are involved in intense competition among themselves each year to establish their quotas for the ensuing year. Each year during the three critical months the present quota arrangement forces producers to produce as much as possible. The producer is forced to feed high-cost concentrates and to actually buy fresh cows at this time and pay high prices for them. On his production during these months his share or quota on the Brisbane milk market is determined for the remainder of the year.

This competition with the rest of the suppliers has two undesirable effects. Firstly, the producer is forced to produce much more than his quota in order to establish his quota each year. In other words, a producer is forced to produce some 120 gallons or so in order to establish a 100-gallon quota, and he has to do this each year. With the production of somewhere around 120 gallons a day, his quota might only be somewhere around 100 gallons a day and his entitlement might be less than this. Secondly—and this is the most important and pertinent point—a producer's costs are artificially high and consequently his profits are down. Therefore, the fact that he is receiving some 42c a gallon for his product does not necessarily mean that he is "on the pig's back" from the point of view of profitability. Because of the set-up in the quota arrangements, his costs are artificially high.

Mr. Porter interjected.

Mr. AHERN: If it is suggested that the element of competition is removed, as was done in New South Wales, and quotas fixed at their highest level out of the last three years, then direct suppliers would be much better situated. In reply to the hon. member for Toowong, I am not saying that they are necessarily in a bad way, but they are not necessarily in as good and high a profit situation as many people would expect, after looking at the prices they receive for their products.

The situation would be further improved—this is not suggested in the Ivers-Hamilton Report—if quotas were made saleable. That is one of the recommendations of the New South Wales investigation. This high-cost system, which relates to direct supplies in

Queensland and is inherent in the present quota arrangements, was reflected in the analysis of the Sydney metropolitan market, and there was some attempt to estimate the higher costs by way of what winter incentive was offered to a man to produce milk during those low periods. In New South Wales it was established that a \$1.10 to \$1.70 a gallon winter incentive was implicit in the scheme at that particular time. This is where we are now. In other words, a producer could afford to spend \$1.70 a gallon producing milk during the winter months in order to establish his quota for the rest of the year. Whilst this winter incentive is high, his costs, too, are high. This is the reason why the quota system for the direct suppliers is in urgent need of revision as suggested in the Ivers-Hamilton report.

I am sure that the whole of the milk industry will agree that the position of the direct supplier in relation to his high costs is unnecessarily unfavourable. I should like to support conclusion 14 of the report and to suggest that the industry should make submissions on these particular subjects. Secondly, the report suggests the constitution of a Queensland dairy products' board. Here again I differ from the submission of the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha on this subject. At the present time dairy products in this State are controlled by a fragmentation of boards—the Butter Marketing Board, the Cheese Marketing Board, the Brisbane Milk Board, and so on—and I regard the submission that there should be a Queensland dairy products board as sensible, basically for two reasons. The first—and this is vitally important at the present time—relates to changes in industry technology. The second is the interrelationship of the marketing of various dairy products. These are becoming inherent in the modern situation today.

A board such as suggested in the report would be similar to the New Zealand Dairy Board, as at present constituted. This board is doing excellent work in New Zealand, representing all sections of the industry and making an excellent contribution to the over-all management of the dairying industry in that country.

In Great Britain, all products are controlled by the United Kingdom Milk Board. This is a very satisfactory arrangement.

In New South Wales, one of the suggestions contained in the report of the Hon. W. A. Chaffey, M.L.A., who investigated the whole set-up of dairy produce marketing in that State, was that an urgent need existed in that State to establish a dairy products board that would encompass all of that State's dairy produce marketing.

I return to the two basic reasons why I think that a single dairy board is required in Queensland. The first is the change in technology to date. An immense amount of money has been spent by the Department of Primary Industries and many other agencies

in this State in the field of dairy product technology. A variety of new products will be produced in the future. Kraft Foods Ltd. has only recently released a new dairy spread which could have vast effects on the butter and cheese industry. I understand that the spread contains both butter and cheese, and the widespread use of a commodity of this type throughout the State could have great effects on the butter-producers of this State.

Another product that has been marketed recently is u.h.t. milk. Its effect will be felt in many sections of the dairying industry in Queensland. A dairy products board would control the interests of consumers and all sections of producers in the industry. This is very desirable. The industry will be forced in future into research into this technological field to a greater extent; it will be forced to make more investments in research, as is done now in New Zealand and the United Kingdom.

The second reason is the interrelationship of marketing of the many dairy products. On the most recent occasion when the milk price was increased, a consumer reaction was felt in the Brisbane metropolitan milk market. This meant that butter and manufactured milk, which had to be sold at the ruling export rates, were forced onto the already saturated market. A measure of conflict existed between butter-producers, manufactured-milk producers and direct suppliers to the metropolitan milk market. These problems could be looked at on an industry-wide basis, and this is how they should be looked at.

The university report in New South Wales to which I referred earlier assessed that if quota arrangements in New South Wales were revised it could be shown that increased net returns to butter-producers of half a cent per lb. of butter on the Australian scene could be shown. In other words, if the quota arrangements on the Sydney milk market were substantially revised, sufficient milk could be taken off the overflow of the Sydney milk market to raise the price of butter in Australia by half a cent per lb. Complex interrelationships exist in the marketing of individual dairy commodities.

A dairy board would be better equipped, too, to handle outside pressures on the industry. This was demonstrated very effectively in New Zealand.

I welcome the report, and I hope that the industry accepts it as a basis for discussion only. I hope, too, that as a result of the report the industry can win for all sections a marketing arrangement that will be of universal benefit to all of the State's dairymen. It is becoming the fashion today for many people to move motions of no confidence in the dairying industry's future. That is unfortunate, and this comment is coming from within the industry as well as from outside critics.

Mr. Hanlon: There may be some other industry that will face the same difficulties in time to come.

Mr. AHERN: Yes, that could be so with the present export prices.

When an onus is placed on an industry to export, it carries with it the responsibility to withstand the vagaries of an export market, which is very difficult.

Mr. Hanlon: Some who blame the dairying industry for the present position may find themselves in the same boat.

Mr. AHERN: That could be so.

Many people are going out of dairying and into the beef industry because of a lack of confidence in the dairying industry. Many of them are apparently forgetting that the beef industry requires two or three times the amount of capital that is required in the dairying industry to return an assured income. In the long run, many people who have gone out of dairying into the beef industry will be hurt because they are on too small a scale. I maintain that the dairying industry is an industry that people can get into with reasonable capital if they are prepared to work hard and for long hours to make a reasonable profit. I hope that the dairying industry has a sound future, and I know that all members on the Government side of the Chamber will work to ensure that it has.

Recently the 32nd Annual Report of the Fish Board was released. It contains a couple of statements that I should like to mention. In referring to the present facilities at Mooloolaba and to plans for the future, it says—

“Mooloolaba continues to be an important receiving centre, particularly for uncooked prawns purchased by the Board for processing for overseas markets . . . Mooloolaba is developing into one of the State's major trawling ports.”

It goes on to say—

“A site in the newly-developed harbour area is available for the new market which the Board intends to establish when funds can be allocated for this purpose. Reclaimed land with a frontage to the dredged trawler basin of 150 ft. has been set aside on the northern bank of the Mooloolah River estuary. The Board envisages that the new depot will be so designed as to permit the maximum provision of mechanical equipment so as to achieve the expeditious turn around of trawlers supplying the market.

“While the Board's financial resources have been heavily taxed by the Colmslie project, consideration will be given to the construction of a new market at Mooloolaba as soon as possible. The provision of unloading facilities at the new site is planned as a first step to this end.”

I welcome the report of the Fish Board as it alludes to the Mooloolaba situation, and I express the hope that the ideas outlined therein will come to early fruition.

Mr. Newton: Will that have any effect on the Caloundra market?

Mr. AHERN: No. The present facilities are not nearly sufficient to cater for the increasing business that is coming to the Fish Board in Mooloolaba with the opening of the new harbour. About 40 prawning boats are working out of the Mooloolaba boat harbour, and the facilities provided by the Markwell interests and the Fish Board are severely overtaxed. The facilities at present operated by the Fish Board are too far up-river and there is not an adequate channel depth to the old Fish Board wharf. The facilities there are archaic and are very grossly out of touch with modern techniques. So I welcome the suggestion that the matter will be revised, and express the hope that it will be proceeded with as early as possible.

There is another reason why the Mooloolaba Fish Board is receiving increased business, and I should like to see this matter thoroughly investigated. At present a Fish Board agency is operating in Caloundra. Because of the complex marketing arrangements inherent in the Fish Supply Management Act relative to agencies of the Fish board and Fish Board depots, many fishermen find it uneconomic at any stage to supply the agency in Caloundra. Most of them are taking their product from Caloundra, past the Fish Board, to the old site in the Mooloolaba boat harbour. This again has taxed increasingly the Mooloolaba Fish Board facilities.

Mr. Newton: It is very difficult to get into Caloundra, too.

Mr. AHERN: It probably is.

This is placing increased weight on the facilities at Mooloolaba. I should like the Minister in charge of fisheries, Mr. Herbert, to thoroughly investigate the difference between the arrangements for agents of the Fish Board and the Fish Board depots, as I feel that this difference is very unfair to the agents of the Fish Board as it at present operates.

I again compliment the Treasurer on the Budget that he has brought down and express the hope, on behalf of all Government members, that he will be here to bring down many more Budgets of the same type in the future.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (3.42 p.m.): Before dealing with some aspects of the Budget that attract my attention, I should like to inform the Treasurer, through the Minister representing him here this afternoon, of the concern felt by members of the Opposition at the position in the State Government Insurance Office. I do not intend to deal with this subject at any length, but I want to make it quite clear that members of the Opposition have always approached any matter involving departmental administration, or alternatively where there are aspects of an industrial nature involved—either an industrial dispute or circumstances that could lead to one—on the basis that we should not make ourselves a party to such a situation. I shall confine

my remarks, therefore, to what we consider to be, nevertheless, a very important matter that is giving us concern relative to the operations of the State Government Insurance Office.

I refer to the general malaise affecting the morale in that office. I do not think there is any secret about this, because it has been well publicised in the Press over a considerable period. There has been an element of considerable discontent at staff level in that office arising from administrative arrangements, made no doubt with the best intentions. There have been the inevitable difficulties associated with the installation of a computer and the pending move to the new building when it is completed. In an organisation of this size it is obvious that some teething problems would be expected in such a situation.

Some time ago, as the result of its concern in the matter, the Government saw fit to appoint an efficiency expert to make a report on this office. The hon. member for South Brisbane asked a question of the Minister early in August on whether that report would be tabled. The Government declined to do so, claiming that certain aspects of it were of a confidential nature to the Government. I shall not pursue that matter, but I appeal to the Treasurer to make every effort to resolve the position in that office. My remarks do not apply to the value of that office as an insurance company. The reports that we have received indicate that it is working efficiently relative to premium income and management expenses.

The office should be kept functioning at the standard that we have come to accept from it over the years, and the developments of the time. I urge the Treasurer to make all efforts at Government level to resolve the situation that has arisen in the office, and to respond to requests received, emanating from either the office or the union. In an organisation of such a size some degree of uncertainty is generated in the circumstances that I have outlined. I understand that in some cases where, after being requested to do so, employees have put forward solutions to problems, those solutions seem to reach a dead end after apparently being well received by the administration.

I am not in any way endeavouring to enter into a discussion on any matter of an administrative nature between the general manager and his staff, or anything that is really a matter for the union. We leave such things rightly where they belong. Indeed, we have been criticised on some other occasions because we have consistently adopted such an attitude. However, because of the great respect that Opposition members—and, I believe, the Government and the people—have for the State Government Insurance Office, it is desirable that every effort be made to get to grips with the problem to enable the

office to function with the high level of efficiency that is possible only when morale is high.

I suggest that all efforts be made to let the employees know what is going to happen in the office in the future. Everything should be done to resolve problems that might arise as a result of the installation of the computer, and to allay quickly any "bush" rumours that might spread through the staff. When a move is to be made to a new building and it is whispered that only a certain number of desks are to be provided, or suchlike, the inference is immediately drawn that only an equivalent number of employees will be needed. Although such rumours may have little or no foundation, they generate much concern and discontent. I also ask that all efforts be made to try to provide solutions to such problems as the granting of leave which have arisen for reasons that I have mentioned.

I shall now deal with the Budget itself. I think that taxpayers of this State would probably feel when examining the Budget that they had discovered in Mr. Chalk another Grand Old Duke of York. It will be remembered that that old gentleman "marched his men to the top of the hill and marched them down again. When they were up they were up, and when they were down they were down, and when they were only half way up they were neither up nor down." There is no doubt, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, that the aim of the Treasurer's drill schedule is to have his men at the top of the hill at election-time. We have the "ups" at election-time and the "downs" after elections.

I suggest that, rather than being at the top of the hill, as the Treasurer and Government propagandists would have us believe on the strength of this Budget, we are more like the Duke's men in that we are neither up nor down. True, we are up to the extent that the accumulated deficit has gone, as have, I might add, a hatful of reserves that were left to the Country-Liberal Government in 1957 by the outgoing Labour Government, and another hatful of once-only raids on various suspense accounts that have featured the operations of the Government, particularly the operations of Mr. Hiley—now Sir Thomas Hiley—when he was Treasurer.

The Opposition, as was pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition, is not prepared to go along with this back-slapping and tub-thumping of the Treasurer on his so-called best-ever Budget. If the Treasurer has arrived wittingly—I say "if" advisedly—at this current Budget, possibly it reflects little credit on him. It reflects little faith in Queensland only a matter of a few years ago; it reflects little faith in the resilience of this State and its people in the face of drought; it reflects little capacity to anticipate and to grasp such windfalls as eventuate; and, above all, it reflects little concern for the taxpayer who, like the ill-fated vending-machine investors,

are now being paid a small dividend from their own funds but being short-changed in the process.

On the other hand, if the Treasurer has arrived wittingly at this situation, which I suspect is partly true, if he, as the words of the song say, has run down the street on the chance that he will meet and has met, but not really by chance, and he has planned an election treasure chest and found one bigger than his wildest dreams, again there is little credit due to him for either motive or performance. It may be good politics; but surely it is good politics in the worst sense of the word, and certainly not the financial management that one would expect from the custodian of the taxpayers' purse.

To my mind, a good Treasurer of any organisation, whether it be a small organisation, a business concern, or the State itself, arranges a smooth flow in accordance with expectations, great or otherwise, and I think that most people examining a business enterprise would be very suspicious of the managers of a corporation who allowed accounts to fluctuate violently in the way in which the Treasurer's accounts have fluctuated in recent years.

In the last two years, after crying poor for a number of years, after holding hard down on the obvious requirements of education, hospitals, law enforcement, and so on, the Treasurer has produced a windfall of something like \$20,000,000, which is a fantastic about-face in the financial affairs of Queensland. I repeat: if this was the situation in a business enterprise, people would look with some reservation at it before being prepared to invest in it or give the accolade to the management, because they would wonder whether it was about to go down again as quickly as it had come up.

When I refer to \$20,000,00, I point out that I arrived at that figure in this way: two years ago the State had a deficit of \$7,098,000, which was eliminated to the extent of \$2,700,000 in 1966-67, the remainder being eliminated last year; there is a carry-over into this year of close to another \$1,000,000; an additional \$6,800,000 worth of activities of various types were carried out that were not anticipated by the Treasurer when he presented his Budget 12 months ago. In addition, the Treasurer has allocated \$750,000 to a deferred relief rate rebate fund, which admittedly will be used this year; he has put aside another \$853,000 in the Stock Fund for use in due course; he has relieved the Loan Fund of nearly \$2,000,000 by charging Consolidated Revenue for subsidies to local authorities, having relieved them of \$860,000-odd the year before; and, apart from an augmented maintenance vote for the Department of Works and the Railway Department, he has put a further \$1,874,000 into the Railways deferred maintenance account. If we add all those up, we find that over a period of two years, as I pointed out, \$20,000,000 has appeared suddenly, and the Treasurer, like the man who

has been playing fruit machines until he has virtually fallen asleep, monotonously plugging away, has found all this money around him and has not been able to accommodate it. This is one of the complaints that I have about his financial management of this State.

That brings me back to the Duke of York and his neither-up-nor-down men. The tragedy of the Treasurer's best-ever Budget for this State and its people is that it would be a best-ever Budget if it met today's needs today, which is what the people of Queensland are entitled to expect. When they have a Treasurer who comes to them and says, "I have suddenly raised \$20,000,000, more or less overnight", he should be able to say, "I am dealing now with the things that are required in 1968-69 and the soon-due 1970's in this State." But what is he doing? He comes into this Chamber with his best-ever Budget and deals with the requirements of the years 1960 to 1963, taking it at its best. The needs of yester-year are being dealt with today by this best-ever Budget, not the needs of 1968-69 or, as I said, the 1970's, which will soon be upon us.

If we look at the hand-outs that are listed by the Treasurer, what do we find? Provision is being made for an increase of 850 in the number of primary and secondary teaching staffs in the current year, and an increase from 3,167 to 3,824 in the number of teachers in training. But in 1966 the Treasurer himself told us in his Budget that he needed an extra 1,700 teachers. In 1966 he needed this huge increase in teacher trainees—that is, if it had eventuated, because we have heard about these 800-odd extra teachers in previous Budgets. However, if the Treasurer is able to get the number of teachers and trainees that he has listed, he is merely providing something that a couple of years ago he told us we must have then if we were going to lift ourselves at that point to a level with the other States. Whilst the Treasurer is presenting this Budget which provides for these increases in the field of education, the other States, of course, are improving their positions also. So, as I say, we are dealing not with today's needs today but with the needs that should have been cured back in the early 1960's.

To indicate the Government's record in some of these things, so far as the education Vote is concerned, for example, I want to quote some figures percentage-wise—not the increase of 19.88 per cent. that the Treasurer quotes as the increased expenditure for the Department of Education this year as against last year. I think a more realistic assessment of the additional emphasis that has been given to education would result if we examined the expenditure that is directed to the departments and services from Consolidated Revenue and see what percentage of this is devoted to education and what has been the movement of this percentage over the last 12 months.

In 1967-68, 29.42 per cent. of expenditure, excluding State undertakings such as the railways and any deficit adjustments that might have been made by way of the Consolidated Revenue account, was budgeted for education. This year, I estimate that it will be 30.80 per cent., an increase of 1.38 per cent. This is not a very significant increase, I suggest, because between 1966-67 and 1967-68, when the Treasurer told us that he could not do as much as he wanted to for education, the increase was from 27.63 per cent. to 29.42 per cent., which was an increase of 1.79 per cent. So that in a year when he tells us that he is making special provision for education to try and improve our position compared with that of the other States and to bring us up to where he considers we should be in education performance on a per capita expenditure basis, he actually reduces the escalation of percentage of Consolidated Revenue that he is devoting to education. It is pertinent to point out that in 1956-57, when Labour went out of office, it was devoting 24.34 per cent. of its Consolidated Revenue to expenditure on education. This was an increase of .65 per cent. on the previous year. In the 12 years since that time, the present Government has increased such expenditure by 6.46 per cent., or an average of only .54 per cent. a year. Therefore, its effort in the field of education, when we examine it not on the basis of how much more has been spent this year as against last year, which after all can reflect only how poorly we were doing last year, but on the basis of how much additional percentage of over-all expenditure has been devoted to education, is nowhere near as bright as the Treasurer has claimed.

If we look at the percentage of expenditure that is devoted to hospitals, we see where some of this augmented expenditure on education is coming from. In 1956-57, 16.33 per cent. was devoted to hospitals, including mental hospitals; in 1967-68, only 14 per cent. was devoted to this source. Again, over the last three years expenditure from Consolidated Revenue on primary industries, as a percentage of expenditure from Consolidated Revenue, has decreased from 5.02 per cent. to 4.18 per cent. It is therefore apparent that if the Treasurer is doing anything significant for education, he is doing it by reducing the percentage of expenditure on hospitals and primary industries in this State. Again, if we take the percentage of expenditure on law and order from Consolidated Revenue, this also is showing a slight decline. These are the very places where one would think the Treasurer would not be interfering with his expenditure, because they are key sections of the Budget and are just as important in their own right as is education.

I do not think that even the most ardent advocate of education would say that we can afford to downgrade and reduce our expenditure on public health and hospitals in order to increase our expenditure on education.

Money has to be found for education, but I do not think that it should be found at the expense of those other essential departments.

The Treasurer's efforts in depriving those departments of their just entitlements is again reflected in the discontent that exists in the medical and nursing professions. They complain of the stagnating standards at the best of our hospitals and the training of nurses.

In the last "Insurance News" booklet that was published, I noticed a quip that is appropriate to the Treasurer and his Budget. It read, "Figures don't lie, but girdles often redistribute the truth." I would say that the girdle that the Treasurer has wriggled himself into for his date with the electors may be an improvement, but his trouble spots still show. They started to show in 1959 when the present Government was faced with the prospect of negotiating a new formula for tax reimbursement with the Commonwealth and other States because the one that had been negotiated by the Labour Government had expired. On that occasion the stated aim of the then Government was to have Queensland's cut improved at the expense of South Australia's. It was rightly claimed that South Australia was being over-pampered as a claimant State. But what happened? A formula was negotiated, under which, as I have pointed out on previous occasions—and I do not intend to quote the figures again—in the six-year period from 1959 Queensland's entitlement increased by 58.5 per cent. but South Australia's increased by 61.2 per cent. The situation was so ridiculous when the formula came up for review again at the end of that six-year period that the Commonwealth and the other States voluntarily said to Queensland, to use the words of Sir Robert Menzies, "We believe there is one State which, when compared with others, is clearly lagging in the financial sense. I refer, of course, to Queensland." This State was given \$20,000,000 each year as an addition to its base to recompense it for the folly of the representatives of this Government when they negotiated the 1958 formula.

This can be seen in Table 8 of the tables relating to the Treasurer's Financial Statement, wherein can be found, under the heading "Uniform Taxation" the percentages of the various States. Hon. members will see that under this Government's 1959 formula the highest percentage that Queensland has received, namely, 15.38 per cent., has at no time since 1959 reached the lowest percentage received when Labour was in office in this State. The peak of this Government's performance in negotiating entitlement for Queensland by way of uniform taxation payments under the State Grants (Tax Reimbursement) Acts and State grants Acts falls short of the worst Labour performance in that period.

It can be seen that in 1958-59, when Labour's formula terminated, this State was receiving 15.56 per cent. of the total of the six States. Immediately after the new formula came into operation, as negotiated by Mr. Nicklin and Mr. Hiley on behalf of this State, we dropped in the next year to 14.88, the following year to 14.80, then to 14.99, then to 14.96, then to 14.91, and then to 14.84. South Australia's percentage jumped from 9.26 per cent. to 11.47 per cent. It is only in the last few years that Queensland has started to climb again as a result of the adjustment by the Commonwealth and other States to give Queensland an additional entitlement because of the way Queensland had worked itself into its invidious position in the 1959 negotiations.

It is nevertheless true that the improvement effected since 1964-65 has been a factor in the present improved financial position of our revenue account. But it has taken \$7,000,000-odd—not as a new infusion in the last two years for the needs of those years—to eliminate the deficit of past years of low performances, attributable to poor financial representation by this Government. Whilst it will help as it continues in the next two years, there is no certainty that the other States or the Commonwealth will accept it in our base in 1970-71 when the new agreement will be negotiated, particularly as Western Australia will come to the negotiating table not as a claimant State but as a non-claimant State, with the same built-in, take-off base that South Australia achieved in 1959.

To an extent, as I said, this has balanced the previous shortfall in our true entitlement. That was quite apparent in 1966, when the Treasurer imposed the savage post-election increases in taxes and freights that were cited by the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Belmont during this debate. It will be recalled that we urged the Treasurer to withhold the "tax stick" he was wielding, particularly against the primary producers, who were feeling the effects of drought at that time. We urged him to accelerate expenditure on education, hospitals and other basic needs that obviously required augmented expenditure and close attention by the Government. We urged that he should do that, even to the extent of going further into deficit.

Of course, we heard the cry, "Where will the money come from?" I do not think we should have to listen any longer to such queries from the Government when we suggest a comparatively mild increase in expenditure in any year, because, as is pointed out, some \$20,000,000 has suddenly appeared over the horizon in the last couple of years. We told the Treasurer that not only would the effects of this augmented return from Commonwealth tax reimbursement help to meet any additional deficit incurred at that time, but also that the need for financial assistance could be demonstrated to the Commonwealth Government.

That was borne out during the last financial year by the fact that the Treasurer referred to almost \$2,500,000 that flowed to his account in February this year—almost unasked for by Queensland—as a corollary to the representations made by Mr. Askin and Sir Henry Bolte because of their budgetary difficulties. We pointed out that rentals deferred because of the drought to assist those in difficulties at the time would be a shortfall only during the continuation of the drought in the particular areas and that they would eventually flow automatically to the Treasury to offset any deficit incurred. We were again proved correct in the following year, when some \$780,000 that was not expected by the Treasurer came into the Revenue Account under this heading.

However, the Treasurer declined to accept our advice in 1966. He played a waiting game and sat carefully on his haunches and hoarding his money, knowing that an election was coming in 1969, preferring to let schools go without the teachers they needed; preferring to let the non-State school system continue to struggle on with its obvious disabilities in primary education, disabilities that were recognised some years previously by other States through per-capita grants to non-State primary schools, which are only now to be paid in this State. The Treasurer preferred to wait until an election was on the horizon to use the funds that we pointed out would become available to him, and that would alleviate any concern caused by additional expenditure that he might incur because it would be self-eliminating as time went by.

The Treasurer, in his Financial Statement, when referring to some of the disbursements to be made in this best-ever Budget, said—

"One of the legacies which we inherited as a Government was a higher level in the rates of certain taxes and charges in Queensland in comparison with those operating in some other States."

That is not correct. Generally speaking, the Treasurer might be able to point to an isolated tax that is comparatively insignificant compared with the whole. But this sort of story has been told since the pre-war period, when we did not have uniform taxation, and, as a consequence, the State Government, to meet its commitments, had to impose a higher level of charges on companies and in various other avenues than existed in other States, as this Government would have to do today if we went back to imposing our own income tax and other forms of taxation.

The State Labour Government reduced the impact of State taxation, that is, taxes imposed at a State level in Queensland. In 1947-48, when the new uniform taxation arrangements made after the war had finally settled down, the per-capita segment of our total revenue by way of State taxation was 12.7 per cent. of the total, and we reduced it to 11.9 per cent. in 1956-57. We recognised that, as we were getting this infusion of Commonwealth money by way of the tax

reimbursement formula, which gave us some advantage as against what had previously occurred in relation to New South Wales and Victoria, we could allow some concessions in the State taxes that were being levied at that stage.

Under this Government, taxation, far from being reduced as was the case with Labour, steadily climbed from 11.9 per cent. when we left office to 14.4 per cent. in 1955-56. Unfortunately, for all the gloss of the new tables presented by the Treasurer, the one which gave the per-capita receipts under the various headings of State taxation, Commonwealth assistance and so on was eliminated. I have calculated that in 1967-68, the latest financial year, it has climbed from 11.9 per cent. in 1956-57 to 16.1 per cent., which is a large increase.

Included in the taxation measures that the Treasurer introduced in 1966, which have contributed significantly to the elimination of the accumulated deficit, to some of the disbursements he is making as concessions, and to increase allocations to improve education this year—imposed, he claimed, because of the drought situation—was a new stamp duty on the registration of new motor vehicles and the transfer of second-hand motor vehicles. This was a completely new form of tax in Queensland, at the level of \$1 per \$100 by way of stamp duty.

I purchased a new Holden Torana—it was not a Rolls Royce or anything like that—a few weeks ago. Its price, without registration and so on, was \$2,159. Part of the payment that I had to make in addition to its price was \$22 stamp duty. I traded my old vehicle in. I suppose it would have been sold by the dealer for about \$1,100 so that the person who purchased it from him would have paid \$11 stamp duty. If that person had traded in another car and it was resold for \$600, somebody else paid \$6 on the transaction. So the fact that I bought a new motor vehicle returned \$22, \$11, and \$6 to the Government in stamp duty.

Every time a car is sold in this State, except to a dealer who is exempted to avoid the payment of double taxation, stamp duty is payable. Last year this form of taxation amounted to \$2,721,758. That is a lot of money to be received from a new stamp duty applied by the Treasurer in 1966. He makes no mention in this Budget of distributing any concession from that duty. I point out that in New South Wales, the Treasurer of which State, we are told, is in dire financial straits, a similar duty is imposed at the rate of 50c for each \$100, or half the rate in Queensland. When the Treasurer introduced this duty he estimated that it would bring in \$2,000,000 in a full year. In the first full year, it has in fact produced \$2,721,000. I think that the Treasurer is morally bound to relieve the motorist and the motor trade of this heavy burden.

To give an idea of the extent of application of this tax, the amount produced by it was about \$400,000 more than was produced

last year by the 5 per cent. turnover tax on operations of the Totalisator Administration Board, which yielded \$2,366,000. In addition to sales tax, petrol tax, registration fees, third-party insurance premiums, and all the other ways in which motorists are hit right, left, and centre in this State, they contribute approximately \$400,000 more in stamp duty than is collected from the operations of the T.A.B. throughout the whole of Queensland. The T.A.B. is an enormous organisation operating throughout the whole State, whose introduction was something of a social revolution, yet the return to the Government from its operations is less than the simple stamp duty imposed as an emergency measure by the Treasurer in 1966 because of the drought situation and the difficulty that he said he had in balancing his Budget.

Mr. Bromley: He is taking more off the people in taxes than the State is getting out of royalties.

Mr. HANLON: The hon. member for Landsborough referred the Committee to the value of royalties paid this year. He did not say that it is less than the figure for last year. I appreciate, of course, that Mount Isa Mines Limited paid large amounts last year, which had the effect of distorting the figures. A lot of things can be said about royalties. Many of those who have to pay this stamp duty are battlers who are selling cars of a considerable age and buying others not much newer for perhaps \$400, and on such a transaction \$4 has to be paid to the Treasury. When royalties are imposed at the rate of 5c a ton on coal and bauxite, there is, I believe, a strong case for the Treasurer's conceding that the stamp duty on the sale of motor-cars is imposed at an excessive level. It is twice the rate of a similar tax in New South Wales, and it is a very heavy burden on the ordinary taxpayers, particularly those of lesser means.

Mr. Bromley: That is one of the reasons why they will not introduce annual checks on motor-cars; they want more sales.

Mr. HANLON: That is the situation that I refer to as being "neither up nor down". The Treasurer has suddenly received a large sum of money which has enabled him to eliminate accumulated deficits and make some disbursements in some portions of the Budget. But what is the position from now on? Are we to continue to be "up and down" in stop-and-go operations? I think all will agree that there is not much scope for increasing receipts through State taxation. State taxation has risen from 11.9 per cent. of revenue to 16.1 per cent. under this Government and there is very little scope for the imposition of further taxation on motorists or any other section of the community.

That brings me to the question of our relationship with the Commonwealth Government. The hon. member for Toowong

took some time in dealing with this subject recently in the Chamber. He told the Committee that Federalism would die unless the present Commonwealth-State financial relationships were radically amended. Perhaps he may have been aware of the meeting that was being held by the Liberal Party in Canberra, which was reported in this morning's Press, at which the Prime Minister more or less tried to keep the lid on the resentment of the various State segments of the Liberal Party and declare his attitude on the question of Commonwealth-State financial relationships.

I noticed with interest that the hon. member for Toowong got away a little bit from his previous approach to this question. He used to tell hon. members that the erosion of Federalism was a sinister plot by the Labour Party because of its socialist background. On this occasion he said that the position would be the same whether we had socialist Gorton or socialist anybody else there. He told us that something had to be done about it. I think all hon. members agree that something has to be done about it, and I believe that the present Prime Minister has certainly brought the question right out into the open.

We have been carried along in Commonwealth State relationships in a way similar to that in which a man is carried along when he knows that he has a serious illness but does not want to go to the doctor. He hopes that the signs do not reach the stage at which they will be recognised as needing medical treatment. Commonwealth-State financial relationships have been going from bad to worse, and the stage has now been reached at which consideration of them cannot be put off any longer. This is indicated, as the hon. member for Toowong pointed out, by the activity that is evident in all parties, Federal and State, even at organisational level, to examine what should be done about the matter.

The hon. member for Toowong suggested a rather direct approach to this by way of a proposal to be implemented if agreement could be reached on it. He suggested that the States should voluntarily withdraw from any entitlement to tax reimbursement as it was originally—that is, from income tax, or by way of financial assistance, as it later became known—and that the Commonwealth should hand over to the States payroll tax, sales tax and some of the other special taxes that the States could impose at their own discretion, thereby controlling their own destinies.

The hon. member's proposal seems to be rather similar to one that was put forward in the Legislative Council in New South Wales last November by the Hon. R. C. Packer, M.L.C. That gentlemen circulated a copy of his speech, in which he made a suggestion not quite identical with that put forward by the hon. member for Toowong.

I am not suggesting that the hon. member for Toowong plagiarised the speech of the hon. gentleman in New South Wales.

Mr. Porter: It has been advanced in quite a number of quarters.

Mr. HANLON: It has been advanced over many years. Although I accept the proposal put forward by the hon. member for Toowong as at least being constructive to some extent—he is saying, "This is something that can be done to correct the present situation"—I do not favour a situation, particularly from Queensland's point of view, in which the States would not be "plugged in", as it were, to the growth revenues of this nation, which fundamentally are in the income tax and company tax field, but would be swaying crazily along, like a caravan or a trailer, behind the prime-mover of the operations of the economy. I believe that the result of the implementation of that proposal would be this: initially the States might be better off financially; but in the ultimate they would not be any better off, and possibly would be worse off, than they are at present because of the factors that I have mentioned.

I believe that the States must be plugged in on an agreed basis, as has been suggested in the past by the hon. member for Kedron and endorsed by the Treasurer in a previous Budget debate, to some fixed percentage of income tax collection and other growth revenues of the Commonwealth.

Mr. Porter: Does the hon. member consider that this would not occur at all with excise and sales tax? Surely there is a growth factor in excise and sales tax.

Mr. HANLON: There is a growth factor in them, but it is minor compared with the growth factor in Commonwealth income tax and other taxes. Secondly, there is not the growth element so far as Queensland is concerned compared with the more populous States, where there is a concentration of people who buy a greater range, and certainly a greater quantity, of consumer durables and the type of things that are taxed, without realising just how much tax they are paying. I think the hon. member for Toowong would concede that the capacity of Queensland to raise revenues by way of taxes that he would allocate to the States would be nowhere near that in New South Wales and Victoria, for example, and in some respects, perhaps, in South Australia.

The hon. member did suggest, of course, that we should still have, running parallel and concurrent with his proposal, a Commonwealth Grants Commission which would correct disabilities. I believe that that would be necessary, irrespective of what proposals are put forward, and that some recognition will have to be given to the disabilities of particular States whether they be because of scarcity of population, density of population, dispersal of population throughout the State, decentralisation, or any such cause. Many of our problems come from the fact that we have been fairly successful in this

State, over a long period of years, in decentralising. This presents problems to us which other States that have not been so successful do not face in their State Budgets.

I believe, as I say, that the States have to be "plugged in" in some way to the income tax collections and the other revenues, including those that the hon. member for Toowong has mentioned, such as sales tax and so on. I believe that this will have to be thrashed out in some way by argument. Of course, that is not a very profound statement, because it is a question of getting agreement rather than working out a proposal. I feel, firstly, that the Commonwealth will resist any attempt at this. The Prime Minister, Mr. Gorton, has come right out into the open on this matter. I was rather disappointed at the absence of any vigorous defence of the States from Queensland at the Commonwealth and State Ministers' Conference held in Canberra in June, 1968. I quote from page 36 of the report, where Mr. Reece from Tasmania said—

"If we are entitled to be in a field of taxation and there is no disagreement between the Commonwealth and the State, . . ."

As a matter of fact, not a question of intruding on income tax collections, such as stamp duty on salaries or anything of that nature. But, leaving that aside, Mr. Reece said—

" . . . the incidence of tax which we apply in that field should be our responsibility. In fact, as a sovereign Government we would have to demand this."

The report of the conference continues—

"MR. GORTON: I am sure you would, but I have indicated that there would also be a capacity and a requirement on the part of the Australian Government if it felt that the incidence of that tax was such that it went to the point which I have indicated in my statement, which would cause us to consider other grants being made.

"SIR HENRY BOLTE: Who decides that? Surely that means the Commonwealth is the sole judge?

"MR GORTON: I think this would be so."

That clearly demonstrates the present Prime Minister's attitude towards the principles of Federalism, as espoused by the hon. member for Toowong.

Mr. Lloyd: What do you think would happen if the State Premiers refused to pay payroll tax to the Commonwealth?

Mr. HANLON: Payroll tax paid by the States amounts to quite a considerable amount, but the Commonwealth, because of its position, reached gradually over the years, is in a position to threaten the States. The Commonwealth is in this position not because of the right that has been established by the States for tax reimbursement purposes, but purely because of the position of strength into which it has worked itself, largely because of the inability of the States to

combine. As the hon. member suggests, if they did combine against the Commonwealth it would be a different matter, but, having reached this position, the Commonwealth threatens them with the withdrawal of favours that are proliferated all over the Commonwealth Budget. Whether it be education, health, and so on, we are getting more and more of the special purpose grants, either revenue or capital-wise, thus tying the States in one way or another to the Commonwealth.

I point out that this morning the Prime Minister was reported as follows:—

"After general revenue grants had been provided for the States—to be administered by those Governments nearest to the people—there was a need for the Federal Government to see that certain responsibilities were met, such as in education, national development and health."

I take issue with the Prime Minister on that matter. I think that it should have been the other way round, that a general revenue grant should be provided to the States, who are closer to the people, so that they can accept and carry out their responsibilities in education, development and health.

I would remind the Prime Minister that in 1957 the High Court ruled in a case that was begun in 1955 that the Commonwealth had no priority over the States in the collection of income tax. If the situation was reverted to—and I do not believe that it should be or would be—where States imposed income tax, as the High Court has ruled, the States have an equal priority with the Commonwealth in the collection of it. So the States are not some form of second-class citizens, to be treated in the same way as the Prime Minister and his officers treat pensioners and some other unfortunate segments of the community who have been neglected by the Commonwealth Government; they are people who have equal legal rights in the essential fields of taxation that were under discussion when the Prime Minister made his statement.

Mr. Porter: It is a point always to remember that it is as much our money as it is the Commonwealth's.

Mr. HANLON: That is true, but the stage is being reached when gentlemen like Sir Robert Menzies have not advanced their proposals to the States so directly as the present Prime Minister has.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: Sir Robert Menzies was always a Federalist at heart.

Mr. HANLON: If he was, it was not very evident to anyone else. However, I do not want to be unkind to the hon. gentleman, who is suffering from ill health and returning to Australia.

As soon as the suggestion is made to the Commonwealth that the States should be "plugged in" by way of an entitlement to use the revenue, the Commonwealth says, "What about defence?" That is the standard reply that was demonstrated by Mr. Gorton

and Mr. McMahon at the recent Premiers' Conference. Should the State be entitled to be "plugged in" to an augmented taxation that is imposed to meet a special need like defence? I think that that is a sound argument. Perhaps it could be thrashed out, as I suggested when the Appropriation Bill was debated that the matter of loan moneys should be thrashed out where a necessity exists for the Commonwealth to collect additional tax to meet shortfalls in loan raisings for public purposes. This should be set down in the income tax return as some special segment of tax, and consequently I believe that the same principle could be applied to revenue. Where the States are "plugged in" to the Commonwealth for revenue it could be made clear by the use of terminology that where taxation is referred to, whether it is at the State or Federal level, the proportion of taxation is one in which the States are sharing as well as the Commonwealth, and therefore the Commonwealth should not be required to accept the stigma of having to increase taxation in order to pass revenue over to the States, saying, "Here you are. Do what you like with it." I do not blame the Commonwealth for resisting that proposal.

Mr. Porter: That was the finding of the 1954 Treasury committee. This is feasible.

Mr. HANLON: We have not gone any further with it.

What I reject is the idea that the income tax form should show some addition for what Queensland's Treasurer wants and what Victoria's Treasurer, Sir Henry Bolte, wants, in each State. Obviously this sort of caper is ridiculous and will never work. I believe that a little bit of give-and-take and mutual co-operation could be shown in these matters and that an indication could be given of the fact that the States have a share in income tax, and any additional amounts that have to be raised purely for Commonwealth services, outside of those revenues in which the States rightly share with the Commonwealth as they grow, could be shown as a separate segment in the taxation returns.

Mr. Hanson: One was the National Welfare Fund, which was plundered by Menzies.

Mr. HANLON: The hon. member for Port Curtis has referred to the National Welfare Fund, and what he says is true. We know what can be done if the Government is prepared to do it. We know what was done in the past when we more or less had a separate social service scheme so far as income was concerned. People knew that portion of their income tax was being used for various purposes, for which they received a benefit in the social services made available to them.

Mr. Hanson: Menzies plundered hundreds of millions of pounds.

Mr. HANLON: As the hon. member for Port Curtis has said, when the Menzies Government came to office it abolished that scheme and poured everything into a combined tax and revenue. Consequently, people who paid their taxes had to wait and see what they got in pensions, social services, and so on. What the hon. member has said gives an indication of what can be done if we wish to do it.

Before concluding my speech, I wish to deal with workers' compensation entitlement for people who choose to be treated by a private doctor, or go to a private hospital for treatment when on workers' compensation. It is true that in Queensland we have the benefit of a free hospital system—or such as is left of it by the present Government—but for one reason or another a number of people who are injured in their employment seek treatment in private hospitals by private doctors. At present there is a limit on the amount payable for medical expenses under workers' compensation, and costs of private hospitalisation are not paid under workers' compensation. This matter could well be looked into by the Government.

A leading city specialist who has taken an interest in this matter—I assure hon. members that he has no axe to grind—outlined to me some of the disabilities relating to the workers' compensation system as they affect people in these circumstances. Firstly, if they are treated in a private hospital they do not receive any recompense by way of workers' compensation. If treated by a private practitioner a limit of, I think, \$300 is imposed on the amount that can be claimed. If the injury suffered is of a minor nature, or does not involve medical expenses exceeding that amount, they can be recompensed. However, if they suffer a serious injury and, for some reason or another, seek treatment from a private doctor or specialist they are either obliged not to take that treatment where it is beyond their means or to discontinue it when the fees involved total the amount beyond which workers' compensation expires and transfer to public hospital treatment.

That is not fair, particularly when we consider the claims ratio on the Workers' Compensation Fund. In 1963-64 the proportion of claims and claims expenses to premium income was 72.55 per cent. In 1967-68 that proportion decreased to 57.28 per cent., the lowest ever. That was largely because of the increased premium income. As inflation has taken wages and salaries higher, the premium income of the fund has increased. The accident level has also been reduced somewhat because of the introduction of a merit-bonus system for employers who try to maintain a safe factory or shop. They now receive recognition by way of a special merit bonus, which I think is warranted.

I believe that this concession could be accommodated quite easily in the claims and expenses against workers' compensation in the light of the figures that I have given. This concession would not make any great impact on the Workers' Compensation Fund and would not interfere unduly with the merit or general bonus paid from that fund to employers. On the other hand, it would assist those people on workers' compensation who find that they are at a disadvantage compared with a fellow citizen, in similar circumstances, who can use public hospital and free medical treatment. If the people who, for one reason or another, do not have the advantage of this treatment of their compensable injuries could be accommodated, there would be equity.

Mr. E. G. W. WOOD (Logan) (4.41 p.m.): As the hon. member for Logan I am entitled, on behalf of the people in my electorate, to offer congratulations to the Treasurer, notwithstanding that congratulations have already been offered by other Government members. When someone does a splendid job I am expected by my people to offer such congratulations. Therefore I congratulate the Treasurer and Mr. Sewell and all other members of the Treasury Department on what is without doubt the best Budget ever introduced on the Australian continent. This is a barometer of our State's progress under the Country-Liberal Government.

I am broadminded and I want to be fair in this matter. Members of Her Majesty's Opposition have a difficult task. They have to combat the buoyancy in finances revealed by the Budget. I feel that they have made some mistakes. They would have been much better advised to adopt a bold and positive approach and to accept that this Government has shown them how to govern the State and make it prosper. The Leader of the Opposition adopted a negative, petty approach to the Budget, which was a sure sign of mediocrity. He would have done better to give his party a bold lead by following the example of the Government.

Let me deal with some of these matters. The Treasurer pointed out that \$15,000,000 had flowed into our economy from the railways as a direct result of this Government's bold policy on expansion. Yet the Opposition is still following the time-honoured custom, which has proved a failure, of attacking royalty rates. They cannot see the forest of expansion for the trees of petty political policy. If they wish to prosper they must alter their negative approach.

Without any doubt this policy has been enunciated throughout the whole of my term here. When the Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Bill was under consideration, Opposition members rose one after another and objected to the royalty rate. They expected the companies to come in with millions of dollars of risk capital and try to find oil, which is difficult to find. They should have known that Canada had made millions of

dollars from the sale of leases, but they were too petty to agree to similar development on the Australian continent.

I shall now deal with coal. I suggest to Opposition members that they do a little reading on this matter. I shall deal with the Bowen coal mass, and I refer to the Queensland Government Mining Journal on May, 1968. The Bowen coal area, which is roughly the triangle bounded by Cracow, Blackwater and Collinsville, has 713,000,000 tons of coal measured, 2,590 million tons indicated, and 4,215 million tons inferred. That means that there are nearly 10,000 million tons of coal in that area alone. The Premier stated that he expected 12,000,000 tons of coal to be sold by 1970. The latest estimate is that 16,000,000 tons will be sold to Japan. Local consumption is about 3,000,000 tons. I point out that in the Bowen area alone, at the present rate of delivery to Japan, there is sufficient coal to continue exporting for 600 years.

Let us now direct our minds to what is happening in Great Britain, where nuclear power is being used more and more. With improvements in technology, it is quite obvious to all that nuclear power is the power of the future. Without any doubt, before very long a generation of Queenslanders will find that it has on its hands vast reserves of an unpopular and unsaleable source of energy. By not encouraging the inflow of outside capital the Australian Labour Party lost a vital 40 years, the full effects of which will show in the years to come when coal will be without a market. Why should we say that we want more in royalties from a product that we must sell? It is quite obvious that a mineral deposit is nothing till it is discovered, access to it is provided, and a market is found for the product. Under this Government each of those things has been done. When they were in office, hon. members opposite sat with their fingers crossed, in a maze of Labour politics, and did nothing.

Mr. P. Wood: Do you want royalties reduced?

Mr. E. G. W. WOOD: I do not want them reduced. That is a very foolish statement.

The Treasurer has every reason to be proud of the Budget, and it is not correct to say that it has been brought down for special purposes in a special year. The drought was combated, and the reward for the implementation of strong policy measures is now being received.

Let me deal now with education. The Minister for Education has pointed out that the Vote for education rose by 11½ per cent. this year and 20 per cent. the previous year, which is an increase of one-third in the last two years. A sum of \$85,000,000 is to be spent on education, plus \$29,000,000 on buildings. I agree with the allowance of \$25 each to be paid for all children attending non-State schools. That is no more than

fair when it is realised that it costs the State \$36 a year to educate a child at a State school. I agree also with the book allowance. Ten new primary schools are to be built, one of them in my electorate at a cost of \$164,000.

Prior to 1957, there was no pick-up of secondary-school pupils in the Logan electorate. Since the Country-Liberal Government has been in office, \$1,400,000 has been spent in this field in my electorate, and arrangements have been made for 805 pick-ups for primary pupils and 240 for secondary pupils. In the State, 41,713 pupils are carried to school each day, which costs the Government \$71 a head for primary-school pupils and \$64 a head for secondary-school pupils.

I do not know of any problem relative to education in the Logan electorate that the Government has not made arrangements to meet, and, accordingly, I thank both the Minister for Works and Housing and the Minister for Education. True, there are certain things that need doing. For example, two additional classrooms are needed at the Birkdale school, Cleveland. The Beenleigh High School is to have two new classrooms, and I do ask that particular attention be given to the school library.

I have discussed at length, particularly with secondary-school teachers, the outcry relative to teaching standards and conditions. Those teachers have told me that their major difficulties would be solved if the department could ensure that they continued to teach the specialised courses for which they have been trained and not be moved from course to course. They suggest, secondly, that all transfers be arranged at Christmas-time so that examinees will not be upset. They said that if these desires could be met, a great deal of the trouble would be eliminated, at least in secondary schools.

I should like to express at this stage my opposition to the Ivers-Hamilton report on the Brisbane milk market. I say that it is a matter for the industry, and the industry must solve the problem itself. You will understand, Mr. Carey, that for many years the direct milk suppliers have been geared to milk production, and they have no equipment to enable them to deal with the milk in any other way. They were the pioneers in the industry, and I congratulate the Minister on the action that he took on the report. It is quite obvious that the report merely sets out the position that the industry knew of and had been dealing with for a number of years, and the Minister took the correct action when he threw it back to the people in the industry to discuss and did not treat it as a matter of Government policy. Consequently, I am quite entitled to say, on behalf of the milk suppliers in my electorate, that I will not stand idly by and see an attempt made to upset the present arrangements without the unanimous approval of those engaged in the industry.

I listened very carefully to what the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha said on this subject. Although I do not always agree with what he says, I at all times admire his tenacity and his individual, direct thinking. I think that he made a wonderful address last week when he dealt with the whole history of this matter. In itself, that address set out a very clear picture—much clearer than a Government report. I have found over the years that various departmental reports contain many platitudes and axioms that are self-evident truths, known to everybody. It is no good trying to solve these matters at departmental level, particularly when the ramifications of section 92 are hanging over one's head and making any settlement very difficult. The position is very complex, and I will not agree to any settlement that the industry does not come to itself in solving these things.

I should like at this stage to deal with the Department of Harbours and Marine. In this Budget \$325,827 has been provided from the Commonwealth Aid, Marine Works Fund. As my electorate takes in the greater part of Moreton Bay, I am particularly interested in the expenditure in that area. The Moreton Bay islands represent some of the most picturesque spots in the bay, but unfortunately, the economics of these islands are such that they are dependent on fruit and vegetable production. Consequently, they are not unduly prosperous at this stage. They have difficulties with transport, and I view with some concern the new harbour dues that have been put onto all the jetties on these isolated bay islands and that will be passed on to school-children, the producers, and the inhabitants generally.

I have asked the Treasurer to take action to nullify this and exclude these people because they are not in any shire. They are dependent for road work on their own efforts—they are independent people—and I ask the Treasurer to make a particular effort to neutralise the suggestion that harbour dues be placed on these islands.

Within the Redland Shire there is one of the loveliest islands in the bay—Coochiemudlo—to which we in the Redland Shire are contemplating taking some of the Harrison Dam water. The S.E.A. is taking electricity to it. It is one of the most favoured spots in the bay for water-skiing and picnicking, yet it is dependent on a dangerous, obsolete private jetty. The Redland Shire, since taking over Coochiemudlo, has made every effort to have a jetty constructed there, and I think the time is long overdue when a Government jetty should be provided. True it is that the Treasurer has suggested that we erect a tourist jetty there and charge tourists fees for using it, but I do not see why Coochiemudlo should be penalised to that extent, any more than the jetties that have been provided on the mainland. In bringing this case forward, I think it is well merited and long overdue.

Mr. Hughes: Tourists' fees are not charged on the jetties on Barrier Reef islands.

Mr. E. G. W. WOOD: No, but unfortunately, that was a suggestion with regard to Coochiemudlo. The Redland Shire Council rejected it. I could not agree with the hon. member more.

The Brisbane River is presenting certain difficulties as huge new tankers of 60,000 and up to 100,000 tons are being built. Two alternatives now face the Department of Harbours and Marine. Is it going to deepen the swinging basin at Luggage Point and put all its eggs in the one basket to make the mouth of the Brisbane River the outer harbour for Brisbane? It should be borne in mind that large oil tankers do not present the same difficulties as those presented by large dry-cargo ships, because a lot of a tanker's cargo can be pumped into another vessel in the bay to reduce its draught.

However, the department has to consider the future congestion of the Brisbane River and the huge cost of dredging the swinging basin at Luggage Point to accommodate vessels of great size. The department has to consider also whether it should use the reserves that have been set aside in the Wellington Point and Ormiston areas as Brisbane's outer harbour. It is a distance of only 13,000 feet from the 36-fathom mark to the foreshores of Wellington Point, and at least 7,000 feet of that area can be reclaimed. This would be a reasonable prospect for the future, because I can see that dredging of the Brisbane River cannot continue ad infinitum. Whether it be in this generation or the next, the outer port of Brisbane will be established in the Wellington Point-Cleveland area. More than a century ago Cleveland nearly became the capital of Queensland, but unfortunately the Governor of the day was tipped into the mud there and would not accept it as a site for the capital city.

The Treasurer has been very helpful in the development of Toondah Harbour. That will be the gateway to Stradbroke Island until the time comes when a bridge will link Stradbroke Island with the mainland. Stradbroke Island's beaches will then become the closest surfing beaches to Brisbane. Until that time comes the jumping-off place will be the sheltered Toondah Harbour, at Cleveland. I press for greater development in this area. At present most of the capital that is provided is private capital, and the Department of Harbours and Marine is not spending a great deal of public money on it. Plans have been drawn up for the establishment of this harbour, but I find it very difficult to understand why a greater number of boat harbours are not constructed in the sheltered waters of Moreton Bay. It is much safer to go boating in the protected waters from Cleveland-Redland Bay to the Logan River than it is in the open waters near St. Helena Island. Consequently, the Redland Shire has been making great efforts to establish this boating harbour.

I draw particular attention to the protection of fishing in Moreton Bay. I feel that I, more than any other hon. member, am entitled to have some money spent on the fishing resorts of Moreton Bay. The Redland Shire Council invited officers of the Department of Harbours and Marine into its area in an effort to have declared illegal all professional netting on the foreshores of the bay so that they can be reserved as a pleasure resort for the metropolis. I do not look on the Redlands area as a tourist resort in its own right. Of course, it is subject to metropolitan tourism, and the council goes to a great deal of trouble and expense to provide facilities for the people of Brisbane. I do not think that the area lacks in those facilities.

The Main Roads Department has made a special effort to do something about the erosion at Amity Point. Whole segments of the foreshore allotments have disappeared into the fast-running currents of the bay. It has been decided to develop the new township of Flinders Beach, which will face the surf where the Rufus King lies, on the South Passage. It will have the advantage of the quiet waters of the bay and will be a wonderful seaside resort. We are spending a lot of Lands Department money and Main Roads money that has been set aside for this purpose, and I particularly thank the two departments for their efforts.

The culmination of my efforts to have the Department of Primary Industries do something about the buildings on the experimental farm at Ormiston is one of the most pleasing things that has happened to me this year. The C.O.D.—the growers' organisation—has made \$80,000 available over five years for the development of certain sections of this farm. I have been continually pressing the department to match this sum, and I am indeed pleased to say that the Minister for Works and Housing has advised me that the Department of Primary Industries is now to spend \$57,000 on a new administration and laboratory block at Ormiston. This experimental station is the finest of its kind in Australia, and is probably one of the finest in the Southern Hemisphere. It has done a marvellous job for the industry and has assisted the small-crop farmers throughout the State by developing many new lines of fruit and vegetables and inquiring into every phase of the industry. I suggest to those hon. members who have not visited this farm that it would be to their advantage to do so and see the very complicated equipment used there.

When I made my first speech in this Chamber I appealed for aid for this station, and I should like to make particular reference to a deputation which Mr. Gordon Wilson, Mr. Don Kidd, the present Minister for Works and Housing, the chairman of the C.O.D., and I had with the then Premier, Mr. Nicklin. This new building is the culmination of that effort. I might say that it is long-overdue, but I am really thankful for the department's help.

With the construction at Cleveland of the new court-house, and the new shire chambers at a cost of \$230,000, public expenditure in the Redlands district is reaching a particularly high level. Expenditure generally is increasing throughout the Logan area. A new court-house is to be built at Beenleigh, and I will cite the other developments at a later date.

Compton Road is another project that I raised in my initial speech. Finally sufficient money, totalling \$50,000, has been allocated to connect Woodridge with the industrial complex at Acacia Ridge. I should like to particularly thank the Minister for Main Roads and the Treasurer for this sum. After a long effort, the Rickertt Road bridge, which connects Wynnum with the Redlands area, and which has been lacking for over 40 years, is to be constructed. The Treasurer has at last given Redland Shire and the Brisbane City Council sufficient money to build the bridge. Its construction will commence next April.

During debates in this Chamber I have heard many matters raised that I know quite a deal about. For instance, valuations have been mentioned and the Valuer-General has been criticised. I find it difficult to understand why hon. members would do this and leave the shires concerned completely blameless. If a shire valuation is increased, the shire has the right to reduce its level of rating. The hon. member for Townsville North referred to the Thuringowa Shire valuations. The previous valuation of that shire was \$1,117,000, and the rate was 8½c in the dollar. The new valuation is \$6,549,451, and the rate is 2.6c in the dollar. The Valuer-General's valuation rose 500 per cent., the figure that the hon. member for Townsville North complained about on behalf of the ratepayers, and the shire reduced its rate 300 per cent. As a result, the total rates payable by the ratepayers nearly doubled. Therefore, it is wrong that the Valuer-General should be held completely responsible for the increase.

It is difficult to understand why these vast rises take place on an uneven scale throughout a shire, unless of course there is a major development like the Harrison Dam in the Redland Shire. Sometimes there are steep rises where no major development is going on, and this indicates either that the new valuation is too high or that the previous valuation was too low. We cannot expect that the rise would be even; otherwise, what would be the use of valuations? I do not like to see steep rises where no development is being carried out. This is something that should be watched.

I am firmly of the opinion that valuations should be based on use rather than on sale price. It is difficult to understand that if land is sold for subdivisional purposes, all other land, according to the town plan in the area, should be valued in accordance with that sale price, because a potential is

being put on the land. If that valuation was applied to all land, there would be an overflow on the market and it could not possibly be sold. This land will be disposed of over the years. To my mind, if it is valued in that way a potential value is being put on it.

I shall conclude with a few comments on what has been done in benefiting the Logan area during the time that I have represented it. During the past 2½ years we have spent, or planned to spend, \$15,000,000. In case anybody doubts this statement, I shall mention some of the projects involved. They are: the Ormiston experimental farm; the Logan Dam, at the head of the Logan River, costing some \$3,000,000, which has been awaited for 40 years and is to come into being this year; Compton Road has been put through; the Slack's Creek service road has been constructed; school improvements have cost \$164,000; the Rickertt Road bridge will cost \$280,000; the mining roads on Stradbroke Island will cost well over \$200,000; the Beenleigh by-pass road cost more than \$2,000,000. The Redlands water scheme cost more than \$6,000,000. There was also the Woodridge sewerage scheme, which was very expensive; the sewerage of Beenleigh; the court-houses at Beenleigh and Cleveland; and the new shire building at Cleveland. The cost of those works is well in excess of \$15,000,000. I take great pride in that, and I feel that when I present an account of my stewardship to my electors, I can do so with the utmost confidence.

Mrs. JORDAN (Ipswich West) (5.16 p.m.): I rise to support the Leader of the Opposition in his contention that during the last two years the Government has deliberately overspent, whilst at the same time it has overtaxed the people. As I sat and listened to the Treasurer delivering his Budget speech and followed him page after pictorial page, my mind went back to two other Budgets that he has presented and I could not help but think of the change in his attitude when presenting this Budget from his attitude when presenting the other two. This Budget spelt out, step by step, decisions that he thought would be the best vote-catchers. Truly it is an election Budget, presented whilst looking ahead to next year. There were tough Budgets for 1966-67 and 1967-68. Higher taxes were imposed in a number of fields in those years, and expenditure was reduced in some departments. Rates and charges were increased. Of course, there was the drought, which came in very handy as it could be blamed for everything.

This year the tale is that everything in the garden is lovely. With the election in sight, some concessions have even been granted. I should like to think that the Treasurer is right and that everything in the garden is lovely, but I am afraid I am not gullible enough to believe that. I think the hon. member for Baroona earlier today dealt

very effectively with that assertion, and very concisely gave some figures in an analysis of the Budget.

There is, too, much evidence of dissatisfaction and discontent in many spheres, particularly primary industries, which have for long been the backbone of this State and, indeed, of Australia as a whole. Quarters other than the Labour Party are beginning to question the Government's policies on foreign investment and the lack of Australian equity in mineral development. There is a considerable body of opinion that the Government has been rushing its hurdles in its policy of selling the State's mineral resources as cut-price bargains to overseas countries. And what cut prices they have been! No other countries in the world, even the undeveloped countries, ask for so little in royalty or equity of investment. Even the Federal Treasurer and the Federal Government are now expressing some concern over local equity in foreign investment in this country.

There is some concern, also at Federal level, about what will happen to the Australian economy if, as is believed in many informed quarters, another credit squeeze is imminent. It is no secret that foreign investment, balance of payment problems, and related matters, have never been more worrying than they are now, and what is done about them will affect all of us.

It seems that each Budget the Treasurer brings down must have a name. The present one is "Queensland's march to progress". I hope Queensland is in fact marching to progress. The previous two were "push ahead" Budgets, and on the presentation of each of those the Treasurer tried to tell us that instead of staying still he had decided to push ahead, even though conditions were not as good as he would have liked them to be. Apparently the Treasurer is the prophet in matters of this sort. I hope he is a successful prophet, because I, for one, wish to see Queensland progress.

It is rather enlightening to go back to the Treasurer's final words in the 1966-67 Budget and read—

"We have come through rough times before and I am prepared to believe that Queenslanders are willing to accept a little 'tightening of the belt' to ensure development of their State. . ."

Tough medicine it was, indeed, in the first two years of his term of office; but this year we see the sweetener trotted out for the State election. There is not now a word of criticism of the Federal Government or its loan allocation to the State for this financial year; no strong criticism in this Budget of the Commonwealth-State Financial Agreement and the workings of the Loan Council, as was the case in earlier Budgets. The tune has changed for the Treasurer of Queensland—no criticism now, only praise. Not so the other State Premiers and Treasurers. They still hurl criticism and defiance at the Federal

Government over the financial treatment they receive, particularly in Victoria and New South Wales.

It is easily discernible that it is an election vote-catching Budget for Queensland, and even the prospect of a Federal election, which was spoken of for so long but is now, apparently, a thing of the past, was part of the whole performance. But whatever the reason for the change in the Treasurer's attitude and approach to the Federal Government's division of the financial cake, there is a very great need for alteration of the formula under which the allocations to the States are made. In today's newspaper, we see that the Prime Minister, Mr. Gorton, has bent to pressure from Queensland and New South Wales, which have items relative to this matter on the agenda for the Liberal Party conference, and has agreed to call a conference and have a discussion on it next year in an endeavour to pull the teeth of those States.

It is the Commonwealth Government that collects the taxes and has the say as to who gets what. But development is not the same everywhere. For special reasons, there may be explosive development in one area or in a number of areas, and, consequently, those areas need special financial help. Changes are constantly taking place at a much faster tempo than has been the pattern for so long. Old attitudes must give way to new thinking, new methods and new techniques in this age that is constantly referred to as the scientific and technological age. If it is found that a complete overhaul of our methods and thinking is necessary, let us get on with it. Efforts to just "tidy up" a bit here and there will not alter the pattern, nor will a campaign to cut down waste or inefficiency achieve much if the whole set-up needs changing.

State Governments now fare badly; but local government is much worse off, and yet, as each week passes, it has more and more to do. Local government needs more than its present income of property tax, or rates, as they are commonly referred to, and loans, which are paid for out of property tax on a long-term basis, and the meagre special grants it gets from time to time. I believe the day is coming fast when there must be regional planning of financing, but I shall not speak on that subject today.

No matter what field one refers to, more money is required for each department, and so we go from one priority to another. Agitation often results in more being channelled into a particular field to the detriment of other fields. It is high time that the Commonwealth Government assumed greater responsibility for providing more money for education, health, housing, local authorities, and, indeed, for industrial expansion. All of these things are national affairs, and, in comparable countries, the national Government accepts this responsibility. The average income-earner now pays a higher proportion of his income in direct taxation, and a higher

proportion in indirect taxation as well; the time is therefore long overdue for the Commonwealth Government to play a more responsible role.

The amount of money allocated to a particular department decides what, and how much, can be done in that department and, indeed, in other departments. After the criticism that the Opposition levelled at the Education Department in the past two years, it was very pleasing indeed to learn through the Budget that there was to be a greater expenditure on education, including schools and school buildings. The need still outstrips what can be done with the finance available for these things, but we just cannot sit back and make excuses. Our youth must be educated for tomorrow's world or they, we, and our country will fall by the wayside. It is imperative that standards be constantly raised, in all levels and in all spheres of education in Queensland.

Mr. Hughes: Do you support my request for free textbooks for secondary schools?

Mrs. JORDAN: Yes, I do. I think it should all be free. Indeed, I was talking only the other night on that very matter with one of our head-teachers who has been teaching in Canada for two years, and he told me that in Canada all of these things are provided free in schools. Even loud-speaker units are provided. All sorts of things necessary for education are provided free by the Education Department, and there is no need for parents and citizens' associations, as they are known in Queensland, to provide what they do here or to work so hard, with the Government pretending that it is supporting them by giving them a subsidy. These things are provided as part of the education system in Canada.

While I believe that education is of very prime importance and that we can never spend enough to ensure the future of this country, nevertheless I hate to think that some other services must suffer because of additional money going to education. This year, I feel that health has become one of the "bunnies" and that the hospital services in Queensland are fast deteriorating because a lesser percentage of expenditure is being devoted to our supposedly free hospitals, in spite of the fact that an increasing number of people in our community are using, or want to use, these services.

I listened to the hon. member for Nudgee the other day speaking of some of the failures in diagnosis as a result of doctors lacking the time to spend on individual cases. It is again a case of too much work for the doctors and staff, and too few of them to do what must be done. In today's Press there is a report of a shortage of 14 doctors in country hospitals. They say they will muddle along. This is not good enough. Though there is the reference to a shortage of 14 doctors in country hospitals, no reference is made to the shortage in provincial base hospitals. If that was taken into

consideration, the doctor shortage in hospitals throughout Queensland would be shown as being much greater.

In considering this, I could not help but think of my own area and the dissatisfaction and criticism currently raging in Ipswich at the treatment received at the Ipswich Hospital, particularly in the maternity section. I know there is dissatisfaction in other areas, probably for similar reasons, but I will deal with my own area because I know what the position there is and that I have my facts straight.

I have asked several questions of the Minister, only to be fobbed off or given a detailed list of building alterations apparently in an attempt by the Minister to side-track the issue and obscure the answer to my question. I know that in some instances the Minister has not been given the truth of the matter, but perhaps only half-truths. I am very concerned at the low standards that exist at the Ipswich Hospital, caused by the shortage of doctors and nurses and the use of much obsolete equipment, as well as the inconvenient, higgledy-piggledy arrangement of buildings, some old and some new, bobbing up here and there. The set-up for the staff, the in-patients and out-patients, and visitors, is very inconvenient. A whole new concept needs to be embarked upon instead of the erection of bits and pieces here and there. Only one section can in any way be called new, and that is the administration block, which has floors added to it from time to time.

I want to refer particularly to the maternity section of the Ipswich Hospital, which has been the centre of much publicity recently. A number of mothers who have been patients there have been very dissatisfied with their treatment and the conditions that they have had to endure before, during and after the birth of their babies. They have written letters to the Press and have phoned me, and it seems that they have reason for complaint. Indeed, I advised several of them who had contacted me and informed me that they had paid in advance for private rooms at the hospital to apply for refunds. Of course, they will not receive refunds. They had paid for private rooms but were pushed into washrooms or public wards, or indeed almost any space into which a bed could be squeezed. There is simply insufficient room at the hospital to accommodate all the mothers and babies. No concessions are made to those patients who have to accept a lesser standard than that for which they paid.

Some time ago the visiting obstetrician-gynaecologist to the Ipswich Hospital resigned. I can give his name; it is Dr. Chester Wilson. He is a very reputable and able women's specialist. He published his reasons to the Ipswich Hospitals Board, and "The Queensland Times" published them in an account of the board meeting on

24 September, at which his letter was discussed. Dr. Wilson gave his reasons, and broadly they were that the conditions prevailing at the hospital forced him to resign.

I do not want the Minister to try to put me off by telling me that I am believing the Press. I have with me a copy of the letter that Dr. Wilson sent to the hospitals board, and I shall quote from it in a few moments.

A few weeks ago the visiting obstetrician-gynaecologist who was appointed to take Dr. Wilson's place also resigned for the same reasons. He is Dr. Suchting, who is also a very able women's specialist. Do not let the Minister tell me that he gave no reasons, as he tried to tell me in an answer that he gave me on 26 September to a question that I asked of him.

That doctor, too, wrote a letter, which the Minister should view if he has not already done so. I am given to understand that a report has been furnished by the hospitals board. Two specialists claim that they can take no more of the conditions prevailing at the maternity ward in spite of their concern for their patients. I am greatly concerned about the situation at the hospital and the lack of specialist treatment for young mothers and mothers-to-be.

Another specialist has been called for, and, in the light of recent happenings, I cannot help wondering, if one applies and is appointed, how long he will stay. Do not think for a moment that only the doctors complain. A number of letters have been written to the board and the Press, and I shall quote from a letter written by one young husband to the board. His wife had a premature baby and was a patient at the hospital from 7 to 13 September. Amongst other things he claimed that there was no hot water for six days and patients were forced to take cold showers; that six babies were crowded into the premature ward, which appeared to be about 8 feet by 6 feet; that his wife was turned out of her private room at 10.30 at night and put into what appeared to be a washroom with basins on the wall and a basket for soiled linen in the corner. He said that he had no complaint about the staff at the hospital, but he did not consider that he should have to pay \$10 a day for the accommodation provided at the hospital. He claimed that the mothers had to go downstairs to feed their babies, and that they had to stand to feed them because there was no space for chairs in the tiny room. He further said that one mother of twins had to stand to feed her babies. He claimed that if the mothers did not wake at midnight the premature babies were starved. He said that the room into which his wife was transferred had a window in it that could not be shut and a smell came through it from garbage cans outside the window. He said that there was little privacy in the room and the nurses were coming and going all the time.

A number of letters were sent by mothers who signed their names. They did not hide behind nom de plumes but came out into the open by signing their names and giving their addresses.

The medical superintendent of the hospital, Dr. O'Rourke, replied at the board meeting that during September there was an unusually high number of births at the hospital and that it was packed to capacity. He also admitted the failure of the hot-water system and the inability of the smaller emergency unit to cope. He referred to planning for a new wing in the maternity section, but I have looked in vain for it in the Minister's announcement of work to be done at the various hospitals that he made in his Address-in-Reply speech. It seems that it is still a long way off. No-one else seems to know much about it except that it has been talked about for the last 10 years. It appears that our mothers and babies will have to continue to play a guessing game as to who goes where and at what price. Perhaps the Department of Health is playing Russian roulette with the lives of the mothers and babies.

Another serious matter concerns a very sick woman who claims that she was left in labour in the labour ward for two days without any food and that, although strict instructions were given to the contrary, she was left alone and a drip tube that had been put into her arm came out as she moved in her delirium. A very serious situation developed. Fortunately the young mother did not die—she revived after treatment. It was again a case of too much work and too few nurses to give the necessary care.

In perusing the recent report of the Queensland Committee for the Study of Maternal Deaths between 1961 and 1965, which we recently received, I note in the foreword that the Minister for Health showed concern that in 1960 the maternal death-rate of 0.68 per thousand live births in Queensland was the highest in Australia. It is a very comprehensive report, containing a good deal of information which I am sure everyone found interesting. It was pleasing to read that there has been a decrease in the death-rate of mothers and babies. I hope that this will continue, but the situation at the Ipswich Hospital maternity section is not one that will contribute to such improvement, nor is it one that we can be happy about. I hope that the Minister will take steps to have improvements effected quickly. It is of paramount importance.

For the record, I think some of the points put forward by Dr. Wilson should be placed on record. His letter to the board reads—

"The Secretary,
Ipswich Hospitals Board,
Dear Sir,

"The Ipswich Hospital, especially the Maternity wing, has for too long been satisfied to give the public a third-rate service. I resigned because of this, and now Dr. Suchting has also resigned."

I point out that it is a specialist who is saying this. Diverting for a moment, when I spoke in this Chamber, I think, two years ago, I referred to the treatment given at the Ipswich Hospital as second-rate. Some people thought that I was not very wise in saying that. Now, here is a specialist, who went regularly to the hospital, referring to the service as third-rate.

His letter continues—

"The staff conditions are intolerable, and the care of patients is inadequate. The domestic and laundry facilities are hopeless for the present turnover of patients."

Further on he says—

"Maternity was built 25 years ago in the war years, and was never designed to cope with present-day numbers and conditions. This means that (i) working conditions are always bad: . . . And labour wards are too small and too few to cope, and the whole block is an old dirty, leaky, unhygienic building—and the lavatories are disgusting."

Before reading any more of his letter, I point out that this doctor is completely opposed to me politically; in fact, I believe that he and his wife are members of the Liberal Party. However, as far as he is concerned, the conditions at the hospital are of paramount importance and he puts up an argument for their improvement.

In relation to infection he says—

"Since the hospital laundry has not the modern equipment necessary to deal with foul linen, nurses spend much time washing down foul linen after delivery—then they go from the sluice room to feed babies or to care for women in the Labour Ward. This involves unjustified risk of infection, and laundry facilities must be improved."

Mr. P. Wood: Is it Dr. Chester Wilson who is making this allegation?

Mrs. JORDAN: This is Dr. Chester Wilson, the specialist, who was at the Ipswich General Hospital. Dr. Suchting, who was there after him, agrees with what he has to say.

Dr. Wilson goes on to say that inadequate attention is given to the patients, and that the staff is limited, at times, to only one sister on duty.

The letter continues—

". . . if Labour Ward is busy, either premature babies don't get fed or mothers in labour are neglected. It should be primary in our thinking that Labour Ward should be attended—no mother should be left alone in labour, no woman should be delivered without a doctor at least being in attendance, nurses in training should be supervised and taught what to see and what to look for in Labour Ward, medical students of all years should be encouraged, taught, and trained . . . and we do virtually none of these."

He goes on to speak of the ante-natal clinic which is held at the hospital each Thursday. He says—

"These tie up staff, since there is usually only one doctor available, and the Clinic . . . takes all afternoon. This means that mothers—many small children—are waiting for hours in poor conditions, and if for any reason the doctor is not available patients may be seen only by a Sister."

There is no guarantee that on their weekly visit to the ante-natal clinic at the hospital they will be seen by a doctor. He says that whilst it is good for hospitals to train nurses and medical students in ante-natal clinics, the patient must be seen by a capable senior medical officer as well.

He further refers to dangers, and says that neither he nor Dr. Suchting is happy about the rule that women who have previously had babies are seen by doctors only if staff members think that there is anything wrong. That is making the nursing staff take the responsibility of doctors, and they are not trained for that. He fears, he says, that there will be a tragedy sooner or later, and that the hospital will be responsible. Moreover, whilst the staff, recognising the difficulties of the medical staff, may willingly take this load, the extra emotional burden, which is considerable, is a factor in loss of morale, especially if the nursing staff are blamed, on the one hand, for poor medical judgment and, on the other hand, for lack of willingness to co-operate with the medical staff. Staff members point out that if a doctor insists on a particular line of treatment, the staff position is such that the patient's treatment cannot be adequately given or, if given, adequately supervised.

He also goes on to deal with a number of other matters in relation to lecturers, and what he says should be done by outside doctors who come in to lecture nurses. I shall not go into those details. He concluded his letter by saying—

"There is a tendency for our hospital to deal with its problems by trying to renovate sections one at a time. This is short-sighted, and will be exceedingly expensive and ineffective. We need an overall plan for the hospital, and temporary arrangements (such as the new Pathology and/or X-ray department) need to be geared so as to fit in with the final plan. The Ipswich community needs a hospital designed not as a stop-gap for 1944 (the present Maternity block), but designed to serve our community for the next twenty years, from 1970 to 1990. It is time for us to look on our hospital with vision, and convey this vision to those Departments also concerned in Brisbane."

Mr. Wallis-Smith: What is the date of that letter?

Mrs. JORDAN: 20 September, 1968.

The resignations, and all the discussions on this matter, are current happenings in Ipswich, and I feel that, if the Minister is not aware of these things of which I have spoken, he should make further inquiries about them. I appeal to him to set improvements in motion quickly in an endeavour to reach a higher standard at the Ipswich Hospital, particularly in the maternity section, before tragedy strikes.

Mr. P. Wood: There must be considerable disquiet in Ipswich about that?

Mrs. JORDAN: There is considerable disquiet among the public, particularly mothers. Anyone who could see the letters that have appeared in both the free Press and "The Queensland Times" on this matter would realise that a considerable amount of concern is being felt. I know that staff members, able, over-worked, and over-taxed as they are, cannot do the impossible. I also know that an additional resident medical officer has been called for, but as yet no appointment has been made. I know, too, that another resident medical officer is to be sought in 1969.

On 27 August, in reply to a question that I asked, the Minister for Health advised that a medical officer is on duty 24 hours a day in the casualty ward. This was a matter about which I was very concerned. In his reply he told me that I had implied in my question that there was not someone on duty all the time, and that that was not correct. I wish to tell him that I can give him the names of a patient and his wife and daughter who sat with him for three-quarters of an hour while he was unconscious in an ambulance outside the casualty ward waiting for a doctor to examine him. This was in the late afternoon, not late at night or in the small hours of the morning. Indeed, I can give the Minister the name of the ambulanceman who sat with those people in the ambulance for that three-quarters of an hour waiting for the doctor to come to them.

The man concerned was a heart patient who had collapsed unconscious in his yard. His private doctor, in reply to an urgent telephone call, said, "Call an ambulance and get him to hospital". He did not come out. The man's wife and his married daughter did that, only to have to sit and wait in the ambulance. Hon. members can imagine the mental state of the two women who sat with him for all that time. They were informed that the doctor on duty in casualty had been called to a ward, so he could not be in two places at once, and no other doctor was available in casualty. Therefore, it does not have a 24-hour service.

It is shocking that such circumstances should exist at a base hospital as big as the Ipswich Hospital, which serves a city with a population of over 55,000. One wonders what to do in an emergency. One cannot be sure of getting a private doctor to visit; one cannot be sure of attention even if

one rushes a sick person to hospital in an ambulance. It must be very worrying indeed when there is sickness in the family.

I should like to tell the Minister that I am well aware of the building programme that has been undertaken at the Ipswich Hospital in recent years. He knows that I am aware of it. He can score off me if he so desires and give lengthy accounts of hospital buildings. As long as he effects real improvements, I shall be happy for him to skite about how much the Government has done at the Ipswich Hospital. All I want is a decent service there and an improvement in the conditions that now prevail.

As far as the building programme is concerned, I refer the Minister to his answer to my question. Although he makes brief reference to one new building, most of the work is additions and improvements to existing buildings, or conversion or remodeling of the buildings. The Ipswich Hospital needs new buildings, not just a patching of old ones. I appeal to the Minister to look at the Ipswich Hospital in the light of the needs of which I have spoken.

Recently, while driving through Toowoomba, I went past the Toowoomba Hospital. Looking at the assortment of buildings there, I said to myself, "Well, I don't think Toowoomba has had anything much done to it, either, since I lived here in 1945". It is a higgledy-piggledy mixture of buildings. I should say that conditions similar to those existing at Ipswich, because of a shortage of doctors and of staff, would exist at every base hospital in the provincial cities of Queensland and in the 14 country hospitals that are referred to in the newspaper today. The position would be, as the department itself said, that they are "muddling along", and muddling along in this day and age is not good enough.

Much ado is made about modern discoveries and new drugs, and what can be achieved by their use. But if there is no doctor in charge of a hospital and no specialist to give treatment, things can get into a terrible mess. Many of the drugs have very bad side effects that only specialists would know about, and only top-class doctors would know what to watch for. I hope that the Minister will put up a fight in Cabinet to see if he can get a greater share of the finances of the State for the Department of Health.

I want to say a few words now about Karrala House, the much-publicised institution for delinquent girls. This is a subject that has blown up again recently. I had quite a bit to say on this matter last year, and I protested at the treatment meted out to these maladjusted girls. I made comparisons which showed even the worst prisons in a more favourable light than Karrala. It is high time that a more humanitarian approach was made to the treatment of these unfortunate girls.

Mr. P. Wood: There seems to be little rehabilitation carried out there.

Mrs. JORDAN: None at all. I do not want to go over the ground I covered last year, but I have visited Karrala and I know the conditions there. I know staff members who work there and I have a very good "grapevine" inside Karrala. However, I deliberately kept quiet about it for a while, to give the Minister and the new superintendent a chance to do something. But time has passed and conditions remain the same as previously. Indeed, this place is worse than any prison I have ever seen, and I might say that I have visited prisons in New South Wales as well as in Queensland, so I can make comparisons.

Mr. Miller: Have you been to Hay?

Mrs. JORDAN: No. Hay was one I did not go to.

Mr. Miller: It's a pity you didn't go there?

Mrs. JORDAN: Has the hon. member been to Hay?

Mr. Miller: You are the one who is talking about it.

Mrs. JORDAN: You asked me.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member for Ipswich West to address the Chair.

Mrs. JORDAN: I went to the recent open day at Westbrook. The hon. member for Norman accompanied me, and the hon. member for Toowoomba West was also there. I looked around and the only member of the Government there was the Minister himself. He did not have any of his colleagues in this Chamber to back him up in any way, or to be company for him. The only members of this Assembly present, other than the Minister, were three members of the Labour Opposition. Consequently when the Minister referred in his opening remarks to "my parliamentary colleagues", he should have said, "my parliamentary colleagues of the Opposition." As I say, he did not have any members of the Government there with him.

Mr. Sullivan: He perhaps felt he could do the job well enough himself.

Mrs. JORDAN: He is doing a good job at Westbrook, to a degree, and I was very pleased with the things I saw there. I could not help but notice the striking contrast between the treatment of delinquent boys and the treatment of delinquent girls. I did not just walk around. Immediately I arrived at the gate the Children's Services Department had a very charming young man waiting to escort me around. With Mr. and Mrs. Bromley, I went to various parts of the building. We could ask any question and he tried to answer our questions. Indeed, two answers he gave me were not quite correct. He went away and found the

correct answer, and came back to me later in the afternoon, apologised for supplying some incorrect information, and gave me the correct information. The officials were extremely courteous. We were also given an opportunity of talking to some of the boys, and it was very interesting to learn that many boys who had been there previously had returned for the open day. They had been happy there and had come back for the day. Apparently it was a case of the old school tie.

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

Mrs. JORDAN: Before the dinner recess I was saying that I could not help comparing the conditions of delinquent boys at Westbrook with those of delinquent girls at Karrala House. Many of the offences committed by the boys who are kept at Westbrook are far worse than those committed by the girls who are sent to Karrala House. Indeed, many of the boys at Westbrook are sentenced to a term there, but this is not so in the case of girls who are kept at Karrala House. At Westbrook I could not help noticing the surrounding amenities, the games, the reading matter that is provided, the outdoor sports that are engaged in, the provision of a swimming pool, and the training facilities for woodwork, metal work and farm husbandry.

Mr. Bromley: It was pretty weak on the part of Government members not to be there.

Mrs. JORDAN: I was very surprised that no Government members were there. I went there not so much as a duty but out of a desire to visit the establishment after I had been so critical of it in this Chamber. On the open day I took the opportunity of seeing for myself what conditions existed at Westbrook. When one criticises a place like that one is duty-bound to visit it. Some members of the Government criticised me last year when I spoke on this matter. I looked for them at Westbrook on this occasion, but in vain. Some of them should have been there so that they could view the place for themselves.

I could not help noticing what was provided there for the boys and comparing the whole attitudes, both mental and physical, of the inmates of both these institutions. It was amazing to see the vast area that is provided for the delinquent boys and the little one-acre allotment, surrounded by a barbed-wire fence, that is provided for the girls at Karrala.

Mr. Sullivan: That is the lovely Darling Downs.

Mrs. JORDAN: I wish the girls were sent to the "lovely" Darling Downs—and the Minister, too. He should be kept there.

On Friday, 18 October, I asked the Minister to arrange an open day at Karrala, but he answered by saying that surely I was not serious. I want to assure him that I was

serious in my request to have an open day so that anyone interested in the institution could visit it. I am sure that a lot of people would be interested in visiting the institution. They would see the great disparity that exists between the facilities provided at Karrala and those provided at Westbrook, and even those provided at the prisons. Anyone who looks at the place would say that all the criticisms of it were well and truly justified.

It is a dreadful place, with poor ventilation and dark, twilight rooms on the "under-privileged" side, even on the brightest day. The girls are provided with dreadful rubber pots that are supposed to be their toilet facilities. The boys in Westbrook are not asked to accept these conditions; they knock on the door and are taken to the toilet. They do not have to use the dreadful, shameful rubber pots that are kept in the rooms at Karrala. In fact, the whole thing is reminiscent of the dungeons of bygone days. Even on the "privileged" side there is very little to occupy the girls, or to encourage them to lead a better life.

This sort of treatment only induces more and more resentment at a world they feel has already treated them badly. When I asked that correspondence courses be provided, together with handicrafts and sporting facilities, I was told that they must be considered in relation to safety. I immediately thought of the big lads at Westbrook who use tools such as saws, hammers, nails, lathes and all sorts of things inside the workshop, and the many tools required outside on the farm. They are not considered dangerous for boys, but needles, plastic straw, paint material, or any materials that can be used by girls for handicrafts, are considered dangerous for them. How screamingly funny it would be if it were not so tragic! It is more tragic to be a girl delinquent than a boy delinquent. I am afraid that, try as I might, I cannot follow the reasoning applied to Karrala.

I know that delinquents must be disciplined for their own good, be they boys or girls. I have told the Minister so, and I have said so in this Chamber. But the treatment that these girls are getting is not discipline; it is straight-out punishment of the worst kind—mental punishment in a completely stultifying existence. Quite frankly, I am ashamed of Karrala House, but it goes on in the same pattern year after year.

I did not previously blame the staff and, indeed, in the main the staff cannot do anything about altering the pattern. They must do as they are told; they are not the bosses and they do as they are told and the pattern remains. I know that the doctor in charge of Karrala is not happy with the situation there, and I do not think he will be happy about it so long as he remains there and so long as Sister Kraut remains as sister in charge.

Mr. Miller: You think she is to blame?

Mrs. JORDAN: In my opinion, she is the stumbling block. I hesitated to say that before, although I thought it. I do not like dealing in personalities. In this case, however, I feel that she has become so addicted to the pattern of control at Karrala that she is convinced it is what is required. I cannot say that she believes it will improve the girls, but she apparently thinks it is the required pattern. It would seem that a different sister in charge is required at Karrala if any changes are to be made. The time is long past when this "Belsen" at Karrala should be stopped.

I appeal to the Minister for Health, as I appealed to the former Minister in charge of Karrala, to do something for these girls. I am pleased that this institution now comes under the Minister for Health, and I appeal to him to give these unfortunate girls a chance to rehabilitate themselves. I ask him not to continue adding further kicks to the kicks that life has already given them. I was hoping that the Minister would institute improvements when his department took over Karrala, as I believe he has a humanitarian attitude. I therefore ask him to "get cracking" and clear up the whole show at Karrala, and ensure that the girls are treated as human beings rather than animals.

I now wish to say a few words about the facilities for myself at Parliament House. Here, again, the contrast is somewhat similar to the different treatment of delinquent boys and delinquent girls. But I am no delinquent. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Albert say, in his Address-in-Reply speech, that a toilet had been especially provided and redecorated for me. I wish he would tell me where it is.

I am not complaining on that score—I am quite happy to share with the female staff—nevertheless I feel that it would be nice to have a room provided for me to which I can retire quietly if I want to. There have been times when I have not been well and when I have had personal worries—and I have had a few of those in the past 12 months. It would be convenient not only for me to have a little place but also for the wives at least of Opposition members. When they visit Parliament House for various functions they have nowhere to go and have to sit on chairs beside their husbands' desks or hang around the corridors. There is just nowhere for them to go while they are waiting. If such a room was provided for me it would also be handy for them.

Mr. Bromley: We even have white mice in our room.

Mrs. JORDAN: May I say that I do not want a special office provided for me. I am very happy to be in the big room. I do not want to be segregated and I am happy with the corner I have, along with all the men, and the white mice that now run around our floor to entertain us.

Some time ago I asked for a mirror on the wall so that I can make sure that my hat is on straight or that I can comb my hair neatly and powder my nose so that I will be presentable to all hon. members when I come into the Chamber. But ask as I might, I have not received a mirror on the wall. The Department of Works has come and measured up, but it is still a case of no mirror on the wall for me. As I walk past some of the other offices I see mirrors on the wall with a little shelf for a brush and comb and all the extras for the male members. But, ask as much as I like, I cannot even get a mirror on the wall. And that is the only thing I have asked for since I have been a member of Parliament. It is not much use trying to prune and cut down, because I will be here for the next three years. There is no way that I am being got rid of, and there may even be other lady members next year. Then we will see what can be done about providing facilities.

Another thing this brings to mind is the outmoded rule, call it what you like, that no woman, other than a woman member of Parliament, is allowed in the lobby of this Parliament. This attitude certainly belongs to a bygone era. I have sat in this Chamber and watched women go from the veranda through the lobby—not once, but many times—and on one particular afternoon last March I counted no fewer than five going from the veranda through the lobby. Is Parliament so afraid of women visitors and women journalists that they are not officially allowed in the lobby? I do not think a full-scale campaign is warranted to have it altered, as was suggested when I first entered Parliament. I feel that the position is just plain ridiculous and that it is high time that the rule, if a rule it can be called, was eliminated and the practice discontinued.

In the few moments that I have left I wish to refer to aid to deserted wives and the wives of prisoners and their children. I wish to say how pleased I am that there has now been some alleviation of the distress and poverty suffered in the first six months of their plight as a result of the Commonwealth Government's paying 50 per cent. of the payments made by the State, thus enabling the State to increase payments and give help quickly. The increased rate of \$18.50 a week for a mother and one child, and \$1.50 for each additional child, is a big improvement on the previous payments, although there is still room for vast improvement. Indeed, previously in Queensland a deserted wife with three children, who now will receive \$21.50 a week, received \$9.85. That was certainly a shocking situation, although the new amount is still lower than the payments made in a number of other States.

(Time expired.)

Mr. WHARTON (Burnett) (7.31 p.m.): It is with much pleasure that I join in this debate, and I want to say how glad I am to speak under the very able chairmanship of my friend the hon. member for Albert. That alone prompts me to make a real contribution to a good debate. I am glad, too, to keep in step with the "march to progress" Budget, because this is the type of thing that is needed today. If Budgets can continue to be progressively better, as they have, this State will certainly get somewhere.

Mr. O'Donnell: It would be better to present a "sitting on the tram track" Budget, wouldn't it?

Mr. WHARTON: All that the hon. member could present would be a "knocker" Budget. I shall return to him later.

During the last few years the Treasurer has presented Budgets that have become progressively better, and this is real progress. This financial year began with a deficit and has ended with a balance on the credit side in the Treasury. In addition, many things have been done to the advantage of all sections of the community, which is surely progress.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. From the way he read it, I really thought at first that he was a lay reader. If he had read his Budget speech when he was on the back of the truck at Childers last Friday, I am quite sure that he would have gained no votes for his candidate.

An Opposition Member: We had a big crowd up there, too.

Mr. WHARTON: But they would only have been listeners; that doesn't say that they will vote for the Labour candidate. He is tied to the good old A.L.P. platform—socialised industry, production, distribution and exchange.

Mr. R. Jones: Why didn't you put a farmer up?

Mr. WHARTON: We put a good man up. And he is going to win, too.

As I have said, the Treasurer has produced a very good Budget. I noticed, too, that the Opposition must concur with it because, whilst we were happy about it, they all looked quite dismal. When I heard the hon. member who has just resumed her seat speak about the labour ward at Ipswich, I was glad that I was not in the Labour Party. We have produced something to be proud of. The very fact that a deficit has been wiped out, that the Budget has been balanced and a surplus produced, shows that the State has progressed under this Government.

Mr. Bromley: In what way?

Mr. WHARTON: I know it would be hard to educate the hon. member for Norman.

Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt: The people wouldn't want to go back to the days of Labour.

Mr. WHARTON: That is true. Who would be so silly as to want that?

Mr. Bromley: You got a big property under Labour.

Mr. WHARTON: I got nothing under Labour. I had to work for it.

Mr. Bromley: Your father got one, too.

Mr. WHARTON: He did not get anything under Labour.

We see in Queensland many irrigation schemes being implemented, many dams being built. The Wuruma Dam, which is in my electorate, is almost complete. Certainly there has not been any rain to fill it, but we cannot control the seasonal conditions. It is true that we have had a dry period for about 10 years. The hon. member for Barcoo is smiling. So he should be; he is getting a big dam in his electorate. When it rains it will be filled, as will the Wuruma Dam, but until then water rates should be waived.

I pay a tribute to the Government for making provision for the building of dams and water conservation schemes. As the hon. member for Logan said, the State Government is providing \$7,500,000 in this Budget for irrigation. That is very good. Great advantages will flow to the State, as other hon. members on this side of the Chamber have emphasised, from the implementation of water conservation schemes.

Although I do not wish to go into detail on this issue, I once again draw to the attention of hon. members the need for funds for the Kolan scheme, which is similar to the Nogoia scheme. It will serve more people than the Nogoia scheme and, although I do not decry what is being done in Central Queensland, I do want for my electorate a share of the funds obtained from the Federal Government.

In the field of electricity supply, I know that the Government has taken action to submit a case to the Federal Government for the establishment of a major powerhouse in Central Queensland.

Mr. Sherrington: They have not got very far.

Mr. WHARTON: The Government is getting there.

Mr. Sherrington: You would not know where to put it.

Mr. WHARTON: I am sure that the hon. member for Salisbury would not know where to put it.

Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt: It will be in Central Queensland.

Mr. WHARTON: It will be in Central Queensland. The Government is approaching the Federal Government for funds, and it will get them. Cheap electricity is needed to encourage further development.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. WHARTON: Look at the development at Mt. Isa and at Gladstone. The hon. member for Port Curtis never gives the Government credit for anything that happens at Gladstone. Hon. members opposite claim that the hon. member for Port Curtis is responsible for the development at Gladstone and that the hon. member for Burke, Mr. Inch, is responsible for the development at Mt. Isa. I have never heard so much tripe. It is the Country-Liberal Government that has been responsible for that development.

Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt: It has put money into his pocket.

Mr. WHARTON: Yes. It is all due to the Government's great work, but the hon. member for Port Curtis never gives the Government any credit.

Mr. Bromley: The hon. member for Port Curtis finances the Government.

Mr. WHARTON: Then we need not go to the Federal Government.

I wish to see the power-stations retained at Howard and Torbanlea, because they are playing an important part in the economy of Queensland. However, further development is needed to provide employment for more people, and another large power-station would be very useful in that direction.

Hon. members opposite say, "Why not help the farmers? The Country Party has forgotten them." I want to pay tribute to the Federal Government and say a word of thanks for the money it has found for the development of beef roads—a total of \$39,500,000. This is important; it is of benefit to the whole State. The people may have contributed by way of taxation, but it is some reimbursement to our own State Government. Those are the things that mean development, and I want to show that this is a Government that is developing the State. We are developing in the interests of the worker, because he is assured of a good job and a decent salary.

Every time we create more employment for more people we make a better home market for the products we have to sell. This is the kind of development we want, development from which everybody skims a little bit, not the sectional type of development that the A.L.P. gave us for years. It put us in a state where we were really embarrassed trying to keep our heads above water and get the State moving. We have our heads up now; our credit is good and progress is assured under our great Government.

Mr. Bromley: What about telling us about the race meeting that is coming up?

Mr. WHARTON: I invited the hon. member to Gayndah on 23 November for the re-enactment and anniversary of the first derby in Queensland. I invited every hon. member. They are all invited to come; I cannot do anything more than that.

I now want to speak for a moment about local government and subsidies. The Budget contains approval of \$15,000,000-odd for the use of local government. Local authorities are playing a more important role every day, because they have to attend to the local affairs of their various communities and shires. Virtually every shire in the State is making progress. One can see it every day in better roads, better sewerage schemes, and things such as that. Local authorities have a great part to play in local government and we, as a Government, respect this. I think we should, if we can, delegate work to local government, and encourage and assist it. It will do a grand job because it knows the local needs, just as we, as a State Government, know State needs and the Federal people know the national needs. We are allocating to local authorities more funds so that they can perform their very important role.

Mr. Bromley: What about employment in the country for young people?

Mr. WHARTON: That is very important. We are doing something about it. I do not want to go back over what I said in the Address-in-Reply debate, but obviously this is very important to everybody. We want to retain in our own country towns the people who were born there and want to stay there. Some want to go further afield, into State and Federal enterprise. That is fair enough, but we want to hold the people already in our country centres if we can possibly do so; otherwise we will have to import some from other places if we want to maintain the present population.

Private industry, coupled with Government help, will, I am sure, solve some of these problems. The scope is there for private enterprise to do something to establish industry. The Government, with its new plans and new Minister for Industrial Development, will help in freight concessions and land concessions, and so on, which we hope will encourage industry to become established in country areas so that we can hold the young people, in particular, who are already there. They then, in their turn, can take a hand in fostering local development, which in turn helps State development.

I should now like to say a few words about succession and probate duties.

Mr. Bromley: Didn't the Government get enough last year?

Mr. WHARTON: I think they did get enough, and I do not think the hon. member should help me along in this; he should be very quiet for a moment.

Mr. Bromley: Did you look at the figures they got?

Mr. WHARTON: That is the point I want to raise. I do not mind the hon. member saying something about it. We can sometimes agree in this Chamber; we can always

agree if we are reasonable. This is a very vexed problem in the sense that it is a matter of concern to us all.

I want to express my appreciation of what the Government has done in this matter. When Sir Thomas Hiley was Treasurer some concessions were provided in the field of succession and probate duties. In the Budget that has just been presented by the Treasurer some further concessions are provided, and we are assured by him that even more are forthcoming.

Mr. Bromley: You know that the Government got over \$21,000,000 from probate duties last year.

Mr. WHARTON: In 1958-59, \$6,000,000 was collected by the Government in probate and succession duties, and in 1967-68 \$17,000,000 was collected. The latter amount is nearly three times the former, but I feel sure that the increase is not due to the fact that three times as many people died in the latter period as in the former period.

Mr. Bromley interjected.

Mr. WHARTON: Mr. Carey, I cannot even think for the hon. member's interjections. He is like a parrot; he keeps on talking. He will not cease.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Carey): Order!

Mr. WHARTON: I hope that he will peter out for a moment. I am talking about probate and succession duties, but I do not wish anything ill upon him.

A Government Member: He is probably worth more dead than alive.

Mr. WHARTON: I dare say that most of us are.

A more equitable way must be found of collecting probate and succession taxes. Obviously we have reached the stage where we are collecting a greater amount, in an unjust way. That is the point that I wish to make. Collections have increased nearly three times as much since 1958-59, and the increase is not due to the number of people who have passed on.

Because of a rise in valuations and the inflationary trend, an urgent need exists for a reduction in the rate of taxation that is applied to probate and succession. There is no doubt that values have increased, and as the valuations have climbed the local authorities have reduced the rates so that practically the same amount of rates will be collected. This is the sort of thing that must be done with probate and succession duties. When this tax was first introduced—and I am not saying which Government introduced it—

Mr. Newton: It was introduced by your Government as soon as it gained office in 1957.

Mr. WHARTON: The hon. member for Belmont does not know what he is talking about; he is right off the ball.

Mr. Newton: The hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha is very interested in this.

Mr. WHARTON: Probate and succession duties were introduced in about 1929 by the Labour Government. I did not want to "put this on" hon. members opposite, but if they want to wear the cap they have to put it on. If they want to put it on, that is all right by me. I want to give hon. members opposite a little credit, and, if they listen, I will do so.

When the Labour Government introduced succession and probate duties a certain level of values was in existence and the tax that was charged was reasonable at that time. Over the years values have increased, and the Government has not reduced the rate of tax. We are therefore collecting a higher amount of tax. This is unjust, and I want to impress this point upon the Government. I know that the Treasurer will do something about this.

Mr. E. G. W. Wood: The Treasurer said that he will review the whole matter.

Mr. WHARTON: That is so, but I want him to do it in the right manner. I do not want him to give a concession here, and a concession there. I want him to look at the rates of duty. I feel that the problem lies within the rate of assessment. A greater amount of tax is charged on a deceased estate than should be. It is necessary that the scale of duties, both State and Federal, be substantially reduced, and the period of payments so arranged that the burden of this iniquitous taxation is not so heavy on the rural sector of the community, whose members have either to mortgage or sell part of their properties to pay probate duty. Hon. members may be interested to know that the primary producing section pays almost one-half of probate and succession duty receipts. They are faced with the problem of a capital tax. When a man who has created a capital asset passes on, his estate has to pay tax out of capital.

Mr. Newton: Don't you think it touches the workers when they die?

Mr. WHARTON: The hon. member would be a terrible taxing authority if he ever got his hands on the reins.

Probate and succession duties are charged on capital assets, whereas income tax is paid on profits. People who make profits are prepared to pay income tax, but it is not fair and just to have such a capital tax. It diminishes the estate of the successor, who has probably made a grand contribution towards it. In family partnerships people plough all the funds back into a property, but finally, when it is assessed for probate

and succession duty, it has to be mortgaged to pay what is really a capital tax. When taxation was low in the early days—

Mr. Newton: Under a Labour Government.

Mr. WHARTON: I give the A.L.P. some credit for that, but times have changed. The country has advanced; we have created progress and I give the Government credit for that.

Mr. Dewar: The pre-war tax under Labour was the highest in Australia.

Opposition Members interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Carey): Order!

Mr. WHARTON: Since 1911 the retail price index of the capital cities—

Mr. Newton: Where were you in 1911?

Mr. WHARTON: I was not here, and I am glad of it. Since 1911 prices have risen by 400 per cent. The trend in land values has been somewhat similar. If values have risen by 400 per cent., surely we should reduce the rate of succession and probate duties by a comparable figure to make it more realistic, and not unduly harsh.

Mr. Newton: It is a shocking indictment of your Government that there has been so much inflation.

Mr. WHARTON: I would not say too much about inflation. The A.L.P. has really created inflation. They hopped on the wagon and cried out loudly when the sugar industry enjoyed prosperous times. They said, "We want an extra £2 a week; it will only be temporary." However, when prices came down the wage increase became permanent. The A.L.P. is responsible for inflation. The biggest inflationary influence is wages. A.L.P. members have been continually scrapping; they will price themselves out of a job soon and the whole world will suffer. They should not talk about inflation.

Mr. Bromley: What is the Government going to do to help the sugar industry?

Mr. WHARTON: It is doing plenty. It could do nothing and still beat the A.L.P.'s record.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. WHARTON: Admittedly Labour got sugar agreements and a few other agreements, but that was in the good old days when there was a real A.L.P. The A.L.P. lost itself in 1957 when the Q.L.P. left it. Now what has it got?

Mr. Newton: We still have the A.L.P.

Mr. WHARTON: Have a look at it! It's a beauty!

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Carey): Order!

Mr. Bromley: You should be attacking the Gorton Government, which is borrowing money from the American Government to buy the F-111.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Carey:) Order! The hon. member for Burnett.

Mr. WHARTON: The A.L.P. has done nothing for the sugar industry but talk. The A.L.P. said, "We have Dr. Patterson". Well, it can have him.

Mr. Bennett: He defeated your Deputy Leader.

Mr. WHARTON: The A.L.P. can have him. What has he done but talk and sing to high heaven and get the A.L.P. in trouble? He hates being in the A.L.P. He has a chip on his shoulder. He has to talk about many things just to get into the Press. He does nothing but talk and talk, without achieving anything.

The sugar industry did not benefit at all under Labour. But this Government has got on side with the industry, and the industry knows what it wants. The A.L.P. does not know what the industry wants. The Premier is overseas now and an international sugar agreement is pretty close. This will help the industry most.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. WHARTON: The decision has not been made, or I would have told you.

We are fighting for the sugar industry, which is more than the A.L.P. did. What is worse, the A.L.P. is trying to knock down those who are trying to do something for the industry. They are "knockers". This Government gave the industry reduced freight rates in this Budget and in other Budgets. What did the A.L.P. do? It put the freight rates on sugar up 437 per cent. in 10 years. We put them up 7½ per cent. and then took 5 percent. off, which is an increase of only 2½ per cent.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. WHARTON: The trouble with members of the Opposition is they will not be honest. They will not tell the truth. They do not like the truth.

Mr. Bromley: There has been more unemployment in the sugar industry since you have been in power. Automation has caused some of it.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Carey:) The Chair is most anxious to hear the hon. member for Burnett—

Mr. Bennett: You would be the only one.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair would like to hear the hon. member for Burnett develop his own speech. While I am very happy to allow pertinent interjections, I feel that there is far too much noise in the Chamber.

Mr. WHARTON: Thank you, Mr. Carey. I appreciate your wise comments.

I have asked Opposition members what they have done for the sugar industry. The answer is "Nothing", and they cannot alter that. On the other hand, this Government has done many things for the sugar industry throughout the years.

Mr. Newton: Tell us some of them.

Mr. WHARTON: We gave the farmers drought relief when they were in trouble, we arranged loans, we arranged with the Reserve Bank to give them finance, and we tried to arrange some finance for them to carry them on until we get a better international sugar agreement which Opposition members are trying to "knock". I should like to tell them what we are trying to do. We are trying to develop this State and to get more people here, more well-paid people, so that we can sell our sugar and dairy products locally. Whilst an international agreement is most important the return is far better than all the international markets and would do a good deal for the Australian economy. These are the things that matter—more people, more markets, better markets for our sugar industry, our dairying industry and our other local industries, so that we can develop this great State and feed it and get a decent price by encouraging decent returns to the workers. Opposition members have forgotten all about the workers. They are thinking about farming and they know nothing about it, and they know a little less about the workers.

I should now like to get back to probate and succession duties, which is a very important matter in the sense that a property valued at \$40,000 in 1911 is today worth \$200,000, merely as a result of the inflationary process. Death duties on the property in 1911, at today's rate, would have been \$4,566, representing 11½ per cent. of its value. Today, as a result of depreciation in the value of money, and not because of any change in real value, the same property would attract duties of \$67,000, representing 33 per cent. of its value. These are the things that we must look at. I am glad that the Treasurer is prepared to look at this one. Surely it was never the intention of the Legislature or the administration that what was originally a fixed scale of probate and succession duties should be increased year by year by a monetary process entirely outside its control till eventually those duties become exorbitant, even ruinous, on quite moderate estates.

I am concerned about the effect that this has on primary industry, because that is an activity in which high profits are not made and the return on capital is low compared with that obtained in some other businesses. The family of a testator makes a grand contribution to building up his estate, and I do not think that these families should be penalised as they are now. One way of meeting the problem would be to reduce the rate and, where there is a partnership or a group of beneficiaries, the person who succeeds to part of the estate should be

taxed on the part that he inherits. If there were five brothers who were beneficiaries in an estate, I would prefer and recommend—

Mr. Bromley: What about, "Brothers and sisters have I none but that man's father is my father's son"?

Mr. WHARTON: There is no doubt that we have some poets in the Chamber, but that is about all they are.

Rather than having to pay probate duty on the whole estate, I think it should be divided into five and each beneficiary should pay on his share. That would be a more just way of doing things, and I recommend it to the Treasurer.

Mr. Newton: Are you cutting sisters out? They do just as much work on the land as brothers do.

Mr. WHARTON: I think the interjection is quite irrelevant. I do not think that the hon. member for Belmont really knows and appreciates what has been done.

Mr. Newton: If it were not for a woman you wouldn't be here today.

Mr. WHARTON: I have to concur. I have already said that the A.L.P. has done nothing. I have asked to be told what Dr. Patterson has done and what others have done, but I have been told nothing.

The A.L.P. says, "The Country Party has forgotten all about the farmers". I say that we are fighting for the farmers, and indeed the whole community, every day. Concessions have been made in road tax, freights and various other charges for the benefit of primary producers.

Mr. Bennett: What have you done for the worker?

Mr. WHARTON: Everything. We have made sure that he has employment now and in the future. The State is progressing and job opportunities are increasing. Security of employment and a reasonable return for his labour is what the worker wants, and that is what the Government is encouraging.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. WHARTON: I am not a member of the Industrial Commission; I am speaking as the member for Burnett, and I am trying to emphasise the virtues of the Country Party. The A.L.P. has done nothing. Someone said the other day, "You haven't done any good with the Liberal Party". What rot! We are a good coalition Government that is doing something for the whole State, and, when the whole State benefits, the worker, the farmer, and everybody else benefits. Up in the bush we hear it said, "The Country Party is complacent and is not doing this and that." That cannot truthfully be said.

What I want to do is "stir the possum" in the A.L.P. so that they will be a better Opposition. At present they would be the most hopeless Opposition that I have seen in any Parliament. From the monotonous way in which the Leader of the Opposition read his speech the other day, I thought he was a lay reader. Even Hughie O'Donnell could beat him. Some of the other Opposition members made wonderful contributions compared with that of their leader, who nearly drove me out of the Chamber. Yet he had the audacity to go to the cane fields and say, "The Country Party is complacent". I assure him that it is going to fight on, and it will fight to the death. The Country Party is a fighting party. It will fight to the last for the primary producer and the worker, and for this great State that means so much to us. The Government is going to develop the State and not be knocked aside by hon. members opposite, who "knock" it every time they speak and howl and wail and whinge. Let the people of Queensland stay on-side with a Government that fights for progress; let the "knockers" stay on the Opposition benches. The Country-Liberal Government will get on with the job of developing Queensland.

Mr. HANSON (Port Curtis) (8.6 p.m.): The Financial Statement presented by the Treasurer in any Parliament is a very important document, perhaps the most important that is placed before the Legislature. In addition to giving hon. members an account of his financial stewardship over the previous 12 months, the Treasurer is cast in the role of a forecaster. He has to assess and present to the Legislative Assembly, or to the House of Parliament in which he is speaking, what he thinks will be the state of the economy in the ensuing 12 months.

It has become the vogue for Treasurers, particularly those administering the Treasury in this State, to give a name to each Financial Statement that they present to this Assembly. This year, for some unknown reason, the Financial Statement is called the "march to progress" Budget, a name that, to my mind and to the minds of other members of the Opposition, contains a certain amount of falsehood.

I think it should be recognised that in the minds of the ordinary people in the community—I do not exclude members of this Assembly—the Australian Labour Party is the champion of the great mass of the Australian people, particularly those of the working class. Their interests are our interests; their interests are very dear to our hearts. After a man has provided in his daily budgeting for the basic needs of himself and his family, he likes to have something left over so that he can make provision for future expenditure on the education of his children or for his old age. Over the length and breadth of Queensland, one finds savings bank branches and agencies, and the savings of the ordinary people are placed in

those branches and agencies and play a very significant part in the economy of the State and of Australia.

Let us see just how false this "march to progress" Budget is. Any Budget must be applicable to the people of the State in which it is presented, and I point out to the Committee that the savings bank deposits per head of population in the various States of the Commonwealth up to the end of June, 1968, were as follows:—

	Per head \$
New South Wales	490
Victoria	634
Queensland	444
South Australia	576
Tasmania	471
Western Australia	419

Those are the deposits in all savings bank institutions. Those figures, show that the savings bank deposits per head of population in this State are the second lowest in the Commonwealth.

Mr. Pilbeam: Have you got the trading bank figures?

Mr. HANSON: I have not come to them, but at a later stage I will give the hon. member a clear and concise examination of them. It will not be in this speech, but I will not disappoint the hon. member.

The figures reveal that savings bank deposits in Western Australia, at \$419 per head, are nearly \$30 per head lower than ours. This is a very interesting state of affairs. Great emphasis has been placed on the Western Australia and its development in the last five years, and this Government has been loud in its praise of the development that has occurred in this State. If we look at the five-year term ended 1 July, 1968, we find that the Queensland figures show a 58.6 per cent. increase, compared with a Western Australia increase of 77.2 per cent. This clearly indicates that the rate of growth in industrial enterprises and industrial development in that State certainly exceed what is happening in this State, despite the eulogies of "The Courier-Mail", which likens the present Treasurer, Mr. Gordon Chalk, to Mr. Gordon Court, the very adept and brisk Minister for Development in Western Australia.

Mr. Dewar: The comparison is odious to him.

Mr. HANSON: Exactly. I agree with the hon. member for Wavell. The statement is certainly out of "court". Possibly one of the greatest political misnomers ever would be naming this the "march of progress" Budget. As we all realise, the State elections of 1969 loom very near on the horizon and the public of this State are still reeling under the pangs and suffering

inflicted on them in the 1966 State taxation onslaught originated by the present Treasurer. The public is certainly far from satisfied and is certainly not in accord with the Treasurer's naming of this financial document.

I mentioned at the time of the presentation of the Budget two years ago that the Treasurer would not have the courage or the guts to present a similar Budget in 1968, in the year before the next State election.

Mr. Newton: He was not game to do it in 1965, either.

Mr. HANSON: Certainly not. As in many cases of Christian baptism, there is added to the tongue of the infant the salt of life. It usually produces a wail, but certainly nothing like the wail that went up from the people—primary producers, workers, and the public of this State generally—when the 1966 taxation imposts were inflicted upon them. I remind the Committee that some pertinent statements were made today by the hon. member for Baroona relative to certain facets of this matter. A stamp duty of 3 per cent. on workers' compensation was implemented, I think, for the first time, and it was geared to produce \$400,000 in a full year. The stamp duty of 1 per cent. on motor vehicle registrations, whether they were new or second-hand vehicles, was referred to by the hon. member, as were the savage increases in hospital fees, with particular emphasis on increased fees for intermediate patients; substantial increases on all motor vehicle registrations, which were instituted not only on cars but also on trucks; large transport fee increases; and rail freight increases of considerable magnitude. It was stated at the time that the Treasurer was indulging in a very slick political performance. How true!

If we examine the freight and taxation relief deductions that are being instituted in the present Financial Statement on page 7, we find that there is to be a maximum rate for all grains of \$9 a ton. Much has been made of the concessions that will be applicable to freight rates on raw sugar—the expected reduction being in the region of 5 per cent. A similar percentage reduction of 5 per cent. will be made on railway freights for livestock, general merchandise, fruit, wool and cotton. To sum up, the Treasurer expects that these reductions will be to the extent of a generous \$3,150,000 in a full year.

I suggest to the Committee that it should look at the other side of this Budget—at these savage increases that were inflicted in 1966, at a time far removed from the 1969 election, and during one of the most serious and severe droughts that this country has experienced.

This was the Treasurer's performance on that occasion: freights on wheat, maize and other grains, coal, coke, and refined sugar

were to rise (and they did rise by 15 per cent.); fares were to be increased by 25 per cent. in the city and 20 per cent. in the country; a freight increase of 10 per cent. was to be applied to livestock and general merchandise; the freight on fruit, cotton and wool was to be increased by 7½ per cent.; and lastly—and this is very interesting in view of the freight reduction of 5 per cent. that is being signalled in this Budget—on sugar-cane and raw sugar a freight increase of 7½ per cent. was to be applied.

These increases were estimated to bring in \$8,400,000 in a full year. As has been said by the hon. member for Baroona, in a few instances the sums received by the Treasury were far in excess of those estimated. If we go on estimates, we will find that within the period of the Treasurer's stewardship he was able to bring in a profit of \$8,400,000, less the 1968 expected reduction of \$3,150,000, which shows him a net profit of \$5,250,000 on more or less identical items in the one year. That does not allow for the inflationary trend in the economy during the last two years. What a wonderful profit!

One might say, "Fair enough; he has to get his money somehow," but my prime objection to this financial manipulation is not so much the obvious and apparent duplicity of the things in question, but the fact that the Treasurer wants us to believe, in the presentation of his Budget, that he is politically a good fellow, or a public benefactor. How utterly ridiculous!

Mr. Hanlon: He, not the Premier of the State, is being promoted as the father of this.

Mr. HANSON: That is quite true. He might fool members of the Country Party, the alleged representatives of the rural interests in this Chamber, but he will certainly not fool me or the hon. member for South Brisbane, or any other member of the Opposition. I am sure we can all remember that, when we were young we occasionally had administered to us the "blue" bottle—the bottle of castor oil. We also remember that Mother stood in the background to give us, as expeditiously as possible, the quarters of orange after this obnoxious fluid was poured down our throats by the spoonful. The treasurer poured amounts of taxation hardships down the throats of the public generally two or three years ago in his 1966 Budget, but the sweetness of his reduction in 1968 will in no way compensate for the distaste that remains in the minds of the Queensland people.

The Country Party, which, as I said, is numerically the strongest party in this Chamber, has a long and deep memory. I give it credit for that. Country Party members may not realise political implications as quickly as other hon. members; they may not be as resourceful as other hon. members. They are certainly not as studious or as knowledgeable, nor do they have the political

capacity of those hon. members who sit at the back of the Chamber on the Government side—the members of the "ginger group". Nevertheless, I warn the Treasurer that one day they will most certainly assert themselves. When they do, they will know how to command. I think the Treasurer well knows that is quite possible.

I will proceed a little further into this area of slick operations by the Treasurer. One has only to turn to the 1966 Budget to see that, in State transport operations, several imposts were placed on the community. They have been adequately dealt with and canvassed by Opposition members. They were estimated to return about \$750,000 in a full year. The concession given on this occasion, which primarily affects the country people of the State, the people in the rural areas in which the Country Party avidly maintains it is so much to the fore, will amount to \$400,000 this year.

Mr. Hanlon: If the Treasurer put this out as a company prospectus the company squad would be after him.

Mr. HANSON: That is so. That is further proof of the Government's non-existent munificence.

To sum up the general situation briefly, the extent of the extra taxation that was collected by the self-same Treasurer in his 1966 Budget exceeded \$16,000,000, which makes the sound of the trumpet echoing the concessions amounting to \$4,250,000 in the 1968 Budget very hollow indeed. It is certainly not a very good comparison. For those who know something of music, and I presume from listening to their melodious voices at times that many hon. members do, the sound is certainly not that of a trumpet, but would be referred to in musical circles as pianissimo, a very soft noise, hardly able to be heard.

I mention briefly the obnoxious, obvious political side of this Budget. There is a most pregnant political implication in this financial document. We see the Treasurer standing between two warring factors, or two warring tribes, ready to place war-paint on themselves and do the tribal dance, waiting for the day of warfare so that their particular ideals or principles can reign supreme.

It was mentioned by the Treasurer himself at the Liberal convention in Brisbane some months ago that he certainly hoped to see the Liberal Party ultimately become the supreme governing party in this State. This is very strange. He has not a branch of the Liberal Party in his own electorate. As a matter of fact, while he remains the titular head of the Liberal Party and proclaims that he is very much behind it, it looks to me as if he is well and truly in Gatton, removed from Liberal headquarters by some 40 or 50 miles.

The Treasurer, because of highly complex constitutional problems, may have reigned as Premier for seven days and seven nights, but he must realise that he will never permanently be the fellow with the big feathers. Rather will he be the one standing beside the pot in the centre of the war-like contenders waiting for the day of his political execution.

I shall finish that point with these famous words, and I hope that the Treasurer will never forget them. It is a good motto for him and other members of the Liberal Party who are very close to him and actually support him: "*Partes agricolorum locuti sunt causa finite est.*" Translated, that means, "The Country Party has spoken, and that's that. The issue is finished."

In recent years a considerable number of statements have been made in this Chamber appertaining to foreign investors. I fully realise that members of the Government, purely for political advantage, seriously misrepresent the position to members of the Opposition. We have often advanced the premise that we are members of the Australian Labour Party, with emphasis on the word "Australian". We have also advanced the premise that the companies of Australian origin should rank high in the mind of the Government when any form of concession is being handed out. There is nothing wrong with that idea; a little patriotic fervour is not out of place, even within a political party. Our party was founded in this country and did not originate across the seas in the old, hard conservatism which was the forerunner of the parties of hon. members opposite. We are the Australian Labour Party, and we are proud to have that name.

There are many problems that confront not only this country but other countries in the field of foreign investment. This is something that has exercised the minds of those in government not only here but in very many other countries. European countries have many problems of foreign enterprise and foreign investment which are similar to ours. Whereas our immediate problem is accurately forecasting the long-term effects of foreign investment, European countries are trying desperately, under heavy pressure, to maintain their individual entities.

Recently I read some statements by E. L. Wheelwright and Judith Miskelly in their "*Anatomy of Australian Manufacturing Industry.*" They made a detailed analysis of 299 companies which account for 50 per cent. of the corporate wealth and 40 per cent. of the total employment in manufacturing industries. The authors go further and note that in 26 sectors of industry five were subject to more than 80 per cent. of overseas control, nine were subject to between 50 and 80 per cent. of foreign control, and five were subject to between 20 and 50 per cent. of such control. Those are very pertinent figures indeed.

I personally side with some of the articles written recently by Servan Schreiber, and I heartily agree with him on a couple of points in matters pertaining to this problem. He maintains that nothing very much would be achieved by completely excluding investment from the United States, the United Kingdom, Japan, or other countries. He also believes that there is nothing wrong in learning to co-exist successfully with the greatest economic power in the world, namely, the United States, and that choking out foreign investment altogether from this country would possibly be disastrous for our national solvency. I think that we could agree with that. Further, exclusion of foreign investment would deny to our young people the opportunity to learn the techniques of modern business and industrial operations, and this we have no right to do.

I do believe, however, that it is necessary at times to impress upon members of the Government that in dealing with foreign investment they can become somewhat over-zealous and fail to gain for our people the benefits that they should ultimately have. Governments have a clear and concise responsibility to obtain the greatest possible benefit for the people. It is worthy of note that some years ago the Australian dairying industry tried to gain a foothold for some of its products in the United States of America. It was certainly shown the front door, the back door, and every other door. Legislation was enacted that certainly was against the interests of the Australian dairying industry, and it was so effective that it staved off any invasion by that industry, whether on a small or a large scale. Knowing the great possibilities in the field of dairy production in this country, I suppose that it could eventually have been an invasion of some consequence.

Because of its internal political problems, the United States of America has boycotted the International Sugar Conference being held at Geneva. A successful agreement on world sugar prices could boost the Cuban economy, and the Democrats, while they are in the throes of the Presidential election, do not wish to see an agreement negotiated that might be to the advantage of and help the cause of the Republicans. It is quite true that the United States of America does not buy its sugar on the free world market; but the presence and participation of American representatives at Geneva would have assisted considerably to lift the economy of many countries whose export earnings from the sales of sugar are very significant.

The points advanced in this debate by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition relative to the meat export trade to the United States of America are also worthy of interest and study. For many years, Australian beef and mutton have met a growing demand from the smallgoods and hamburger trade in the U.S.A. But ranchers—large graziers, principally from southern States—have engaged in deep political lobbying and have pressured

the Government. They have constantly refused to recognise imported meats as a product complementary to their surplus fat killings. They have been successful in going to Congress and, in 1964, having legislation passed by Congress with the idea of imposing a meat quota on imports, with the proviso that a ceiling would be placed on imports if that quota was ever exceeded. The ceiling has now been reached, and Australian graziers, meatworkers and many others who are dependent on the meat industry probably will have a lean time in the next few months. Their loss of income and loss of wages will be significant.

In addition to the quota system that was instigated by the ranchers in the United States of America, almost impossibly high standards of hygiene have been imposed upon the Australian meat industry and extensive alterations have had to be made in certain export plants.

Mr. Sullivan interjected.

Mr. HANSON: I agree with the Minister for Lands that in many instances an uplifting of the standard of hygiene was very necessary. However, I point out to him that the standards of hygiene applicable to meat-packing plants in the U.S.A. are not nearly as high as the standards that they are asking for in this country.

Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt: Have you had a look at them yourself?

Mr. HANSON: No; but I have made it my business to converse, and converse quite freely, with many people who have been associated with the meat industry in America for many years and who have actually worked, and worked very assiduously, for several meat companies. Conditions have been applied to cattle dips, the packaging of meat, and the shipping of meat, and this has been a constant harassment to those engaged in the meat industry, as the hon. member for Mackenzie would know. As I said earlier, some of the demands that were made were very necessary; nevertheless, I maintain that they represent the long political arm of some interests within the United States of America. They have certainly reached the political forces in that country, because enactments of Congress have been brought down that are prejudicial to the Australian meat industry generally.

If we look at the wool industry we will find that America is our only customer of significant size that introduces a 25c a lb. levy on our wool. In the European Economic Community, the Common Market area, this duty does not apply. It applies on certain agricultural products, but it certainly does not apply to wool. No such duty applies in those European countries and there is no discrimination against the Australian wool industry.

I thought I should mention these matters because, although I believe it is wonderful to have friends, particularly in times of defence and when one's country faces dangerous and serious days, I also believe that, in trade matters, we are entitled to a fair crack of the whip. The balance of trade between the two countries weighs very highly in favour of the United States of America. American interests have open to them a very large door through which to intrude into many of our industries, and they have been very generously treated by successive Governments.

Americans are business people and they expect to bargain. They are trained along such lines right from the time of their early business life. They are good negotiators, and any Government entering into a commercial alliance with them or doing business with them should be alert to see that the rights and needs of our people are protected and realise that it is just as well to probe a little more deeply than I have tonight into some of the matters affecting primary production in this country.

I mentioned towards the end of my Address-in-Reply speech that any company that is given generous concessions within this State or nation has a moral obligation to see that once such concessions are granted they should in no way hinder, debar or prejudice the advancement of a company with a large Australian content, and principally a significant Queensland content. I was developing these points when unfortunately my speech was terminated because time had expired.

I was asked by a member of the Government just what I had in mind, and I was proceeding to explain this when, unfortunately, I had to sit down. I think hon. members will remember the Harbours Acts Amendment Bill, which was introduced in the early part of this year, when members on this side of the Chamber opposed several of the ideas put up and the principles contained in the Bill. One such principle appertained to wharf storage and facilities, the owning of lands adjacent to wharves, and the handing over of them to private operators. In my second-reading speech I mentioned that the thinking from which the Opposition sprang was not confined to a political party; it did not have its birth in any political philosophy. That is the considered opinion of people who for many years have been associated with ports and harbours throughout this country and in many other countries in the world. It is the considered opinion of the members of the Australian Harbour Authorities Conference, the great majority of whom would not be of a Labour political leaning and who maintain that it is the right of the particular authority to own and control wharf facilities, and so on, adjacent to its place of business and to shipping.

I had said that the Gladstone Harbour Board had to suffer the indignity of going along to the Thiess Peabody Mitsui company and, on behalf of Murphyores Pty. Ltd., asking its permission to make its wharf available for the loading of that company's products. It is worthy of note that Murphyores is a company with a very large Australian content and is engaged in commencing an enterprise in Central Queensland which could, in years to come, pass on far-reaching benefits to the people of Queensland.

Before I develop the point, I mention that over the coal-conveyor belt which has existed at Gladstone for 12 or 13 years the price has been a stationary one of 27c a ton, to which 5c a ton is added for harbour dues. Charges were levelled at the harbour board on many occasions that this rate was excessive, and all types of pressures were brought to bear on the board to reduce it. When the board made the application to Thiess Peabody Mitsui, which was granted this concession under the Harbour Acts Amendment Bill, it found that it was very harshly treated and it had to refuse the offer made by T.P.M. The harbour board approached T.P.M. with a proposal to use that organisation's conveyor system at Barney Point for the loading of mineral sands produced by Murphyores. T.P.M. proposed to the harbour board that Murphyores pay 89c a long ton for its ilmenite and 95c a long ton for its rutile and zircon. Hon. members can see how this figure compares with the 27c a ton that has been charged for coal on the board's conveyor belt at Auckland Point for many years. In each case an additional charge of 15c a ton was imposed for loading on Sundays and 7c a ton for loading on Saturdays, such charges being borne by the harbour board itself.

We can see that the proposal put forward by T.P.M. is not fair. I know that other conditions were probably laid down, but I maintain that T.P.M. has been generously treated (I know that the organisation has invested its money and engaged in this enterprise, and I have gone so far as to commend it in this Chamber for its courage) and certainly it has no right to prejudice the interests of a company with a large Australian and Queensland content. If it is given any concession by any authority or any Government—and this is applicable not only to it but also to other foreign companies that come into Australia and receive concessions—it should live up to its responsibilities and see that companies of Australian origin are in no way debarred from progressing and instituting industrial concerns of their own which could be very beneficial to the State.

I might add that, while these negotiations were taking place, it was reported in "The Australian Financial Review" of 7 May, 1968, that T.P.M. representatives had been in Japan and negotiated a new price for

Moura coal, and that their negotiations were so successful that they were given an increase of 18c (U.S.) a ton. For many years they were the recipients of very attractive loading rates and harbour dues. Only recently, as reported in "The Australian Financial Review" of 9 May, they were given a rise by the Japanese interests of 18c (U.S.) a ton, but at the same time they want to inflict very serious and crippling charges on a good Australian company. I do not agree with that sort of thing, and I want to acquaint the Treasurer with it. I sincerely hope that he does not endorse that action.

A Government Member: What is the name of this Australian company?

Mr. HANSON: Murphyores Pty. Ltd.

Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt: A good company.

Mr. HANSON: I think it will be a very good company, although at the present time it is having teething problems associated with its production. Nevertheless, I think it will be very successful, and I hope it is. I am sure that the hon. member for Mackenzie hopes that it is. He will if he is a good Queenslander and a good Australian, as I am sure he is.

Recently quite a lot has been said in this Chamber about Commonwealth-State relationships. I wholeheartedly subscribe to the wonderful speech made this afternoon by the hon. member for Baroona. I firmly believe that in the next decade there will be a breakdown in Federation if something of a concrete nature is not attempted in Commonwealth-State financial relations. It is worth noting that, as at early July this year—and it seems to be somewhat ridiculous when we analyse the position—the total debt of the Commonwealth was only \$236,000,000—exactly one-fortieth of the total public debt of all the Australian States. It is certainly less than the public debt of Queensland which, we are told in the Treasurer's Budget, increased during 1967-68 by \$65,993,653 to over \$1,777,655,597. That is certainly a sum of considerable magnitude.

The Treasurer has said in many earlier Budgets, particularly in his 1966 Budget, and maybe in the one for last year, that the States are being saddled with high-interest charges. The incidence of interest is a very significant point in any State Budget. On the other hand, the Commonwealth has paid for its capital works out of revenue and at the same time has forced the States onto the borrowing market more and more every year. The Federal Government is the holder of the purse and is forcing State taxation to unprecedented levels. We certainly reached a hysterical level here some years ago, and, by cold-blooded usury the Federal Government is now forcing the States to become real mendicants.

The early principles and ideals of Federation, formulated by the fathers of Federation, are certainly being tossed overboard under the present Federal set-up.

In the past 10 years there has been very little increase in taxation in the Commonwealth field. The Commonwealth, on the other hand, is prepared to let the States do the job of taxing. The old idea of Federalism has been grossly distorted when we find this state of affairs existing. I think it is right to say that all State Treasurers are conscious of this problem and that the States' share of revenue generated by a rising economy tends to flow at a rate less than the national growth rate, while the Commonwealth's share tends to rise significantly faster than the national growth rate. At the same time, basic needs, industrial or otherwise, in the States are reaching important levels. There is a public outcry and a public demand for an uplifting of standards and needs in the world today, and it is not without significance in this State. We have with us constant change in the public requirement.

The Federal authorities at times advance the view that specific-purpose grants are the answer. I maintain that they are far from being adequately satisfactory. One can see the intrusion of these specific-purpose grants, which have become very significant over the past three years. Under section 96 of the Commonwealth Constitution, the Federal Treasury, the Prime Minister, and others in charge of the Federal purse-strings, lay down the terms and conditions of these specific-purpose grants. In other words, as well as handing out the money they actually manipulate the terms, conditions and provisions under which these grants are made. The States merely act as agents assisting to implement Commonwealth policy and decisions and, in the main, they could sponsor Commonwealth activities. They may be very helpful in specialised fields, nevertheless they have their shortcomings and they can be responsible for complicating State Budgets, and at times can divert State funds from areas which State Governments may consider have a higher priority. They could also lead to a costly duplication of administrative processes.

The theory has been advanced that payroll and other taxes could be handed over to the States. Similar theories have been canvassed many times, and one has only to read the report of the Premiers' Conference held a few months ago to find how Mr. Reece, Premier of Tasmania, was answered by the Prime Minister when he quite definitely and bluntly rejected any intrusion by the States into this particular field. At the moment we have to hang on to what we have and what is best for us, and whilst it would be a little perilous to throw overboard the formula as it exists, I believe, along the line of Opposition thought, that the welding together of the taxation reimbursement formula to fixed proportions of total Commonwealth income tax collections is something that could be feasible. This of course would not be accepted by the Prime Minister.

Renegotiation of the 1965 formula comes up in 1970. I hope in the meantime that that serious problem is ironed out. The public generally do not really appreciate it. On the one hand, there are the demands—the excesses, possibly—of the people in this modern day and age, and the States, which supposedly have sovereign powers, find themselves constantly pleading, arguing and cat-scratching each year in their attempts to obtain increased Commonwealth allocations. Paramount in the minds of members of a responsible Opposition will be attempts to find a solution to the problem, which will benefit the State and this country.

By his many public statements before the opening of Parliament, the Treasurer was not very helpful to Queensland's cause. Many times before Parliament assembled he was reported as saying what a wonderful Budget would be brought down this year. He spoke of running into better times, but always he concealed the harsh imposts of 1966, which kicked the workers and primary producers in the guts and gave them really savage treatment. He proclaimed in the Press what a wonderful Budget it would be and how accumulated deficits would be wiped out. But what effect would that have on the Commonwealth Government? When he sat down at the conference table to negotiate with the Commonwealth Treasurer, what was the effect of his saying, "Everything is rosy, and this will be the best Budget ever to be presented from the floor of the Queensland Parliament"? This must place the Treasurer in a very fragile position, particularly when deficits can be wiped off almost in a flash. He certainly disadvantaged himself and the State in efforts to negotiate a better deal for Queensland. He speaks in this Chamber about what he is going to do and what he is not going to do, but again he speaks in demi-semi-quavers. At the conference he did not speak very much, nor did he advance much of an argument on why Queensland should get a better deal.

It is worth noting that the Treasurer proclaimed throughout the length and breadth of Queensland, per medium of the present occupiers of high offices in the newspaper world who are friendly to him, that, with industrialisation proceeding in this State at such an accelerated rate, Queensland was no longer dependent on primary industries. I hope the Country Party is listening to this. That statement was made on 11 June, 1968. A few days later he opened the Rockhampton Show, and there he spoke of the wonderful things that primary industry did for the State. He made a complete about-face within a matter of a few days.

Mr. Newton: He was crying up there.

Mr. HANSON: Yes. He was almost in tears when talking about the wonderful things that primary production had done for this State, and what it will do in the years

to come. Unfortunately some of us happened to have seen the remarks that he made a few days previously.

A short time after making those statements the Treasurer was on his way to the United States of America, and it was reported in the provincial Press that the Queensland Government was not satisfied with the results achieved at the Loan Council and had decided to fend for itself on the overseas money market. Great play was made in the Press of the fact that the Treasurer was going forth to the promised land to borrow huge sums of money for an industrial power complex. A few days later a report written by a political roundsman appeared in the Brisbane "Telegraph" stating that the Government's hopes were growing that a super power-station would be built in Central Queensland and that the Treasurer was being very successful in his early negotiations in the U.S.A.

What did we find on his return? He arrived almost empty-handed. There were three points mentioned: the Goonyella coal mine, which had been decided before he left; the calcination plant at Weipa, which had been on the drawing board for many months; and the agency that he brought back for White Trucks, which would mean that Thiess Holdings would be employing 100 men within the State.

(Time expired.)

Mr. CORY (Warwick) (9.6 p.m.): At the outset, I congratulate the Treasurer on the improvement and simplification he achieved in presenting this year's Budget. I realise that, since he has been Treasurer, he has put a lot of thought into the presentation of his Financial Statement, and his desire has been to make it as easy as possible for the ordinary citizen of Queensland to understand it. Improvements that he has made this year have facilitated the understanding of every subject discussed in the Budget.

I note with interest, too, the Treasurer's desire to receive any further suggestions for improvement that might be forthcoming. I appreciate that, because the Financial Statement is the most important document that the Government brings down during the year, the one that affects more people in the community than any other.

Mr. Newton: Are you satisfied with the answer you received this morning to the question you asked about rail freights?

Mr. CORY: I will get the answer tomorrow morning. I will tell the hon. member then whether or not I am satisfied.

I congratulate the Treasurer also on his approach to his portfolio. He believes in what he does and sticks to his beliefs through thick and thin, as he did when he was Minister for Transport. He never hides behind sham coverings, and when he brings forward a proposition he has the courage of

his convictions. Whether or not one agrees with what the Treasurer does or does not do, he is prepared to stand up for what he has done because he believes that he is right, and I think that is a very good trait in a Treasurer of a State. In discussions with him on any matter affecting his portfolio, we begin on a very firm and honourable basis, and I thank the Treasurer for adopting that attitude to his duties.

At this stage I wish to say a word of appreciation for the increased aid for non-State schools that was announced in the Budget. As hon. members know, that aid has been increased from \$15 to \$25 for each secondary student and from nothing to \$25 for each primary student.

Mr. Hanlon: That is only a small percentage of the cost of education in State schools.

Mr. CORY: I will deal with that in a moment. At first, I was very disappointed with the attitude of members of the Opposition to this increase. I quickly realised that it was only a completely socialist system of education which would be considered satisfactory by them, the type of education system which would debar private enterprise and have no consideration for individual thought in the field of education.

Mr. Bennett: What do you know about the attitude of the Opposition?

Mr. CORY: For a long time we have heard complaints about how this assistance was not given and now that it is given hon. members opposite are not satisfied. The cost of education to the State in the year 1966-67 was \$141.32 for each primary school child and \$223.93 for each secondary school child. Those figures do not include capital works or redemption on capital works. But they indicate the high cost of education and the large amount of money that non-State schools have had to spend from their own resources to educate the children under their control.

There are in Queensland over 86,000 students at non-State schools, and the saving which those non-State schools have made to the State because of the number they are educating is very important in State Government finances. We can all realise the chaotic condition that would exist if these 86,000 students had to go to State schools to be educated. As I say \$25 per student, both primary and secondary, is one of the greatest and most welcome forms of assistance that could possibly have been given in the over-all education of children in this State.

Mr. Bennett: Your figures make the Government's contribution look paltry.

Mr. CORY: It is a very important contribution and one the hon. member's Government would not have been prepared to

consider. It has given our non-State schools a much-needed boost to extend their enterprise and so continue to take a greater number of students. It will be a great boost to their morale and will enable them to obtain the equipment and facilities which our modern education demands.

I can mention later the things which the Treasurer is giving to the State schools, to improve their standards, and it is only fair and proper, considering the important role they play, that non-State schools should also be given some assistance to improve their position. Both systems must work side by side. Each system has a lot to offer, and, further, each system is of equal importance within our community.

Other education benefits such as an extra book allowance, money for modernisation of furniture and equipment, extra teachers, and the training of extra teachers within our schools, are all very important facets which the Government is prepared to tackle and improve, for the making of a better education system in Queensland.

I should also like to mention a rather small item but one that is appreciated in the one-teacher or two-teacher schools and particularly by the parents and citizens' associations. I refer to the Treasurer's gesture of paying phone rentals and phone calls. This is not a large item, but to a small school, with an enrolment of 10 or 15 students, it is a big saving, particularly to the parents and citizens' association, which previously had to meet it out of the limited finances available to it. This gesture by the Treasurer relative to the problems of schools and parents and citizens' associations indicates a genuine attempt to alleviate their difficulties.

I mention, too, the land-tax exemptions that he has provided in the Budget. The normal exemption rate has been increased from \$6,000 to \$7,000 and the rural rate from \$18,000 to \$21,000. These concessions are very welcome. The exemption rate does little more than cover increases in valuations owing to the inflationary trend within our monetary system, but I do believe that it is a little ahead of this trend, and I trust that as years go on it shall be kept ahead of the inflationary trend.

The concession granted of a minimum payable tax of \$6 instead of \$4 is also very welcome. The system is streamlined because there will be no necessity to fill in forms and accounts for very small sums of money that pass from landholders to the department. This, too, indicates the Treasurer's preparedness to look at all facets of our financial structure.

I mention also the concessions provided relative to death duties. The Treasurer indicated the expansion of a principle introduced by Sir Thomas Hiley of a concession for the surviving spouse and dependent children. This concession has been increased

from \$10,000 to \$15,000, and a reducing scale applies from \$15,000 to \$19,000. This is not a large amount, but it is the extension of a principle that was established by this Government, and it is very significant because it is the start of greater exemptions from death duties. I am sure that the exemptions will be increased as the State's finances permit.

Mr. Bennett: You will probably die; you are worried so much about probate duties.

Mr. CORY: I do not think I will die before the hon. member, and when I do it will be a very comfortable process.

While speaking of land taxes and death duties I will also refer to the Treasurer's comments last Friday when introducing the measures relating to these items. He said that he felt there was a need for a new farm-land valuation system. Ever since coming to this Chamber I have advocated a different system of arriving at land values.

Mr. O'Donnell: You haven't spoken often about them here because we do not hear from you very often.

Mr. CORY: When hon. members do hear from me I talk common sense. I do not ramble on for an hour, as some hon. members opposite do.

Mr. Newton: We have also asked for that.

Mr. CORY: Yes, but hon. members will not get it. If we ask for it in a sensible way we will get somewhere.

We firmly believe that we should have a different formula to assess the true value of rural lands because there are too many special reasons why an individual may pay more for a parcel of land than could be reasonably considered to be a fair and just price. Although under the present formula allowances could be made for excessive prices above and below the normal price, the same principle applies in that any sale price of land in a given area affects the value of all other land in that area. That does not take into account the land's natural physical state, or what can be earned from it, but only what someone, for some reason known only to himself, happens to pay for it. Such a system is prone to far too many inaccuracies to be considered in this day and age to be the right and proper way. I have reiterated these remarks because that is what I have thought for a long time. I welcome the Treasurer's comments. Apparently he, too, feels there are weaknesses in our present system.

Mr. O'Donnell: One of the biggest weaknesses is that the fellow who develops his country gets it in the neck.

Mr. CORY: The fellow who develops his country makes a few dollars, too, with a bit of luck.

I will not elaborate on the road transport permit system at this stage because I have previously done so. I will only say that I still have many reservations about the present permit system especially when it is impracticable to move the goods by rail. With that in mind, I will say that whilst we are stuck with our present system we do appreciate the reduction in permit fees for livestock from 2c to 1.5c per ton-mile and from 1.5c to 1c according to whether or not 50 per cent. of the distance is in competition with rail. They are very worthwhile and much appreciated reductions. However, as I said in my Address-in-Reply speech I had hoped for a wider application of the principle of reduction in some of our road permit fees.

I again refer to the 2c a ton-mile on the load capacity of the vehicle, for butter and cheese transported from the Darling Downs. I do so not because of the commodity, butter and cheese, but because of the fluctuation in production in this area owing to seasonal conditions and the inability to load trucks fully, when there is no doubt whatsoever of the weight carried. All these consignments are based on invoice weights ex-factory and no factory issues an invoice with a lesser weight than is in the box on the truck because the factories get paid on that basis and so do the producers. We would have liked a wider application of this principle which would have been of greater assistance.

As primary producers, more than anybody else, we must attack in every possible avenue in order to combat this cost-price squeeze. I remind the city dweller that the production of the primary industries of Queensland is worth \$861,000,000, or 59 per cent. of our gross production, compared with production by secondary industries worth \$592,000,000. This of itself may not seem particularly significant, but our primary commodities, not including minerals, represent in the vicinity of 80 per cent. of Queensland's exports. All of this is being done for a return on capital of between 3 and 8 per cent. The benefit of those exports to the State and to Australia is tremendous. Few industrial enterprises could operate without importing raw materials, specialised machinery or other valuable products.

With this in mind I must refer to some comments passed in this Chamber in the past few months on the fight for an increase in the amount of money to be spent on main roads works in the metropolitan area. Without rural areas and production there would be no metropolitan area. All-weather roads, and in most cases bitumen roads, have existed in the closely settled areas for 30, 40 and more years. But many people in the country still have not an all-weather or bitumen road. There is every justification for the Government continuing to spend larger and larger amounts in the inland areas so that each and every citizen has the same sort of amenities.

Mr. O'Donnell: The Liberal Party will totally disagree with you.

Mr. CORY: It probably will, but this is its story. The man in the inland, without the amenities of the city, is still producing an article of real value, and to a large extent an export commodity. We must never allocate moneys in this field on a population basis, but must take into account production and the distances involved. I only hope that the Government will, as time goes by, continue to increase this allocation so that the upgrading of our whole roads system can continue at a faster and faster rate. The Department of Main Roads has done a remarkable job in recent years in upgrading our whole highway system. But much more has to be done and I hope that we will have no problem in getting a reasonable allocation for these areas.

I shall now leave the matter of road transport and make a few comments about rail freights for all commodities. First of all, freight rates must also be associated with an improvement in services, in both time and efficiency, within the railway system. I think that that is being done. The announcement by the Treasurer of a 5 per cent. reduction in rail freights on hay, livestock, general merchandise, logs and sawn timber, fruit, wool, and cotton is commendable. I shall say no more about that as I am hoping to get a little more information on this subject in the very near future.

I should like to make a few comments on the grain freight situation as it affects my mid-inner area. I use that term because there is in the inner area an area that is closer, in which a different benefit applies. I shall therefore compare this with what I shall term my mid-inner area. The Grain Growers' Association presented a very good case for the reduction of grain freights, and one of its submissions was that the freight rate for grains other than wheat should be reduced to the wheat rate. That submission has been accepted. It does not perhaps mean as much as the figures may indicate, because of the number of grains other than wheat that are carried under contract rates. In the case of all grains that do not come under contract rates, there is a State-wide reduction in the vicinity of 15 per cent.

I should now like to make a comparison between the inner and mid-inner areas and the outside areas which, amalgamated, show a 15 per cent. State average. In that 15 per cent. are the mid-inner areas of Warwick and Dalby which received reductions of 8½ per cent. and 9½ per cent. respectively, whilst Toowoomba, which is the closest of all, received a reduction of 14½ per cent. I cannot see why there should be such fluctuations within the same producing belt. From Goondiwindi the reduction is 43 per cent. and from Roma it is 49 per cent., and I have no argument with that because it was done for specific reasons. One of the main

submissions of the Grain Growers' Association was that outer areas should be given a larger measure of assistance. The anomalies within the inner area are a little hard to understand. The submission of the Grain Growers' Association was for an over-all reduction of 20 per cent. in the freight rate for wheat. The Treasurer has told us that the reduction has been set at about 12½ per cent., which will infuse into the industry approximately \$1,000,000. This is a considerable amount of money, and it should be, and is, welcomed by the industry.

However, I see a good deal of justification for disappointment that that amount of money was not spread more widely over the whole industry, and I shall give the Committee my reasons for saying that. Firstly, the cost problem of growers in more distant areas arises from the cost of clearing and opening up their country. It is only in recent years that they have moved into large-scale agriculture, and each year clearing has to be done to increase the acreage. Secondly, there is a climatic problem, which is based mainly on fluctuating rainfall. That is a major problem and certainly does add to their costs, because it is not possible for them to grow a payable crop each year.

To their advantage, they are farming land that has been purchased at a grazing value and which is large enough to bring them a moderate living from a grazing enterprise. In some cases they have additional areas onto which they can expand. Very few properties in the West are using all the agricultural land at their disposal; they have room to expand an agricultural enterprise if they wish to do so. They have the advantage, also, that they have not yet had to use fertiliser.

On the other hand, growers in the mid-inner and inner areas are farming land that was purchased on a farm productivity price. Properties in the inner area have been purchased—this could go back 50 years or more—at a price that makes intensive farming and agriculture imperative if growers are to make a go of it. They are rated and valued at a farming price and the whole of their economics are based on that valuation of the land. There is also the problem that the area is completely committed. With mechanisation, there is a tendency for the economics of the industry to make larger enterprises necessary to ensure financial success, and the growers in inner areas do not know where to turn for additional land, other than to buy land on adjoining properties that they can use for expansion. In common with every grower in Australia, they have a climatic problem. I think one could add another problem that faces growers in inner areas—it can also affect growers in distant areas, but not nearly to the same extent—and that is damage by frost. The Darling Downs is more prone to frosts, in the main, than areas farther inland.

Mr. O'Donnell: You had better come up and look at the Central Highlands.

Mr. CORY: All areas can have frosts, but the danger is greater in the inner areas, and I put that down as another one of the problems. In addition, more than we are game to say, the need for fertiliser is becoming apparent in inner areas. In fact, most grain-growers on the Darling Downs now have to use fertiliser.

I mention also that the inside grain-grower, in the main, has no other source of income. He may vary his types of grain but he has no other source of income. I bring to notice both of these sides, to indicate that there are problems, and varying problems, according to location. It is not just one problem, and one remedy only will not overcome all the problems of the grain-growers in both areas.

It is no disgrace for growers in these inner areas to have to use fertiliser. Many of these properties have been farmed for 40 or 50 years and have been the backbone of the grain industry; they have been the launching pad, shall we say, for extension into other areas. At the same time, they have been the basis upon which the flour-milling and stock provender milling industries have been based. Both of these milling enterprises form a very important part of our economic structure.

We should be fair and give full recognition to the problems of these inner growers who are limited by the size of their properties and have a high cost factor of ownership, which does not as yet affect the more distant grower.

I will mention also an anomaly, as I see it, for the middle-distance grower regarding the ratio of grain to general merchandise. It is wheat now, but whether it is wheat or grain it is all the same rate, which, as I said before, is very commendable. Dealing with the ratio of grain rate to general merchandise, I notice here that Warwick and Dalby have a ratio of 73.5 per cent. and 70.5 per cent. respectively; Toowoomba has a lesser percentage of 68 per cent. The difference is not great but it is a principle that I cannot quite understand. Goondiwindi has 64 per cent., and I think perhaps that that can be explained. I will try to do so in a moment. Roma has a ratio of 44 per cent. This is understandable on the ground of the distance to Roma, without any other special freight rates. The distance from Goondiwindi, is not as great as from Roma, but is close to it. However, it is on the border and concession rates have been given in that area to try to overcome border-hopping and so on.

However, what I am pointing out is that it is the mid-inner area which is having to pay these freights based completely on mileage, and, once past that area, the freight is no greater. With general merchandise, the

ratio is based on the special rates close to the New South Wales border, but why not keep grain freights also in perspective, because grain is going over the border. Wheat is going over the border, as are other grains, so why not keep the freight rates for grain and general merchandise in perspective?

If it is good enough to give general merchandise these concessions to cope with individual problems, it is good enough to give the grain industry the same concessions.

Mr. O'Donnell: Don't you think section 92 is the most stupid thing that exists in Australia?

Mr. CORY: I do. Because of the transport monopoly which the Railway Department has with the Board grains, I think it is only reasonable to hope that in the future it can look at this anomaly and try to bring rates for grain and general merchandise, or any other type of commodity, into perspective, one with the other, according to the location of an area. Admittedly rail cartage of large quantities of wheat and grain is by far the best means of transport, but the challenge of movement of these products over the border needs to be met if the industry is to stay in business in the areas close to the border. The last thing that the industry wants is to be divided on these industry-wide problems. The problems of the growers in the West differ from those of the growers near the coast, but let us not have a divided industry; let us keep it united so that it can continue to put forward suggestions to aid the industry as a whole. Perhaps an economic survey could be made of activities and financial problems associated with those near-border areas. Although the mileages travelled have not been the only problem to those areas, other important cost factors arise but have not been considered.

As a primary producer, I should now like to sound a note of apprehension on the suggestion of creating a lion park near Beenleigh. I do not say that I am completely against the project, but many factors need to be taken into consideration. One is quarantine. I should like the matter to be looked at very closely because I am somewhat concerned about the project. I say this because very many of the major pests to the State's primary industries have been introduced from other countries. I mention particularly the fox. It was brought here as an animal of pleasure, and no-one thought that the fox would make this country its natural home and cause thousands of dollars worth of damage to our sheep industry. The rabbit is another animal that was introduced for purposes of pleasure and food, and it, too, has caused many millions of dollars worth of damage to primary industries in Australia. I do not think that we should lightly accept the introduction of some other form of animal life only for pleasure. I am not going to comment on the danger to the public if lions happen to get out of

the reserve, but if they do get out into the ranges they would settle down there, and we would be chasing them for a long time. That is not the most important point. The most important point is that animals that are not natural in Australia's environment may be hosts to diseases or parasites that could affect the nation's commercial animals.

Cane toads were introduced to combat the cane beetles, and they have created serious problems for the cattle industry. They may not be as bad as those created by the rabbit or the fox but the problems they create by polluting watering facilities and bores and by spreading botulism in cattle are quite serious, and, for the individuals affected, are very serious indeed. The introduction of the cane toad was undertaken obviously without a full knowledge of what it could do and how it could spread. Its usefulness in the canefields today is very limited but it has been, and still is, a big problem in the cattle industry.

Deer in our range country are a source of worry to landholders and they will be a greater source of worry as time goes by.

Mr. O'Donnell: So will the wild pigs.

Mr. CORY: The wild pigs will be a problem too.

It is impossible to control the cattle tick while large numbers of deer roam our range country, and it costs the cattle industry many millions of dollars each year.

I mention these matters purely to highlight the fact that we should be most careful about introducing animal or plant life from overseas. It is easy to run through a list of plant species that have been introduced and have cost our primary industries many millions of dollars. Some of the major introduced pests are: prickly pear, tiger pear, *Harrisia cactus* (which, I guess, is one of those); all the burr families (including noogoora burr, Bathurst burr and galvanised burr); saffron thistle, Mexican poppy and mint weed. All these introduced plants are a great problem to us because they have no natural enemies in our environs. In this instance I repeat that we must be very careful about introducing lions. I oppose their introduction because I do not think all these matters have been looked at as closely as they should have been.

I imagine that it is the responsibility of our Department of Primary Industries to sanction their introduction, in collaboration with the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry, which obviously handles quarantine. Once lions are established here they will be found to be hosts to something detrimental to our domestic and commercial animals. The danger will be upon us before we know it. These lions will not be caged so that they can be regularly sprayed and treated. They will have a certain amount of freedom and will not be under a keeper's eye daily and, even if they are, they will not

be in places where they can be easily treated as in a circus or zoo. We must be very careful about this and I ask the Minister for Primary Industries to investigate this matter very carefully. If there is any doubt whatsoever relating to problems that could arise I suggest that he should not let them be introduced to Queensland.

Mr. R. JONES (Cairns) (9.54 p.m.): This Budget, the Treasurer's third successive, and final, presentation, in the apparent trend, just had to have a caption in coloured "chalk". It was titled "Queensland's march to progress". That was a little corny, perhaps, but it had to be called something. Then the P.R.O. men did their job, the icing was put onto the cake, and the ultimate self-satisfaction was achieved. There appears to have settled over the Country Party, judging by the speeches that have been made tonight, an aura of complacency that this Budget will "do it". It contains a reduction in rail freights, but blithely forgets, of course, that in the 1966-67 Budget, the one immediately following the 1966 election, rail freights were increased.

The State taxpayers know that the custodians of their money are perpetuating violent fluctuations, and I suggest to those on the Government side who have this feeling pervading their thinking that their instinctive permissiveness will be their downfall. If they really believe that the function of this Budget is to protect them, as politicians, from the voting public of Queensland and that the Premier will protect them from the naughty students, their premise is false. It is quite easy to make a salesman into a Treasurer and Acting Premier, but the reconversion will be most difficult for the Country Party. It might be able to do it in name only, but it should heed the warning that repercussions will follow.

Mr. E. G. W. Wood interjected.

Mr. R. JONES: The hon. member won't worry? I think that we will come to the rescue next year to assist the Government out of its predicament, anyway. I feel that we might bowl the Government right out next year, so that half of its problems will be solved that way.

This practice of naming Budgets is blase. The Government has purposely conserved funds to spend in the financial year before a general election. This is evidenced by statements by members of the Government and the Cabinet—they can readily be turned up—that insufficient funds were available during the interim period for education and other purposes. Members on the Government side should be ashamed. This Budget is a damning indictment of the Government, and, in a pre-election year the Government should be more honest about it.

If the Budget has to have a name, I think it should be called the "running for cover Budget", because that is what it is. I feel

that that is a very well-worded epitaph. The focal point of the whole presentation is an unadorned attempt at an indivisible and infantile pronouncement that here we have the guilt of the guilty. Surely Government members are not so naive that they believe that the voting public will take this Budget, even though it is gilt and delivered with guile, except for what it is. It is one glorious brocade of brushed-up electioneering bait. It simulates the heroine in Greek mythology named Atalanta. Hon. members may recall the tale. She was exposed by her father and suckled by a she-bear. Hon. members can draw their own analogies and inferences as to who her father was and who was the she-bear. The myth goes on that she was a great huntress and slew the Centaurs who pursued her. Her father urged her to marry. She agreed on one condition, namely, that each suitor must contend with her in a foot race—it is rather like politics—death being the penalty for defeat, and her hand the prize.

Here we come to the intrigue. Any hon. member who is a romantic can conjure up all sorts of nominal bookmakers, clerks of the course, and "spivs" to fit the scene. The hero, Meilanion, or Hippomenes, depending on which legend is read, was returned from the wars and was a suitor and competitor. He was a childhood sweetheart and he had a leg wound. He was a pretty long-priced "shot", actually. He was not too bad as a galloper, but he had this disability, probably non-compensable, and it probably was not a war-caused injury, so no repatriation was payable. But he was the hero, nevertheless. Out came the golden apples. Eventually he won the race by throwing the golden apples at the feet of Atalanta.

I am quite sure that hon. members have brushed up on their Greek mythology and know all about this. Of course, Atalanta stopped to pick up the apples, there was a photo finish, and she was pipped at the post. Some say she wanted to win, and some say she wanted her childhood sweetheart to win.

Hon. members can draw their own analogies. My point is quite obvious, anyway. Take into consideration all the fellows she slew previously who did not have golden apples to throw around. How conclusions are drawn from this little epic is indecisive if the game is taken to its ultimate. In the analogy they displeased the mythical Greek gods and were all turned to stone. I am sure that the Treasurer will be able to find a sensitive interpretation of my little analogy, even if hon. members on my left, who seem to be making little grumbling noises, are a bit confused at my interpretation. I am sure that the people of Queensland will be able to assess the paradox and will not be taken in by any gift apples rolled before them in the track and field events of real life.

In the race to identify a logical economy, the people will pursue a course for a Government interested in them and the community as a whole, not the narrow interests of individual profit-makers. They will demand a Government that will act in the interests of men in general and not particular cases interposed for greed and profit. They will demand a Government that will not tax their wage packets and then tax them by every other means, and then have the temerity to come out before an election as "wonder boys" with this Budget with its meagre entitlements, lamentably and poorly designed.

Let us analyse some of the taxation figures over a period of years. The Queensland Year Book for 1966, at page 496, shows taxation from all funds by the State Government of Queensland for quite a long period. Let us go back to the period of the first Labour Government in its own right, which was 1915-16. Taxation from all funds and associated receipts was then \$2,922,000. In 1928-29, when that Government went out of office, the total was \$10,350,000. In 1931-32, when the Moore Tory Government went out of office, the figure was \$9,524,000. I shall now deal with cycles of 10 years going back from 1967-68. Taxation in 1947-48 amounted to \$24,102,000. In 1956-57 it was \$80,066,000.

Mr. Newbery: Tell us about the sugar industry.

Mr. R. JONES: We all know the attitude of the hon. member to the sugar industry; all that worries him about it is how the result of the international sugar conference is going to affect his chances at the next election. I shall deal with that later. I ask the hon. member not to interrupt me now, because I have important things to say about the Budget.

In 1956-57 taxation by the Labour Government of the day amounted to \$80,066,000. In 1957-58 the figure was \$86,580,000, and in 1964-65, which is the latest year for which detailed figures are recorded in the Year Book, it was \$165,990,000. The amount of State taxation per head of population was \$102.03. In 1947-48 total collections amounted to \$24,102,000, and the amount per head was \$21.57.

Mr. Lickiss: Do you think that means anything?

Mr. R. JONES: My word it means something. The total taxation collected in Queensland in 1957-58 was \$86,580,000, or \$61.70 per head. If one looks at the comparison in the tables, one sees the amount of taxation per head rising gradually with the total State taxation over the years. In 1965-66 the total was \$181,660,000, or \$110.2 per head; in 1966-67 the total was \$204,702,000, or \$121.26 per head. The total in 1967-68 was \$248,496,789. The mean population figures are not available

to me; but if one divides the mean population into that total, one gets the figure per head for the last Budget.

Analysing the figures a little further and going to those for 1964-65, one finds—

Taxation Collected in Queensland		
Tax	Total Amount	Amount per Head
	\$	\$
Income	101,111,000	63.34
Probate, Succession and Estate ..	9,863,000	6.18
Motor Vehicle Operators' Fees	809,000	0.51
Lottery	737,000	0.46
Racing	2,990,000	1.87
Other Stamp Duty	12,546,000	7.86
Liquor	3,568,000	2.24

Making a further comparison of a 10-year period, one finds that in 1957-58 the figures were—

Tax	Total Amount	Amount per Head
	\$	\$
Income	51,842,000	36.93
Probate, Succession and Estate ..	6,276,000	4.48
Lottery	674,000	0.49
Other Stamp Duty	6,590,000	4.70
Liquor	1,830,000	1.30
Betting	656,000	0.48
Motor Vehicle Registration ..	9,596,000	6.84
Land	2,936,000	2.09

The figures for 1947-48 show the rise that took place in that 10-year period—

Tax	Total Amount	Amount per Head
	\$	\$
Income	14,852,250	13.35
Land	744,766	0.67
Probate, Succession and Estate ..	2,144,772	1.92
Lottery	336,000	0.30
Other Stamp Duty	2,175,376	1.96
Liquor	368,748	0.33
Betting	316,098	0.28
Motor Vehicle Registration ..	1,922,982	1.72

All the figures that I have tabulated are not included for addition purposes, but if one makes a comparison one can see the amount of State tax per head which has been incurred over the period that this Government has been in office.

In this Budget, land tax is placed at something like \$4,742,546; succession and probate duties for 1966-67 were \$11,322,236, and, in 1967-68, \$15,999,135, an increase

in the last 12 months of \$4,671,899. The Golden Casket in 1967-68 had a surplus, the highest ever achieved, of \$3,211,041. Fees collected from licensed victuallers—this is very important—in 1966-67 were \$4,549,236 and, in 1967-68, \$4,847,639. Racing, in 1966-67, \$4,090,270, and, in 1967-68, \$5,170,537; T.A.B. tax paid by the board in 1967-68 amounted to \$2,366,360, and in 1966-67 it was \$1,636,089, an increase of \$730,271.

Mr. Hodges: What was it in 1947-48?

Mr. R. JONES: Nil. If the Minister had been listening he would have heard me read certain figures earlier in my speech. If he cannot understand them, I suggest that he read a copy of my speech tomorrow and everything will be quite clear to him. He will see that, over a long period, his Government has increased taxation on the individual citizen of Queensland, and particularly fiercely in the last 10 years. These figures will show exactly who is paying this tax and how much per head is being paid.

Of course, to go a little further with figures and point out who does pay the taxation, let me quote some figures relative to the earning power of the people. Of course, these are Federal figures on income tax, but they give an idea of the people who are required to pay taxes and who are capable of paying them.

The latest year for which income tax statistics are available is the 1964-65 income year. In that year a tabulation was made of salary and wage-earners according to the total salary or wages received, and I shall quote the size of the salary or wages received and the number of taxpayers. I think this is very pertinent. I propose to show the number of taxpayers and the income brackets within which they fall. They are—

Income Bracket Per Head	Number of Taxpayers
Under \$2,000	1,695,740
\$2,000 to \$2,499	633,610
\$2,500 to \$2,999	577,058
\$3,000 to \$3,499	396,363
\$3,500 to \$3,999	234,281
\$4,000 to \$4,999	203,317

The figures then become very revealing.

The bracket from \$5,000 to \$5,999 comprised 75,748 wage-earners. In the bracket over \$6,000, in which hon. members opposite are included, there were only 74,152. The majority of people in Australia earn below \$3,000 per annum. Indeed, nearly half of them earn less than \$2,000 per annum. These figures are very enlightening when the tax slug that is imposed by this Government in State taxation is considered.

Mr. Porter: What statistics are you quoting from?

Mr. R. JONES: This is from a Federal "Hansard", and the figures are taxation figures.

A Government Member: Who quoted the figures?

Mr. R. JONES: It was one of the hon. member's colleagues in the Federal sphere, Senator Henty. Mr. McMahon provided Senator Henty with the answer, so I think that the figures will be reliable. They can be found in Question 413, of 8 November, 1967.

My point is that this Budget is not in the interests of the majority of the people of Queensland. Little progress has been made by the Government, and I charge the Government for its failure to overcome the obstacles to progress. There is nothing in the Budget to command the attention of the electors, and there is nothing in it that will solve the problems that confront the State at the present time.

In the matters of metropolis v. country, foreign investment in the State of Queensland, the hazards of geography of this State on a national basis, the diversification of population and industry, the programme for educational reform in technology and school personnel, and agricultural forward planning, the Budget lacks vitality and attentiveness, and it presents no answer to the problems relative to transport communications designed to cater for the decentralisation of the State. In the cities, slums will evolve by the year 2000 if the influx of people from the country to the city continues. The Government has trained country people to come to the city and has catered for them here in the last 10 years.

We hear members of the Country Party saying that standards of living never have been better. Let them try to convince the sugar farmer, the dairy farmer, the tobacco farmer, the banana grower, the pineapple grower, the wool grower and the wheat grower, and let them try to convince the age pensioners and repatriation pensioners, that they are enjoying standards of living that today are higher than they have ever been previously. Real incomes today are low, particularly farm incomes, and I believe that members of the Country Party, who profess to represent the farmers, should take stock of themselves and persuade their party to pay more attention to a better allocation of money to country areas instead of being led by the nose by the Liberal Party.

If the changing economic pattern and the main Asian Markets are to be recognised, it is fundamental to recognise that Cairns and Far North Queensland is 1,000 miles closer to those markets than Brisbane is. An appreciation of the industrial potential of the Far North relative to the manufacture of some products, which I mentioned in the Address-in-Reply debate, highlights the vast potential of a fishing industry, which would give Far North Queensland an added advantage. This industry is of vital importance because of the vast food potential that is available in it, and so also are other underdeveloped natural resources in that fertile

and tropical region of the State near Cairns, its hinterland, and beyond. The area between the south-east coast and a line drawn in an inverted arc from Maryborough in Queensland and swinging down to Whyalla in South Australia contains 90 per cent. of the population of the Commonwealth of Australia, which is approximately 11,500,000 at this time. Sydney has a population of 2,540,000 within a radius of 25 miles of the Sydney G.P.O. In that area live 22 per cent., or nearly a quarter, of the people living in Australia.

Taking Cairns again as the central point and drawing a circle to encompass this large metropolis in the South, including Brisbane and other large cities which are taking away the country people of Queensland for educational and technical purposes, it will be found that in this circle—taking Sydney at one end and Cairns in the centre—the northern area embodies such places as West Irian, Papua-New Guinea and the Solomons. Here is a complex of highly populated areas. If we draw another arc, with Cairns as the centre, passing through Tokyo, it encompasses 400,000,000 people, who are geographically closer to us than is generally realised.

We in North Queensland cast our eyes to northern markets. This Government and the national Government have failed to encourage industries to cater for those markets. It cannot be denied that the problem of decentralisation is reflected in the declining populations or the dormant growth-rates reflected in statistics of the 1966 census. The population of Australia, at 11,121,525, includes only 419,239 people north of the Tropic of Capricorn. Those are startling figures, particularly taking into consideration that Townsville had such a great impetus in population between 1961 and the 1966 census.

Mr. Porter: That is part of a world-wide phenomenon; surely you cannot blame the State Government for that.

Mr. R. JONES: If it is a world-wide phenomenon, the State Government should be facing up to it.

I will return to the statistics. The population of Townsville increased in the period I mentioned by 14.89 per cent. The type of development in Townsville has encouraged an increase in population. A university centre has been established and an Army barracks has been set up. Even though Townsville has a copper refinery, it is mainly a service industry town. On the other hand, in the same period the population of Cairns increased from 25,204 to 26,555, an increase of 1,351, or 5.36 per cent. Townsville has a new university and Army camp, while in the same period Cairns suffered depletions in railway staff because of the closure of railway lines and workshops, railway dieselisation and the implementation of bulk-handling facilities on the wharves.

There is a grave silence on the other side, because this Government was instrumental in the closure of the workshops and railway lines. Statisticians say that the loss of basic employees in industry affects two or three times the number in service industries, as statistics show that approximately $2\frac{1}{2}$ people depend on each pay packet. Therefore, the loss of these basic employees from such towns would have a dire effect on their economy because of the percentage depletions.

Mr. Hodges: You have had an increase.

Mr. R. JONES: I am pleased that the Minister recognises that we have had an increase, but what has the Government done to encourage the increase? We in North Queensland have done it on our own. We have had no assistance from the Government. The Government has annihilated us in respect of assisting industry. Can the Minister point to one industry north of Townsville, or even north of the Tropic of Capricorn, that the Government has assisted?

The Government has failed to provide an alternative. The City of Cairns faltered during those years, partly due to Government decision. I accuse this Government of allowing these evils to appear. It developed a social problem, associated with a drift to the city during these years. This does not apply to Cairns alone. It is happening all over the State. No work is available for country children and they leave for the metropolitan area at the age of 16 or 17 years to obtain employment. Apart from being exposed to the evils of the city—I refer not only to Brisbane; it applies also to cities further south—they lack parental control and supervision and are forced to board. This accentuates the breaking-up of families. Finally their families follow them to the city. This Government must find the solution and bring industry to North Queensland, where there is plenty of potential—I have pointed this out ever since I came here—and the most pertinent industry is fishing.

Mr. Hodges: How long has that potential been there?

Mr. R. JONES: The potential has been there for a considerable number of years, but it is only in the past few years, since the advent of this Government, that there has been a regression. The development pattern has not shown up as much as it should have. This is the result of Government action. In the old days, country people stayed in the country.

Mr. Thackeray: How many were sacked in the railways?

Mr. R. JONES: I think it was 123 or 127 out of about 207. This was just one aspect of it. No thought was given to decentralisation. This all goes back to the Government's policy of not electrifying the Brisbane suburban railways. Had this come about, the

Government would have farmed the conventional wagons to the workshops in Cairns and other places, and we would have been able to see a gradual process rather than there being one fell swoop.

This problem of imbalance in our development leads to an international problem. If we do not get a better distribution of population over our land mass, particularly North Queensland, before many years have passed it will be said that Australians are not developing Australia as it should be developed and, with a demand on space and food in this world of ours, possibly somebody will try to intervene or lay claim to our great lands in North Queensland. There have been many frustrated attempt at the establishment or advocacy of a separate State in North Queensland. Such attempts can be understood when these things take place.

Let us draw a comparison with what is happening in a developing country town. The greatest developing country town in Australia is Canberra. It could not be farther out in the country. It was developed from nothing. It just grew. Why has it developed at such a fast rate? It is because the level of the standard is comparable with that existing in our capital cities. Canberra has universities, schools, libraries and art galleries as good as or better than any in the Commonwealth. It has recreational and sporting facilities galore. It has adequate, high-standard housing. If it did not have these amenities, public servants would not move there from Sydney and Melbourne. They want conditions as good as, or better than, those to which they have been accustomed.

Queensland must learn the lesson that Canberra has been able to get its population because standards there are as high as those applying in the areas from which public servants came. A person goes to Canberra because he knows that his wife and family will be adequately housed; that they will have good recreational facilities; and that their living conditions will be attractive and of as high a standard as is possible. Education and cultural facilities will be commensurate with their needs, and first-class medical treatment is at hand.

These are the fundamental things that are necessary, and without them development and the retention of population cannot be obtained. People will be prevented from leaving decentralised areas only when job opportunities, chances of advancement, and amenities are equal to those found in the larger cities. There should be adequate amenities, travel concessions and higher wages in isolated areas, and tip-top facilities for leisure. These are things in which there has to be government participation for northern development, or efforts to bring this about will fail. It will be impossible to hold people in the country and even in provincial cities unless the State Government plays its part to the full by the provision

of housing, education facilities, and the other things that I have outlined for which the State Government is responsible.

The Government has to realise that it is possible to post letters in Cairns for Brisbane, Bungalow, Boulia or Broome, and in each case, irrespective of distance, the cost is only 5c. This lesson must be learnt in the assessment of freight rates, and anomalies must be overcome in the interests of balanced development and decentralisation.

It is also necessary to look at the field of taxation, and the influence of the State has to be felt in the portals at Canberra. Such things as zone income tax and an extension of a system to encourage industry from the centres of high population should be looked at in conjunction with telephone charges, which place a penalty on distance from capital cities. Even the Governor stated in his Opening Speech that morally our tenure of this country will become indefensible unless we can show before many more years have passed that we have undertaken great works of development and settlement. I therefore have the support of the Governor in what I am saying, and I wholeheartedly concur with his sentiments. He added later that we are conserving and developing a great national asset in a way which will ensure that Queensland will actually become in the foreseeable future a home for a much greater population.

My advocacy is for this movement of population not to be to metropolitan but to provincial and country centres. If the record of the Government over the last 10 years is any criterion, I share the view that this has not been happening, and will not happen, under the direction of the Country-Liberal Government.

The Governor also referred to the failure to obtain a satisfactory international sugar agreement, and drew attention to the fact that the economy of the major part of our developed coastal land is based on this great and efficient industry. I might point out that the Australian Sugar Journal discloses that the population in the State's sugar towns between 1961 and the time of the 1966 census increased from 135,790 to 148,339. That was during a period in which statistics show that the population of Queensland increased by 114,857. In 1961 the population was 1,518,828, and at the time of the 1966 census it was 1,633,685.

We all know that the Premier is at present in Geneva attending the International Sugar Conference, which finishes tonight. I shall not comment very much on the sugar talks; I shall await the Premier's return and see what developments have taken place.

Before the Premier left, I tried to get a statement from him in this Chamber. I read

an editorial in "The Courier-Mail" recently that could easily have been referring to me, but it was not. It read—

"A back-bencher has every right and reason to be indignant at the 'brush-off' he received in Parliament this week.

"He asked . . . a perfectly valid question and, in fact, a very valuable one The points he raised were ones on which the public would have liked answers, too.

"But no. The Minister seemed to feel either that dealing with the query was below his dignity or above his knowledge.

"Come now, Mr. Minister, how about facing up to your responsibilities and giving fair answers to fair questions?"

These are not my words; they appeared in an editorial in "The Courier-Mail". It concluded—

"After all, Parliament is the final and most important place for citizens to be told the facts."

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: What it means is that the member for Mt. Coot-tha is doing a good job.

Mr. R. JONES: The hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha was the member referred to in the editorial, but some time previously I asked a question and was tipped out of Parliament simply because I had the temerity to ask it.

An Honourable Member: It was a strategic withdrawal.

Mr. R. JONES: Rubbish! It was not a strategic withdrawal. I was dumped out on my head simply because I demanded the right to be heard, and I think that I had every right to be heard.

The question was submitted with 24 hours' notice on Wednesday, 25 September, 1968.

All I asked was—

"In view of the tremendous importance of the International Sugar Conference reconvened in Geneva on 23rd September, what effect will the following have on Australia's representation:—

(a) the reported refusal of the United States of America to send delegates?"— incidentally, the question was directed to the Premier on Wednesday, the last day of the sitting was Thursday, the day on which the Budget was brought down, and the Premier was leaving for Geneva on Saturday—

"(b) recent Press reports anticipating a reduction in mill peaks for the 1969-70 season?"—

that was something in which I am sure every cane-farmer in the State was dramatically interested—

"(c) the announcement of Dr. Prebisch"—

he was the Secretary of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development—

"concerning reductions by up to 28 per cent. in the production of free market sugar?"

I then prefaced the second portion of the question by saying—

"On the eve of his departure for Geneva next Saturday, is he able to allay the fears apparent, in one of Queensland's major primary industries, regarding these statements, and grant assurance for the preservation of the State's future sugar production at a level not below the aggregate of the present mill peaks?"

Mr. Bromley: And all you got was the old song "Bye, Bye, Blackbird".

Mr. R. JONES: It was "Bye, Bye, Blackbird" all right.

I submitted that question, as I said earlier, with 24 hours' notice, and I cannot see that any parts of it were offensive. I believe that I was seeking information, not an expression of opinion. If any parts of the question were offensive, they could have been struck out at the table in accordance with the procedures of Parliament. I do not think that the question should have been treated as trivial. It was very important, particularly to people in my electorate.

Mr. Hanlon: It is a question that one would think the Country Party would be asking.

Mr. R. JONES: It is a wonder that a Country Party member did not put up a "Dorothy Dixer" to the Premier. After all, I think that Parliament was entitled to know before the Premier went overseas what he expected would happen at the conference. The sugar industry is so important that the Government saw fit, and was quite willing, to adjourn Parliament for a fortnight to allow the Premier of the State to attend the conference. I agree that it was important enough for him to attend. This Assembly was prepared to send the Premier to Geneva at public expense, and I agree that this is right. Yet my question was disallowed. I was merely asking for information about the effect that certain things would have on Australia's representations.

I believe it was a rather weird sort of ruling that was given. It was a matter of utmost importance to one of Queensland's major rural industries. Cairns is the heart of the sugar area, and I am seriously disturbed about how questions are being treated. I am disturbed, too, that it was done to protect the Country Party Premier. He was given a golden opportunity to record in "Hansard" a lengthy reply, in detail, to my question. He could have told us all about his mission; he could have grasped the opportunity and told us exactly what was going on or, if he wanted to dodge the question, he could have been given the opportunity to dodge it. He could have tersely replied to me, if he wanted to do so, and said that he would make a full and detailed statement on his return. But no; I was ruled out of order. I will give the Premier the benefit of the doubt; he did not get the opportunity to reply. He could have answered the question without notice—He

had 24 hours' notice anyway. What riles me is that the question was answered in the "Cairns Post". I have here cuttings headed, "Crop limited to mill peaks," and "Sugar talks are resumed."

Anyone who wants the answers to the questions—and I want them recorded in "Hansard"—can go back to the question and work out the answers.

On the reported refusal of the United States of America to send delegates, the Premier is reported as follows—

"Commenting on the probable outcome of the Geneva talks, he said the climate appeared right for the negotiation of a satisfactory agreement despite the non-participation of the United States."

On my next question about recent Press reports anticipating a reduction of mill peaks for the 1969-70 season, it says—

"It appeared certain that acquisition from the 1969 season sugar crop would have to be limited to mill peaks. One of the major tasks at Geneva would be to ensure a free market quota for Australia which would not necessitate any restriction of production below mill peaks and that a new agreement was certain stock-holding provisions. The Sugar Board felt confident of peak acquisitions."

After being rejected in this Parliament, the question was answered in the Press.

Mr. Hodges: Did the Premier refuse to answer the question?

Mr. R. JONES: I have already given the Premier credit for not having the opportunity to do so. I said that he answered it in the Press after my question was ruled out of order. All I am saying is that I was denied the right to ask the question, and I felt that he was being protected when he obviously did not need to be protected. The only difference is that he took 48 hours to answer it. The report is dated Brisbane, Friday. I asked the question on Wednesday, the 25th, so it must have been 48 hours later that he answered it.

Mr. Hodges: Did you put your question in the Business Paper?

Mr. R. JONES: I had it on the Business Paper for 24 hours. It was ruled out of order, and I then was thrown out because I had the temerity to object.

Reverting to the Budget, I should like to make a short comment on the speech of the hon. member for Chatsworth. I think he was very gracious to recognise the decision of the A.L.P. conference, and that the decision in no small way was responsible for removing from the political arena the subject of financial aid to non-State schools. He was very gracious in granting the A.L.P. that recognition and removing a barrier to allow its introduction to the Government. This shows that, even though the A.L.P. is in

Opposition, once these decisions are made Governments become a little braver in the introduction of these matters.

Dr. Delamothe: It's a wonder you did not do it in the 40 years you were in power.

Mr. R. JONES: Actually, I was not in power for 40 years. If the Minister wants to debate the question I can tell him why it was not brought in in the last 10 years.

Dr. Delamothe: You tell us why it was not brought in in those 40 years.

Mr. R. JONES: I was not a member of the Australian Labour Party for that period of time, but I should say that my party believes in free education and the provision of the greatest facilities possible to enable children to receive the best education that is available. If the Minister wants my personal opinion, I would tell him that I am a strong believer in religious education for children. I will continue to support our system of Catholic and other denominational schools. The Government took a long time to bring it about.

Dr. Delamothe: We still have 30 years up our sleeve.

Mr. R. JONES: And the Government was not game to bring it in between 1957 and 1967. It was not game to bring it in until such time as the Australian Labour Party passed its resolution at its conference. This was admitted by the hon. member for Chatsworth, and he at least has the honesty to say this.

Dr. Delamothe: This is brought up every year.

Mr. R. JONES: It might have been brought up every year, but I feel that recent additions to the Cabinet exerted the necessary influences. However, I shall not comment on the matter any further, but if the Minister wants to debate it I am prepared to do so.

I wish to comment on some other matters that have been raised during this debate, and I am open to comment on them. I refer particularly to the remarks of the hon. members for Ithaca and Chatsworth on the right of students to distribute literature and to demonstrate. The real danger in this particular matter is repression. I should say that the Government would be wise to let the young people of this State dissent, debate, demonstrate and distribute pamphlets. Its ideal should be to give those people an open and receptive mind, and to allow them to criticise, argue and enquire. After all, do we not seek to obtain a critical attitude from them? Is not that what we are training them for and educating them to do? I do not think that we should try to force them by authority to deception, disregard, dishonesty, and distaste. We should encourage them to analyse, and enlightenment can come only by their own dissection,

logically sifting the issues of a social and a political nature. Until such time as we allow them to debate freely they will be antagonistic towards us. If we are going to hold them down they will be "crooked" on us. If they are to find a place with us in society we should give them their own opportunity of doing so.

All Governments, including this Government, will need to learn that the winds of change are blowing, and that traditional legacies that were imbued by Labour are coming alive, and a new spirit is emerging. Young hearts with classic ideas are becoming an active force, and the future is plainly seen on the faces of young people. New well-educated, young men of considerable talent are coming into society, and they are reaching out in the cause of progress. If we do not span this generation gap we will be in trouble. It is the bridge to our State's future, and indeed, to our nation's future.

We know that some of their ideals and ideas are impracticable and that some of their views are "way out", but we cannot deny them their right, ability and concern. After all, they have an honest commitment and enthusiasm. Surely we should take some of their inspiration with some of our experience and dilute it with their daring, when, I am sure, we would come up with solutions to our problems. They want us to hear them, and I believe that they have a right to be heard. They only ask this Government, or any member of Parliament, to speak fairly, reasonably and justly. We can win their vital sense of commitment only by sharing in it and showing by personal effort that we are prepared to hear their problems, discuss them and act on them. Those are the substantial alternatives available to us.

We should remember that, in past years, students in Indonesia, Korea and Turkey have helped to overthrow Governments. If the Government does nothing but proceed with a policy of abandoned arrogance it will not be able to withstand the onslaught of these students.

Mr. E. G. W. Wood: Are you trying to encourage them in this respect?

Mr. R. JONES: If the hon. member does not understand what I am saying, he is too old to understand.

In America, London, Japan, Russia, Czechoslovakia and South Africa young people are denouncing hypocrisy and demanding authenticity. The goal of today's youth is not necessarily that of increased wages or the uplifting of the under-privileged. It is tuned to changing society for the better. If the Government does not understand that it will fail. If the Government condemns these young people and does not try to understand them when their cause is just—

Dr. Delamothe: Big words.

Mr. R. JONES: Yes, they may be big words. I appreciate that the Minister does not want to understand them, but I want to understand them. I have teenage children and I know their problems. I know what they are aiming at, what they are living for and what they believe in, but the Government does not and that is where it will fail. If the Government does not give them the right to dissent—if it does not listen to them carefully—I can only say, "Let not the words of Tennyson's poem become the litany and prophetic lament of the youth of Queensland". To demonstrate my point, I will quote the words to see if they mean anything to the Minister—

"What shall I be at 50 should Nature keep me alive

If I find the world so bitter when I am but 25?"

Dr. Delamothe: Recite "The Man from Snowy River".

Mr. R. JONES: I would if it had any relevance. Those are the Minister's thoughts on this matter and I am sure he will be quoted. If that is the Minister's attitude, and he is reflecting the Government's attitude, I feel terribly sorry because the young people of today are being ignored by the Government. At least the British Labour Government has conceded that youth today is more enlightened; that young people mature much earlier than the majority age of 21. In some of the legislation that he has introduced, the Minister has recognised that, but he does not recognise that they should have the right to dissent, the right to demonstrate, the right to distribute pamphlets and the right to think things out for themselves. Yet he is giving them legal rights at 18! In a few years' time they will be demanding the right to vote at 18. They will be demanding the right to be heard.

I have not the time to read a letter that I have here—if the Minister is interested I will be quite happy to show it to him—from a young man who was involved in the last demonstration in Roma Street. The letter, which is quite enlightening, was written on 13 September, 1967. This young man was twice thrown from the road for sitting down. The Minister might think that he was revolutionary, but his father is a member of the Country Party. At the beginning of his letter he speaks about whether his father would buy him a car and what they intend to do about the farm. In a couple of years' time he will have to enter a ballot on whether or not he will be conscripted to Vietnam. These are the things that are troubling our young people. This is why they demonstrate. Further on in the letter he described why he took part in the demonstration. He talks about his football training and says that he was in pretty good "nick".

(Time expired.)

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 10.57 p.m.