

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**THURSDAY, 27 NOVEMBER 1969**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## THURSDAY, 27 NOVEMBER, 1969

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

### CIRCULATION AND COST OF "HANSARD"

Mr. SPEAKER laid on the table the report of the Chief Reporter, State Reporting Bureau, on the circulation and cost of "Hansard" for the session of 1968.

### QUESTIONS

#### ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF ABORIGINAL AND ISLAND AFFAIRS

**Dr. Crawford**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Conservation,—

With regard to State Aboriginal affairs in general, what medical and lay staff exercise authority in the Aboriginal and Island Affairs Department?

*Answer:—*

"The Hospitals at the major centres are under the supervision and control of Hospitals Boards. Other Health aspects are determined based on local forces, in consultation with Medical Officers, Health Inspector advisers and Health Authorities regularly. The total number of staff presently employed by the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs is 277."

#### FEEDING OF ABORIGINAL CHILDREN AND HOSPITAL TREATMENT OF ABORIGINES

**Dr. Crawford**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Conservation,—

With regard to Aboriginal health specifically—

(1) Has the suggestion of Dr. Clements in Sydney, and proved in the Northern Territory, that Aboriginal children thrive if given three meals daily, been implemented in Queensland?

(2) Why has \$80,000 been spent recently on a new hospital at Lockhart River to incorporate two four-bed wards and a fully-equipped operating theatre when all sick patients are evacuated to Thursday Island or Cairns?

(3) Is it envisaged to increase the establishment of one Sister at Lockhart and to have more than a monthly visit from the Flying Doctor?

(4) Why are all confinements flown out from Lockhart at thirty-six weeks?

*Answers:—*

(1) "No. Parents are encouraged in Queensland to accept full responsibility for the well-being of their children. However, some complementary meals and special supplementary nutrients are provided."

(2) "Lockhart is a completely new town being built and, in keeping with the Government policy of providing the best for its Aboriginal people, it is including Hospital facilities there also."

(3) "Yes in regard to Sisters, and the matter of the Flying Doctor visit is one for the Royal Flying Doctor Services Council."

(4) "Under existing circumstances this is in the best interests of the mother and the child."

#### NEW CLASSROOMS, CENTRAL STATE SCHOOL, TOWNSVILLE

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

(1) Are two permanent classrooms to be built under the existing classroom blocks at Central State School, Townsville?

(2) If so, has consideration been given to the fact that the children presently occupying the five classrooms at ground level, in addition to those accommodated in the two floors above, will be further deprived of shelter on hot and wet days?

(3) As the building of such classrooms will only aggravate the shelter problem, will his Department build a new wing at the school instead?

*Answers:—*

(1) "No."

(2 and 3) "Funds are not available for the construction of a new wing, and additional classroom requirements for the commencement of the 1970 school year will be provided by a demountable building."

#### TOWNSVILLE OPPORTUNITY SCHOOL

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

(1) How many children are presently attending the Opportunity School, Townsville?

(2) How many are on the waiting list to attend the school?

(3) Is there a maximum number which the Department considers can be adequately handled by one such school and, if so, what is the number?

*Answers:—*

(1) "One hundred and forty-two."

(2) "Six."

(3) "A maximum of seven or eight classes (140 to 160 children) is generally considered desirable. A second Opportunity School in Townsville is included on the forward planning program for 1970-71."

#### FLYING-FOX CONTROL IN NORTH QUEENSLAND

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

Has the C.S.I.R.O. conducted investigations, in conjunction with his Department, with the object of minimising or eliminating the flying-fox pest in North Queensland? If so, what are the full details?

*Answer:—*

"No. C.S.I.R.O. has never conducted investigations in conjunction with my Department in the field of flying-fox control in North Queensland. I know that the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (the forerunner to C.S.I.R.O.) carried out investigations in this field in the 1920's but no effective control has ever come out of this work. I am not in a position to give the Honourable Member full details of flying-fox investigations in this State since they were not carried out either under the aegis of my Department or in collaboration with it."

#### DEVELOPMENT OF BOHLE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, TOWNSVILLE

**Mr. Aikens**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Industrial Development,—

What are the details of the industrial development, actual and proposed, on the Government-sponsored industrial site at the Bohle, Townsville?

*Answer:—*

"Fully serviced sites on the Bohle Industrial Estate are now available for allocation to manufacturing undertakings. As the Honourable Member is aware, Concrete Industries (Monier) Ltd. has already established a concrete tile manufacturing plant on the Estate. The Department is in negotiation with certain other industrialists and at this particular stage has provisionally reserved allotments for two organisations. Details of these industries will be announced when negotiations are finalised."

#### PAYMENT OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION CLAIMS THROUGH UNION SOLICITORS

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

Has he been informed that some trade unions, of which the Australian Workers' Union is one, merely hand claims for workers' compensation made by members, or widows and orphans of members, to

the union's solicitor and that the S.G.I.O. pays the compensation awarded to the solicitor, who deducts a large portion for himself before passing the remainder over to the claimant? If so, what steps can be taken to protect workers, their widows and orphans from this gross overcharging by legal vultures?

*Answer:—*

"I am not aware of the practice which the Honourable Member alleges. I am advised that payment of Workers' Compensation is always made by cheque payable to the claimant. However, if the Honourable Member has any evidence to the contrary, then I suggest he lodge such evidence with me. The policing of solicitor's charges is beyond my Ministerial jurisdiction."

#### TABLING OF AMENDMENTS TO ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER REGULATIONS

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

Were the Electric Light and Power Regulations of 1938 amended by the Executive Council on October 23, 1969, and gazetted on October 25, 1969? If so, have the Regulations been tabled in the House as required by the Act? If not, what is the reason?

*Answer:—*

"The Electric Light and Power Regulations, under *"The Electric Light and Power Acts, 1896 to 1967,"* were amended by the Governor in Council, by Order in Council dated October 23, 1969, and published in the *Gazette* on October 25, 1969. Unfortunately, the provisions of the Act, in relation to the Regulations being laid before Parliament within three weeks after they are made were overlooked. The matter is being corrected, by revoking the regulations made on October 23, 1969, and making the new identical amending Regulations immediately, following which they will be tabled in the House."

#### BYFIELD FERN

**Mr. V. E. Jones**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Lands,—

(1) Is he aware that all Byfield fern adjacent to the forestry area in the district has turned brown and shows signs of dying?

(2) Will he ascertain what is causing the destruction of this exclusive and much sought-after fern and advise the House accordingly?

*Answers:—*

(1) "No."

(2) "This is a matter which should be raised with my colleague the Honourable the Minister for Primary Industries, and I suggest the Honourable Member redirect his Question."

CLASSROOM ACCOMMODATION, INNISFAIL STATE HIGH SCHOOL

**Mr. Casey** for **Mr. F. P. Moore**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Works,—

(1) Is he aware that two classes at Innisfail State High School are situated under the school and are open to the elements and that one class is accommodated in what was once a locker room?

(2) As it is understood that the enrolment of Grade 8 students far exceeds the number of leaving students, will he have the position remedied?

*Answers:—*

(1) "As a temporary measure, one small class group is accommodated in an upstairs room previously used as a locker room, and another class is located in a partly enclosed area under the school building."

(2) "No increase in enrolment is forecast for the commencement of the 1970 school year, and action is being taken to provide the additional accommodation for the two classes referred to in (1) for the start of the new school year."

FILM PROJECTOR, INNISFAIL STATE HIGH SCHOOL

**Mr. Casey** for **Mr. F. P. Moore**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

As in recent years most State high schools have been provided with new film projectors when new requisites were issued, why has Innisfail State High School not obtained a new projector as the present one, a recent replacement, is well out-dated?

*Answer:—*

"The Honourable Member is advised that new 16mm sound film projectors have been supplied to State schools, primary and secondary, only under subsidy. Innisfail State High School had been experiencing some difficulties with its projector, even though it had been recently overhauled. Rather than persist in repairing the school's machine, it has been possible to make available to the school another of the same model to use in place of the faulty machine. This machine is in reasonable condition and should meet the school's needs. Consideration of the application by the Principal for subsidy on the purchase of a new projector is dependent upon the performance of the replacement machine."

AXLE-OVERLOADING OFFENCES BY TIMBER HAULIERS

**Mr. Casey** for **Mr. F. P. Moore**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Mines,—

(1) Referring to his Answer to my Question on November 26 that hauliers, after experience, would be able to judge weights on their vehicles, is he aware of the large number of species of timbers which vary in different growing areas and of which only a very inaccurate estimate can be made?

(2) Will his officers visit the areas of loading and illustrate the requirements of the Department?

*Answers:—*

(1) "Yes. It is recognised that loading difficulties do exist but sympathetic treatment is extended by way of warnings and adequate error tolerances."

(2) "It is considered that no good purpose would be served by officers visiting the areas of loading. From Departmental records it is apparent that, with few exceptions, log hauliers in South Queensland through their initiative and experience and use of suitable vehicles have overcome this problem and are able to load their vehicles to meet Regulation requirements."

DROUGHT-RELIEF LOANS TO PRIMARY PRODUCERS

**Mr. Tomkins**, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

In view of the decision by State Cabinet that maximum individual loans of \$10,000 at an interest rate of three per centum are now available to graziers in necessitous circumstances for re-stocking purposes,—

(1) What are the conditions and methods and from whom are these funds made available?

(2) Are any restrictions placed on how a primary producer may use these funds for the purchase of stock?

(3) Can a primary producer still qualify for the \$6,000 "carry-on" finance loan as well as for the \$10,000 loan for re-stocking, as some areas of the State have had drought-breaking rain?

(4) Will it be possible to increase the loan of \$250,000 for re-stocking purposes in view of the likely heavy demand for funds for the purpose?

*Answers:—*

(1) "Assistance is available only to primary producers who have no credit or other resources of their own for re-stocking purposes, and are unable to obtain assistance for these purposes from their Bank, Pastoral House or Commonwealth Development Bank. These are requirements by the Commonwealth when making

funds for this purpose available. As in the last Re-stocking Scheme applicants, who should be in working occupation of their property, will be required to satisfy their Local Drought Relief Committee that their property has recovered from the drought to such an extent that re-stocking is a sound proposition. Applicants will also be required to satisfy the Agricultural Bank that they have good prospects of rehabilitating themselves with the assistance provided. The Scheme will be administered by the Agricultural Bank."

(2) "Yes. Funds must be utilised for the purchase, at reasonable prices, of breeding stock except in some sheep areas where it is not practical to run ewes. In such cases the purchase of wethers will be considered. In other words the purpose of the loan is to enable the primary producer to rehabilitate himself by building up his stock numbers."

(3) "Yes. If the circumstances require it, a 'carry-on' loan will be made available at the same time as the re-stocking loan."

(4) "The \$250,000 was provided for possible re-stocking up to December 31, 1969. Further allocations will be discussed with the Commonwealth at that time."

#### TOBACCO LEAF SALES AND PRICES

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

As the 1968-69 tobacco-selling season has ended, what was the total amount of and the average price paid for (a) quota, (b) supplementary quota and (c) over-quota leaf sold on the Mareeba-Dimbulah and Northgate floors?

*Answer:—*

"(a) Quota—Mareeba, 12,386,799 lb. (123·2c lb.); Northgate, 2,990,583 lb. (107·5c lb.). (b) Supplementary Quota—Mareeba, 1,672,519 lb. (92·1c lb.); Northgate, 352,839 lb. (91·3c lb.). (c) Over-Quota—Mareeba, 1,486,260 lb. (84·4c lb.); Northgate, 389,000 lb. (81·6c lb.). The figures for over-quota leaf are preliminary estimates only."

#### LYTTON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE

(a) **Mr. Sherrington** for **Mr. Harris**, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

(1) Is he aware of the dangerous condition of Pritchard Street, Lytton, caused by excavations to allow delivery pipes to carry silt pumped from the Brisbane River for reclamation purposes?

(2) Who is responsible for the restoration of the road sections damaged by dredging contractors?

(3) Will he arrange to have warning devices and signs erected in Pritchard Street for safety purposes?

(4) Is Pritchard Street to be realigned between Lytton Road and Wynnum Road in the not too distant future?

*Answers:—*

(1 to 3) "No, but I shall arrange for the matter to be fully investigated by the Department of Industrial Development, which administers the Lytton Industrial Estate."

(4) "Yes."

(b) **Mr. Sherrington** for **Mr. Harris**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Industrial Development,—

As it is expected that there will be a substantial demand for industrial land on the south bank of the Brisbane River in the near future, with a possible increase in opportunities for work, will he expedite the development of the Lytton industrial estate?

*Answer:—*

"Development of the Lytton industrial estate commenced some two years ago when a start was made on reclamation of a 66-acre section. Tenders were called earlier this year for the construction of roads, sewers, drains and like services in the reclaimed area. Contracts valued at \$285,850 have been let and these works are expected to be completed during April, 1970. Other works to the value of approximately \$35,000 will be undertaken prior to June 30. The Department will then be able to offer to industry fully serviced sites on the estate. The Department's Works Programme for the current financial year also provides for reclamation of another significant area of the estate to proceed. Funds to the extent of \$250,000 have been allocated for this purpose."

#### SUITABILITY OF DARLING DOWNS COAL FOR EXPORT

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

Having regard to the low tonnage of coal being mined at Acland, Sugarloaf and Willeroo on the Darling Downs and with a view to providing continued employment for the miners, will he investigate the possibility of this coal being suitable and acceptable to overseas companies to meet part of their orders?

*Answer:—*

"The Honourable Member should be aware that one of the collieries mentioned by him—Sugarloaf—has been closed since March of this year. Coal being mined on the Darling Downs has an average ash content of 22 per cent. and a swelling index of 1½, making it entirely unsuitable as a coking coal, which is the type of coal

most sought by overseas purchasers. The ash content makes it extremely doubtful whether this coal would be attractive even to purchasers of steaming coal, for which type of coal there is an extremely limited market."

UNIVERSITY FEES; COMMONWEALTH  
MATCHING GRANTS FOR RECURRENT  
EXPENDITURE

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

(1) How many increases in student fees have been made at the Queensland University since 1958 and what was the percentage increase in each case?

(2) (a) What is the maximum Commonwealth assistance by way of matching grants available to Queensland Universities for recurrent expenditure and (b) what were the actual grants received for each year from 1961 to 1969?

(3) Did he recently communicate with the University of Queensland, as reported in *The Courier-Mail* of November 13, indicating in any way that the question of increased student fees should be considered by the University? If so, was the Government anticipating difficulty in matching increased Commonwealth grants for recurrent expenditure commencing in 1970?

(4) Will the proposed increase of twenty per centum in student fees mean a reduction in the State Government University grant for recurrent expenditure in 1970? If so, what is the estimated saving in State Government grants over the period of the three years of the triennium 1970-72?

(5) What proportion of the Australian total of Commonwealth matching grants for the current financial year for University capital works is available to Queensland?

(6) What proportion of the Australian total of Commonwealth grants for Australian Universities has actually been received by Queensland since the introduction of Commonwealth assistance in 1958?

(7) What is the anticipated increase in University revenue for 1970, 1971 and 1972 as a result of the proposed increase in fees?

(8) As Queensland has received only 8.8 per centum of the Australian total of Commonwealth grants for colleges of advanced education to June 30, is it his intention to suggest a similar increase in fees paid by students attending institutes of technology?

Answers:—

(1) "I am advised by the University authorities that the Senate approved the following increases in students' fees since

1958:—1960: 33 per cent. (Increase effective from beginning of Second Term). 1964: Full-time courses—\$4 per subject per term. (Average increase 4 per cent. to 6 per cent.); Part-time courses—\$4 per subject per term. (Average increase 28 per cent. to 30 per cent.). 1965: 22½ per cent. 1967: 11 per cent. 1968: 12 per cent. 1969: 1 per cent. to 4 per cent. This increase was an amount of \$6 per annum for Full-time students and \$3 per annum for Part-time students. The amount was paid to the Students' Union."

(2) "The State has attracted the maximum Commonwealth grant for recurrent purposes each year since 1958. Details of amounts received are available from the annual reports of the Auditor-General."

(3 and 4) "Over recent years the State has increased the recurrent grant to the University at a rate one and one-half times the rate of escalation in State expenditure generally. The Acting Vice Chancellor sought from the State Treasury Department a statement of likely level of State endowment for the ensuing triennium and the Under Treasurer gave him figures based on this rate of escalation. The figures given showed a broad calculation of moneys which would require to be received from State endowment and student fees to attract the maximum Commonwealth subsidy under the formula of \$1 Commonwealth subsidy to \$1.85 State endowment and student fees. It was made clear to the Acting Vice Chancellor that the question of the level of fees was one for the Senate. There is no reduction in the rate of State endowment nor is there any saving by the State in the amount of endowment payable."

(5 and 6) "The Honourable Member should refer to the relevant Commonwealth legislation and the Commonwealth Budget papers."

(7) "Until the University makes a decision in this regard, I do not know the levels of revenue for the years 1970, 1971 and 1972."

(8) "The State has endeavoured to direct moneys to the Colleges of Advanced Education at a rate far in excess of the average increase in expenditure permitted State services generally. These are new institutes and require extraordinary financial aid in their formative years. I suggest the Honourable Member refer to the comments of the Honourable the Treasurer in his recent Financial Statement concerning tertiary education programmes for the ensuing triennium. I know of no suggestion at present for any increase in the scale of fees paid by students attending Colleges of Advanced Education."

ABORIGINAL AND ISLAND AFFAIRS  
LIAISON OFFICER, MAREEBA

**Mr. B. Wood**, pursuant to notice, asked  
The Minister for Conservation,—

In view of the needs of the area, will he appoint a liaison officer of the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs who will reside in Mareeba? If so, will the appointment or transfer be made immediately?

*Answer:—*

"A Liaison Officer has been appointed to Mareeba and will take up duty on Monday, December 1, 1969. I have already advised the Mareeba Shire Council of this appointment."

CONFERENCE OF CHAIRMAN AND COUN-  
CILLORS, TORRES STRAIT ISLANDS  
AND CAPE YORK PENINSULA

**Mr. B. Wood**, pursuant to notice, asked  
The Minister for Conservation,—

(1) When was the last conference of chairman and councillors of the Torres Strait Islands and Cape York Peninsula area held?

(2) Other than chairman and councillors, who was present?

(3) Will a report of the conference be released?

(4) Were representatives of the Press invited?

(5) Does he intend to make the decisions of the conference public?

*Answers:—*

(1) "October 15 to 26, 1965."

(2) "No person other than the Chairman and Councillors was present. However, by invitation of the Conference, the following persons attended special sessions for consultation:—Minister's Representative—Mr. R. A. Armstrong, M.L.A.; Director of Aboriginal and Island Affairs—Mr. P. J. Killoran; Deputy Director of Aboriginal and Island Affairs—Mr. C. F. Reardon; State Electoral Officer—Mr. H. Radford; Commonwealth Electoral Officer—Mr. R. Willis; Repatriation Commissioner—Mr. R. Miscamble."

(3 to 5) "These are matters for determination by the Conference and it was not approved that observers attend. A Press Release only was issued following the Conference."

PUBLICATION OF TRANSFERS OF  
TEACHERS

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

(1) Is he aware that many principals, head teachers and teachers on transfer first learn of their moves from sources other than his Department?

(2) Can the procedure of his Department be amended so that the teachers involved are the first to hear of their transfers?

*Answer:—*

(1 and 2) "I have had no complaints from teachers on this matter. For some years it has been my Department's practice not to publicise transfers of principals and head teachers for several days after the letter of advice has been sent to the officer on transfer. This has been done specifically to prevent any advice reaching the officer concerned other than through the official channel."

MOTOR VEHICLES FOR BRANCH OFFICERS,  
QUEENSLAND GOVERNMENT TOURIST  
BUREAU

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

(1) Are motor vehicles supplied to officers in charge of the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau offices outside the metropolitan area?

(2) If so, to which areas are the vehicles allocated and, if not, when is it expected that branch managers at tourist centres such as Cairns will have vehicles allotted to them?

*Answer:—*

(1 and 2) "No. It is not proposed at present to allocate motor vehicles to Branches of the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau. However, arrangements exist whereby motor vehicles attached to other Sections of my Department by arrangement are made available for use by these Branches. In addition the appropriate mileage allowance is payable in those cases where private motor vehicles, with prior approval are used on official business."

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Proclamations under—

The Sugar Experiment Stations Acts,  
1900 to 1965.

Forestry Act 1959–1968.

Orders in Council under—

The Agricultural Bank (Loans) Act of  
1959.

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

The Stock Acts, 1915 to 1965.

The Wheat Pool Acts, 1920 to 1957.

Forestry Act 1959–1968.

Regulations under—

The Fruit Marketing Organisation Acts,  
1923 to 1964.

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

CITY OF BRISBANE ACT  
AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

**Hon. W. A. R. RAE** (Gregory—Minister for Local Government and Electricity): I move—

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the City of Brisbane Acts 1924 to 1967 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

CITY OF BRISBANE TOWN PLANNING  
ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

**Hon. W. A. R. RAE** (Gregory—Minister for Local Government and Electricity): I move—

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the City of Brisbane Town Planning Act 1964–1968 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT  
AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

**Hon. W. A. R. RAE** (Gregory—Minister for Local Government and Electricity): I move—

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Local Government Act 1936–1968 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEES—ESTIMATES—  
SIXTEENTH ALLOTTED DAY

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

ESTIMATES-IN-CHIEF, 1969-70

EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR  
(BALANCE OF VOTE)

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (11.28 a.m.): I move—

“That \$81,878 be granted for ‘His Excellency the Governor (Balance of Vote)’.”

This Vote shows an increase of \$5,310 on the actual expenditure for last year. The increase is due principally to higher salaries that were awarded during 1968-69.

It would be remiss of me not to take this opportunity of paying a tribute to Sir Alan for the outstanding service that he is giving to Queensland as the representative of Her Majesty the Queen in our State. The high regard in which he is held is, in itself, a mark of his achievement. The manner in which he has carried out his duties has won the admiration of all sections of the community, and it is indeed fortunate that in the office of Governor we have a man of the calibre of Sir Alan Mansfield.

I feel that it would be appropriate also to pay a tribute to Lady Mansfield for the able support that she has given Sir Alan in the discharge of his Vice-Regal responsibilities. Her charm and personality have endeared her to the Queensland people, with whom she has mingled freely and frequently.

As hon. members are no doubt aware, during the last 12 months Sir Alan and Lady Mansfield paid an extended visit to the United Kingdom and the continent of Europe. During His Excellency's absence, the Chief Justice, Sir William Mack, occupied the position of Administrator of the Government. Sir William's sudden illness was a shock to us, and I am sure that all hon. members join with me in wishing him a speedy return to good health.

As a consequence of Sir William Mack's illness, it was necessary to swear in the Senior Puisne Judge, Honourable J. A. Sheehy, as Administrator of the Government. It was in this capacity that His Excellency opened the present session of Parliament, and I am sure hon. members agree that he discharged that duty with dignity and efficiency.

I commend the motion to the Committee.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (11.31 a.m.): I do not think I would be unkind in saying that, although I have heard some very short introductions of Estimates on other occasions, this morning we have heard the shortest possible introduction. However, it will give many hon. members an opportunity to take part in the debate.

First, I endorse what the Premier said relative to His Excellency the Governor, Sir Alan Mansfield, and Lady Mansfield. The Opposition believes that Sir Alan is doing a very fine job for Queensland and proving that he is a “big” Queenslander. Hon. members on this side of the Chamber were sorry to hear of Sir William Mack's illness, and they join with the Premier in expressing the hope that he will be restored to good health in the near future.

In discussing the details of these Estimates as such, of course, it is difficult to find logical comparisons. It is true that expenditure has increased by over \$5,000, but my investigations show that, as the Premier said, the increase is due mainly to salary changes.

Under the Premier's control is the Department of the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works. The work of that department has a great bearing on Queensland's future progress, so I shall spend a few moments referring to it.

At the outset, I pay a compliment to the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works and his officers, right down to the men who do the practical work, for the high standard of work they have achieved. Unfortunately, the amount of work that the department can do depends not only on State Government policy but also, and to an even greater extent, on the generosity of the Federal Government. As hon. members know, the money spent in the department comes mainly from loan funds, and if the Commonwealth Government, for reasons best known to itself, determines that the State's loan allocation for the year should be relatively small, the State suffers as a result.

The Government has indicated from time to time that it believes that Queensland is on the brink of great development. The only trouble is that people have been hearing that for so many years that they are not paying a great deal of attention to it. In my opinion that is a great pity, because enthusiasm breeds enthusiasm. On the other hand, of course, an old cracked record gets on everyone's nerves. Therefore, I should like to see a new approach by the Government.

It is true that progress is being made. Those of us who live in Brisbane have only to look at the city's skyline to see that great development has taken place in the past few years. Over the years development has also taken place in many country towns. No-one is denying that, but the point is whether that development has taken place as quickly as we would like, or as quickly as it might have under a different administration or a different policy. Many people in the community, including members of the Opposition, believe that in a number of cases the efforts have been wrongly directed.

It is true that the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works carries out major developmental works in Queensland, ranging from the building of dams for purposes of irrigation, or to provide water for power-houses, to the construction of universities and teaching hospitals. The work is diversified to such an extent that the Co-ordinator-General constructed the fish markets in Brisbane, developed industrial lands, built the new Victoria Bridge, is building the riverside expressway, has built beef roads, developed brigalow lands and carried out water-conservation work in the Bundaberg area, to mention only some of his various activities. However, as I said, the amount of work that can be done depends on the extent of Federal loan money available. The allocation of those funds and approval of priorities, of course, is a matter for the State Government.

As the debate progresses I and other Opposition members will show that in some fields the available money could be directed with greater emphasis to give Queensland quicker and greater benefits. Unfortunately, Mr. Hooper, we are restricted by time and it is impossible to touch on all aspects. However, I trust that in the Federal field the Prime Minister is not going to become completely arrogant about the needs of the States and deny them their rights relative to loan allocations and free grants.

I am sure that everyone in Queensland, if not in Australia, regretted the arrogance that was displayed in the Federal Parliament a couple of days ago. Without going into the rights or wrongs of the political situation, surely this would have been a wonderful opportunity for the Federal Government, which was returned with a very much reduced majority, to welcome the views of other elected members, particularly new ones, who might have made it more aware of what is going on in various parts of the Commonwealth. I know how most of us react to criticism. I suppose that is a human failing, but when a man is appointed to high office surely he must be big enough to accept criticism provided it is made in a constructive manner.

Even though no legislation was involved, because time would not permit of its preparation, surely it would have been in the interests of the nation, including Queensland, if members had had the opportunity to tell the Federal Government about some of its shortcomings. From Queensland's point of view, one of these would have been relative to the allocation of money. On this subject, of course, the Opposition completely supports the Queensland Government in its claims and in the State Treasurer's advocacy. I believe that if we, as a united Queensland Parliament, could impress upon the Federal Government that this is not a political matter in the party-political sense, and that we must have a greater allocation of funds, we would have some chance of getting an increase.

A couple of days ago, when discussing the Estimates of the Department of Industrial Development, the Minister told us of the Government's hopes in Central Queensland. No-one will deny the fact that a power-house there will bring development, and I and all of my colleagues have tried to communicate to the Federal authorities that we completely support the State Government in its request for help to establish this essential power-house. We did this even in the Federal election campaign, but according to the Minister we cannot expect the power-house to be completed until around 1975. What a vacuum that leaves in Queensland's progress!

I do not care how much coal we sell or how much bauxite is taken from the ground; it is virtually only primary industry when viewed from the angle of large-scale development of the State. Certainly the sale

of this State's coal attracts royalties, and, although I dispute the amount, it is true that the Government obtains finance by way of railway freights also. It is true, too, that the production of bauxite brings royalties to the Government and has increased employment in Gladstone. However, the great development of this State will take place only if the secondary industries can benefit from the primary production of its minerals.

Owing to the Federal Government's attitude over recent years, coupled with this Government's laxity in not realising earlier the need for a Central Queensland power-house, this State will be left with this great vacuum until approximately 1975. In the meantime, Queensland could lose to other States industries that rightfully belong to it. I do not want to go back over past history, but some time ago this State lost an aluminium plant because sufficient power was not available. It has taken a long time for this State to get under way. Unfortunately, we still cannot be certain that the Central Queensland power-house will be of the size required to provide cheap power for industries. Any power-house with an output below 1,000 kW is not capable of producing electricity at the low cost demanded by industries that consume great quantities of power.

I believe that the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works is the authority charged with the responsibility of assisting industrial development, because in addition to the construction of the power-house a great amount of ancillary work needs to be undertaken. I refer particularly to the provision of water and the construction of roads and distribution lines. All of those projects can be undertaken only if Queensland receives large sums of loan money.

Industries will be attracted to Queensland only if they believe that they will be provided with a profit margin. It does not matter how well they might think of a Government or of individuals, they will not establish their plants in this State until they believe that they will be able to make profits for their shareholders. No-one will quibble with that comment. Therefore, the State Government and those associated with government are charged with the great responsibility of ensuring that the proper climate is created to attract industries.

In addition to providing cheap power, the State must offer minimum transport costs. I do not want to deal with rail freights at present, but one factor that militates against low road-transport costs is the time taken to deliver the goods. If freeways and good bridges and roads capable of taking traffic speedily and safely are not provided, then road-transport costs will rise. Queensland has many advantages over other States, particularly in its climate and scenic beauty, but it suffers the disadvantage of vast distances. In commerce, the transport of goods over long distances adds to their cost.

A great mileage has to be covered whether the roads are good or bad. If the time factor can be reduced and if roads are capable of taking heavy transport vehicles, the cost of commodities can be reduced. However, it all comes back to the allocation of loan money.

Establishing industries is one thing, but before an industry is established a survey should be conducted to guarantee that the people required to work in it are available. We must also ensure that once people go to an area they will stay there. Unfortunately, there have been occasions in Queensland's history when people have gone to an area but have quickly left it because of the living conditions, with resultant industrial problems arising as a result.

As our society becomes more affluent, people expect certain living conditions as a right, particularly in the larger cities. If they go to an area that lacks these conditions they become upset very easily, whereupon other problems develop. In recent times one of the most common complaints has concerned the lack of television facilities; and people in the West particularly are advocating the provision of this amenity. Every possible attraction must be provided to keep young people particularly in western and other country towns. Too often they say, "We can go elsewhere and have them," and in many instances the amenities take precedence over the financial return.

The provision of housing is important in keeping people happy. The Co-ordinator-General of Public Works has some responsibility in providing housing for new industries in places like Weipa, where it has been necessary to build a number of houses. If the Government provides houses in certain areas, surely it should maintain a balance in its housing developments between the number provided in new areas and those provided in established parts of the State. It is regrettable that the Queensland Housing Commission has been unable to increase its home-building programme on a basis comparable with the development of the State.

I should like to present some figures to highlight this point. In 1961-62, 2,006 homes were built by the Queensland Housing Commission, whereas in that year there were 9,490 marriages. In other words, the relationship between marriages and homes constructed by the Housing Commission was one home for every 4.7 marriages. In 1966-67 the number of houses built by the Housing Commission decreased to 1,643, whereas the number of marriages increased to 13,634. In 1968-69 the Housing Commission constructed 1,678 houses, whereas 14,860 marriages were celebrated.

Although the Government talks about society being more affluent and also about providing increased amenities so that people will be attracted to this State and will stay here, it has not correspondingly increased its rate of home-building. If we attract industries

we must have the people to work in them and stay in them, and we must also ensure that they remain in order to ensure real development. Last year the ratio of homes constructed to marriages was 1 to 8.8. We are going the wrong way about tackling the problem. Certainly the total number of houses constructed last year was 16,963 compared with 9,880 in 1961. The Government and private industry combined are making an effort, but I believe that the State has a greater responsibility. It should be doing more for the people of Queensland because Government home-construction provides stability of costs.

I repeat that if we are to develop Queensland we must have not only the industries, but also the conditions that attract people to an area and keep them there.

We are being let down on two scores: the first is the total amount allocated to education, and the second is the priority given to educational facilities. The Premier can claim that the Government has extended the school-bus service, and no-one would deny that. However, we are still lagging behind other States in educational facilities, and this is a shame. After all, we do not want to have to import our tradesmen and top professional men. Surely we have reached the stage where we can produce qualified men; and to produce them, we need the best educational facilities. And I do not mean only at university level, although that is important, because the majority of our people will not go to the university, or need to do so in order to discharge their responsibilities in the development of the State.

Although I am an ardent supporter of State control of education, for decentralisation if for no other reason, the States should collaborate in formulating a uniform education standard throughout the nation. When speaking to interstate friends, I always advocate that they come to Queensland. I tell them it is a great place. However, I am immediately asked, "What about Peter and Tommy? What will happen if I take them up there? Your education system is different from ours?" Whether we are vastly different in the final analysis I do not know, but interstate parents consider that there is a tremendous difference. We are a nation, and we should get together on this matter so that a child can go from one State to another and continue with his education. Surely the knowledge required in Queensland is no different from that required in New South Wales. I believe that the administration of the system should be in State hands, but that the States should get together to achieve a common standard.

I join with the Premier in paying respect to the Agent-General (Dr. Summerville) and his officers for the work they do. They have assisted our trade position and the many Queensland people who have gone to London. That office has been an asset since its establishment. It proves the need

for Queensland to be identified as such in dealings away from our shores. When the office was established, Britain was the main country with which we traded and from which most of our migrants came. Generally, Britain was considered close to us. Although personal ties still exist, there has been a great change in the location of our markets.

The Premier should consider setting up small trade offices in Malaysia, Singapore and Japan so that representatives of Queensland could, on every day of the week and not just when a trade mission is there, give information to possible customers and, more to the point, look for new customers. They could be salesmen on behalf of Queensland, as distinct from the trade missions that visit those countries. They could do work similar to that done by the Agent-General in London.

From what I have read and seen, it appears that we could produce many primary and secondary commodities in Queensland that could be exported to other countries. Unfortunately, we do not know enough about them. When he has been overseas, no doubt the Premier has seen things that he wanted to buy and that certainly are not produced in any quantity in Queensland at present, and he probably felt that they could be produced here if the necessary incentives were given and markets were assured.

I feel that an investigation should be made, and that the offices should be set up as a trial. If that were done, Queensland would not be the leader in that field. Two or three years ago the Government of Western Australia established such an office in Japan. I have not made a check of the position within the last few months, but my information prior to that time was that the office was proving most successful. Although Western Australia has certainly made great advances in mineral development, it is not considered to be a State that is progressing at a greater rate than Queensland. Queensland is closer to potential markets, and it has a more diversified production potential in both primary and secondary industry. Queensland should therefore be able to do what has been done by Western Australia, and I urge the Government to give that matter consideration.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. PORTER** (Toowong) (11.56 a.m.): It is always a pleasure to follow the Leader of the Opposition in debate because invariably he opens some interesting avenues of speculation. I thought that this morning he covered much of the ground that hon. members opposite covered during the debate on the Estimates of the Department of Industrial Development. He rather tediously traversed points that were on that occasion adequately answered by members on this side of the Chamber.

It is easy to generalise and say that development has not been as rapid as one would like it to be. What is there in life that is always as perfect as one would like it to be? He also queried if the State's performance would have been superior under a different administration. That, too, is a very easy question to ask. I merely point out that his party has not been entrusted with the reins of government in this State for more than a decade, nor is it in government in any State or in the Commonwealth.

**Mr. Houston:** I would not talk too much about that if I were you.

**Mr. PORTER:** I am quite happy to talk about it at any time. I repeat that the present situation suggests that most people in this State and throughout Australia do not believe that development would be more rapid under Labour administration.

**Mr. Casey:** The majority of voters thought so.

**Mr. PORTER:** They did not. The hon. member has a peculiar understanding of arithmetic if he suggests that a majority of voters indicated, at either the last State or Federal election, that they wanted a Labour Government.

I was also interested to hear the Leader of the Opposition castigate the Prime Minister of Australia, with particular reference to his attitude to the States. I never fail to be amused by the somewhat righteous indignation that hon. members opposite display at any indication in Canberra of centralist tendencies. One has to remember that the A.L.P. platform quite specifically and unequivocally calls for the abolition of State Governments. In that regard, I must pay hon. members opposite the rather dubious tribute of saying that that is one plank of their platform that they acknowledge, with tongue in cheek.

It was also delightful, and even refreshing, to find the Leader of the Opposition paying a tribute to the profit motive. I have always thought that for the A.L.P. "profit" was a six-letter obscene word. I am very glad to discover, without recourse to the courts, that it has been elevated to the area of respectability in the Labour Party.

I wish to make a few comments about the Legislature, which is to me perhaps the most important aspect of the Premier's Estimates. I have often said that we live in changing times, in which values in many areas are being questioned. Indeed, institutions which over a long period of time have been accepted without question are being regarded with scepticism and ever-growing cynicism. I think those remarks apply particularly to younger people, who are the products of greater affluence, higher education, who have more mobility, and who are perhaps more exposed to communication than we were when we were young. It is often said that, as a result of all of those things, there is among young people a permissive society.

I believe that it would be much more apt to describe what we have as a more questioning society. People are not prepared to accept the standards and values of the past merely because their elders tell them that these are indeed the best values. They are sceptical; they question; they want to have things demonstrated to them. I think that, in many ways, that is a good thing. But certainly it is against that background that we have to consider the declining regard for the institution of Parliament, and, of course, together with that, we see on many hands a thinly disguised mockery for us politicians, the people who are the essential part of the Parliament.

That is very sad. I think that it may well explain to some degree the huge swings of the political pendulum, varying in intensity from area to area, which have become a marked feature of all elections in recent years and will become, in my opinion, a much more marked feature. So do not let the Opposition gloat over what may have happened to parties on this side of the Chamber in recent elections; the same thing could happen to them at any time and in any place.

If there is to be no deep regard for the instrument of parliamentary democracy as such, it may well be found that in the voting community—the electorate—political decisions will become much more arbitrary and capricious in the future than they have been in the past. The vote then becomes not so much, as it once was, an affirmation of faith in any particular political philosophy as a condemnation of the whole practice and procedure of parliamentary institutions, and it is in that context that I wish to speak briefly about the relationship between the Cabinet and the Legislature in this day and age.

**Mr. Houston:** That is an old one.

**Mr. PORTER:** The Leader of the Opposition says it is an old one. That is true; it is an old one, but I think it is a growing problem.

The increasing power of the Executive and the diminishing role that the Parliament plays is not unique, and certainly not new, but it is the prime concern of all Western countries that are operating a parliamentary system which devolves from the British system. Many hon. members are concerned about what, if anything, can be done to remedy that. We ask ourselves, "Is it possible to arrest the trend, or are the factors involved in the trend such that they cannot be checked?"

We all know that our parliamentary institutions are derived from, and are still very reliant upon, the procedures that have been evolved over the centuries by the House of Commons, the Mother of Parliaments, and it is interesting to consider that in the British Parliament this has become

as much a problem as it is anywhere else. In 1937, Mr. Dingle Foot, a back-bench M.P. in the House of Commons, moved—

“That in the opinion of this House the power of the executive is increasing and ought to be diminished.”

Then, in 1950, Viscount Cecil moved in the House of Lords—

“That the growing power of Cabinet is a danger to the democratic institutions of Parliament.”

All the authorities agree that the primary problems of the relationship between the Executive and Parliament today stem from the formal convention of the collective and individual responsibility of Ministers. They all agree that, without doubt, it is that convention that has exerted by far the greatest influence in reducing the power of Parliaments to initiate, to assess, and to determine. I say “the convention of collective Cabinet responsibility” because it is interesting for hon. members to remember that it is indeed a convention. It is not recognised in law, and hon. members will not find a concept of Cabinet enshrined in any statute. Cabinet is literally Parliament’s executive committee, with Ministers, as it were, being the Crown’s appointed representatives, and the first amongst Ministers being a Prime Minister or, in the case of a State, a Premier.

However, in any consideration of the changing relationship between Cabinet and Parliament, I think that one should always remember that Cabinet should properly be an instrument of Parliament. In other words, Ministers and back-benchers alike all enter Parliament through precisely the same electoral gateway. All of us are members of Parliament; in fact, a member cannot become a Minister until he is a member of the House.

I think this is important when we consider the classic concept of the relationship between the Executive and Parliament. I do not wish to quote authorities at length but I think it is desirable that occasionally we have a look at this thing in depth. Halsbury’s “Laws of England” points out that Parliament is not an executive authority but either directly or indirectly it exercises a dominating control over the actions of the Crown and of the executive Government and the administration of the laws which it has enacted.

I would therefore hope that all of us who want to see a healthy parliamentary system would accept that Parliament’s control of the Legislature and administration should be both real as well as apparent. To me, this is essential to the effective functioning of the apparatus of democracy. One of the first, and perhaps still one of the most highly regarded of the political philosophers, the Frenchman De Tocqueville, said that it was both necessary and desirable that the Government of a democratic people should be both active and powerful. Our object should

be not to render it weak or indolent but solely to prevent it from abusing its aptitude and its strength. I hope that all of us on this side of the Committee and on the other side would agree with this theory, but the question is how do we practise it.

In this day and age of ever-increasing complexity of administration, when the growing power of executive is the greatest problem facing parliamentary control in this and other Commonwealth countries, how do we make Parliament more active, more powerful? How do we make it stronger? In other words, if Cabinet is looming larger in the scheme of things, then inevitably the back-bencher and his role, of necessity, must be declining. What can we do about it? I do not think any of us can be in doubt as to the declining role of the back-bencher. It is rather amusing to read the comment made by Nigel Nicholson who, when he became a member of the House of Commons, said something along the lines that he was told by a senior member, “You will move into the House past the Speaker’s bench and, once having done so, you will return to the obscurity from which probably you should never have emerged.” This may well be true. It is perhaps more applicable to the Commons with its hundreds of members, but it is a basic problem here.

**Mr. Baldwin:** What are you going to do about it?

**Mr. PORTER:** The hon. member for Logan asks what are we going to do about it. Let me remind him that most of the undesirable practices here are a heritage of 40 years of Labour Government which had no interest whatever in back-benchers but merely wanted numbers. The hon. member for Logan suggests that we fill Parliament with academics. I should hate to think that the hon. member for Logan is representative of a useful academic.

Nobody desires to deny the necessity for this convention of Cabinet collective and individual responsibility. It has been accepted for almost a century. As the Leader of the Opposition said, it is old hat; but with many others who study politics today and write about it—and many of the textbooks refer to this—I cannot help but wonder if, in accepting the convention, we are not fashioning a kind of Frankensteinian thing which is apt to get well beyond the control of the body that created it.

I have said that we can do little to reduce the concept of Cabinet because it has to have collective responsibility in Parliament and in relation to the outside world; but I wonder if the growing trend of using this Cabinet block—this Cabinet collective responsibility noted by so many writers—inside party rooms, is not something of a problem, because this means—and many writers refer to this—that in the arena where quite properly the governing party should consider, amend, accept or reject matters prior to facing Parliament with them, there is a

growing tendency in many Parliaments for a bloc Cabinet vote to be cast in the party room. This, of course, gives a substantial advantage to one side of any case, and what is worse, I think, it means that members inside a Government party are precluded from knowing the arguments that were used and perhaps rejected before Cabinet came to its joint decision.

So I wonder, as do many writers in this sphere, whether here is an area where the convention of Cabinet collective responsibility is not being unduly exploited. If any attempt is made to control the deliberations of a party at their very source, that will have a deleterious effect on Parliament. We must guard strongly against the growing role of the Executive in the affairs of Parliament, because this tends to reduce Parliament's role and to enlarge the gulf separating Ministers from ordinary members, and also tends to upset the theory that all members of Parliament should be equal. This becomes rather like the George Orwell satire "Animalism", where all animals are equal but some are more equal than others. Consideration of this matter is important in any Parliament, but it is doubly important in this Parliament where we have only one Chamber and matters that come up for consideration are not reviewed in a second Chamber. Parliamentary procedures, important anywhere, are even more important in this Assembly.

Several members of the Opposition have said, "It is all very well to tell us the problems, but what do you propose to do about them?" What are the solutions? Clearly, if back-benchers become more effective in Parliament and help to check the rise of Executive domination, we must have effective machinery by which private members can fully discharge their essential roles. This is why I, with many other hon. members, have been an ardent protagonist for changes in our parliamentary procedures. I am glad that the majority of members on this side, and, I am sure, on the Opposition side, want some changes. Whatever is done should be directed towards strengthening the role of the individual Parliamentarian.

This can be done mainly in two ways: collectively, as members of Parliamentary committees; and individually, by providing adequate opportunity to members to raise matters either on behalf of their constituents or as their beliefs and convictions impel them. When I talk of acting collectively I think of two things, namely, the proper use of standing committees and the proper use of select committees of Parliament. In the Commonwealth and every other State there exists a Public Works Committee or a Public Accounts Committee.

**Mr. W. D. Hewitt:** Both.

**Mr. PORTER:** It is true that most of them have both. In the Commonwealth and all States, except Western Australia and Queensland, there is a Subordinate Legislation Standing Committee, or, as it is called

in some States, a Regulations and Ordinances Committee or a Statutory Instruments Committee. It is good to know that similar committees are planned for Queensland. I hope that in the future several standing committees will be set up.

As a direct result of Labour practices over very many years, we have allowed select committees to fall into disuse. I do not think that this Parliament has appointed a select committee for nearly half a century. It is interesting to reflect that almost 50 per cent. of the Standing Orders of this House have to do with the conduct of select committees of Parliament. Quite obviously they are a major instrument, which, unfortunately, is not now used.

Hon. members may be interested to know that in the first half of 1968 no fewer than 16 select committees of Parliament were operating in the House of Commons. Spread over the other States' and the Commonwealth Parliaments there are at present 20 select committees of Parliament investigating certain matters. Here is an area in which the role of the private member could be vastly enlarged, with great profit to Parliament and to the Executive. These committees' spheres are essential and their considerations are long overdue.

In the individual sphere for the private member also, a number of avenues are open. Most other State Parliaments and the Commonwealth Parliament have long-standing practices, but they are not very well known here. I refer to matters such as questions without notice, the use of adjournment debates and the opportunity to raise matters of great public importance.

I do not wish to canvass these proposals in any detail, as I have done so on previous occasions, and of course they are now under consideration. With many other members on this side of the Chamber, I look forward to the Government parties clearing their minds on these essential matters so that some can then go forward to the Standing Orders Committee of this Parliament, and others, which do not require to go to that committee, can be implemented by the Government through this Parliament for 1970.

All the indications are that the instrument of Parliament, the machinery of Parliament, the institution of it, it is not as highly regarded today as it was only a few years ago. I think that flows almost certainly from the feeling amongst so many people that Parliament is something of a paper tiger; that the real power is being exercised not by Parliament but by Cabinet and by public servants who are behind the Ministers and have their ear and who, of necessity again under this system, must initiate most of the legislation. I suggest that that is bad for Parliament, bad for Cabinet and, worst of all, it can well become a tragedy for the democracy for which so many have made so much sacrifice over the years.

I have made these comments with no thought of party-political or self advantage. It is quite obvious that, in making such comments, they would not advantage me. I have been motivated solely by a very sincere desire to serve, in the best way possible, the institution of Parliament that I have served for so much of my life. I hope therefore that what I have said will be considered and accepted in the spirit in which it is offered.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I should like to remind hon. members that I was unaware that the Premier intended to introduce his Estimates in three parts. The first is the Vote that we have before us at the moment, dealing with His Excellency the Governor. The second is the Vote for Executive Council and the third is the Vote for the Legislative Assembly. I allowed the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Toowong to range fairly widely in their speeches, but from now on we will deal with the Votes as they are brought before the Committee.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (12.17 p.m.): I appreciate what you have said, Mr. Hooper, in relation to the matters under debate.

If there are no further speakers on this matter I should like to thank the two hon. members who have expressed their thoughts. The Leader of the Opposition spoke at considerable length on the growth and development of the State, and made certain suggestions about that. He also referred to the need to provide a suitable standard of education and referred to some matters of which the Government has been aware for some considerable time. These matters are being closely looked at and dealt with from time to time.

The representation of the State in various countries in South-east Asia has been discussed in Cabinet. The hon. gentleman presented the Chamber with some fine suggestions. Some of them involve considerable cost but, on the other hand, they could ultimately reap great benefits for the State.

I thank the hon. member for Toowong who expressed thoughts and views that we, as the Government, are very interested in. I, as Premier, am very interested in procedures in the House, and new methods. As the hon. member indicated, these matters are under review at the moment. I thank the hon. members for their submissions.

Items (His Excellency the Governor—Balance of Vote) agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (12.19 p.m.): I move—

“That \$1,080 be granted for ‘Executive Council.’”

The amount is a decrease of \$1,161 on the actual expenditure last year. The allowance that has been paid to the Clerk of the Council has now been merged with the salary of the Under Secretary, Premier's Department, and certain printing costs that were charged to this Vote are now to be met from the Chief Office Printing Vote.

Vote (Executive Council) agreed to.

#### LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (12.20 p.m.): I move—

“That \$556,886 be granted for ‘Legislative Assembly’.”

This is an increase of \$53,892 over the actual expenditure last year and consists of an increase in salaries of \$9,034 and an increase in contingencies of \$44,858. This Vote for salaries makes provision for the annual increments becoming due during 1969-70 and the salary increases awarded by the State Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission during 1968-69, including the basic-wage increase from 28 October, 1968.

In the contingencies Vote, the major proportion of the increase is accounted for by two amounts, namely, the provision of \$30,000 which has been made to cover the expenses of the parliamentary mission which is to visit New Zealand, Fiji, and Honolulu, and of an additional \$21,000 which has been provided for “Hansard and Other Printing” which is necessary to cover the heavier printing costs resulting from the longer 1969-70 session compared with the previous session.

I am sure that many hon. members will wish to speak on the various aspects of the Legislative Assembly Estimates and, because of the limited time available for such discussion, I do not propose to say anything more at this stage. I shall be interested to listen to the contributions of hon. members to this debate.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (12.22 p.m.): When I spoke previously I was acting under a misapprehension, and I do not wish to take an advantage now and use the time available to other hon. members. I had my say earlier.

However, I wish to reply to some comments made by the hon. member for Toowong. I assure him that I am sick and tired of hearing him crying in this Chamber and attempting to belittle the A.L.P., both now and in the past. This Government has been in power for 13 years and it has had ample time to change the Standing Rules and Orders of this Parliament if it so desired. I remind him that what he is advocating in respect of questions without notice and parliamentary committees was fully outlined by our party during the election campaign as established policy. He should be called the leader of the “onion group”, not the “ginger group”, because all

that its members do is cry, and when things get a bit hot for them they fall apart under pressure.

If the hon. member for Toowong really wants to help, he should advocate that we get the Standing Orders Committee to meet as soon as possible to look at those various matters.

**Mr. AHERN** (Landsborough) (12.24 p.m.): Many people in Australia today say that the quality of life is deteriorating. That may not always be obvious, because the graphs that measure affluence and living standards of the community as a whole are moving steadily upwards. One of our favourite delusions is to assess our current performance against that in the past, whereas the valid test must be to compare it against our potential, and do better in the future. As a Government, we must regularly question every aspect of our activity. That must be done very frequently, because Government activity affects every citizen in the community.

There are matters that, more now than ever before, affect some people deeply, and it is true that ultimately every citizen is affected, whether he realises it at this stage or not. There is within the community today a marked difference between constructive self-criticism and the cynical knocking of things Australian, of which we hear so much. Unfortunately, not enough of us are aware of that marked difference. For instance, we tend to admire the British for their ability to laugh at themselves and their institutions. Some of us admire the Americans for their sometimes agonising periods of doubt in their own institutions. But we hesitate to look into our own mirror clearly and fairly. Not enough of us are doing that.

There is today a need for a much clearer view of what is involved in this argument as the nation is entering a period of unprecedented economic and material growth. We in this country are constantly searching for a more distinctive identity. National economic growth may leave most people a little better off than they were previously. But that is not really what the argument is about today. It is also likely to leave various minorities relatively worse off in material terms unless a deliberate effort is made to distribute the fruits of progress more equitably. All those things depend on Government action of some kind. Mostly they depend on money.

Unfortunately there is in this country today, in far too many places in the community, an unhealthy contempt of Parliament as an institution. I have heard indications of such contempt, and I am sure that many other hon. members have heard it expressed in conversation in many places. There are two things that are not being discussed at all in the community and are virtually taboo in the Australian way of life. I refer to religion and politics. Governments must respond to the people

as well as lead them, and it is true that it is harder under our system than it is under many others to establish adequate communication between government and governed. I am sure that there are faults on both sides. One result is a feeling within society of individual helplessness—a spirit of, "What can I do? What is the point of getting involved?"

The simple answer is that to achieve any result at all the people have no alternative but to become involved in the political system, either directly or through organisations with specific interests. I refer there in particular to the political organisations in Australia. When there is evidence of public feeling, I think that we as politicians do not treat it lightly. As a matter of fact, when we hear expressions of opinion, we tend, at the present time, to over-react. There have been stories in the Australian Press during the past few years of politicians receiving hundreds and hundreds of letters on various subjects from people in their communities. I do not believe that this type of response from the people is as large as some politicians pretend it is. Too often politics in Australia operate in a semi-vacuum, not necessarily from choice (although it certainly makes political life much easier most of the time) but usually from a lack of a clear lead.

A few countries find it consistently necessary to manufacture electoral issues, as we do in Australia very regularly. Whereas a British or American politician accepts as the normal course of things a huge daily mail, dealing not only with the problems of his constituents but also with their views on public affairs in general, his Australian counterpart, either State or Federal, is unaccustomed to more than a trickle of mail from activists and pressure groups.

As a young member entering Parliament, I have thought that we, as politicians, do consider in this Parliament a great breadth of legislation that is put before us that affects many people very intimately. Do we hear expressions of opinion from those people as to their attitude towards these problems?

**Mr. P. Wood:** If you move around your electorate, you should.

**Mr. AHERN:** I, for one, move around my electorate frequently. If an hon. member moves around his electorate, does he sample adequately the views of his electorate on every issue that comes before this Parliament? I do not believe that he does. If the hon. member for Toowoomba East believes that he does, he is only kidding himself. If he did that relative to every issue that comes before Parliament, he would not be giving sufficient time to considering the policy matters that come before this Assembly.

**Mr. B. Wood:** How big is your electorate?

**Mr. AHERN:** My electorate is much bigger than the hon. member's.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. AHERN:** I thought it was the hon. member for Toowoomba East who interjected. My electorate certainly is larger in terms of population, anyway.

As the country is forging ahead in the economic field, this is a logical time to change the state of affairs now existing, and I refer particularly to the lack of communication between government and people. I believe that steadily growing numbers of people do care about the quality of life available to them; but they need to demonstrate that fact, and demonstrate it regularly, to their legislators. In my opinion, having in mind the wide variety of matters that come before Parliament, we, as Parliamentarians in a democracy, should receive many more expressions of opinion from our constituents in letters relative to the matters that come before us.

**Mr. Sherrington:** You are receiving quite a few postcards at the moment.

**Mr. AHERN:** One section of the community is exercising its rights. On the other hand, a vast number of people do not exercise their rights, and they should when matters affect them directly.

A natural adjunct of that situation, which will become more obvious in the future as political awareness grows in this country, will be a need for more secretarial services to Parliamentarians in this State.

**Mr. Sherrington:** There is a need for that now.

**Mr. AHERN:** There is a need for more secretarial services to members of Parliament at present. An excellent service is provided by shorthand-typists each of whom caters for the needs of six to 10 members, but that is not good enough in a Parliament such as this. There is a need not for shorthand-typists as such but, both at the moment and in the future, for secretarial services as such.

**Mr. B. Wood:** Have you asked for that?

**Mr. AHERN:** I am asking for it now; I have asked for it before, also.

**Mr. Sherrington:** We will support you on that one.

**Mr. AHERN:** A situation in which members have to do their own secretarial work is clearly not satisfactory in this State today. More than ever there is a need for members of Parliament to study the wide variety of policy items coming before them. This requires a considerable amount of study of legislation coming forward in other States and of the relevant information from overseas. This study takes time, and if a member does his own secretarial work he cannot devote sufficient time to this type of very necessary research. I therefore call on the Government to investigate the situation, as I feel that the present position is not adequate for many members of this Parliament. In the future the need for secretarial

services must increase as the work-load on members increases. We are receiving an increasing number of expressions of opinion from our constituents, and in future these will become heavier as constituents increase in number. I suggest that this matter should be looked at urgently.

**Mr. B. Wood:** Do you want this in your electorate?

**Mr. AHERN:** On the matter raised by the hon. member for Cook as to whether we want it in our electorates, this will have to be done. Secretarial services will have to be, to a degree, decentralised. If a secretarial service as such is to be provided, it will have to be sited, to a great degree, outside the metropolitan area. I believe that some co-operation can be achieved in this matter.

I said earlier in my speech that one of our favourite delusions is to assess our current performance against the past, whereas the valid test must be made against our potential to do better in the future. After all, that is what our electors do at election-time. They do not assess us so much on what we have done in the past; they are rather more interested in what we are going to do in the future. In the light of this, I suggest that changes should be made in the parliamentary system to meet the modern situation, and that we, as a Parliament, should be alive to what is occurring in other States of Australia and in the Federal sphere and be ready to undertake changes in our Queensland system.

In this way we will do better service to the democratic system that our society enjoys. I believe it is very necessary that, in the future, we space parliamentary sessions over the year. The sessions should be spaced over 12 months rather than cramming most of our activity into a five months' session. The spacing of sessions would allow members time to visit various parts of the State as they require, to acquaint themselves with what is going on, and to service their electorates more adequately than they do at the present time.

**Mr. Jensen:** You are not being forceful enough. You will never get your Government to agree to this.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. W. D. Hewitt:** The former member for Bundaberg would make a much better contribution than the present member.

**Mr. AHERN:** I believe he would. I believe also that questions without notice should be permitted in this Chamber. This practice has been adopted in other States of Australia for some time with quite good effect, and it ought to be adopted here. I have every reason to believe that it will be adopted early in the New Year.

I think also that adjournment debates should be allowed, and that the time for speeches should be substantially reduced. At

present, the time allowed for debating Budget matters is one hour. I think this is far too long and could be substantially reduced.

One of the most important changes that should be introduced into this Parliament is, I believe, a system of parliamentary select committees. These committees are an integral part of the parliamentary systems in other States and overseas, and they could well be employed in this State so that back-bench members on both sides of the House could be given greater opportunity to participate in the investigation of possible policy matters. The fact that this Parliament has not appointed a select committee for 50 years should not hold it back from appointing select committees in future, because many areas of Government activity should be under constant review.

I have already recommended that a parliamentary select committee should be appointed to investigate a number of the problems that face Queensland's farming industries. Recently I had the pleasure of reading the report of a Canadian parliamentary select committee appointed to investigate problems that face Canadian farmers. Vast policy changes emanated from the report of that committee. Similar committees should be appointed in Queensland to investigate not only those problems but many other areas of Government activity as well.

Several standing committees should be appointed also, and their appointment has been recommended already today. They could consider subordinate legislation, public works, and, most importantly, privilege. It appears to me that a very urgent need exists to appoint a standing committee to deal with possible breaches of privilege.

As planning for the future parliamentary institution in Queensland goes forward, as it is doing, it will be realised that all those matters should be taken into account and that there is need in the planning for areas in which Government committees could meet and in which greater provision should be made to increase the secretarial services available to members, and so on.

Finally, I thank the Premier and his officers for the courtesies that they have extended to me during the year.

**Mr. BROMLEY** (Norman) (12.44 p.m.): It appears to me that during the Estimates debate unless an hon. member praises the Minister or, in this case, the Premier, for the administration of his portfolio the member leaves himself open to a very savage attack in the Minister's reply. That situation arose during the debate on the Estimates of the Department of Industrial Development. Whether or not the statements made by the hon. member concerned were true, the Minister for Industrial Development wilfully misconstrued them. Only recently I was almost tossed out of

the Chamber without a warning, and I do not think that that is fair. Incidents of that sort should be looked into. However, I forgive the Minister and the Temporary Chairman for their conduct on that occasion.

Without doubt, the Premier is responsible for very important matters.

**A Government Member:** Are you going to praise the Premier?

**Mr. BROMLEY:** Yes, I shall praise the Premier. I am always willing to praise Ministers, Mr. Speaker, the Chairman and the Temporary Chairmen if the occasion demands. Of course, I am also prepared to attack if I feel that an attack is warranted.

The Premier is responsible for a great magnitude of matters. His title of Premier and Minister for State Development indicates the tremendous responsibilities that he has. Surely the Premier's portfolio of Minister for State Development covers every facet of growth in Queensland.

Many matters need the attention, overseeing—and I stress the word "overseeing"—intervention, and suggestions of the Premier. I am sure all hon. members agree that whatever an hon. member cares to speak about must be covered in some way by this portfolio, and must be influenced by the Premier's thoughts and influence, irrespective of what the hon. member for Toowoong said when he tried, in his know-all manner, to criticise the Leader of the Opposition for speaking about matters relative to the development of the State. He said, in effect, that those matters came under the Department of Industrial Development. If that is true, and I very much doubt it, why does the Premier have the portfolio of Minister for State Development, which, I am sure, covers all these things?

As the Premier exercises a great influence on all undertakings in Queensland, I urge him to heed my plea to intervene in speeding up the establishment of a new airport in Brisbane and facilitating improvements at other airports in the State. Before very long Jumbo jets will be arriving in Australia. Perhaps because of inclement weather, they may not be able to land in Sydney, but they will be able to travel the 500 air miles to Brisbane to land here.

**Mr. Hinze:** The distance to Brisbane is shorter than the distance to Sydney.

**Mr. BROMLEY:** That is so, but they cannot come to Brisbane because we do not have an adequate landing strip. I urge the Premier to intervene with the Commonwealth Government in this matter. He must be worried about this matter, as must all hon. members, including the member for South Coast.

I also ask the Premier to render assistance by approaching the Commonwealth Government about wharf installations. Recently, a friend of mine went to one of the wharves

to greet some of his friends who were arriving on the "Himalaya". He told me that the amenities provided were absolutely primitive.

**Mr. Davis:** They have not even got any women's toilets.

**Mr. BROMLEY:** As the hon. member for Brisbane interjected, women's toilets are not provided, and the men's toilets are shocking. I do not know the conditions on all wharves, but such amenities are important to the development of Brisbane and the State. We should have at least one decent wharf with adequate, modern amenities at which tourist ships can berth.

Some hon. members may think that I am not discussing State Development, but I am, because all these matters are essential to Queensland's development. I ask the Premier to approach the Commonwealth authorities in his usual kindly way and use his good graces and influence with them to have the wharves modernised.

I pay a tribute to all officials connected with the Premier's Department. I would dearly love to name each and every one of them, but unfortunately time does not permit me to do so. I am most sincere in offering my thanks to all of them for the assistance they have given me in carrying out my parliamentary duties.

I understand that Mr. Col. Curtis will leave for overseas shortly to take up his position as Agent-General in London. I congratulate him on that appointment. I am certain, and I am sure all hon. members will agree with me, that he will do a fine job and that his work will be of great benefit to this State and its people.

I pay a tribute to the officers of the State Public Relations Bureau, particularly the State Public Relations Officer, who on many occasions have assisted me by providing material for friends of mine going overseas. Only the other day I rang him. He was very courteous to me and, as quick as a flash, he sent me a great deal of material on Queensland, including some booklets published by the Department of Industrial Development, about which the Minister for Industrial Development, in a most unkind way, chastised me the other day. At this moment, all of that material is on its way to America where it will be distributed to many people by a person who has a good deal to do with public relations work over there.

It is apparent to all that there is a shortage of shorthand reporters in this State, not only Court reporters but also "Hansard" reporters. I understand that this morning the hon. member for Salisbury gave notice of a question on this subject. Without a doubt, "Hansard" reporters do a tremendous job. In fact, when I read some of the speeches of Government members, I am amazed to find what good speeches they appear to have made.

I wonder, in passing, if a special course could be established to overcome this shortage. Perhaps Mr. Speaker as well as the Premier could note this. On page 8 of the Annual Report of the Public Service Board it is stated that only one candidate qualified for appointment in 1968-69. That is very worrying. I know there is a course and we should encourage more people to take it. Perhaps we could have a crash course for reporters for the State Reporting Bureau and associated departments.

I also note in the board's report that both male and female candidates participated in tests for promotion in the State Reporting Bureau. That shows some equality in treatment of the sexes. I pay a tribute to the members of the Public Service Board for allowing females to participate in those tests, and I am not being sarcastic when I say that because I believe that it is their right.

"The Courier-Mail" of 1 August, 1969, contained an article headed, "State's 'pressing needs' given snub by P.M.," from which I intend to quote. I believe its contents must give all Queenslanders cause for great concern, because the words of the Prime Minister reported in it constitute an insult to the Premier and the State of Queensland. In a paragraph headed "Slighted", this appears—

"There was comment in State political circles last night that the Premier had been slighted and that he shouldn't have had to go to Mr. Gorton's suite within an hour of the Prime Minister's departure.

"It was claimed Mr. Gorton's visit had been a poor exercise in public relations."

It was indeed. It was an insult to the Premier, the Government, and Her Majesty's Opposition.

The article goes on to state—

"He had met only Liberal-arranged audiences and had not given the impression of treating Queensland problems with any great urgency."

Events have proved that statement to be correct.

The next paragraph is headed, "Graziers are disappointed." No-one can deny that graziers, and all others connected with the land, have done a tremendous job to assist the development of this State. The article states, under the heading that I have already quoted—

"The United Graziers' Association president (Mr. C. B. Peter Bell) yesterday described as a bitter disappointment Mr. Gorton's reported reluctance to accede to Queensland's request for increased drought aid.

"Mr. Bell said the grazing industry continued to experience one of the most critical periods in its history.

"It was suffering low prices for wool, high costs which were applicable to all industries, and a drought situation which was becoming increasingly worse every day."

I pay a tribute to the Government for assisting in many ways some of the people on the land. Although it may perhaps be said that I do not often compliment the Government, I believe in doing what I consider is right. Admittedly, some of the finance for this assistance may have come from the Commonwealth Government, but I believe that the State has done more than the Commonwealth has done.

It is true that there are in Queensland today districts that could perhaps be called depressed areas, and I have one or two suggestions that might assist in the development of the State. I think that more generous assistance should be given to industries in the country, or those industries that are prepared to attempt establishment in some of the so-called depressed areas. No doubt the Premier must be concerned about some of the industries in his electorate, in towns such as Kingaroy, which are helping to develop the State. I have been to Kingaroy and spoken to some of the people concerned, and they ask for some assistance. The Government builds high schools and colleges to educate the young, but when those young people finish their education they invariably have to go to the capital city or to provincial cities on the coast to obtain employment, because no jobs are available in their home towns.

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

**Mr. BROMLEY:** Before the recess for lunch, I was dealing with some suggestions that I think could be implemented by departments under the control of the Premier to assist the development of the State. Although I have before me a list of the suggestions that I have in mind—they include the establishment of a steel works and other things—I do not think I should deal with them any further because time for debate on these Estimates is limited and I know that other hon. members wish to take part in it and that the Premier will wish to reply. I shall, therefore, quickly finish my speech and give other hon. members an opportunity of commenting on the Estimates.

The report of the Public Service Board deals with wages to some extent, although it does not deal with the precise figures that I wish to mention. I have taken figures from the report of the Director of Industrial Development relative to factory employment, but the comments that I wish to make are connected with State development.

If one analyses the figures relative to factory development and compares the wage scales of males with those of females, one sees that although the number of males employed is more than four times the number of females—this should give the Premier some food for thought—the total wages earned by males are more than eight times those earned by females. It is quite evident, therefore, that female workers are not drawing their fair share of wages, and

it emphasises the point I made in an earlier debate that equal pay should be introduced in all industries, including the Public Service.

**Mr. Davies:** It sounds as if they are being exploited.

**Mr. BROMLEY:** I think they are being exploited. Equal pay should be introduced now, not in the distant future.

I wish to deal briefly with the need for a Bill of Rights in this State. I do not think that the present Premier has spoken of the need for a Bill of Rights—I do not remember his doing so—but other Premiers of this State since 1957 certainly have done so. I believe that there is a very great need for a Bill of Rights. Recently I perused an article headed "Rights Bill 'is a big need here'", which appeared in "The Sunday Mail" of 20 July, 1969, and I completely agree with the Supreme Court judge who said in that article that personal liberties in Australia were in danger of being eroded.

Hon. members have seen in this Chamber during the present week the way in which personal liberties are being eroded. Parliament, in my opinion, is master of its own destiny, but members are denied the right to speak on subjects that are sub judice. I do not intend to mention them, because a ruling has already been given, but I point out that the rights of the individual in this State and the personal rights of individuals in this Parliament are being eroded when members on both sides of the Chamber are prevented from bringing to the notice of the public, through answers to questions, information desired by numerous people in many walks of life.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I hope that the hon. member for Norman is not in any way reflecting on the Speaker.

**Mr. BROMLEY:** No, I am not reflecting on the Speaker. I would never do that. I simply say that I feel that the personal rights of individuals are being eroded. I will continue by reading the article from "The Sunday Mail", in which a Supreme Court judge in Victoria, Mr. Justice M. V. McInerney, strongly urged Australia to draw up a Bill of Rights to guard personal freedom. He said—

"Too often our liberties can be taken away without consciousness by Parliamentary bodies."

The judge claimed that parliamentary bodies themselves are taking away the liberty of the individual, and I think that is quite right. I do not think that Parliament should take away the rights of anybody else, nor should the rights of members of Parliament be taken away.

**Mr. W. D. Hewitt:** As soon as you try to define a right you limit it, don't you?

**Mr. BROMLEY:** In answer to the hon. member, it is very difficult to define actually what is a right, either within this Parliament or outside it. Some say that freedom of speech is a right. I heard one hon. member say in the library this morning that the freedom to walk away from somebody who is speaking to you is a right. The freedom to walk away from a demonstration is a right, and the freedom to demonstrate is also a right.

If we do introduce a Bill of Rights, which in my opinion should be done as soon as possible, let us consider the liberties of all individuals in Queensland irrespective of their manner of life, the positions they hold, or whether they are members of Parliament. Let us consider the rights of everyone, from the Premier to the lowest or poorest individuals in the State. Their rights, like those of everyone else, should be considered in every way.

The hon. member for Chatsworth asked what one would consider to be the right of an individual. That is too big a subject to debate in the time that I have left.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. RAMSDEN** (Merthyr) (2.23 p.m.): I desire to enter into the debate on the Estimates of the Legislative Assembly, not to speak on matters of internal reform within the Parliament, as other hon. members have done, but rather to speak on the principles, if I might call them such, of the Legislative Assembly and the Parliament in general.

I believe that we, as members of Parliament, have done very little over the years to improve our own status and standing in the community. In fact, I think that when Parliament is denigrated by members of the public generally, in many respects that denigration is self-inflicted and we should do something about it.

That is the subject about which I wish to speak for a few moments this afternoon. I should like first of all to try to correct the impression held generally by the public that members of Parliament, as such, do no work or that their working days and working weeks are governed merely by the days of sitting of the House.

**Mr. Davies:** The Prime Minister does not seem to want many working days in Parliament, does he?

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** That interjection by the hon. member is the sort of thing I have been complaining about over the years. Hon. members who have no respect for themselves merely denigrate themselves within the community. The hon. member's interjection is a shining example of that. What I have said is that members of Parliament are not given sufficient public recognition for the work that they do, irrespective of the party to which they belong. For too long we have allowed the general public to think that because Parliament is not sitting for certain

months of the year we are on a perpetual holiday, and the hon. member's interjection only adds fuel to the fire.

When Parliament sits, its job is to consider legislation. The job of Government members is to support the Government in legislation that it introduces after discussions in the party rooms. The job of members of the Opposition, like the hon. member for Maryborough, who is becoming quite adept in that capacity and looks like staying in Opposition for a long time, is to oppose the Government of the day if they believe that the Government is doing the wrong thing. Those are the functions of members of the Legislative Assembly.

Another aspect of the relationship that exists between members of Parliament and the general public and that calls for consideration is the number of times that Parliament is referred to as a coward's castle. Quite often attacks are made on parliamentary privilege, and because it is exercised members of the public challenge parliamentarians to "come outside Parliament, that coward's castle, and say those things."

Let me delve into the history of privilege. We should realise the necessity for it, and, having done so, we should then look at the responsibility that it demands from us. Parliamentary privilege has been handed down to us through the House of Commons, where it was realised that Parliament should be protected, firstly, from the Crown and, ultimately, from people outside Parliament. It was designed to protect a member who believed that it was only by exposing a particular situation in Parliament that he was able to bring to the notice of the Government some abuse that needed correction. It is quite obvious that if members did not enjoy parliamentary privilege many men's tongues could be silenced by the mere issue of a writ. We know from experience that if anyone wants to silence another, all that he needs do is issue a writ, even though he has no intention of executing it. I hope that the Government in its wisdom, through the Minister for Justice, will give some thought to the matter of letting writs lie in the Registry of the Supreme Court ad infinitum simply to keep people silent. As the supreme court in this State—and I use the word "court" in its fullest sense, because all courts derive their power and authority from Parliament—this Parliament must enjoy parliamentary privilege and must learn to exercise it with discretion and caution.

**Mr. Davies:** Does this come under the Premier's Department?

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** Again the hon. member shows his complete ignorance. I would like him to read page 7 of the Estimates of expenditure, where he will find that the Legislative Assembly and its many ramifications come under the Premier. If the hon. member wishes to speak, I suggest

that he use his own time and not waste mine. I want to give hon. members opposite a "fair go" and, at the same time, finish what I have to say. As I do not want to waste my time in answering the hon. member for Maryborough, from now on I will ignore him.

Because we enjoy the parliamentary privilege of saying what we like, when we like, and how we like, without fear, favour or worry about what may happen to us—except possibly having a bomb thrown into our homes if we say the wrong thing about some people—as members of Parliament we should exercise self-discipline and self-restraint when using this privilege. When we exercise our parliamentary privilege we should do so for the good of the State and the nation, and not to score off an individual or to blacken someone's character. We are not justified in exercising parliamentary privilege merely to destroy; we are justified in exercising it only to bring about good government and responsibility for the people of the State.

**An Opposition Member:** Who will be the judge of that?

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** The only judge in the matter of parliamentary privilege is each member himself.

I emphasise that we are free in this Chamber to say whatever we like. The only limitation on what we say and how we say it is imposed by ourselves, as members of Parliament, through our Standing Orders.

**Mr. Davies:** What do you think of your position when you said that all second-hand-car dealers in Brisbane were crooks?

**An Opposition Member:** You are not game to answer that.

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** If hon. members opposite want me to use my full time, I will be delighted to answer the hon. member for Maryborough.

Having stated very briefly what I think about parliamentary privilege, I hope that the Press, and the public generally, will recognise that simply because Parliament is not sitting, members of Parliament—back-benchers and Ministers alike—are not on a perpetual holiday.

**Mr. B. Wood:** I do not think the public has that idea.

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** The hon. member has just entered this Assembly; he has not yet cut his teeth in it. When he has been here a long while he will understand the situation.

I place on record my appreciation of the work performed by the members of the "Hansard" staff, particularly Mr. Rohl. In the Address-in-Reply debate I omitted to place on record my gratitude to Mr. Dunlop, the former Clerk of the Parliament, for his guidance in past years. I also failed to congratulate the present Clerk, Mr. Johnston,

and Mr. Cyril George, the Sergeant-at-Arms, and Mr. Wilson, on their promotion. The gentlemen who sit at the centre table have rendered me every assistance in my 12 years here. I am sure that all hon. members agree with those sentiments. In matters of parliamentary procedure and guidance, no approach is made by hon. members to the gentlemen at the centre table that is not met with their utmost co-operation and help, irrespective of party affiliations.

**Honourable Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** We also depend heavily on the staff in the correspondence room. I know that the present system has its faults, but we do not have sufficient money to do all that we would like to do. I know that many hon. members believe that we should have a secretarial service rather than a typing pool. I also realise that this cannot be done.

**Mr. Hanson:** Are there enough fire extinguishers in the House?

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** So many fiery speeches are made here that the House would have been burnt down long ago if there had not been sufficient fire extinguishers.

Other members of the House staff who deserve our remarks of appreciation are those who work in the Parliamentary Refreshment Room and the Parliamentary Library. They are unseen by the public, to a large degree, and work long hours while the House is in session.

Finally, I say how pleased I am to see in the Estimates an amount allocated for overseas parliamentary missions. These missions were introduced by this Government. I had the honour of being a member of the first mission, which visited South-east Asia. It was led by the hon. member for Somerset (Mr. Richter) and comprised the former hon. member for Toowoomba West (Mr. Duggan), the hon. member for Rockhampton North and the late hon. member for Roma (Mr. Ewan). Let me say, as an hon. member who has been on such a trip, that these missions do a tremendous amount for Queensland and Queenslanders. All that we read about other peoples and all that they read about us do not mean the slightest thing compared with the personal understanding that comes when we visit them in their own homes and their own living conditions, and when we see their problems through their eyes and they see our problems through our eyes.

**Mr. Campbell:** You have been a very worthy Queensland ambassador, too.

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** I thank the Minister.

I commend the Government on allocating money for these parliamentary missions. I trust that future allocations will be made for them.

**Mr. P. WOOD** (Toowoomba East) (2.37 p.m.): I thank the hon. member for Merthyr for cutting his speech short to give me an

opportunity to speak. I do not intend to take my full time, either, because arrangements have been made for other hon. members to speak.

I disagree with the comment of the hon. member for Merthyr that it is a widely held view that when Parliament is not in session, hon. members are on holidays. I can assure the hon. member that my electors do not think that; in fact, they know otherwise.

This debate has been interesting because of the revelations unwittingly made by some Government members. The hon. member for Toowong revealed the impotence of Government members, including himself. He lamented the lack of influence that they have on the policies adopted by the Executive. While he spoke sententiously of being an advocate of change, he seemed to imagine that the mere advocating of change is sufficient to achieve results. He apparently has not learnt that if one wants change, it is not enough to mouth a desire; it is necessary to work hard for it.

To many Opposition members, and to many people outside Parliament, the hon. member for Toowong has typified many of the features of conservative politicians. They may actually advocate change, but, because they do not translate that advocacy into action, they make no change at all. We are obliged to judge them on what has been done, not on what they say they would like to see done. This is the second term that the hon. member has had in this Parliament. The ideas he has advocated are not new or exclusively his, as he would readily acknowledge. He has, in that time, achieved nothing. So we are entitled to allege that, while he is an advocate for change, his policies are really conservative, because no change has been made.

The hon. member for Toowong also revealed the ruthlessness of Cabinet. He complained about bloc voting, which really is an accepted convention of parliamentary democracy. He then went on to say, speaking particularly of this Cabinet, that Cabinet would not reveal arguments or opinions in the party room which may be damaging to its case. In other words, Cabinet presented only one side of the story, and voted as a bloc. That is quite a reflection on his colleagues.

The hon. member for Landsborough said that there was a lack of communication between the Government and the people. That may be so—I accept his judgment on that issue—but there is no lack of communication between the Opposition party and the people. I agree that free communication is very important, and if, as the hon. member for Landsborough says, the Government fails in this regard, it is up to the Government, and the hon. member, to do something about it.

Not only is communication important; so also is participation. By that, I mean that as many people as possible should participate in the workings of democracy. Hon. members opposite seem to have the belief that the single action of casting a vote is sufficient participation in democracy for nearly everybody. Government members' philosophy on democracy seems to be, "Elect us and we will make all the decisions for you." Tied to that is the idea that if the people do not like Government policies or policy-makers, they can vote the Government out of office. In some respects it may be fair enough to say that, but in Queensland there is an electoral system that makes it very difficult to do that. It is very difficult to vote this Government out. Very few people are given any chance to play a part in discussions of this Government—not even, as the hon. member for Toowong pointed out, its own back-benchers.

Whilst I have been critical of the hon. member for Toowong on the ground of his failure to achieve any results in what he has often advocated, I agree with many of the proposals that he has made. There ought to be in this Parliament a range of committees on all matters of concern to the State—health, education, Aboriginal welfare, conservation, and so on. Such committees should meet regularly and hear evidence and submissions from all sorts of groups of interested and concerned citizens. They should be able to move around the State taking evidence and hearing submissions. They should publish their considerations and reports, which should be made available and distributed widely in order to encourage further discussion among concerned people.

Unfortunately, not everyone is concerned about important problems of government, but there are some people who are concerned, who would like to be involved in decision-making and would like to have some opportunity of putting their views forward but who now do not have an opportunity to do so. Such committees would involve Parliamentarians in a continuing examination of major issues and, in addition, they would give to the concerned people the opportunity to make their views known. The flow of information between Parliament and the people would thus be increased in both directions. This would improve both participation and communication, about which the hon. member for Landsborough was so concerned. I am in accord with the hon. member on that point, as I am in accord with some of the points raised by the hon. member for Toowong and other hon. members on both sides of the Chamber over a period of time.

I wish now to discuss some of the workings of this Assembly and the facilities available to hon. members. I agree with the expressions of opinion relative to secretarial assistance available to members of Parliament who do not live in Brisbane. I think it is intolerable that country members should

not be provided with facilities similar to those available to city members, and I cannot understand why the situation is allowed to continue.

**Mr. Ramsden:** They are.

**Mr. P. WOOD:** City members have available to them expert typing assistance from a highly qualified staff that does excellent work. I do not wish to convey any impression that I am critical of the work done for hon. members under existing staff arrangements. However, if it is good enough for a city member to come from his home—I am speaking now of times when Parliament is not in session—to his office, avail himself of the services of a typist, and telephone Government departments in Brisbane, I cannot see why similar typing and telephone services cannot be provided to country members.

It would at least be a beginning if country members living in places in which there are Government offices could make use of a typist from a Government department for a certain time each week. I think that could be done without seriously delaying the work of Government departments, whether in Toowoomba, Cairns, Mt. Isa, or some other place. In my opinion, members of this Assembly should have the services of a full-time secretary.

**Mr. Lee:** What about in the city? Do you think we should have one girl to one member here?

**Mr. P. WOOD:** Let us consider what can be done immediately to improve the situation. I do not think that the hon. member for Yeronga is very familiar with the problems faced by hon. members representing country areas. I have suggested that typists in suitable Government departments in country areas or provincial cities should be made available to members of Parliament, as required, for typing services when Parliament is not sitting. I believe also that members of Parliament in country areas should feel free to make telephone calls to Government departments in Brisbane without having to worry about the excessive cost of such calls. Every hon. member in this Chamber knows that frequently it is necessary to telephone Government departments on matters raised with them by their constituents. Only this morning I had the experience of telephoning a Government department from Parliament House. I was not certain to which officer I should speak and it was five minutes before I was able to speak to someone who could assist me. That is not criticism of the Government department concerned; I did not know who it was to whom I wished to speak.

A similar situation has arisen while I have been in Toowoomba, and it should be remembered that the cost of a trunk-line call from Toowoomba is not nearly as high as it is from Mt. Isa, Cairns, or Townsville. I have remained on the telephone while the operator has asked me whether or not I wanted further

extensions, not knowing whether the person to whom I was speaking was the one that I really wanted.

**Mr. Lee:** You could make a person-to-person call.

**Mr. P. WOOD:** If the hon. member had been listening, he would have heard me say that I did not know the name of the person to whom I wished to speak.

**Mr. B. Wood:** Perhaps the charges could be reversed.

**Mr. P. WOOD:** That is an excellent suggestion, and I hope it will receive sympathetic consideration. These costs to me are not as high as those to members who live further from Brisbane than I do, but they are sufficient to be a somewhat inhibiting factor in making telephone calls to Government departments. Admittedly I receive, as do all hon. members, a rebate of 50 per cent. on the cost of trunk-line calls that I make. I pay the other 50 per cent. myself. Nevertheless, if hon. members examine their telephone accounts, the trunk-line calls that they make are sufficient to constitute, as I say, a somewhat inhibiting factor in contacting Government departments by telephone.

Office accommodation in this building has often been the subject of debate. I know that plans are now being considered—they are somewhat hazy—to improve the situation, and all I want to say is that I believe that office accommodation provided for members should be as close to this Chamber as is practicable. I do not think any of us want a situation where our office desks are far removed from the Chamber. We know of the rather vague plans for new accommodation to be built approximately on the site of the stables.

**Mr. Porter:** You have members on the Parliamentary Buildings Committee.

**Mr. P. WOOD:** That is right, and our desires have been made very clearly known to the members of our party who have served on that committee. We have every confidence in them, but I think it is perfectly fair for me to express my views here.

**Mr. W. D. Hewitt:** They are not vague plans.

**Mr. P. WOOD:** Country members at present in the Lodge generally accept that they would not like to be accommodated further from Parliament House than they presently are. Private members of Parliament would not desire accommodation outside the precincts of this House. I think that is sufficient comment on that point.

From time to time, debate has taken place here about the form of question time. While Press reports have mentioned changes in the form of question time, I do not know whether such changes as are suggested in Press reports are likely to occur or, if they

are, when they will be introduced. But there seems to be general acceptance of the principle that some change is necessary, and the principle of questions without notice receives wholehearted support from this side of the Chamber and also from some sections on the other side.

I have previously suggested that if questions without notice are to be put to Ministers, we must consider not only the Ministers but also the back-benchers who will be posing questions to them. The system that operates in the British House of Commons is worthy of consideration. It is that a written question is posed on one day of sitting and has to be answered on the next day of sitting. That is very much as we now do it here. That question is answered by the Minister next day, and questions without notice then arise because that Minister may be asked supplementary questions following on from the question that he has already been asked. In that instance the Minister is treated very generously in that he is asked a question for which he has prepared a written answer. He knows what the general subject is to be, and then, subject to the discretion of the Speaker, back-bench members are given the opportunity to ask as many supplementary questions without notice as may be allowed. I think such a system is well worthy of consideration. Of course, questions that are to be asked need to be important ones; they ought not to require detailed statistical information, or be of a parochial nature.

All back-bench members should have the opportunity to seek answers to questions. We are able to ask questions on matters that affect our own electorates and seek detailed statistical information. No Minister should be expected to provide such information off the cuff. That type of question could go on to a written notice-paper and the time of the House not be taken up with oral answers. Instead, they could be replied to by written answers.

We have heard many discussions on questions and the form of questions, and proposals and Press statements have been made on this subject. I hope that very soon the Government will make an announcement of its policy on this matter so that the debates and general discussions on this subject that have continued for some time will come to an end and the problem will be solved satisfactorily.

**Mr. McKECHNIE** (Carnarvon) (2.56 p.m.): I take this opportunity to enter the debate on the Premier's Estimates for many reasons, and in the brief time at my disposal I express my appreciation to the Premier for the fine work he has done for this State since his election to that very high office. He has worked very long hours, and I am a little fearful that he could be overworked. I hope that he will look after himself so that this State can have the benefit of his leadership for many years.

I appreciate, too, the help that I have received from his officers in the Executive Building. His Co-ordinator-General, Mr. Barton, has been of immense help in trying to solve some of the very complicated problems that arise in co-ordination between Government departments. I express my particular appreciation for his efforts relative to one that has arisen at Wallangarra.

I have always believed that success, whilst depending on man-power, finance and management separately, depends also on the co-ordination of the three. Having regard to the very small outlay on it, management plays a very large part in the success of an enterprise, and, consequently, I have a good deal of sympathy for members who have expressed concern about the expenses they incur, and I refer particularly to those who live in remote electorates. I would hesitate to accept nomination for membership of this Assembly if I were required to be a professional parliamentarian depending solely on my expenses and salary to carry out my duties.

**Mr. Tucker:** Do you think it would be beyond you?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** I think that the expenses would be insufficient to enable me to do my job as I would like to do it.

**Mr. Tucker:** You mean you would need to have a private income?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** I do not think I would be in this job if I did not have the source of income implied by the hon. member.

The management of Parliament can be very economical. When the costs of running the Queensland Legislative Assembly are compared with the expenditure incurred throughout the State, it can be seen that our efficiency far outweighs that of private enterprise. I do not think that private enterprise would run this State on such meagre administration costs. We should face up to the need to spend a greater amount of money on the Legislative Assembly to make it as efficient as possible, because efficient management can save this State a good deal of money in getting the job done. Although advocating this extra finance, I appreciate what Mr. Speaker has done in providing improvements, particularly within this Chamber. It has become efficient under his direction. Our office facilities are not to my liking, but they have been considerably improved, which I appreciate.

**Mr. B. Wood:** Would you like a typist in your electorate?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** Our efficiency should be concentrated in Brisbane. At times I might like a typist in my electorate, but, as it has six towns and I am moving throughout the area all the time, I do not think I could use a typist to the best advantage. If the

business arrangements here were really efficient, I am confident that I could handle my clerical work. I would not ask for a typist within my electorate.

**Mr. P. Wood** interjected.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** I should like to deal with many other matters, but I know that Mr. Speaker wants to speak, and I want to hear him. I will therefore cut my observations short.

In the last few years I have been very critical of the efficiency of the facilities within this House. It is therefore becoming that I should express my appreciation of the fact that a report was recently presented to the Minister for Works and Housing on the provision of future buildings to accommodate members of Parliament. If finance is available, I understand that the programme could be completed by 1975. Like other hon. members, I should like it to be completed sooner but if by 1975 we can get everything referred to in the report, I will be very happy. When the building programme is completed, I trust that adequate accommodation will be available for the efficient working of this Parliament, that is, the work of Parliament itself and the work of individual members. I join with the hon. member for Toowoomba East in saying that it is desirable that country members should be housed within the complex.

I have had much pleasure in speaking to these Estimates and I will now conclude my remarks because I do not wish to prevent other members from speaking.

**Hon. D. E. NICHOLSON** (Murrumba) (3.3 p.m.): Mr. Hooper,—

**Honourable Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. NICHOLSON:** It is with some pleasure that I take my place on the floor of the Chamber to reply in some way to some of the criticisms—I appreciate that they are very few on this occasion—of the Legislature and its control in general, and to deal with the problems associated with being a member of Parliament. Today I speak as an ordinary member of Parliament but at times I will have to interpose some of my thoughts as Speaker of this Legislature. I think this is only the second occasion on which I have been invited by the Premier of the day to take my place in the Chamber and answer queries or speak on problems associated with the working of Parliament.

Prior to entering the Chamber I heard over the intercom system the comments of those hon. members who have spoken. That system was provided for most Ministers, the Leader of the Opposition, and others. I know that this innovation has been appreciated by all, in that members can attend to their normal work in their offices and still keep in touch with the proceedings within the Legislative Assembly.

I listened briefly to the hon. member for Toowong, who spoke on problems associated with the House, I was pleased that there were not many mentioned by him. One remark he made intrigued me. He spoke of the equality of hon. members. I have never been aware of the existence of any inequality among members. He said that all members are equal when speaking on the Executive. I do not propose to reply to that remark, but the thought struck me that it is a fact that all hon. members are equal, just as all humans are equal, but it is what they are equal to that really counts. It is like the dogfight. It is not the size of the dog in the fight that counts but the size of the fight in the dog. I think this applies particularly to members of Parliament.

We have here vociferous members who speak for up to 60 minutes and say very little. On the other hand, we also have members who speak for only 20 minutes yet say more than other members say in 40 minutes. This is where some of our problems arise, that is, in the length of time allocated for speeches. This subject was touched on by the hon. member for Landsborough, who said that too much time was allocated for speeches in certain debates, such as 60 minutes in the Budget debate, 40 minutes in the Address-in-Reply debate and 40 minutes at the second-reading stage of a Bill.

For some time I have thought that a good deal of this time could be used in a grievance debate or, as the hon. member for Landsborough said, in an adjournment debate instead of having members padding their speeches and speaking on parochial matters that do not matter very much anyway, and filling the pages of "Hansard", which costs a good deal of money to produce. Of course, to advocate an adjournment debate is nothing new. It has been long in my mind, and in the minds of other hon. members, including those on the Standing Orders Committee. Adjournment debates take place in most other Parliaments, and they are particularly enlightening. They are short, sweet, and to the point.

The hon. member for Landsborough mentioned also a shortage of shorthand-typists and secretarial assistants for members of Parliament. That matter was also raised by the hon. member for Toowoomba East and the hon. member for Merthyr. I was pleased to hear the hon. member for Carnarvon say that secretarial assistance would not be of much advantage to him because he moves around his electorate and has many principal towns to visit.

**Mr. P. Wood:** That need not apply everywhere.

**Mr. NICHOLSON:** It need not apply everywhere; I realise that. I was leading up to saying that if hon. members can give me some indication where I can get staff

to increase the number of shorthand-typists or of staff in other places in the House, I would dearly love to be told.

**Mr. Aikens:** Don't you think that country members should have some secretarial assistance in their electorates?

**Mr. NICHOLSON:** I shall come to that. The hon. member for Toowoomba East suggested that departmental secretaries or stenographers could be used in country centres. This, of course, is outside my province, but I think that the suggestion is worthy of consideration, provided that doing the members' correspondence does not interfere with the normal functioning of a department. After all, Government departments in the country have a great bearing on achieving benefits and overcoming problems in an area, and despite the fact that an hon. member might try to help members of the community in one particular sphere, he could interfere with some work associated with that department and what he did could be more detrimental to the community than the good that he was trying to do.

**Mr. Houston:** Don't you think it should work the other way? The services of the girl should be allocated to the member, and in her free time she could be used on departmental work.

**Mr. NICHOLSON:** In my ordinary work as a private member, I have found that Government departments such as Police and Primary Industries have much more work to attend to than a private member would have. Why then should priority be given to typing half a dozen letters for a member of Parliament? This is a matter that calls for a great deal of consideration.

**Mr. Aikens:** The Done Committee suggested that we should write our letters in longhand and send them to Brisbane to be typed, which means that we would get them back in about eight days.

**Mr. NICHOLSON:** I have done that in my office at times when my secretary has been busy.

The position arises in which the demand for extra services cannot be met by the availability of personnel. Let us face up to the problem. We have in Queensland one of the best training systems in Australia for "Hansard" reporters, and our "Hansard" staff is efficient and second to none in Australia. That has been proved time and time again. Even the Commonwealth Parliament filches Queensland shorthand-writers, and indeed makes overtures to them to go to the Commonwealth service where they will be paid one-third as much again as they are receiving here. Queensland shorthand-writers are the best-trained in Australia, bar none. That was demonstrated at the recent conference of Presiding Officers, when our reporters and typists had the report of the proceedings of the day on the doorstep of delegates each evening before they retired.

That exceeded the effort of the Commonwealth staff, who were able to provide their report only at the breakfast table the following morning. Our "Hansard" staff was spoken of on that occasion in very glowing terms.

However, members' problems concern not so much the "Hansard" staff as the typing staff. I can say in all truth that the staff of Parliament House has not grown commensurate with the general expansion of the Public Service and of the State as a whole. As Parliament is the centre of the State and the highest tribunal in the land, that situation has caused me some concern. Recently I applied for a typist to assist the clerks at the table and to help in the general work of the Assembly. I wanted her to be appointed before the one who was retiring left so that the new girl could be shown what was required of her. I waited for four or five weeks before there was any response to my application. I had asked for a senior girl who would be able to assume the responsibilities of the job for which she was required. The girl who was finally sent—and whose courage and pluck, incidentally, I admire—had had only two years' experience in the Main Roads Department. I express my concern over the fact that the Legislature of Queensland should be treated in that way. I think it is just a little too "rich" that, when I applied for a senior girl, a junior was sent.

**Mr. Aikens:** Why do you have to go cap in hand to anybody? Why can't you put one on yourself?

**Mr. NICHOLSON:** I have always tried to impress upon the Executive and officers of the Public Service that Parliament is the supreme body of this State. As the controlling officer of that body, I express my appreciation to the Premiers, from Sir Francis Nicklin to the Honourable Joh Bjelke-Petersen, for the manner in which they have treated me as Speaker. Never at any time has it been suggested to me how I should control the House or the affairs of Parliament. They have respected the Office of Speaker, and I express my appreciation for that.

However, at times we have had our problems and our differences, and the hon. member for Townsville South has expressed the thought that I have had ever since I have been Speaker. If the Parliament of Queensland requires something and that requirement is expressed through the presiding officer, namely, the Speaker, I think that No. 1 priority should be given to it.

**Mr. Aikens:** Why should we be subservient to a civil servant?

**Mr. NICHOLSON:** I am very pleased to say that there has been a complete revision and reclassification of the staff. In some respects a reasonable working basis has been arrived at, but we are still short-handed. I think I should announce at this stage that

my request has been granted for a senior accounts clerk to be appointed to look after the financial affairs of the Parliament and assist the clerks at the table and the back-room boys to carry out their work and undertake the studies that are necessary if they wish to proceed further as officers of this Assembly.

The big problem is the difficulty in obtaining the typing staff needed to meet the wishes of hon. members. I should like to have an additional three or four stenotypists on the staff. Unfortunately, again we are faced with the problem that both the Commonwealth Government and private enterprise pay higher salaries than we do. Indeed, if it were not for the fact that so many stenotypists in the employ of the Government, including those at Parliament House, are so deeply involved in superannuation schemes and in meeting other commitments, more would take employment elsewhere. Similarly, if members of the "Hansard" staff were not settled in Brisbane, with their homes and their roots established here, we would lose more of them, not only to the Commonwealth Government but also to private enterprise, where higher salaries are paid. I believe that that is something to which due consideration must be given.

Salaries and remuneration must be commensurate with the work done by the secretarial staff. In my own office, I have one girl acting as a secretary-stenotypist, and I can tell hon. members that, because of the many duties associated with running the House, we are so far behind with the work that my electoral duties have to be neglected to a certain extent. Again, when I ask that my secretary be given some remuneration for the additional work that she performs, my request falls on deaf ears because it does not comply with Public Service regulations.

I think it is time we dissociated ourselves from the Public Service and hired or fired our staff as we wished, and their remuneration should be commensurate with the duties they perform.

**Mr. Tucker:** When you say your request falls on deaf ears, do you mean in the Public Service Board?

**Mr. NICHOLSON:** I make recommendations, but, unfortunately, I find at times that they are vetoed down the line.

The hon. member for Toowoomba East said that some vague plan was in existence for the establishment of new accommodation for the Parliament. If the plan was vague, then I do not think the document I have here would have been printed. I must give due credit at this point to the previous Minister for Public Works, now the Premier, and the present Minister for Public Works, the Honourable Max Hodges, for the interest they both displayed when, in the first instance, I proposed a certain plan relative to additional accommodation at Parliament House. A committee has been formed and has been working in conjunction with the Parliamentary

Buildings Committee. That committee is termed a "steering committee". As yet we have had only two meetings, but we have come to certain conclusions and they are open to criticism and suggestion.

I appreciate the thinking of hon. members—especially country members—who say that they do not want outside accommodation, that they would prefer to have accommodation within a new building in these grounds. They have my whole-hearted support in this, because I believe that the closer a person is to his work the happier he is and the more efficiently he can carry it out.

To add to my thoughts on this matter I have taken out some figures relative to the cost of providing accommodation within a new building. Figures have been given to me showing the cost per day to provide outside accommodation for hon. members and, without quoting any of those figures, I can say that in a matter of two or three years we could well pay for the accommodation in the new building with what it would cost the Government to provide outside accommodation. I think this could well be the deciding point in whether or not increased accommodation is provided here.

At this juncture we have an all-party committee, which has been set up as a steering committee, to pose certain things to the Public Works Department, and I am quite sure that the department will take notice of the committee's recommendations.

The hon. member for Merthyr spoke about members of Parliament, as other members did, and touched particularly on the question of privilege. This matter has always been a worry to me, and I should like to stress that, as members of Parliament, we must value the privilege that is given to us to express our thoughts and opinions free of the problems associated with outside legal action. But let me admonish hon. members and say, for what it is worth: let us, as members of Parliament, uphold our own dignity by not ourselves abusing the privilege of Parliament. Let us not allow privilege to become licence to slander some person in the outside world who has no redress and no recourse to law to redeem himself in the eyes of others. This, I think, we should all remember. It is entirely up to ourselves. The image that any one of us creates within the four walls of this Assembly can well be the image applied to all members of Parliament in this State. I say that advisedly, because too often do we hear and read criticism in which all members of Parliament are judged on the doings of one or two.

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (3.24 p.m.): I am sure this debate has been of great interest to all members. I think hon. members would agree that it was very pleasing to have Mr. Speaker address the Committee from the floor of the Chamber. Hon. members would benefit greatly if Mr. Speaker were to talk

more often about Parliamentary procedures. I was particularly interested in his reference to the responsibility that we, as members of Parliament, bear and the manner in which we conduct ourselves. The hon. member for Landsborough, too, referred to the standing of members of Parliament in the community. Mr. Speaker said that our standing has a great bearing on our attitudes in carrying out our duties both inside and outside of Parliament.

I was interested to hear Mr. Speaker say that generally hon. members' speeches are short, sweet and to the point. I do not know that they are always short or sweet, and I am not quite sure that they are always to the point. Only today some hon. members wandered a long way from the matter under debate. However, that is by the way.

The Government accepts its responsibility to create an atmosphere in this State in which incentives are provided to people to make the State a better one to live in.

I agree with Mr. Speaker that the granting of many of the requirements necessary to the functioning of Parliament would be to its benefit. Many of the matters mentioned by him are being considered at present.

I listened with interest to his comments about the responsibilities of members not only in this State but also on overseas missions. Visits by our members to other countries and by members of overseas Parliaments to this State create goodwill, and that goodwill must be maintained. Members gain a great deal of knowledge and experience from overseas missions.

I thank the hon. member for Carnarvon for his kind remarks about me. I hope that I shall be able to continue as Premier for a good while. I do not know whether members of the Opposition would agree with his sentiments. I do not suppose it would be good politics if they did.

I express my thanks to the members of the staff of the Parliament. I thank the "Hansard" reporters, to whom reference has been made, and the typing staff for the very important work that they do. I thank the staffs of the Parliamentary Library and the Refreshment Rooms. They all do a very efficient job.

Members of Parliament recognise their responsibility to Mr. Speaker and the fact that he discharges his responsibilities in a very commendable manner.

Mr. Hooper, we all realise that at times we are not an easy group to control, and your job is not an easy one. We appreciate the manner in which you seek to uphold the dignity of members in this Chamber.

I say "Thank you" to all members of the Government. We are a big team who work together in the interests of this State. We have shown that we work towards the progress of Queensland. Members of the Opposition, too, have a responsibility in ensuring that Queensland progresses as it should. Over the 23 years that the Treasurer,

the hon. member for Cooroora, the hon. member for Townsville South and I have been here we have seen many members come and go. All members of Parliament work very hard in the interests of their electors.

VOTES PASSED UNDER STANDING ORDER  
NO. 307 AND SESSIONAL ORDER

At 3.30 p.m., under Standing Order No. 307 and Sessional Order agreed to by the House on 22 October, the questions for the following Votes were put by the Chairman and agreed to—

	\$
Legislative Assembly ..	556,886
Premier and Department of State Development ..	2,864,861
The Treasurer .. ..	19,554,377
Department of Conservation, Marine and Aboriginal Affairs .. ..	7,838,438
Department of Education and Cultural Activities ..	98,540,909
Department of Justice ..	8,113,498
Department of Local Gov- ernment and Electricity ..	2,045,037
Department of Mines and Main Roads .. ..	2,300,866
Department of Primary Industries .. ..	6,608,276
Department of Works and Housing .. ..	29,906,837
Department of the Auditor- General .. ..	577,493
Trust and Special Funds Estimates, Balance of Estimates .. ..	366,096,405
Loan Fund Account Esti- mates, Balance of Estimates .. ..	72,445,000
Supplementary Estimates (Consolidated Revenue), 1968-69 .. ..	16,836,291.37
Supplementary Estimates (Trust and Special Funds), 1968-69 ..	5,828,556.83
Supplementary Estimates (Loan Fund Account), 1968-69 .. ..	4,991,286.79
Vote on Account, 1970-71	150,000,000

SEVENTEENTH ALLOTTED DAY—RECEPTION  
OF RESOLUTIONS

Resolutions reported and, on motion of Mr. Chalk, received.

ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS

The Resolutions being taken as read—

**Hon. G. W. W. CHALK** (Lockyer—Treasurer): I move—

"That the Resolutions be now agreed to."

Honourable members indicating a desire to discuss certain Resolutions—

Resolution 1 agreed to.

## Resolution 2—Department of Health—

Mr. AHERN (Landsborough) (3.40 p.m.): I wish to refer to the section of the Annual Report of the Health and Medical Services of the State of Queensland devoted to the Division of Dental Services. Part of that report reads—

“Notwithstanding progressively increased activities of dental Health Education and a more enlightened public on preventive measures, including greater appreciation of the value of fluoride in reducing dental caries, dental diseases still affect more than 90 per cent. of the population. Consequently, the demand for dental treatment at the three Dental Hospitals and the network of country Dental Clinics throughout Queensland remains a problem which can be met significantly only by implementing means of substantially reducing dental disease. Although active research into causes of the various dental diseases is being carried out, fluoridation of public water supplies remains the greatest single factor in combating dental caries and its associated problems, viz.—pain, digestive upsets, trauma, psychological disturbances, educational and economic loss.

“Queensland’s well-developed Dental Clinic services include:—

Forty-six Base Dental Clinics, including three full-time Metropolitan Dental Clinics attached to Dental Hospitals.

Thirty-nine Itinerant Dental Clinics attached to Hospitals.

Forty-nine other centres including Missions, Aboriginal Settlements, Bush Nursing Centres, A.I.M. Hostels, and nineteen Welfare Institutions.

Three part-time Dental Clinics attached to Hospitals and serviced by private Dentists.

One Aboriginal Settlement serviced by a private Dentist.”

The Director of Dental Services goes on to say—

“It is interesting to note that in the areas serviced by all the Dental Clinic Centres, necessitating the employment of 128 dentists, comparatively few people are drinking fluoridated water. Also, as yet, only eight towns have fluoridated their water supplies.”

It is on the matter of fluoridation that I wish to make a few comments. I refer firstly to a survey recently carried out by Professor G. N. Davies, Mr. B. J. Kruger, and Mr. B. T. Homan, of the Dental Department of the University of Queensland. That was a survey of the dental health of children in country districts of Queensland. Some 3,251 children in the 6 to 14-year age group were examined in 20 towns in Queensland, representing 2 per cent. of that age group in the population of Queensland. The survey covered a wide variety of matters concerning dental health, but the most

important was, I believe, the incidence of caries, or dental decay, in teeth. It is interesting to see the results of that survey. The report, which was published in June of this year, states—

“Caries experience in deciduous teeth: The 3,251 children had 8,281 df deciduous teeth . . .”

“df” means decayed or filled. The report continues—

“. . . a mean of 2.55 df teeth per child. Caries experience in deciduous teeth decreased from 4.9 df teeth per child at 6 years to 4.0 per child at 8 years, 2.1 per child at 10 years and 0.4 per child at 12 years. Of all the affected teeth 2,352 or 28.4 per cent., were filled. Conversely, 5,929 or 71 per cent. were carious and required to be restored or extracted.”

The report goes on to refer to caries experience in permanent teeth, which is much more important. In the 3,251 children, 15,408 permanent teeth were decayed, missing, or filled—a mean of 4.7 DMF teeth per child. Caries experience in permanent teeth increased from one DMF tooth per child at six years to 2.7 at eight years, 4.4 at 10 years, 7.4 at 12 years, and 10.7 at 14 years. Those are very high and extremely significant figures.

The report goes on to group certain towns within the area surveyed, and it mentions four groups. Groups 1 and 2 were groups in which there was high dental decay experience. Group 1 included Laidley North, Injune, Gatton, Chinchilla and Oakey, and in Group 2 were Stanthorpe, Caloundra, Jericho, and Bell. In Group 3, with low caries experience, were Alpha, Jandowae, and Blackall, and in Group 4, with very low caries experience, were Cunnamulla, Quilpie, Barcardine, and Aramac. Groups 3 and 4 are naturally fluoridated. The results of that survey surely reveal a very serious situation relative to the health of children’s teeth in Queensland.

It is stated elsewhere in the report that the health of children’s teeth in the particular area of Queensland that was surveyed indicates quite clearly that Queensland has the worst record of any area in Australia.

The report also investigated several factors in dental health in Queensland, and one to which I should like to refer specifically is idiopathic mottling. The cause of it is unknown, but it decreases significantly with the use of fluoride in the water supply. The report said—

“There was a considerable variation in the geographic distribution of idiopathic mottling. Areas with a particularly high prevalence include Caloundra (70 per cent. of children affected), Jandowae (55 per cent.), Blackall (50 per cent.), Bell (46 per cent.) and Alpha (40 per cent.). Areas with a particularly low prevalence include

the high fluoride towns of Barcaldine (5 per cent.), Aramac (7 per cent.), Quilpie (11 per cent.), Cunnamulla (22 per cent.), and the low fluoride town of Proserpine (11 per cent.)."

The report also investigated enamel fluorosis in Queensland, and of the extremely high number of cases that were assessed, only 19 showed evidence of excessive enamel fluorosis.

To lead up to one point that I wish to make, I shall quote from the summary of this report, and I think that Parliament should give active consideration to it. It reads as follows:—

"The results from the Queensland Dental Survey of 3,251 children between the ages of six and fourteen confirm the fact that the prevalence of dental defects is so high that existing dental services are unable to cope with the problem. The backlog of lesions still to be treated exceeds the amount of treatment that has been carried out. It would require the services of at least 394 dentists and the expenditure of more than \$5,000,000 to cope with dental decay alone in all 6 to 14-year-old children in the State.

"Some suggestions are made on steps to be taken to meet the dental needs of children. These include the widespread use of fluoridation to help in the prevention of dental caries; more intensive dental health education with particular reference to an improvement in oral hygiene to assist in the prevention of periodontal disease, and the gradual introduction of operative auxiliaries to whom dentists can delegate a restricted range of operations for pre-school and school children.

"It is recommended that a dental survey of adults be commenced as soon as possible."

The results of this survey indicate a very serious situation in dental health among children in the six to 14-year age group in Queensland.

In 1963 a rather long debate took place in this Parliament on the introduction of the Fluoridation of Public Water Supplies Bill. Many comments were made by hon. members on both sides of the Chamber. Hon. members will no doubt remember the purpose of the Bill. It sought to indemnify local authorities against any charges that might be made against them as a result of fluoridation and it also certainly confirmed that it is the responsibility of local authorities in Queensland to undertake fluoridation as a public health measure.

The Bill also made provision for the taking of a poll on the fluoridation of public water supplies.

At that time many members spoke against the Bill. They gave as their opinion that the matter had not been fully investigated

and that there were too many doubts in the minds of people in the technological field to warrant the passing of legislation giving Government support to the fluoridation of public water supplies.

I have read that debate. The then Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Duggan, said he considered that the vote on that occasion should be on non-party lines. In the light of the present serious situation, I think this matter should be reconsidered, on non-party lines.

**Mr. Ramsden:** There may have been a change in thinking since then.

**Mr. AHERN:** In Government circles?

**Mr. Ramsden:** No, in medical circles.

**Mr. AHERN:** In medical circles there certainly has been, and I hope to make a few comments on that matter.

The local authorities and city councils of Townsville, Dalby, Biloela, Allora, Proserpine, Gatton, the Gold Coast and Mareeba have taken advantage of the protection given by the fluoridation of Public Water Supplies Act of 1963, and have fluoridated their water supplies, but they represent only a relatively small number in the State. The local water supplies of Barcaldine, Cunnamulla, Quilpie and Aramac are naturally fluoridated. I have already informed hon. members that the survey carried out by the dental committee of the university clearly indicated that dental caries in children in those towns was exactly half of that in the rest of the population tested.

I suggested for the consideration of hon. members that there should be a departmental allocation towards the fluoridation of public water supplies and that this matter should now be a responsibility of the Department of Health. At present in this State it is entirely the responsibility of local government to decide and implement this change. On the face of things having regard to the small number of local authorities that have implemented fluoridation or considered it, I submit that the Act has failed in its purpose and that the matter should now become a responsibility of the Department of Health.

In Tasmania, there was a royal commission into the pros and cons of fluoridation of public water supplies.

**Mr. Jensen:** Have they fewer dentists per head of population in those areas than in other areas?

**Mr. AHERN:** No. Those factors were taken into account. May I suggest to the hon. member that he read the report as published in *The Australian Dental Journal* of June this year. It is available in the Parliamentary Library.

**Mr. Davies:** What right do you have to compel people to accept fluoridation?

**Mr. AHERN:** I am about to deal with that point. I rather expected the hon. member for Maryborough to come in on it.

The situation relative to local authorities undertaking this responsibility was outlined very capably in the report of the royal commission in Tasmania, which says that the decision on whether or not fluoridation, as a measure of public health designed to protect the dental health of the young, should be instituted, should not be left to local authorities; that it is a matter for decision by Parliament; that a referendum as a means of arriving at this decision is not only without constitutional warrant but is highly unsuitable as well; and that to refer the matter to a forum both technically incompetent and constitutionally incapable would constitute an abrogation of Parliament's responsibility. I support the comments made in that report. They are consistent with the views I have expressed.

Following on the report, the Tasmanian Government made fluoridation a State responsibility, as did the Governments of Western Australia and South Australia. The great majority of the waters of New South Wales are already fluoridated because the Metropolitan Water Board and the local authorities have accepted that responsibility. However, that is not the position in Queensland. The dental health of our children is of sufficient importance to warrant the State usurping this power, which I think it should rightly have and exercise.

It is interesting to look at control of fluoridation in Western Australia. The Western Australian statute established a committee to be called the Fluoridation of Public Water Supplies Advisory Committee. It consisted of seven members: the Commissioner; the Director of Engineering, Public Works Department; the Chief Engineer, Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Department; the Director of the Government Chemical Laboratories; and three members appointed by the Minister, one from a panel of names submitted by the Australian Medical Association (Western Australian Branch), another from a panel of names submitted by the Australian Dental Association and the third from a panel of names submitted by the Local Government Association of Western Australia.

**Mr. Jensen:** Are they all honorary?

**Mr. AHERN:** I do not think they are. I think they are paid expenses for the days that they meet, but surely that is beside the point.

All of those bodies have parallels in this State.

The activities of that committee are of great importance, and are set out in section 7 (1) of the Act, which reads—

"The Committee shall consider, advise and make written recommendations to the Minister relating to—

(a) Any proposal with respect to the addition of fluorine to any public water supply;

(b) Any proposal for making, amending or revoking any regulation; and

(c) Such other matters, being matters that are conducive to the achievement of the objects and effectual administration of this Act,

that is or are in writing referred to it for its consideration, advice and recommendation by the Minister."

Section 7 (3) of that Act states—

"Before making a recommendation with respect to the addition of fluorine to any public water supply the Committee—

(a) shall ascertain the amount of fluorine, if any, already contained in the water in respect of which it proposes to make the recommendation; and

(b) shall ensure that the amount of fluorine so ascertained together with the amount of the fluorine that the Committee proposes to recommend should be added to the water, will not result in a concentration in excess of 1 part by weight of fluorine per million parts of water."

I understand that in Queensland .5 of a part per 1,000,000 is advised by the medical associations.

**Dr. Crawford:** That is exactly where the arguments of the anti-fluoridationists break down.

**Mr. AHERN:** Very definitely. We will be drowned with their arguments in a minute.

**Dr. Crawford:** Only a minute amount is necessary.

**Mr. AHERN:** I will come to that shortly. At the moment I am referring to the machinery provisions of the Western Australian Act. It continues—

"Where the committee makes a recommendation to the Minister that fluorine be added to any public water supply, if the Minister approves the recommendation, the Minister shall—

(a) send the water supply authority having control of the public water supply a copy of the recommendation; and

(b) direct in writing the water supply authority to give effect to such matters contained in the recommendation, as are specified in the direction within a time so specified."

**Mr. Houston:** Do you know what the present law is?

**Mr. AHERN:** In Queensland?

**Mr. Houston:** Yes.

**Mr. AHERN:** If the hon. gentleman had been present a little while ago, he would not be wasting his time in asking that question.

**Mr. Houston:** You are wasting a lot of the time of the House on what you are talking about now.

**Mr. AHERN:** If the hon. member had been here, he would realise that there is a very important reason for this.

I am suggesting that in Queensland fluoridation should be a Health Department responsibility; it is a pity that it is not so at the present time.

Over the years a great controversy has raged about fluoridation, and it has not been restricted to this country or to this Parliament. Much has been said against the proposal and much has been said in favour of it. A strong weight of medical opinion favours fluoridation; it is stronger than ever before, for one reason, namely, that 62,000,000 American people drink fluoridated water and have been doing so for many years without ill effects. A vast number of people in Australia, and in Queensland, are drinking fluoridated water, also without ill effects. Many millions of people throughout the world have accepted fluoridation as vital and necessary to their health and that of their children.

Quite clearly, this is the situation: the effluxion of time has proved the critics to be wrong. If all the ill effects that traditional critics have advanced as natural consequences of fluoridation had materialised, there would be a great number of sick people in the world today. There have been no significant ill effects and the benefits have been proven beyond all possible doubt.

**Mr. Davies:** Why not let people take it in tablet form?

**Mr. AHERN:** The hon. member for Maryborough asks why people should not take it in tablet form. They can do so but that method is not nearly as effective as putting it in the supply of drinking water. It has been suggested that it should be put in salt, which is better than in tablet form, but it is not nearly as efficacious as it is in the water supply.

**Mr. Jensen:** Can you tell me how much of the water supply in the city is used for human consumption and how much for industrial use?

**Mr. AHERN:** Enough is used.

**Mr. Jensen:** Can you give the percentage?

**Mr. AHERN:** I could not tell the hon. member that, but the situation is clearly this: for the small cost of 20c to 30c a year the incidence of dental caries in the population is halved. That is the relevant point.

**Mr. Davies interjected.**

**Mr. AHERN:** I think that that has been proved wrong. The present system is tried and true, and is the one that we should have adopted in Queensland years ago. I believe that it is a system that we should implement. If some people in Queensland have to make some sacrifice in their mental attitudes—and that is all it would be—then, in the interests of the health of the children of Queensland, those sacrifices should be quickly and willingly made.

**Mr. Houston:** Do you wear any false teeth?

**Mr. AHERN:** Yes. Does the Leader of the Opposition? If I had drunk fluoridated water when I was a child, I might not have needed false teeth, and that applies to many other people.

The charge is laid that the dental health of Queensland children leaves much to be desired, yet we are not prepared to take the action that has been proved to be correct in Western Australia, in America where 62,000,000 people drink fluoridated water, and in many Queensland towns, without any ill effects. I suggest that when the Estimates of the Department of Health are considered again, this should be made a responsibility of that department.

I wish to conclude my speech by reading a resolution passed by the World Health Organization. It was circularised to all members of this Parliament. Many countries in the world belong to the W.H.O., and many of them banded together earlier this year to form a united front on the question of the fluoridation of public water supplies. In substance, the resolution reads—

“Having considered the report of the Director-General on the fluoridation of water supplies . . .

“Bearing in mind that dental caries is a widespread disease in many populations, and is becoming increasingly prevalent in many others;

“Recalling that studies in several countries have consistently shown the prevalence of this disease to be markedly low whenever an optimal concentration of fluoride occurs naturally in water supplies;

“Accepting the reports now coming from countries with experience of the procedure indicating that the adjustment of the fluoride content of water supplies to an optimal level is a practicable, safe and efficient public health measure;

“Noting that other equally effective means are not available for conferring on the whole populations the beneficial effects of fluoride on dental health;

“Emphasizing that in the extensive scientific literature on the subject no valid evidence has been forthcoming of any ill effects on human health from the use of water supplies with an optimal concentration of fluoride;

“Recognizing that several authoritative and independent enquiries conducted in a number of countries have all reached similar conclusions to the above; and

"Recognizing further that for many populations the provision of potable water supplies is a first consideration,

1. . . . .

2. RECOMMENDS Member States to examine the possibility of introducing and where practicable to introduce fluoridation of those community water supplies where the fluoride intake from water and other sources for the given population is below optimal levels, as a proven public health measure; and where fluoridation of community water supplies is not practicable to study other methods of using fluorides for the protection of dental health;"

That is a W.H.O. resolution, and there are many like it throughout the world.

**Mr. Bousen:** Do you really think that the people of Queensland want a fluoridated water supply?

**Mr. AHERN:** I believe that they do. The other States of Australia have been quick to act in this matter. I respectfully suggest that fluoridation should be a State responsibility, and I hope that when the Minister for Health again presents his Estimates he will be able to record some initial success by his department in this matter.

**Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) (4.11 p.m.):** I, too, wish to address some remarks to the House on dental services. It is a coincidence that the hon. member for Landsborough, who has just resumed his seat, chose the same subject. I am moved to make my contribution by the recent increases in fees announced by the Australian Dental Association. No evidence of any kind has been produced by that association to show that fees should be increased, and I think that the increases are quite unjustified. Before dealing with that matter, however, there is another subject to which I wish to refer.

It concerns me that the report of the Director of Dental Services, included in the Annual Report of the Health and Medical Services of the State of Queensland, contains no statistical information on the wide range of services provided by the Division of Dental Services. Surely the Director of such an important division, with so many ramifications, could have given figures of the number of people treated, the number refused treatment, the number with unsound mouths, the number wearing dentures, and other relevant information. Such statistics would give a general indication of the dental health of the people of Queensland.

A very serious situation has developed in the availability of dental services to the people of Queensland. The fees of dentists, who have virtually a monopoly on the provision of dental services, are out of all reason, and many people are now being deprived of very essential dental treatment. As I mentioned during, I think, the session before the previous one, a large section of

the community is receiving no dental treatment at all. Because of the high cost of private dental treatment, approximately 40 per cent. of the community receive no treatment at all because their incomes are not low enough to qualify them for treatment in dental hospitals and clinics, and not high enough to allow them to pay the fees of private dentists. I am referring in the main to young people, with families, on wages and salaries between \$40 and \$60 a week. About 40 per cent. of the people fall into that category.

That is why I gave notice of a question this morning in which I asked the Minister to direct the Director of Dental Services in this State to send a communication to the various dental hospitals and clinics telling officers who are interviewing patients and assessing their eligibility for treatment that there should be a relaxation in the amount of salary that entitles people to treatment in dental hospitals. I am quite sure that the Minister's reply will be that it is not within his province to so direct the officers concerned.

**Mr. Bromley:** That it does not come within his purview.

**Mr. Tooth:** I have said that only once.

**Mr. MELLOY:** He will say that it does not come within his purview to tell officers of his department how they shall assess the eligibility of persons presenting themselves at dental hospitals. In my opinion, it does. He is the supreme authority in the field of health services.

**Mr. Tooth:** You are only kidding, aren't you?

**Mr. MELLOY:** No. The Minister is the supreme authority in the field of health services in this State. If he thinks that there is not sufficient leeway to enable people to obtain dental services, it is his duty to give instructions to his officers to make as many people as possible eligible to use the services of the State's dental hospitals and clinics. If he does not do that, a certain section of the community will not receive the dental treatment that is needed for good health. After all, dental health services are as important as any other health services. I should say that dental health is the basis of general health, and, if the State Government does not provide the service that is necessary, people will suffer and the high incidence of dental caries in this State will be maintained.

In my opinion, the most important aspect of dentistry is preventive dentistry.

**Mr. Lee:** Fluoridation.

**Mr. MELLOY:** I shall say something about that later. I should say that 90 per cent. of the dentists in this country are not greatly concerned about preventive dentistry. They are engaged in restoration and denture work. Speaking generally, people who present

themselves to dentists for treatment have gone beyond the stage of preventive dentistry. The responsibility for inaugurating and maintaining dental measures does not lie only with the dental profession; it lies also with the Government. I shall have more to say about that later.

As hon. members know, there is a shortage of dentists, and, as I say, those who are in the profession are not greatly interested in preventive dentistry. They are more interested in the financial returns of their profession. As a result, there is a lack of preventive dental services in Queensland.

In fixing their fees, dentists are covering themselves to a certain extent by referring to the price-list issued by the Queensland Branch of the Australian Dental Association. A report relative to the increases in fees appeared in the Press. It indicated that the fee for an amalgam filling in an adult would be \$5.85 under the new scale, compared with \$5.50 under the old scale. In the case of many dentists, that is a very conservative figure. I could show hon. members accounts within my own family showing that the cost of an amalgam filling is \$8.50. Therefore, this is not a true picture of the fees charged, or to be charged, by dentists in this State.

It is stated that the cost of an X-ray is to rise from \$3 to \$3.50. Here again I do not think this is a true picture because I have evidence of \$6 being charged for X-rays in a dental surgery. The new price for extractions is to be \$4.25 against the old price of \$3.50. I think that is nearer the mark in most dental surgeries. As far as I can ascertain, most dentists are charging \$3.50 for an extraction and that charge is to be increased to \$4.25.

These are exorbitant charges for the work carried out by dentists. The dental profession is regarded as the poor cousin of the medical profession, but dentists are trying to emulate and imitate the medical profession by bringing their charges up to what they consider to be a professional level.

There has been a tendency to try to raise the dental profession to the status of the medical profession. I do not know how doctors feel about this, because generally, in my conversations with doctors, they do not feel that the dentist is in the same category professionally as the medical man. I agree. I do not think he is. I know dentists very well; I know the manner in which they conduct themselves and their practices, and as far as professional status is concerned they do not approach the medical profession in any way.

**Mr. Tooth:** Do you feel that their behaviour in general is unprofessional?

**Mr. MELLOY:** In what way?

**Mr. Tooth:** You are saying that professionally they do not compare with doctors.

**Mr. MELLOY:** At the professional level. They are inclined to regard their professional status as equal to that of doctors. I do not agree with this.

**Mr. Tooth:** You referred to their behaviour on the basis of your experience and knowledge of them. I was wondering if their general behaviour was unprofessional.

**Mr. MELLOY:** The Minister is raising an entirely different issue. He made the reference to their professional behaviour. Their professional behaviour as such would perhaps be similar to that of doctors, but their profession, both technically and medically, does not compare with that of a doctor. Their work itself does not compare with the work done by a medical man.

**Mr. Tooth:** Because of your long experience with them, I was disturbed at the thought that there was professional misbehaviour amongst them.

**Mr. MELLOY:** I made no reference of that kind. I related my remarks to the amount and type of work they do professionally compared with members of the medical profession. But they have the idea in their minds that if they dress themselves in white shirts, white uniforms and white shoes they have the same professional standing as doctors and they give patients the impression that when they walk into a dental surgery it is virtually similar to walking into a doctor's surgery. That is part of the build-up to create the impression of efficiency and importance that allows them to charge high fees.

**Dr. Crawford:** Their training is extensive. Perhaps I would consider dentists equal to doctors in the amount of time they spend training and in the various aspects of that training. It is a very long and hard course.

**Mr. MELLOY:** The training they receive might be extensive, but the results of that training do not go beyond the human mouth. That is where it ends.

**Dr. Crawford:** They have to be able to pick up diseases that occur in the mouth. Generally, diseases manifest themselves in the mouth—diseases such as leukaemia—and they have to be able to pick them up.

**Mr. MELLOY:** I doubt whether they would be able to diagnose any disease from the condition of the mouth. I would hate to have any dentist diagnose my medical condition from the condition of my mouth. A dentist does not have training in any field other than the treatment of teeth. The only extension of a dentist's activities beyond the treatment of the teeth would be when he opened his mouth and put his foot in it.

I refer now to preventive dentistry. In Queensland a void exists in dental services, and it could be filled by the inauguration of a school dental nurses service similar to

those provided in Tasmania and New Zealand, where tremendous results have been achieved in dental health. The school dental nurses do a wonderful job. They are able to do fillings and minor extractions under a local anaesthetic, and they have taken over portion of the work that previously was performed by qualified dentists. Queensland has the opportunity to inaugurate a similar service at little cost to the Government.

In Tasmania and New Zealand the girls who enter the dental nurses service are trained for two years and, although their field is limited, they are able to do work equally as well as dentists who have been fully trained. I have been told by members of the Australian Dental Association in Tasmania that the girls are highly qualified in their work, and the association approves of the service and would like to see it continued. The matron in charge of the Tasmanian service is a New Zealander who was invited to Tasmania to supervise the inauguration of the service in that State. She has performed wonderful work. Of course, many dentists are associated with the school dental nurses, and in a number of the clinics a registered dentist works in conjunction with the nurse.

While I was in Tasmania I closely examined the matter of fluoridation. Previously I had been against fluoridation, but following my visit to Tasmania I now have an open mind on the matter. While I was in that State I had an opportunity to examine the teeth of children who had lived in fluoridated areas and of others who had lived in non-fluoridated areas.

**Dr. Crawford:** On what evidence were you previously against fluoridation?

**Mr. MELLOY:** Since I visited Tasmania I have an open mind on fluoridation.

**Dr. Crawford:** But what was the evidence on which you made up your mind against it originally?

**Mr. MELLOY:** I shall not go into that matter. It is sufficient to say that I now have an open mind on it.

While in Tasmania I visited the dental clinic in Launceston at which two groups of children, each of 40 to 45 children, presented themselves. One by one, with the use of probe and mirror, I examined their teeth. They came from both fluoridated and non-fluoridated areas, and examination disclosed that there was no comparison between those who came from the fluoridated areas and those from non-fluoridated areas. Those from fluoridated areas had supremely superb teeth in contrast with the badly decayed teeth of those from the non-fluoridated areas. That was practical, positive evidence of the effect of fluoridation on tooth structure. That statement must not be confused with the effect of fluoridation on general

medical health. However, it was proved to my satisfaction that fluoridation had a tremendously beneficial effect on dental health.

I also spoke to medical men associated with the dental profession in Tasmania and asked them if they had evidence of any detrimental effect on the general health of people in those areas where there was fluoridation. They advised me that there was no difference between the general health of those people and that of people in non-fluoridated areas. In the opinion of dentists and medical men in Tasmania, there is no doubt that the fluoridation of water has a beneficial effect in preventing dental caries. That is all I propose to say on that matter at this stage.

I have a few comments to make about the delays in casualty and out-patients' departments in our hospitals. This is a continuing problem. I understand that a senior medical officer is to be appointed to the casualty department of the Royal Brisbane Hospital. An outstanding need exists for such an appointment, and I hope that in future people who present themselves to casualty are not sent home when they should be admitted to hospital. This happens because of the lack of medical men in the casualty department, particularly in the rush-hour periods. It has been stated that it happens mostly at week-ends, when the roster of medical men at the hospital is restricted.

This problem must be tackled firmly if people are not to be turned away from hospital when they should be admitted. Numerous instances have been reported to me of people being sent home from casualty department with broken limbs that subsequently have been discovered by X-ray. Sometimes they have even had broken legs or arms. That happens not because of a lack of interest or care on the part of the medical men concerned, but because of lack of time to examine patients properly in casualty. The number of doctors in casualty at all times must be increased to obviate such happenings.

I had wished to deal with other matters, but at this stage I will content myself with those observations.

**Mr. McKECHNIE** (Carnarvon) (4.35 p.m.): Allegations were made by Opposition members that segregation of our indigenous people is practised in some hospitals. My experience shows otherwise.

**Mr. Casey:** Have you been to Normanton?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** Yes, I have been to Normanton.

On Sunday, 16 November, 1969, I had the privilege of accompanying the Minister for Health to the Mt. Isa Hospital, and it was obvious that the Aborigines were not segregated there.

**Mr. Newton:** Did the local member go?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** The local member was also there, yes.

During the past winter, my youngest daughter was hospitalised twice and on each occasion she was admitted to the children's ward, where there were 10 children. Two of them were of European extraction and the other eight were Aborigines. I have no complaint about that and, so far as I know, nor have the parents of the Aboriginal children. As a matter of fact, sick Aboriginal children from the Toomelah Mission just over the border in New South Wales are admitted to the Goondiwindi Hospital, and the New South Wales Department of Health pays the Queensland Department of Health \$13,000 per annum for that service.

Five years ago, when I was on Thursday Island, I spent two days in the Thursday Island Hospital, and it was quite obvious that no segregation was practised there.

**Mr. Newton:** Why did you have to be there for two days?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** I was a patient in the hospital because I injured my leg on one of the islands in the Torres Strait. While I was there, I spent a very pleasant afternoon with a very delightful native girl sharing my bed. I am sure that that will prove to hon. members that no segregation is practised in the Thursday Island Hospital. Let me hasten to add that the girl was less than one year old. Anyway, who are Aborigines?

**Mr. O'Donnell:** Well, you're not one.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** How does the hon. member know that? Should a hospital have to decide who has Aboriginal blood in his veins and who has not? How could I decide whether any hon. members have Aboriginal blood in them? Of course, I do not want to have to do that.

**Mr. Newton:** Ask them to put up their hands.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** They might not know themselves. After all, it will be 200 years next year since Captain Cook and his sailors spent some months journeying along our coast, and who would be capable of delineating the line between indigenous Australians and those of European extraction? Hon. members opposite must realise that that would be impossible. It is, of course, possible to decide that someone is a full-blooded Aborigine or that he has a high proportion of Aboriginal blood, but, after 200 years of white settlement on this continent, it is impossible to tell who has some Aboriginal blood and who has not. And why should we have to decide?

No hospital should be placed in the invidious position of having to decide who belongs to a certain race and who does not.

It is hard to know how people would feel in such cases. Some would be proud to have Aboriginal blood, while others would not be. The same would apply to Aborigines; some would be proud to have European blood, whereas others would not be. I do not want to see anyone in any hospital

placed in the position of having to make such a decision. It is, after all, an impossible one to make with any certainty.

I also wish to make some reference to the X-ray machine at the Goondiwindi hospital, towards the cost of which the hospital auxiliary raised the sum of \$22,000. That was a pretty fair effort. The machine that has been obtained is equal to any similar equipment outside Brisbane or any provincial city, and possibly it is equal to what is available in Brisbane. I cannot be certain of that.

**Mr. P. Wood:** They have a very good auxiliary.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** They have. I thank the hon. member for that interjection. The members of the auxiliary felt that there was a need for a good X-ray machine so that patients would not have to travel to Brisbane to have exploratory X-rays. In many cases now the trip to Brisbane does not have to be made, and in others X-rays are taken that previously would not have been taken because the patients were not prepared to spend time and money journeying to a provincial city or the capital. Lives are possibly saved as a result. It was a wonderful effort to raise \$22,000, which attracted a Government subsidy of a similar amount. The Department of Health provided suitable accommodation for the machine, and that, too, was much appreciated.

A visiting radiologist comes to the hospital from New South Wales. Such trips are, in the main, financed by the Department of Health, with assistance provided by the hospital auxiliary. The hospital caters for a particularly wide area. It is 330 miles west from Goondiwindi to Cunnamulla, which is the nearest town of comparable size, and 131 miles east to Warwick.

The need for an X-ray machine was felt, and the hospital auxiliary rose to the occasion and provided it. It has been working well, to a point. However, if a full-time qualified radiographer was available, much greater and better use could be made of the machine. We were able to get a female radiographer at Newcastle to apply for the job at Goondiwindi. I applied, through the Minister, to the department for her appointment, but I regret to say that the request was refused. The Minister outlined the reasons for that refusal, one of which was that she would not be fully occupied. I concede that. However, she would have been occupied for more than half of her time on radiography, and she was prepared to spend the remainder of her time doing other jobs in the hospital. There would have been plenty for her to do. I appeal to the Minister to reconsider the refusal to appoint a radiographer at the hospital to meet the needs of such a large area. It also serves a very large area of New South Wales.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** Who does the work now?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** A visiting radiologist. It can be done by the doctor.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** What about the matron?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** Matron Hughes is an excellent, well-qualified woman. As hon. members know, many matrons throughout Australia operate X-ray machines. This one, however, is a superlative machine, and I believe that greater and better use could be made of it if a radiographer was employed full time. Such an appointee could spend the balance of his time on other tasks, as the girl to whom I have referred was prepared to do.

As a matter of interest, I sought from the Department of Health wage rates for radiographers, and Mr. Strutton was kind enough to give me some figures. A radiographer is paid within the following range—

	\$
First year . . . . .	2,950
Second year . . . . .	3,110
Third year . . . . .	3,270
Fourth year . . . . .	3,450

On those figures, I think that the appointment of a radiographer would be a good investment for the health of people in that part of the State. It would relieve the pressure on places such as Warwick, Toowoomba, possibly Ipswich in some cases, and Brisbane, because the people from my electorate patronise those three provincial cities and the capital city at times. Possibly Toowoomba is the centre that provides the greatest service for the area south-west to the border.

The need for ever-increasing medical and hospital facilities in country areas is evident. In addition, I believe that hospitals should be built 100, 200 and 300 miles from Brisbane. No-one hopes more than I do that we never see war of any type, particularly nuclear war, in this country, but we must always remember that war could break out. If it did, I presume that Brisbane would be the first target. An enemy possibly would try to knock out centres such as Gladstone, Townsville and Mt. Isa because they would be supplying the sinews of war, but Brisbane would be the prime target.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** Don't you think that the number of hospitals in Queensland is adequate.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** Not in such an eventuality. If a war broke out, it would be necessary to take as many of the victims as possible from the metropolitan area to centres at least 100 miles away.

**Mr. Newton:** Do you think there would be many left to take? Do you know much about nuclear destruction?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** Yes, I do. I hate the thought of it, but I think it would be foolish not to keep it at the back of our minds and do something about it. If we do not do that, the visits of certain people to Mt. Macedon in Victoria and the service

voluntarily given to the community by other people would be futile. I hope they are unnecessary, but I think we must be prepared if such a situation arises. Hospitals away from the main centres should have facilities better than those now existing, so that in the event of a holocaust there would be some place to which the victims could be taken.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** I have eight hospitals in my electorate, serving 18,000 people.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** I am satisfied that country hospitals have sufficient beds to meet present needs. However, improved facilities are needed, and that is one of the reasons why I am suggesting the appointment of a radiographer in this instance. I am not putting a case for Goondiwindi alone. Facilities, rather than beds, should be provided to handle any situation that might arise. It would be easy to make temporary arrangements for beds in case of emergency, but it would not be possible to set up equipment and have it working in the brief time that would be available.

**Mr. Jensen:** Have you a couple of new tractors in your shed in case one breaks down?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** I have one spare.

**Mr. Jensen:** You are about the only one who has.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** Many people have. A prudent man never commits his machinery to 100 per cent. of its capacity. If airlines did that, aircraft would never run to time. If a farmer did it, crops would be left in the paddock. In my opinion, a prudent man makes provision beyond his minimum needs. Any prudent man takes precautions, and I think it is advisable and desirable to provide facilities for an emergency.

**Mr. Jensen:** It depends on the capital outlay.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** In answer to the hon. member for Bundaberg, even if a man does not have a spare tractor to back up the two or three that are working but has only one tractor, it would spend two-thirds of its time in the shed doing nothing. That could be the case with this X-ray machine at the Goondiwindi Hospital; one cannot commit any facility to 100 per cent. use.

**Mr. Jensen:** You are saying that airline operators should have spare aircraft in case one breaks down.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** They have spare aircraft, but not enough. Therefore, they are not giving as good a service as they could. The hon. member is actually supplementing my argument for the use of X-ray machines in country areas. I thank him for his support.

I merely wished to make those two points. I appreciate having had the opportunity once again to bring this information before the Minister.

**Mr. P. WOOD** (Toowoomba East) (4.51 p.m.): Like the hon. member for Carnarvon, there are but two points that I wish to raise although they are on rather different lines from those that he brought to the attention of the House.

**Mr. R. Jones:** I hope you are more precise than he was.

**Mr. P. WOOD:** I hope to be. First of all, some few weeks ago I was fortunate in that my wife and I had an addition to our family.

**Honourable Members:** Congratulations!

**Mr. P. WOOD:** I appreciate the congratulations, but I did not mention this event for that purpose. That happy event of some weeks ago prompted me to make the remarks I want to make and, although I understand hon. members' good humour, I want to emphasise that what I am about to say will be said quite seriously.

The submission I wish to make to the Minister is that, subject to certain conditions which I will outline as I proceed, I would appreciate his considering allowing husbands of wives entering maternity hospitals to remain with their wives during childbirth. I am not reliably informed on the point, but I assume that responsibility in this matter would rest with the medical superintendent of each maternity hospital. The superintendent would have the responsibility of deciding whether a husband could enter the delivery ward with his wife. If that is not so, I can be corrected.

However, I think I am reasonably accurate in saying that the practice of allowing husbands to accompany their wives into delivery wards is not encouraged in hospitals under the control of the Health Department. I believe that husbands could be of considerable comfort and assistance, and in some circumstances offer useful advice, to wives during the last stages of their confinement.

The situation is not one into which a husband could just walk without some degree of preparation and education for his role. If my suggestion were to be accepted, I think that the medical people responsible for the hospital would have to be satisfied that the husband had been properly educated for his role in such circumstances.

I think I might be fairly accurate in saying that there is substantial medical opinion which holds that a husband can be of assistance during childbirth. Certainly he would be a comfort to his wife, and, I hope, of some assistance to her if for no other reason than that he is present and for the reassurance he is able to offer. A properly educated husband should be able to give some assistance and advice, not of course to the

medical people in attendance but to his wife. Not for one moment do I believe that all husbands, or even the great majority of husbands, would want to be present during childbirth.

**Mr. Tooth:** Could you elucidate your statement on husbands who, you claim, could give advice and assistance? I know you said that the advice would not be of a medical nature, but what have you in mind? This submission interests me.

**Mr. P. WOOD:** I think there is a growing tendency for women approaching maternity to undergo courses of physiotherapy and exercises that will be of great assistance and benefit to them during childbirth. Often prior to childbirth the women perform all sorts of exercises at their homes, in which their husbands, by their presence, are naturally involved. From my own experience I know that physiotherapists give a great deal of valuable advice to wives about childbirth procedures, and husbands can become possessed of that information and, during childbirth, pass it on to the wife, who already may be familiar with it but, under stress, may not be quite sure of what the advice was. I hope that the Minister follows my suggestion.

**Mr. Tooth:** You do not feel that this would be an invasion in the labour room on the province of the obstetrician?

**Mr. P. WOOD:** I would not suggest anything that would be an invasion on the rights of medical people. It would be foolish either to suggest it or to attempt it.

**Mr. Tooth:** I am not trying to be difficult about this, but you would go into the labour room to advise your wife on exercises and muscular movements. Is that so?

**Mr. P. WOOD:** That is right—and breathing control.

**Mr. Tooth:** In your view, that would not be invading the province of the obstetrician?

**Mr. P. WOOD:** I do not think there is unanimity of thought on this matter, but I know that a number of obstetricians have recommended it as desirable.

**Dr. Crawford:** It was started by a man named Grantley Dick Read. He practised it extensively, and his creed spread throughout the world. Since his death it has declined.

**Mr. P. WOOD:** There is significant medical opinion that my suggestion—and it is not my own—can be of some benefit. I have said that not all husbands would want to participate in such a practice, and not all wives would desire them to. But where both husband and wife desired it, and where both had been properly prepared for the roles that they were to play, the practice could be permitted by the Department of Health or whoever is responsible for such a decision.

I do not think that my suggestion will result in a rush by husbands into labour wards, because the number of people who would desire to do this would be very small indeed. However, the number is sufficient to make the request a reasonable one. I know that the practice is allowed in certain private hospitals but, as far as I know, it is not allowed in hospitals under the control of the Department of Health. If I am wrong, I am open to correction. That was the first point that I wished to raise.

Next I refer to a very disturbing matter. Recent Press reports of a case in Queensland of a father who was charged with the manslaughter of his daughter, prompted me to make some investigations and inquiries into the general situation. I believe that that case may still be in progress because I have not read the final report. If it has appeared, I have missed it. However, as the matter is quite likely sub judice I have no wish to comment upon it. It raises the question of what is called either the battered-child syndrome or, as it has been referred to in the cases I intend to quote, the maltreatment syndrome in children.

It seems that the cases of maltreatment of children—especially very young children—that come to the public attention are but a few of the total number. If I may use the simile of the iceberg, we see only the tip of the problem. I am sure that when hon. members read Press reports of such cases they are horrified and amazed at the thought that children can be treated in such a way.

I propose to refer to a report by R. G. and J. H. W. Birrell, published in "The Medical Journal of Australia" of 7 December, 1968, which was prepared after a very detailed survey of maltreatment of children in Melbourne. In doing so, I am taking the liberty of assuming that we might accept that conditions in Melbourne are very likely to be the same as those in Brisbane, bearing in mind, of course, the difference in population levels.

I will now refer to a few of the cases studied by the gentlemen I have named, taken from their summary of case records. A child of six weeks had a gross fracture of the skull and five fractured ribs. It was alleged by his parents that he had been accidentally dropped. The child was born out of wedlock. A significant factor in many of these cases of ill-treatment of children is that the child has been, or is unwanted.

Another child of 12 months suffered "multiple skull fractures, right radius and ulna, left humerus and radius fractures also." It was alleged that the de facto husband was responsible for those injuries. The mother had a low I.Q., and the father drank heavily.

A child of only three months was suffering from malnutrition and deprivation. It was stated that the parents were known to tease the baby over feeds.

A child of four months had multiple fractures of the skull and a fractured tibia. The parents alleged that the child fell two feet onto a carpeted floor. It was born out of wedlock and the mother was emotionally disturbed.

A child of nine months had fractures of the right and left femur, right and left humerus, right and left radius and left ulna. Although it was only nine months old it had those horrible injuries. The mother alleged that she fell when carrying it.

Those are only a few of the horrifying cases referred to as the battered-child syndrome or the maltreatment syndrome in children. Most of the children referred to in the survey were under three years of age. Many of the parents, obviously, because of the nature of the injuries and the age of the children, had a disturbed background.

A summary of the report of those two gentlemen shows that, over a period of 31 months, the cases of 42 maltreated children were reported. Of them, 25 showed evidence of violence, 10 showed evidence of violence and gross neglect, and seven showed evidence of gross neglect. The average stay in hospital was between six and seven weeks, compared with a normal stay in hospital for children of that age of nine to 10 days.

Contained in the report is the opinion that disturbed family background, mental ill-health and alcoholism were common in the parents.

It is quite obvious that not all people are suitable to undertake the role of parents. However, we cannot restrict the right of adults to procreate. On the other hand, we can endeavour to ensure, as far as possible, proper treatment of offspring.

It seems to be very important that all cases of maltreatment of children are promptly reported to the authorities. The survey I have quoted gives ample evidence that most cases of child maltreatment go unreported, although they must be known to various people.

The report contained in "The Medical Journal of Australia" also says—

"Medical practitioners are reluctant to report cases, and a notification law with freedom from suit appears essential to estimate morbidity and mortality and to protect children from further harm."

I am not in a position at the moment to discuss the desirability of the legislation suggested in that report. As is detailed in the report, there are some very powerful reasons why some medical practitioners are reluctant to report to the proper authorities cases of maltreatment of children which come to their attention. If there are good reasons for this reluctance we, as legislators, should accept the responsibility to remove them. I do not propose at this stage to go into details of them. One reason mentioned briefly in the report is freedom from suit. But there are others.

There must be people in the community who see evidence every day of maltreatment of children. Those cases are not reported to the proper authorities, yet they should be. I suppose it is hard to expect neighbours, relatives or friends to become police informers in cases of maltreatment of children. Nobody would like to inform on relatives, friends or neighbours if it could involve them in legal proceedings or prosecutions of some kind. A balanced judgment must be made on which is the lesser of two evils, and clearly where there is maltreatment of a child, certainly if it is the kind to which I have referred, there is no reasonable course of action other than reporting it to the appropriate authorities. It is quite disturbing to me to realise that the cases that appear from time to time in the newspapers, such as the one that I mentioned at the beginning of my speech, are only a very small percentage of the total number that must exist.

The long-term attempt to solve the problem revolves around the education of young people for parenthood. That in itself is a very detailed and involved subject, and I certainly have not made the necessary preparation to indicate in this speech what I believe to be desirable in the education of young people for parenthood. I should like to have the opportunity at some other time to set out clearly my thoughts on that matter. At the moment, I shall content myself with saying that not much at all is done about it today. I hope that the time will come when, for many reasons, only one of which is the matter that I have discussed today, an attempt will be made to educate people in this subject.

I know that in this session of Parliament I have made a number of suggestions to the Minister for Health on what he should be doing. I have no doubt that he receives plenty of such suggestions. This is one matter that I raise in which I find it difficult to say, "We should do this" or, "This is what I believe would be helpful." Quite frankly, it is hard to know what the solution is. All I can say is that where it is known that cases exist, they should be reported. Some prosecutions should be undertaken, and publicity given to them as a deterrent to others. I know that that will not achieve very much. As I have already suggested, the long-term solution lies in education, and my ideas on that will have to wait till another time.

**Dr. CRAWFORD** (Wavell) (5.13 p.m.): I rise to speak in this debate because I think the points made on both sides on general matters of health are worthy of further comment from me.

The hon. member for Landsborough dealt with fluoridation of water supplies. I am amazed that there are still, in 1969, arguments against it. From my very earliest days I have automatically accepted the evidence furnished by dental authorities throughout

the world that minute amounts of fluoride added to the drinking water of the population gives virtually complete protection against dental decay. Fluoride in such minute amounts becomes incorporated with the enamel of the growing teeth of young children, and produces a much more efficient enamel than would otherwise be the case.

I have even felt amazement over the years because certain people who have had specific training in medical and pseudo-medical matters have, for other reasons, spoken out against fluoridation. One of them is a very well-known doctor in Australia. He has spoken against fluoridation for some reason that I am afraid I just do not comprehend.

**Mr. Hanson:** Many doctors are opposed to the use of the pill, too.

**Dr. CRAWFORD:** Yes, I realise that. However, I assure hon. members that it is important that legislation be introduced at a very early stage to provide for fluoridation of water supplies throughout the State. There is no possible reason for arguing against the introduction of such a measure.

**Mr. Davies:** You have no respect for the rights of the individual.

**Dr. CRAWFORD:** That is not the point.

**Mr. Davies:** It is the main point.

**Dr. CRAWFORD:** We might as well say that we will not have any rules of the road, that anyone who wishes to do so may drive on the right-hand side of the road. We might as well not have compulsory chest X-rays or use other knowledge we know is for the benefit of the community. Not under any circumstances am I in favour of legislation of the "Big Brother" type; we do not want control of our activities. On the other hand, if certain experiment and practice over the years show that certain procedures are of benefit to the community, we should be prepared to grasp the nettle and legislate for the benefit of the community.

**Mr. Davies:** You know there are better ways of protecting the teeth of children.

**Dr. CRAWFORD:** What better ways?

**Mr. Davies:** By diet and by regulating the food that they eat—cutting down on sweets, and so on.

**Dr. CRAWFORD:** The dietary points mentioned by the hon. member for Maryborough are valid, but they are of only minute importance compared with fluoridation.

**Mr. Sherrington:** What comments have you to make on the high incidence of dental decay in Queensland? What is the cause of it?

**Mr. Chinchen:** It is associated with fluoridation.

**Mr. Sherrington:** I am asking the hon. member for Wavell.

**Dr. CRAWFORD:** Most normal water supplies in this State do not contain fluoride. I was delighted to hear the hon. member for Nudgee report on the survey that he carried out in Tasmania recently. I should like to hear the reasons why he did not believe in fluoridation previously, because I really cannot see any argument against its introduction. I believe it should be implemented with the greatest possible expedition.

**Mr. Davies:** Our drinking water should be as pure as possible.

**Dr. CRAWFORD:** That is nonsense. None of our water supply is pure. It is chlorinated—

**Mr. Davies:** I know that.

**Dr. CRAWFORD:** It is filtered.

**Mr. Davies:** There may be a dead cow up the creek, or something.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Hooper):** Order! If the hon. member for Maryborough wishes to make a speech, he will have the opportunity later of doing so. I ask him to cease his persistent interjections.

**Mr. Davies:** The hon. member for Wavell asked me some questions.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Dr. CRAWFORD:** The alternative to fluoridation of the water supply is, of course, to feed fluoride tablets to children virtually from babyhood. If the water supply is not fluoridated and we wish to protect our children's teeth, it is essential that tablets be given to the children at the earliest possible age. No advantage is to be gained from giving fluoride tablets to children of 5 or 6 years. They must be given much earlier than that, and there is a regulated dose, of course, of one tablet a day.

**Mr. Jensen:** Doesn't it have something to do with the health of the mother, too? It can come in before birth, can't it?

**Dr. CRAWFORD:** That is true, but calcium levels are quite satisfactory in our community at present, so that is not a problem.

I was interested to hear the remarks of the hon. member for Carnarvon relative to the provision of radiographers to country hospitals. I appreciate the difficulties, and it is important that only radiographers with the correct training and of a high calibre be appointed to handle X-ray machines. I had intended elaborating at some length on certain aspects of the use of risky X-ray machines in the community. However, quite apart from that, in our modern living we face radiation hazards with which previous generations did not have to contend. Our community, in common with the rest of the world at the moment, has the problem of the level of strontium 90 in the atmosphere, and it is essential that all Governments in

Australia, State and Federal, be aware of the fact that we must have monitoring apparatus to be cognisant of the level of strontium in our atmosphere so that appropriate measures may be taken.

In Queensland, of course, we have a committee watching radiation risks to our community and this committee has acted expeditiously in the past. Hon. members will recall that a few years ago feet were being X-rayed by major retail stores and others who were selling shoes. The feet were actually being X-rayed in the shoes, which was a very dangerous pastime indeed. Our committee acted promptly and efficiently and stopped that very unhealthy practice.

We must at all times have very careful controls in the training of people who use X-ray machines—radiographers—and I completely agree with the type of training they have to undergo. The major risk of course of over-exposure is that the victim will develop leukaemia.

**Mr. Murray:** Is the hon. member aware that the Henzell case has been satisfactorily fixed up?

**Dr. CRAWFORD:** Yes, I had heard that.

**Mr. Murray:** Full marks to the department!

**Dr. CRAWFORD:** Yes. The licensing of specialist radiologists, who, of course, are the doctors associated with the taking of X-rays, is also carried out with great care in our community. However, I should like the Minister, at some stage, to make a statement to the committee on how frequently X-ray machines in our public hospitals are serviced and the type of person responsible for the servicing. Those matters are of vital importance. Cases have been known—and I am sure the Minister is aware of cases even now—where some doubt exists about the efficiency of X-ray machines. Those machines were producing X-radiation at times when they were supposed not to be producing this X-radiation. I heard recently that there was some trouble with one of the machines at the Princess Alexandra Hospital, and I should like to hear the Minister's comments on the precautions that are taken to make sure that our community—and particularly the radiographers and other people handling these machines regularly—are completely protected against the risk of excessive radiation.

We are aware, of course, that in the Radium Institute, and in other institutes and units where radiation is a problem, each individual worker wears a monitor. This, of course, is the correct practice. No doubt, if there is excessive radiation, the necessary steps to correct the situation are taken. I should, however, like to hear the Minister's comments on this particular subject and on the people in his department who do this work. I should like to hear what physicists are involved and just how they carry out this particular function of their duties.

The expert committee that controls radiation in our community incorporates the various subspecialties in nuclear medicine and is composed of physicists and other experts, including people from the Radium Institute. I understand they include the director. People of this calibre, of course, are used to handling nuclear material in its various forms, and it is very important to have the best possible advice always available so that the staff in such places are not subjected to risks.

We have made mistakes in Australia and in Queensland in other ways. America has a very efficient organisation called the Food and Drug Organisation, which, I understand, is run by a lady. When thalidomide was being introduced around the world by the drug houses, this lady, using her discretionary powers, vetoed its introduction to the United States. We did not do that in Australia. Nor was it banned in Britain, West Germany and various other places. As a result, we have our proportion of deformed children. Of course, with hindsight, it is easy to speak wisely. The control that is exercised in the United States of America could perhaps be emulated in Australia. The State Stores, through which the Health Department buys its drugs, always accepts the lowest tender. No doubt that is good business, but, as I have said, cheapness is not synonymous with quality. Recently rather inferior intravenous fluids that I would not use have been imported from Japan. Because of the very low price of certain types of antibiotics, specifically tetracycline, they have been imported from countries in Europe and passed on to our community via the State Stores purchasing system in Queensland.

**Mr. Jensen:** What is the effect of these "crook" drugs on mass immunisation?

**Dr. CRAWFORD:** I do not think that is relevant; however, I will comment on the hon. member's remark later.

At present I am conducting a survey of drugs used throughout Australia, and at the right time I shall bring the subject of drugs to the fore. However, I wish to bring to the Minister's attention the cheap drugs and intravenous fluids that we have been contending with in Queensland. I ask him to look into the matter and implement corrective measures. I am well aware that a Drug Evaluation Committee is functioning in Queensland, but, as far as I can ascertain, it does not decide the particular type of drug or intravenous fluid that shall be purchased by State Stores. I hope that the Minister can tell me that cheapness of the product is not the only criterion for its acceptance by his department.

**Mr. Tooth:** Would you elucidate your point about tetracycline coming from European countries?

**Dr. CRAWFORD:** I understand that within the last 12 months it was imported from Italy for use in the Brisbane Children's Hospital. According to my pediatric colleagues it was a very inferior product.

**Mr. Tooth:** I am very interested in this matter.

**Dr. CRAWFORD:** I understand that the entire batch was imported from Italy, but some of it may have come from other parts of the Continent. I use the word "Continent" electively because I do not know whether a type other than the Italian was imported.

**Mr. Tooth:** It was a tetracycline?

**Dr. CRAWFORD:** It was a tetracycline, and probably there was some chloramphenicol as well.

With regard to the remarks made by the hon. member for Toowoomba East about obstetrics, the story is a very interesting one. I have referred to Grantley Dick Read, who, many years ago, realised that under certain circumstances it was a good idea to have the husband present at his wife's confinement. But it involves very much more, perhaps, than the hon. member realises. It involves a very extensive course of ante-natal training, particularly physical exercises, for both husband and wife so that the wife can carry out relaxation during the relevant part of her parturition process, and also so that the husband will understand what she is actually trying to accomplish. By talking to her and helping her to relax specific groups of muscles, he can be of great assistance during the first stages of her labour.

**Mr. Marginson:** The medical profession is divided.

**Dr. CRAWFORD:** It is basically laziness. A great amount of work is involved if the training is to be implemented properly. The obstetrician, working with a physiotherapist, must be prepared to take the girls in classes during their pregnancy and teach them the exercises. It is extraordinarily difficult, in that someone must be responsible and, virtually, it must be the obstetrician. Most of these doctors have too much to do already. Grantley Dick Read was one of the few people who managed it, and it worked very well under his control. A few people in Brisbane have tried it in private hospitals but from a practical angle it is difficult in that so much organisation is involved. I may be a little unfair in calling it laziness because there is more to it than that.

The hon. member for Toowoomba East referred to the battered-child syndrome. I agree wholeheartedly with his remarks. I think this is an indictment of our community. I put the case of the battered child on the same plane as that of the Aboriginal children about whom we were talking yesterday.

In dealing with the battered child who needs physical protection from its parents or guardians and the Aboriginal child who needs to have his parents educated so that he may be adequately fed on a three-times-a-day basis, a degree of paternalism in our thinking is called for, so that we can organise the welfare of these very unfortunate members of our community.

Finally, if the Minister will give consideration to one or two of the points I have raised, I think that, together in this House, we can make some contribution to solving some of our major problems. It is essential to air these matters. I can only repeat what I said yesterday, namely, that I make no apology for airing them. I do not particularly appreciate the Minister's comments that such-and-such a remark is unworthy of me. I completely refute that statement. I also state that I will speak the truth in this House to the best of my knowledge, under all circumstances. I will do my very best to aid anyone in this House with any knowledge that is within my ambit. Under all circumstances I will say what I know to be true.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON** (Salisbury) (5.33 p.m.): As, during the debate on the Health Estimates, I was unable to deal with the matter that I now wish to put before the House because of the number of members who wished to speak, I take advantage of the opportunity presented in the debate on the Resolutions.

I will deal briefly this afternoon with a problem that has come to my notice relative to air pollution in a part of my electorate. Some time ago private subdividers developed about 200 or 300 acres of land in the Sunnybank area as an industrial estate. The eastern side of that area is bounded by a rather large housing development. As most of the prevailing winds are westerlies or north-westerlies, quite a bad air-pollution problem has been created for residents living in areas surrounding this estate.

**Mr. Lee:** Where is it?

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** The estate is on the corner of Beenleigh Road and Bradman Street. It adjoins the area presently occupied by Lysaght, General Motors-Holden's, and other companies. The land that was developed comprises very poor sandy soil. In developing the estate the land was cleared of all vegetation, with the result that the area of exposed sand is causing an air-pollution problem to residents living within at least half a mile of the estate. Recently, when westerly winds blew for a few days, the air pollution had to be seen to be believed. If I had not taken the trouble to visit the area after receiving two complaints, I would not have believed the conditions that pertained at that time and the extent of the air pollution created by the clearing of the area.

The woman concerned had cleaned her house continuously during the day and she showed me three ordinary bucketfuls of sand which she had removed from her premises. She took me next door to the home of a relative who was on holidays. Even though the home was unoccupied and the doors and windows had been closed, the whole of the home was covered with fine sand that had blown from this industrial area.

If we allow this situation to continue because there is growth in industry in the capital city, we are sowing the seeds of a problem. While I am dealing with a specific case, there could be a continuing series of complaints in the years ahead.

As a matter of curiosity, I browsed through the debate on the introduction of the Clean Air Bill on 23 October, 1963, and I was particularly interested in the remarks of the late Dr. Noble, who was the Minister who introduced the Bill. He said—

"It is quite clear that bronchitis and other forms of chronic respiratory disease are aggravated, if not caused, by certain toxic ingredients in the air over industrial cities of the world. Asthma, emphysema, and impaired respiratory capacity are more common in industrial areas."

From the evidence that I saw in this instance, I could well imagine the discomfort that was caused to these people. I admit that on that occasion a fairly severe westerly wind was blowing. However, residents there assure me that every time there is a breath of air across that cleared area they are faced with the problem of sand building up in their homes. On the day in question, the woman whom I mentioned told me that the air was so polluted with sand that butter became impregnated with it before it could be spread onto bread.

I raise this matter because I do not know whether the Government has allowed the Division of Air Pollution Control to lag behind because of lack of funds or whether the division has been unable to obtain sufficient staff to put into operation the Act that was passed in 1963. I know that industries emitting pollutants were given a seven-year amnesty in which to overcome the problem. The previous Minister for Health said that he did not want to have a witch-hunt after the Act was passed. However, while this is going on, I am somewhat disturbed. When I started to make inquiries in an effort to obtain some sort of relief for the people who are badly affected by this pollution, I found that there is no regulation to cope with the problem, which will continue because of the growth of industrial estates in this city.

**Mr. Lee:** I do not want to score a point, but don't you think that the local authority—

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I am coming to that. The hon. member cannot put this onto the local authority. I am not merely trying

to be critical. I never do that; I always try to support my contentions with something worth while.

When I raised this matter with the Department of Health and the Minister, I found that there were no regulations currently in operation that give the Air Pollution Council jurisdiction to deal with the matter, or to prescribe any remedial action. It appears, too, that the Health Department of the Brisbane City Council also has no appropriate control regulations. In the case of the problem that I detailed, I am therefore at present at a stalemate.

**Mr. Tooth:** They do have nuisance ordinances for general application, don't they?

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** Yes, I know that there are ordinances to deal with nuisances, but over the years they have been found to be quite ineffective. When the city council has acted against people who have been polluting the air with sawdust, or anything else, the cases have gone to court and fines of about \$10 have been imposed. It is well worth their while for people who are causing this type of nuisance to be prosecuted once in a while and pay a fine of \$10 as a licence to do nothing about providing a long-term solution to the problem.

**Mr. Tooth:** Possibly the ordinances have been strengthened.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** That could be so. I assure the Minister that I am not making this speech merely as a political shot at him and his department.

**Mr. Tooth:** I am not questioning you, either. I know there is this problem, and there is also the problem of noise. Those are two things that give me real concern.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I was not going to deal with noise—I wanted to deal specifically with air pollution—but, since the Minister has introduced the subject of noise, I may say that I agree entirely with him. Brisbane City Council ordinances and Government regulations are equally ineffective in dealing with noise. It would seem that the only effective legislation to control noise is that under which noise from established industrial plants that work round the clock can be controlled after 11 p.m. Recently large-scale clearing operations were undertaken in my area. I shall not mention the name of the company concerned, as what happened there could happen anywhere else. This firm had approximately 10 giant earth-moving machines, like an advancing column of Army tanks, working round the clock.

**Mr. Lee:** Don't "knock" them.

**Mr. SHERRINGTON:** I will, because it is important to me that at that time there were children sitting for the Junior and Senior examinations and they could not get a decent night's sleep. I will certainly "knock" these activities if they affect the public interest.

Seeing that the hon. member for Yeronga has provoked me, I shall go further. I live about a mile and a half, as the crow flies, from the site that was being cleared, yet my slumbers were disturbed by the volume of noise coming from it. The machines were operating 24 hours a day. The complaint that I received was that children who attended the local high school, and who at that time of the year were sitting for the Junior and Senior examinations, could not sleep at night. I could hear the noise at my premises  $1\frac{1}{2}$  miles away, so its effect on those living within 200 or 300 yards can well be imagined. That din was going on for 24 hours a day, and the people were concerned about the effect of lack of sleep on their health and that of their children.

The net result of my inquiries was that I discovered that noise could be controlled after 11 p.m. in an established factory and that, because this was site-preparation work and not an established factory, there was not one piece of legislation under which either the Brisbane City Council or the State Government could control the noise that went on unchecked for 24 hours a day. I am not "knocking" industry coming to this State, but I think that citizens have a right to enjoy the maximum amount of sleep at night-time.

That was the problem I was up against, and in desperation I went and saw the person in charge of the machines and appealed to him to stop the noise. He "graciously" agreed that, whereas only one machine at a time had been serviced, operations would cease at 1 o'clock in the morning, all machines would be serviced at once, and work would be resumed at 5 a.m. However, after these negotiations it rained for about four days, the work fell behind, and the machines operated 24 hours a day for weeks on end. I stress that it was not only an isolated couple of days; it continued for weeks on end. As in the case of air pollution that I have outlined to the House, no legislative measure covered the position to ensure that people could get a good night's sleep.

Having digressed a little from the submission that I was making, let me say that I believe the Government has been remiss in not increasing the staff of the Division of Air Pollution Control. It may be that insufficient qualified people are available, but I was rather amazed recently when, in reply to a question that I asked, the Minister for Health said that only six people were employed in the division—the director, a senior chemist, a laboratory technician, a laboratory mechanic, an attendant, and a clerk-typist—and that an engineer had been recommended for appointment. The legislation was enacted in 1964, almost five years ago, and I do not think that is good enough if effective action is to be taken to control the air pollution that is besetting this city. The problems arising from air pollution are continually being added to as more and more

industries are established. I am aware, of course, that not all the pollutants originate in industry. In capital cities, the increasing number of motor vehicles contributes to air pollution.

Hon. members on both sides of the House supported wholeheartedly the introduction of the Clean Air Bill, and it is very disappointing to find that today, five years after the legislation was enacted, the Division of Air Pollution Control has a staff of only six. I should say that they would not have either the time or the facilities to deal with the many complaints that are brought to their attention from time to time.

To return to the point that I was making, I told the House that I had come up against a brick wall, that it appeared that neither the Department of Health through the Division of Air Pollution Control nor the Brisbane City Council had any regulations or by-laws under which effective action could be taken. In the meantime, people suffering from asthma, emphysema and other respiratory diseases must go on suffering in an area that has been denuded of vegetation and has not been consolidated to prevent light sand lifting every time the wind blows.

I have given some thought to this matter. As we know, most industrial estates are not fully occupied immediately they are opened. The Government estate at Wacol is typical of this. Four or five years might elapse before an estate the size of this one is covered with buildings, properly landscaped and so on. The problem arises because, while the land has been denuded of vegetation, no attempt has been made to consolidate the surface to prevent it from becoming a contaminant of the air. Something will have to be done about the situation.

If we cannot find an immediate remedy for the position at Acacia Ridge, or Sunnybank, then we will have to start looking at the effect that the clearing of areas such as this will, in years to come, have on our State. I think basically the answer to this problem is negotiation between the Health Department—possibly through the Division of Air Pollution Control—and the Brisbane City Council, and other local authorities throughout the State who will be affected from time to time, in order to lay down specifications for the clearing of land for industrial sites. Before a site permit is given for an area, some specifications must be laid down to prevent a recurrence of this problem. It could be made a condition that once an area has been cleared it must be seeded to grass as is done with school ovals, where a condition of the contract for construction is seeding to grass with a certain amount of growth within a certain time. It could take the pattern that immediately land is denuded of vegetation it must be sown to grass.

This is a relatively inexpensive process with which I have had some experience. I have had experience with what can be done with a cricket field, starting from

nothing. Within a few short weeks an area can have a thick mat of grass over it. As I say, it is relatively inexpensive and would answer the problem of wind erosion in this type of area. Whether that is done or whether the area is compounded and consolidated by spraying with emulsion would depend on the nature of the soil, the possibility of revegetation and so on, but I do not think we can just allow these estates to be cleared in the fashion I have mentioned.

We encounter this problem where there is a natural regrowth of grass, which usually is fairly sparse. If the clearing work is followed by a long period of windy weather, such as we experience with westerly winds, the grass cannot re-establish itself and the topsoil is constantly blown away. Such areas eventually assume a semi-desert condition and the polluting topsoil is dumped into the nearby houses. As I have said, the quantity of sand blown into houses in the case that I instanced would have to be seen to be believed.

I appeal to the Minister for Health, who I think has some responsibility in this matter. It is obvious that our laws and regulations are inadequate. It is also obvious that the Division of Air Pollution Control has inadequate staff to handle this problem, but I think that a start could at least be made by negotiating with local authorities. Where it is proposed to establish large industrial estates, particularly in areas where the surface soil is of a sandy nature and is easily blown away, some regulations and conditions of subdivision must be laid down so that people will not have to undergo this air-pollution nuisance. Not only is it injurious to health; it is certainly not conducive to encouraging the housewife who takes a pride in her home and tries to keep it clean.

**Mr. MILLER (Ithaca) (5.55 p.m.):** I rise to associate myself with those hon. members who have asked for an inquiry into Queensland's hospital system. I believe that an inquiry should be held, if only to answer the people who have levelled criticism at the Health Department and to reassure the public of the high standard of the State's hospital system.

**Mr. Sherrington:** Do you include Dr. Crawford?

**Mr. MILLER:** I shall let the hon. member for Salisbury judge who are the critics and who are not. Criticism has been levelled by members of the medical profession, the nursing profession, patients' associations and by individual patients, who have, for some reason or other, been dissatisfied with Queensland's hospital system. On the other hand, many members of the public have come out openly in the Press in support of the system, and a great number of medical people have spoken highly about

it. Therefore, in the interests of good public relations, if for no other reason, an inquiry should be instituted.

During yesterday's debate on the control and treatment of tuberculosis, the hon. member for Belmont attacked the Government because he claimed that it wished to abolish our free-hospital system. Today the Leader of the Opposition said that he was sick and tired of Government members attacking the A.L.P. either for doing certain things or for not doing certain things during the years that it was in power. I am sick and tired of members of the Opposition claiming that Government members wish to do away with the free-hospital system, especially after having heard the policy speech of the A.L.P. prior to the recent Federal election. Members of the A.L.P. cannot deny that if they had won the Federal election there would be no free-hospital system in Queensland today.

**Mr. Hanlon:** Rubbish!

**Mr. MILLER:** I ask the hon. member for Baroona whether the people of Queensland would have been required to contribute towards the free-hospital system that it was proposed Labour should institute if it won the Federal election?

**Mr. Hanlon:** They are forced to contribute to medical benefits, although they have no claim unless they are in the fund.

**Mr. MILLER:** They were not forced to contribute to the fund.

**Mr. Hanlon:** They are forced.

**Mr. MILLER:** They are not forced at the present time to pay into a free medical service or into a medical fund.

**Mr. Hanlon:** And they couldn't have been under any scheme unless your Government imposed it.

**Mr. MILLER:** The only people who would not be required to contribute to it would be those on the basic wage. The percentage of people in Queensland on the basic wage is very low indeed. For example, a worker in the Brisbane City Council can receive 20c above the basic wage, but I would regard his wage as being the basic wage.

**Mr. Tucker** interjected.

**Mr. MILLER:** If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition can show me that I am wrong, I hope he will take the opportunity of entering the debate to do so.

**Mr. Tucker:** Why stand up now when you do not know what you are talking about?

**Mr. MILLER:** I do know what I am talking about. I have had the pleasure of reading a pamphlet circulated by Mr. Hayden, the Federal member for Oxley, in which he pointed out quite plainly that

Queenslanders would have been required to pay for hospital services if Labour had come into power.

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

**Mr. MILLER:** I will now deal with the Department of Children's Services. Whenever members of the public think of public servants, they immediately think of persons who go to work from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. I pay tribute tonight to Mr. Clark and his officers for their sterling work in this department. Few people realise the number of calls made on them during the night when girls are apprehended and have to be taken to denominational homes. I am indeed pleased to pay a tribute to their work.

The past year saw a marked increase in the number of children and families seeking the department's assistance. On reading the report I note that 3,257 mothers and 6,064 children sought assistance during the year. That was a substantial increase on last year's figures which, I believe, was caused by abolishing the six-month waiting period before an A-class widow's pension could be obtained. It is to be regretted that desertion by fathers—the incidence of which has been increasing steadily—is a major concern.

It was argued in the past that the six-month waiting period was a sound practical provision that was likely to discourage desertion and encourage reconciliation but, in fact, it is cruel, heartless and stupid. There is certainly no logic in that argument. The existence of this provision had an adverse effect not only on family relations but also on the actual expenditure by the Department of Children's Services. There was little chance of reconciliation because of this provision. Would a woman who had struggled on relief for six months and then got a widow's pension be likely to risk returning to six months of hell by trying to effect reconciliation when she could be in a much stronger financial position than she was as the wife of a basic-wage earner? As a mother, she would recognise her children's need of a father, but she could not give his offer serious thought.

Some families receive the widow's pension not because reconciliation is undesirable, or impossible, but because of the fear of having to return to six months of hell before getting the pension. As we have now removed that barrier to reconciliation, I hope that many of them will try to readjust themselves.

A note of warning is sounded in the figures presented in the latest report. Are we making it too easy for the husband and father to leave home? Fathers who would not leave their families without sufficient means of support can now decide that the families no longer need their support. I have already stated that 3,257 mothers receive pensions, but only about 200 fathers pay maintenance to the department towards the cost of maintaining deserted families.

As it is impossible to find many of the fathers, I wonder if we should consider the introduction of an identification card for all workers so that the Government could keep a check on the movement of these men. We have a driving licence to identify the driver of a motor vehicle and, during the war, we had an identification card. I realise that members of the public do not like the idea of identification cards, but I think that we have reached the stage where we must decide how many more of these mothers we can support without considering some form of identification by means of which we could locate the fathers concerned, who should, after all, contribute towards the maintenance of their families.

**Mr. Davies:** I think you should give more detailed identification of what you mean.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr. Hooper): Order! The hon. member for Maryborough should interject only from his own place in the Chamber.

**Mr. MILLER:** I thought my argument was clear. I consider that the fathers of these families should contribute towards their maintenance, and I suggested that, as it is impossible to find many of them, we might be able to do so if we had identification cards or work cards.

It is pleasing to see the reduction in the number of children admitted to care and control. This could well be because we now pay this "A" class widow's pension to widows, deserted wives, and wives of prisoners who are now able to care for these children and do not have to put them in the care and control of denominational homes.

**Mr. Davies:** Do you want the widow to suffer because the husband cannot be found and we cannot get the money out of him?

**Mr. MILLER:** I have never heard such a stupid remark in my life. I do not want the widows to suffer. They are now paid by the Department of Children's Services. I say that the fathers, the husbands, should be contributing something to the department because the number of widows, deserted wives and wives of prisoners is rising every year.

I congratulate the Minister on the development of the new services for the care of the aged in Brisbane under the Division of Geriatrics. This division is under the control and in the very capable hands of Dr. Cheong. I have had the pleasure of meeting this gentleman and going with him to the home for the aged at Sandgate and to the geriatric ward at the Princess Alexandra Hospital. This scheme will enable people to remain in their own homes for a longer period. I consider this to be very important indeed. The greatest fear confronting old people today is that one day they must leave their homes because they cannot afford to maintain them, pay the rates, and look after themselves.

**An Opposition Member:** Because of the miserable Federal pension.

**Mr. MILLER:** Because of the very high rates being charged by the Brisbane City Council.

I congratulate the Minister on the very vital step he has taken in the past 12 months. I believe that the community can play a very important role in these services. We already have the Home Help Service, which has been doing the best it can under extreme hardship. I believe that this division will assist the Home Help Service tremendously once it is functioning fully. Even with all the improvements that have taken place in "Eventide" homes, very few people wish to leave their own homes to go into them.

People do not wish to be institutionalised in 1970, and I am pleased that we have now taken the first step to help them remain in their own areas. But this is only the first step. I know of no better medicine for an old person than to be able to talk every day with his old friends, those with whom he has grown up. Many of us in this House are in middle age, and can appreciate what old people go through when they have to leave their homes and friends whom they may never see again. It is wonderful medicine for old people to have their friends visit them. I believe that there must be homes for the aged in all suburbs.

**Mrs. Jordan:** All you think of is Brisbane.

**Mr. MILLER:** And in country towns. There is, of course, the wonderful subsidy paid by the Commonwealth Government. (Opposition laughter.) The Commonwealth Government pays two-thirds of the cost of the homes. There is also the wonderful subsidy of the State Government, which contributes \$500 for furnishing each home. I believe that the Brisbane City Council, and the local authorities in provincial towns, should now play their part in this scheme. The Commonwealth Government is paying two-thirds of the cost of each home, and the State Government is contributing \$500 towards furnishing it. What is the Brisbane City Council doing? Opposition members may say that the Commonwealth Government is not doing enough. But what is the local authority doing? It can play a vital role in this field.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr. Hooper): Order!

**Mr. MILLER:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am speaking particularly about the Brisbane City Council. It has land available in most suburbs of the city.

**Mr. Ramsden:** Are you suggesting that they stop digging holes and do something about providing homes for the aged?

**Mr. MILLER:** That would be a wonderful idea.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I again appeal to hon. members on my left to be less persistent with their interjections. It is difficult to follow the hon. member's speech.

**Mr. MILLER:** I am surprised that any member of the Opposition would regard what I am saying as rot when all I am asking is that local authorities contribute land so that homes for the aged can be built in the suburbs of their choice, to allow them to remain in the areas in which they have spent most of their lives.

**Mr. Sherrington:** Why can't that be done by the Housing Commission?

**Mr. MILLER:** Why cannot the local authority contribute land?

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I realise that the hon. member for Ithaca is making a provocative speech. On the other hand, there are far too many interjections from my left. I again appeal to hon. members on my left. By all means make interjections, but keep them relevant.

**Mr. MILLER:** I did not think that my speech was provocative at all. (Opposition laughter.)

In Melbourne the local authority is already contributing to the provision of homes for the aged, so I cannot see any reason why the suggestion that the same thing be done in Brisbane should be regarded as stupid. I have not the faintest idea why hon. members opposite should think it is. I hope we will see the day when all aged people will be able to remain in the suburbs in which they have lived all their lives.

I pay a tribute to the Milton Congregational Church for the part it is playing in the provision of a centre for senior citizens in Milton. The church decided that its building should be pulled down, and a public meeting was called to decide what should be done with the land. A petrol company made a very good offer for the land as a site for a petrol station, but the church decided, instead of accepting that offer, to donate the land for a senior citizens centre.

**Mr. Hanlon:** It is a very valuable site.

**Mr. MILLER:** As the hon. member for Barooka said, it is a very valuable site. In fact, its value is in excess of \$10,000. Because of the subsidy that is available from the State and Commonwealth Governments, next year Milton will have one of the finest senior citizens centres in the State.

**Mr. F. P. Moore:** What subsidy is given by the State?

**Mr. MILLER:** One-third of the cost is borne by the State Government, one-third by the Federal Government, and one-third by the Church.

**Mr. Casey:** Isn't that true of church organisations throughout Queensland? They are doing it in every city and town.

**Mr. MILLER:** I am pleased to hear it. This is the only church that I know of which is being pulled down and replaced by a senior citizens centre. I am happy to hear the hon. member's interjection, because I am concerned about senior citizens.

I am very pleased to have had the opportunity to speak about what is being done in Milton for the senior citizens and to congratulate Mr. Clark and his officers on what they are achieving in the Department of Children's Services.

**Hon. S. D. TOOTH** (Ashgrove—Minister for Health) (7.33 p.m.): I have found the debate very refreshing and very interesting, and the spirit of gaiety that has informed the proceedings has been particularly gratifying to me. It has been an occasion for the exchange of chaff and banter, and that obviously indicates that there is no great worry or concern about the affairs of the Department of Health in Queensland. It has been very cheering indeed. If hon. members were deeply concerned about the affairs of the department, if they were worried about the administration of the department, if they were concerned about the effect of the department's Acts and regulations—if, in short, there were any serious grounds for criticism or complaint—the debate would not have been as pleasant and entertaining as it has. We have had a very pleasant and entertaining debate—lots of fun, banter, and chaff, and very little concern in the sense that there is a feeling of urgency, that things are wrong, that things must be changed and corrected. It is immensely satisfying to me; I am cheered no end.

I think that I should comment on some of the things that were said during the debate. First of all, the hon. member for Landsborough made a very interesting and serious contribution on the subject of fluoridation. Although some hon. members might treat this as a joke, I am sure that the hon. member for Landsborough, in working on it, spent a considerable amount of time in research. I compliment him on his speech, which was an excellent presentation of the case for compulsory fluoridation.

I realise the importance of fluoridation. I have personally benefited from it because I was born and lived as a child in an area of natural fluoridation where the water supply is naturally fluoridated and where the percentage is almost identical with that recommended. I would say that I have suffered very little in the way of dental caries. I have lost a couple of teeth, but I think I have mentioned before that I lost them in the way that many young fellows do.

The contribution of the hon. member for Landsborough was timely, because this is something we have to think about. As a Government, and as a department, we have a very great reluctance to adopt compulsion if persuasion and example will ultimately achieve the objects which we all desire. That is the policy at the present time—to try, by precept, by example and by education to encourage people to accept fluoridation of their water supplies.

One hon. member—I cannot recall precisely who it was—asserted that this matter should not be left to local authorities. That, of course, is a matter of practical convenience because the local authorities control water supplies and it is a matter of practical convenience to leave to them the implementation of fluoridation. It would also perhaps be wise for them to make the decision on a local basis.

I want to make some comment on what the hon. member for Wavell said in respect of this matter. He said that he could not understand how some doctors and others who accept the scientific basis of this procedure, and who must be convinced of its value, could oppose it. I think he has overlooked a factor that is regarded by the opponents of fluoridation as very important in a debate such as this. It is the feeling that this involves a philosophical problem. There is no exact parallel between chlorination and fluoridation. Chlorination is the purifying of a water supply which otherwise would possibly lead to an epidemic of disease, whereas fluoridation is the adding of some additional substance to a water supply. Many people feel—I think it is an exaggerated view and has not any great substance, but it is the view held by those to whom Dr. Crawford referred—that the practice of medicating a water supply or a food supply trenches upon the philosophical problem of whether we accept “Big Brother” to a greater extent than the necessities of society demand. This, I think, is the basis of the opposition rather than a failure to understand the value and the scientific implications of fluoridation.

**Mr. Ahern:** They are a very small group today.

**Mr. TOOTH:** That may be so, but they are a very vocal group. It is undoubtedly true that when they really begin to proclaim their views and state their arguments they can be extremely persuasive. We have seen proof of that in a number of areas of Queensland where the city fathers or the town councillors have been in favour of fluoridation but when they have submitted the matter to a referendum, as the Act provides they may, they have been defeated.

The hon. member for Nudgee made, shall I say, a fairly pungent attack upon members of the dental profession on two scores—their charges and fees and what he proclaimed to be their lack of interest in the prevention of dental caries. That is not my concern, and I am sure that the hon. member does

not expect me to answer his allegations. I have no doubt that in due course the officers of the Australian Dental Association will give him an adequate reply.

I am interested to hear that the hon. member has an open mind on fluoridation. This means that in due course he will do his best to persuade those whom he can influence to accept it, possibly on a local government basis.

The hon. member's return to the problem of delays in casualty departments was a little untimely. Delays occur in all areas of public treatment. Indeed, I do not suppose that this evening there is one doctor's waiting room in which there is not a number of people who are chafing because of the delay that they face in reaching their own private practitioner. This is a common feature of medical service everywhere, and while we continually do our best to mitigate the problem it is one that is not susceptible to a complete solution.

Reference was made to the fact that we are adding to the staff of the casualty department at the Royal Brisbane Hospital. I hope that this increase in staff will have some ameliorative effect upon the problem; however, that is not the purpose of the increase in staff. Its purpose is to give us a means whereby we can provide specialist training in the field of general practice. That seems to be something of a contradiction in terms. However, as every other form of specialty has developed, so do the general practitioners feel that the time has come when their particular field in medicine must be recognised for what it is, that is, a very specialised form of family medicine. The closest that we can approximate to a general practitioner in the community in a situation in which we can provide training is in the casualty department of a big public hospital, so, with the concurrence and co-operation of the hospital board, and, I hope, the approval of the College of General Practitioners, we are making arrangements by which it is hoped that specialised training will be provided in this field for young doctors and perhaps not-so-young doctors who have had some experience in medicine.

I thank the hon. member for Carnarvon for his interesting speech and his reference to the fact that there is no racial segregation in our hospital and health services. It is true that there is no segregation on a racial basis, but there is segregation on a variety of other bases. One is compatibility. If it can be avoided, we do not put together in a public ward people who are completely incompatible. That is very important. It must be considered on therapeutic grounds. Sometimes it may have the appearance of being based on other grounds, but that is the only ground. And it is a justifiable ground. Anyone who has had experience as a patient in a public ward knows how important it is.

The hon. member for Carnarvon referred also to the radiographer who it was hoped could be employed at Goondiwindi and to the fact that the Department of Health was unenthusiastic about employing her. On his own admission the suggestion was that she would be employed as a radiographer for only about half of her time, if she were appointed and that she was prepared to spend the remainder of her time on other work in the hospital. On the face of it that is very attractive, but it contains the seeds of all sorts of industrial problems, as anyone who has had any experience in this field should realise. It is not wise to look for more trouble than we inevitably have in the industrial field. On that ground alone, the suggestion was not acceptable. I trust that the hon. member realises that it would present a real difficulty.

The hon. member for Toowoomba East, whom we were all very happy to congratulate, raised the matter of husbands being allowed to remain with their wives during childbirth and asked if it was possible for the department or the Minister to allow such a practice. Frankly, that is something into which I would not dare to venture. In a private hospital people can make their own arrangements, as it were, but in a public hospital there are many complications.

This is something that must be left to the discretion of the obstetrician. I would be the last person in the world to consider even dreaming of issuing a directive on the matter. I would not go beyond considering whether it was permissible or not. I do not know that there is any rule against it; I have not heard of any. I do not think we have interfered in any way with the obstetricians' discretion in this matter. I will certainly find out if there is a rule, but I do not think there should be any prohibition. On the other hand, I certainly do not think that there should be any coercion of obstetricians to permit this practice in public hospitals because those hospitals have problems that are peculiar to them alone. They do not have the same flexibility as private hospitals.

The hon. member's reference to the maltreatment of infants touches on an area that has been of great concern to the Children's Services Department and, indeed, to the Police Department. He mentioned the possibility of offering protection to medical men who make a report on this type of thing, and his suggestion is worthy of consideration. I will certainly ask someone to look into it. Of course, the problem is to get a report on these happenings. Once a report containing sufficient evidence to warrant the making of proper inquiries—or anything of that nature—comes to our ears, through the Children's Services Department, with the co-operation of the law-enforcement authorities, we do

our level best to identify the problem and, if possible, correct it. We will certainly look at the matter that the hon. member raised.

The hon. member for Wavell, in the course of his remarks, made some inquiries about the Division of Industrial Medicine and the matter of X-rays, X-ray machines, their servicing, the training of people who use them, and so on. I refer him to a section of my speech in the Supply debate earlier during this session. On page 1226 of "Hansard" of 28 August, I said—

"TECHNICAL ADVISER (RADIATION)—  
DIVISION OF INDUSTRIAL MEDICINE

"Under the subdepartment of the Division of Industrial Medicine there has been created a new position entitled Technical Adviser (Radiation). The capital value of X-ray equipment throughout Queensland in our State public hospitals would be worth many hundreds of thousands of dollars. Each year the cost of providing films, chemicals and allied equipment would also aggregate a very considerable amount of money. The major role that will be played by this new appointee will be to visit all hospital X-ray installations and to report to their condition, their efficiency and their safety. We intend to update existing equipment and to remove any obsolescent units.

"This officer will also play an important role in advising operators in our smaller hospitals in the techniques of operating the X-ray units and in the processing of films. Hon. members are aware that in our smaller hospitals it is not possible to employ qualified radiographers, and, indeed, the work volume would not justify, on an economical basis, their employment. And so it is that we have matrons, sisters and other members of the staff, under the supervision of the medical superintendent, operating X-ray machines in simple procedures. It is our hope that, once this officer organises his programme on a permanent basis, not only will our equipment be assured of regular efficient maintenance but in addition the quality of our films should be enhanced considerably."

Let me add that the work of the people who are operating these machines in the smaller areas will be more efficient, and if there was any danger in the past, which I do not admit, it certainly will not exist in the future.

One other matter referred to by the hon. member for Wavell was the question of drugs. He referred to the type of control in the U.S.A. and the quality of drugs, and made some inquiries as to the steps we take to ensure that the quality of drugs is maintained, and so on. The first thing I would say is that the only drugs that are authorised for use are those which are approved by the Commonwealth Department of Health for pharmaceutical benefits. That in itself, of course, is a very good safeguard against the

use of any drugs that would have any bad effect on a patient, and is a guarantee of the quality of drugs.

I would say also that the Drug Evaluation Committee, an autonomous committee appointed by the Federal Department of Health, keeps these matters continually under review. It has the best advice possible and watches the whole problem of drugs and their quality and use. In addition, we have our own Drugs and Equipment Advisory Committee, so that there is a very careful three-way screen in this field, and hon. members need have little or no anxiety in this regard.

**Mr. Bennett:** Do you think you should take over Dr. Crawford's practice?

**Mr. TOOTH:** No. I feel that that would be more in the line of the hon. member for South Brisbane. He seems to be a Pooh-Bah and seems to be able to handle anything at all. I am conscious of my limitations, thank God.

**Mr. Bromley:** How do many of these young "crims"—

**Mr. TOOTH:** Did the hon. member say "crims"?

**Mr. Bromley:** Yes, young criminals. How do many of them know which drugs to steal when they break into a chemist's shop?

**Mr. TOOTH:** The people who break into chemists' shops for drugs are people who have been using drugs illegally, and if a person uses a drug illegally, I imagine he learns to recognise it.

**Mr. F. P. Moore:** How would they know their chemical names?

**Mr. TOOTH:** It is fairly easy to learn a few technical terms. I have even learned a few myself.

I feel that I owe the hon. member for Salisbury the courtesy of making a few comments on his contribution to the debate.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! There is too much noisy conversation on my left.

**Mr. TOOTH:** I should like to say that the hon. member made a very useful contribution to the debate, and I have very considerable sympathy with several of the submissions he made. However, I want to make clear in the minds of members generally the function of the Air Pollution Council and its officers. That council was set up by legislation with a limited charter, which does not extend to the control of the entire atmosphere, or to natural phenomena such as dust storms and rain storms. It is designed to control chemical pollutants that result from the development of industry. That is the limit of its charter.

**Mr. Sherrington:** What I referred to is not a natural phenomenon; it has been man made.

**Mr. TOOTH:** That may be so, but it has nothing to do with the chemical products of industry.

**Mr. Sherrington:** Then the Clean Air Act is a farce.

**Mr. TOOTH:** No. it is not. It is far from being a farce. It is inevitable that at times there will be dust storms, as major clouds of dust are blown in from the far west. Sometimes dust clouds cover the whole of Victoria. There is a pollution control council in Victoria, but nobody there complains to the council when the whole of Victoria is blanketed by dust from the Mallee.

The point that I am trying to make is that the Air Pollution Council has a limited charter, which leads to the point that it has sufficient staff. The hon. member assumes that, because it cannot deal with the problem that he mentioned at Inala, it must be understaffed. That is not true.

**Mr. Sherrington:** You are even in the wrong suburb.

**Mr. Lee:** It was Coopers Plains.

**Mr. TOOTH:** Well, wherever it was. The suburb does not matter; it is the principle that I am dealing with.

The achievements of the Government in air pollution control were recognised during a recent investigation by a Senate committee that included members of the hon. member's party. The Government's achievements were referred to in a very complimentary way. It is recognised throughout Australia that the campaign in Queensland against air pollution caused by industry is in a very advanced state of development. That is very necessary, because pollution poses a very difficult problem in Queensland, and it was due to the foresight of my predecessor and his Cabinet colleagues that steps were taken early to meet the situation. The only insoluble difficulty now, which it is hoped will not always remain, is the location of the airport, which prevents the use of smokestacks of the height necessary to carry out the procedure that the Director of Air Pollution Control considers necessary.

**Mr. Casey:** When are you going to extend the scope of these activities to cover the whole of Queensland?

**Mr. TOOTH:** That will be done in due course.

I thank hon. members for their contributions to the debate. Once again I say how happy I am with the spirit of gaiety that has informed the debate, and the obvious lack of anxiety and serious criticism. I shall conclude on that note.

Resolution 2 agreed to.

Resolutions 3 to 5, both inclusive, agreed to.

Resolution 6—Department of Industrial Development—

**Mr. TUCKER** (Townsville North) (8.1 p.m.): Over the past week hon. members have heard a continual claim relative to industrial development by the Country-Liberal Government. The Minister for Industrial Development repeated it on Tuesday night last when replying to comments on his Estimates, and I suppose he did that because he and other members of the Government think that people will believe it if it is repeated often enough.

If in fact all the development that the Government claims is taking place in Queensland is taking place, those responsible for that development and the wealth of the State are not sharing in it. To make my point, I shall quote from the latest figures issued by the Commonwealth Statistician showing the average weekly earnings in the various Australian States.

**Mr. Chinchin:** You know that they cannot be compared.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. TUCKER:** It is very obvious that I have touched someone on the quick immediately.

**Mr. Chinchin:** You have to be honest on this. They all begin on a different basis.

**Mr. TUCKER:** Comment is coming from the back-benchers which indicates that the hon. members opposite fear what I am about to say. The figures I shall quote make it very obvious that the workers in Queensland certainly are not sharing in the great development that is said to be taking place.

The average weekly earnings in the Australian States are—

	\$
New South Wales .. .. .	73.80
Victoria .. .. .	73.70
Western Australia .. .. .	69.40
Tasmania .. .. .	66.50
South Australia (including Northern Territory) .. .. .	65.60
Queensland .. .. .	64.30

The average weekly earnings over the whole of Australia, taking all the States into consideration, is \$71.40 a week. Queenslanders have the lowest weekly earnings in Australia, and that has been the position for the last six years. The Government cannot be proud of that. This year the average weekly earnings in Queensland are \$7.10 below the national average. Wages are low and prices are soaring to such an extent that today's prices probably will be quite higher next week. That inflationary trend has been evident for a long time, but I wish to place the figures on record tonight because I was unable to do so during the debate on the Estimates for the Department of Industrial Development. Only 25 minutes were available to hon. members in that debate and I could not develop fully all the

points that I wished to make. As I said, the statistics I have quoted show that Queensland at present has the lowest average weekly earnings in Australia, and it has had the lowest average for the last six years.

Despite the arguments put forward by the Minister for Industrial Development, I think we should examine the unemployment figures for the whole of Australia, particularly those for Queensland.

If unprecedented development is taking place, then the unemployment figures show that there is something wrong in Queensland. Metal trades employees in Queensland, of course, are very much worse off than anybody else. These figures of the Department of Labour and National Service for October, 1969, show that Queensland is in the worst position of all the mainland States of Australia—

	Number of Unemployed	Percentage of Population
New South Wales	14,507	.74
Victoria .. .. .	10,403	.72
Western Australia	2,674	.70
South Australia	4,614	.91
Queensland .. .. .	7,204	1.03
Tasmania .. .. .	1,802	1.17

The only State with a higher percentage of unemployed was Tasmania, despite the fact that the Minister and many Government members have claimed that Queensland has never been better off in its history. The fact is that every State in Australia is leading us today, not only in development but also in employment. This is the kind of medicine that hon. members opposite do not like, but it has to be administered at times in order to refute statements from the Government benches.

This is not something I have dreamed up. I have given hon. members the source of my figures and they can check them if they wish to do so. Dealing now with unfilled job vacancies and the percentage of unemployment to job vacancies, these are the figures—

	Vacancies	Percentage
New South Wales .. .. .	23,124	62.7
Victoria .. .. .	17,574	59.2
Western Australia .. .. .	5,944	45
South Australia .. .. .	3,233	142.7
Queensland .. .. .	3,27	225.7
Tasmania .. .. .	1,06	164.4

Again, in percentage of unemployment to job vacancies, Queensland is faring badly compared with the other States. Obviously no advantage can be gained at present in this State. Whichever way one views the statistics, Queensland appears in a very bad light indeed. The statistics clearly demonstrate that Queensland is the Cinderella State of Australia today; it is booming, as Government members claim.

Let me sum the position up: the percentage of the work-force unemployed in Australia is the lowest for three years, yet in Queensland it is the highest for three years. The position in Queensland is exactly the reverse of what is happening over the whole of the rest of Australia, and that is certainly an indictment of this Government. The ratio of unemployed to job vacancies in Queensland is three times as high as the national average. That is something of which no Government member can be proud, and it easily refutes the claims that have been made over the past three weeks about the supposed development and prosperity of this State. It demonstrates clearly that, if Queensland has prospered and developed, the work-force has not shared in it.

Nobody can argue against the contention that industrial development depends upon increasing capital investment. That increasing capital investment must come from both the Government and the private-enterprise sectors of the economy. It is well known that the body in Australia with the most funds is the Commonwealth Government. What was the Commonwealth Government's capital contribution to Queensland's development? To answer that question, I shall quote statistics that reveal that the Commonwealth Government is not concerned at all about Queensland. The statistics appear in the Commonwealth Budget papers, and show that in the last three years Queensland received lower capital grants per head from the Commonwealth than Western Australia and South Australia, and Queensland can reasonably be compared with South Australia.

The figures are:—

Year	State	Amount Received per Head from Commonwealth Government in Capital Grants
		\$
1967-68 ..	Queensland ..	24.46
	South Australia ..	26.01
	Western Australia ..	50.70
1968-69 ..	Queensland ..	27.66
	South Australia ..	28.22
	Western Australia ..	49.68
1969-70 ..	Queensland ..	34.57
	South Australia ..	35.71
	Western Australia ..	53.06

**Mr. Lickiss:** How do Victoria and New South Wales compare?

**Mr. TUCKER:** Let us have a look at States that are comparable to Queensland. Western Australia's average weekly earnings per head are \$5 ahead of Queensland's, yet over those last three years Western Australia has received by way of capital grants per head something like 50 per cent. more than Queensland has received. On those figures, which reinforce my argument, it is obvious that the Commonwealth Government has been preoccupied with South Australia, and to a greater extent with Western Australia, to the detriment of Queensland.

**Mr. Kaus:** Who worked out the formula?

**Mr. TUCKER:** I told hon. members where I took the figures from. The hon. member for Hawthorne will be able to check them later on. If he had listened he would have heard where I obtained them.

**Mr. Chinchin:** Read what it says at the bottom of the page you are quoting from. It says that a comparison "between average earnings in different States cannot be made on the basis of the figures above".

**Mr. TUCKER:** At present I am saying that Western Australia has received very favourable treatment from the Commonwealth Government despite the fact that average weekly earnings per head in Western Australia are well ahead of ours. Why should Western Australia receive 50 per cent. per head more than we do in capital grants? Western Australia's prosperity is quite obvious from the average weekly earnings I referred to a moment ago yet they have negotiated capital grants from the Commonwealth which represent far more per head than we have received. I pose these questions: How was Western Australia able to do that? How have the Western Australian negotiators been able to go to the Commonwealth Government and convince it that Western Australia should receive capital grants far greater than we are getting in Queensland?

When I look at this matter a little closer, I ask why the Treasurer, the Premier and the Minister for Industrial Development in Queensland have not been able to go to Canberra and convince the Commonwealth Government that we should receive capital grants equal to those that Western Australia and South Australia receive? Surely to goodness something is wrong when the other States can convince the Commonwealth Government of their need. Long ago the cry was that Queensland's difficulty stemmed from the fact that the Government of Queensland was different in political colour from the Government in Canberra. That position changed over 12 years ago, yet the grants to Queensland did not change. We have not done any better, and possibly we have been a little bit worse off since our representatives have been of the same political colour as their colleagues in Canberra. Their meetings have always been detrimental to Queensland. We have received the short end every time, and Western Australia and South Australia have been able to put it over us.

The importance of Commonwealth grants is well known to everyone. By getting a Commonwealth grant we can devote State finances to other State projects; by not getting it we have to use our own finance and we run short of money for schools and other essentials. It is imperative that we get Commonwealth grants similar to those that the other States receive.

Railway capital grants provide a perfect example. The last Commonwealth capital grant for railways in Queensland was given in 1924, when we received \$2,000,000 for the

South Brisbane to Grafton line. We had to undertake the Mt. Isa line rehabilitation on our own and we received nothing for the Moura-Gladstone line. With all the talk about industrial development and its effect on our railways, the Commonwealth Government has not come to the party in Queensland since 1924. Surely to goodness the other States have not been so helpless in this matter.

**Mr. Hinze:** Aren't you confusing—

**Mr. TUCKER:** I am not confusing anything. They have been able to get non-repayable grants year after year for their railways.

I will now quote again from this year's Commonwealth Budget papers, which can be examined by anyone who desires to do so. I have a photostat copy of them here if anyone wants to check my figures.

Since 1951-52, the States have received non-repayable grants as follows—

	\$
South Australia ..	43,400,000
Western Australia ..	33,860,000
Victoria ..	22,100,000
New South Wales ..	10,200,000

Guess what Queensland has received. Nil!

I shall now deal with spending by the Commonwealth Department of Supply, to show what is being done to assist industrial development in this State. I have just shown that the Commonwealth Government would not make non-repayable grants available to Queensland for railway construction. It forced Queensland to go it alone in the rehabilitation of the Mt. Isa line. Surely the rehabilitation of that line was tied up with industrial development because Mount Isa Mines Limited sends its silver-lead and copper to Townsville, and it was necessary to have that link between those two cities. If we were Western Australia or South Australia, we would have received some assistance in that regard, but not on your life; not one dollar did we get as a non-repayable grant. I repeat that since 1951-52 we have received nothing from the Commonwealth Government in the way of non-repayable grants, and I have a photostat copy here that any hon. member can look at later.

Spending by the Department of Supply is very necessary if Queensland is to push its industries along. It is reasonable to assume that the Commonwealth Government, if it intended to assist Queensland in any way, would have taken Queensland into account and allocated certain Department of Supply money to it. Apart from capital investment, which generates recurrent income, the Commonwealth could assist Queensland by spending more of its revenue in Queensland. I consider that that is a reasonable submission. It would increase the level of demand and would in turn create increased production and employment to meet the

higher level of demand. Special Commonwealth assistance in this regard would be of significance, because the present drought has reduced our spending in the rural sector. This has resulted in a minor depression and Commonwealth money would help us no end.

Let us look at what the Commonwealth has done. We have missed out badly in every sphere of Commonwealth spending, and only a small amount of Department of Supply money has come to Queensland. Out of the total Department of Supply money spent in the past three years, Queensland received 2.2 per cent. in 1966-67 and 2.5 per cent. in 1967-68. I say again that those amounts are small and miserly compared with what the Commonwealth Government is spending in other Australian States. In 1968-69, Queensland again received 2.5 per cent. of the value of orders placed by the Department of Supply. Although Queensland has 14.5 per cent. of the nation's population, the Department of Supply thinks so little of this State and its development that all that it was given was 2.5 per cent. of the department's spending throughout Australia. That clearly demonstrates that neither the Department of Supply nor the Commonwealth Government is interested in Queensland. That should concern all Queenslanders. Hon. members opposite have gone on record in days gone by asking the Department of Supply to spend more in Queensland.

Surely the Premier, the Treasurer and the Minister for Industrial Development should be up in arms over the percentage of Department of Supply spending in Queensland. It is quite miserly, and is not assisting the State. The department is, of course, assisting Victoria and New South Wales, in which most of its purchasing is done. It is reasonable that Queensland be given its fair share, and there is something wrong with the thinking of anybody who claims that 2.5 per cent. of the entire spending of the Department of Supply is a fair and equitable deal. It is in fact a clear demonstration of discrimination against Queensland. The Premier, the Treasurer and the Minister for Industrial Development should be fighting for a fairer share of Department of Supply spending.

It must not be forgotten that the Department of Supply also places orders on behalf of other Commonwealth departments. Here Queensland fares little better, although its percentage shows a slight improvement. Of the total value of all the orders placed by the Department of Supply in 1968 on behalf of other Commonwealth departments, Queensland managed to get only 4 per cent. Since 1965, Queensland has obtained only two orders worth \$1,000,000 or more from the Department of Supply. I quote these figures to show that Queensland is not getting its fair share. In the placing of Department of Supply orders, Queensland is certainly the Cinderella State.

In 1965 the Department of Supply placed orders in Queensland for patrol boats to the value of \$10,000,000. No more orders were placed till 1967, when orders to the value of \$1,940,000 were placed for landing craft, gravity and seismic survey equipment, military shirts and trousers. In 1968 orders worth \$778,000 were placed in Queensland for propulsion units. That represents an extremely small percentage of the orders placed throughout the rest of Australia. In 1969 the best Queensland could obtain was an order to the value of \$260,000 for propulsion units.

That miserly treatment demonstrates clearly that the Commonwealth Government does not care one jot for Queensland and will continue to take that attitude despite what the Treasurer and the Premier might be able to say when they go to Canberra. The figures that I have quoted show that the Commonwealth Government holds Queensland in contempt, that Queensland is the backward State, the low-wage State, and that all the people who depend on their right arm and their brains for their living certainly find that there is very little, if any, wealth to be gained in Queensland. Until these attitudes can be changed, I believe it is reasonable for the Opposition to argue that those who sit on the front benches on the Government side of the House, those who go south to put our case, should be able to put Queensland's case as clearly and strongly as the cases for Western Australia and South Australia are put. Apparently they cannot do that, because the figures show that the Commonwealth Government does not give Queensland the same treatment as it gives to other States.

I noticed recently that Mr. Gorton has the same arrogant attitude to Queenslanders generally as he had last year and the year before, and as those who preceded him in office had. I mention that tonight because I suggest that members who represent Queensland electorates in the Federal Parliament should support the case presented by the Premier and the Treasurer and endeavour to persuade the Federal Government that Queensland should receive its fair share of Commonwealth spending. Every effort should be made to increase the development and prosperity of this State, because the figures that I have put before the House show that that is not being done at the moment.

**Mr. RAMSDEN** (Merthyr) (8.33 p.m.): I called "Not formal" to this Resolution because I missed the opportunity to debate the Estimates of the Department of Industrial Development. I intended to speak entirely on the question of migration, but the remarks of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition prompt me to make one or two comments in passing.

The hon. member said, if I heard him correctly, that if there is any industrial development in this State, which he doubts, those who are responsible for that development

and for producing that wealth are not receiving any share of it. If that is his understanding of the situation, it seems to show a lamentable ignorance of those who come to these shores from overseas, and I shall touch on that later when I deal with migration.

The hon. member quoted figures. I take it that they were from the Monthly Review of Business Statistics for October, 1969, issued by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, Canberra. If they were, I think he should have completed reading certain sections of the table. The hon. member for Mt. Gravatt made an interjection on that point and it went completely unanswered. I take this opportunity to read what the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat either forgot or chose, unconsciously or deliberately, not to quote in this House. I suggest that he chose not to do it, because the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt, by way of interjection, called on him to read them. I wish to put the figures on record so that those who read "Hansard" will see them in their true perspective and with some degree of balance.

Just to make sure that I am reading the figures that the hon. member quoted, I point out that they are the "average weekly earnings (a) per employed male unit. (b) for 1968-69."

These are the figures—

New South Wales	..	\$71.60
Victoria	..	\$71.20
Queensland	..	\$62.60
South Australia	..	\$64.30
Western Australia	..	\$67.20
Tasmania	..	\$63.80
Commonwealth average		\$68.90

The hon. member tried to show from his quotation of those figures how badly off we were in comparison with the other States. But the Commonwealth Statistician himself, on the very same page, in the footnote to (b), has this to say—

"Total wages and salaries, etc., divided by the total number of civilian employees expressed in male units, i.e., total male employees plus 55 per cent. of female employees. This proportion is derived from the estimated ratio of female to male earnings in Australia."

The significant point that I wish to incorporate in "Hansard" is this—

"As it was not possible to estimate the ratio of female to male earnings in the several States, the same ratio has been used for each State. Because the actual ratio may vary between States, precise comparisons between average earnings in different States cannot be made on the basis of the figures above."

I now want to get on to a theme that is more important to me in this debate. Having said that, surely one would expect that the real wealth of the nation would be found in savings bank deposits, but these

the hon. member did not mention. I do not want to go through the whole of them; I shall make only one comparison. The hon. member chose to regard Western Australia as the acme of perfection or the standard by which we should judge ourselves. In the very same book from which he quoted, at page 65, we find that in August, 1969, deposit balances in savings banks in Queensland amounted to \$840,100,000, whilst those in Western Australia, the State that allegedly is leaving us so far behind industrially, amounted to \$422,100,000. Queensland has almost exactly double the bank deposits of Western Australia. I leave it to those who read "Hansard", who read the Press and who live in this State and have seen the tremendous industrial development that has taken place from Cape York in the North to the New South Wales border in the South and at Mt. Isa and further west, to judge whether this State has progressed or whether we are still the Cinderella State. If we are the Cinderella State, let me borrow a simile and remind the hon. member that at least Cinderella had the golden slipper. The hon. member who has just resumed his seat regards figures in very much the same manner as judges in the Miss Australia contest; he makes them prove anything.

I shall now get on to the main burden of what I wanted to say in this debate. It affects the question of migration, which also comes under the control of the Minister for Industrial Development. I have a special interest in migration because of the great influx of migrants into my electorate. I well remember that shortly after I entered Parliament the Commonwealth Government really started to put the pressure on in its mass migration campaign, and I became very worried because whole streets in my electorate, particularly in New Farm, were taken over by the Italian community, and it was possible to walk down a street and not hear English spoken. That caused me a good deal of concern.

**Mr. Bennett:** You did not know what they were saying about you; that's why.

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** I do wish that the hon. member would go home and study the brief that he has been studying all day. I could then get on with my speech.

This matter caused me so much concern that I took it up with the Commonwealth Department of Immigration. I said that it appeared to me that if the trend continued and if the conglomeration of one race in one area was not stopped it would not be very long before an area like mine would become a little Italy, a little Greece, a little Yugoslavia, or something of that nature.

**Mr. Jensen:** What are you—a racist?

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** I do wish the hon. member would keep his mouth closed and his ears open so that he might learn something.

The experts in the Commonwealth Department of Immigration pointed out to me that when a migrant in his late 30's or 40's brings his family to Australia he is looking for new opportunities in a new land for his children and is not keen to give away his old language and customs. Consequently, the first-degree migrant, if I might call him that, is something of a problem. The woman does pose a particular problem because she does not leave the house but rears her family in the home. She does not get an opportunity to mix with other people, so she finds the language barrier a very difficult one. On the other hand, the husband has to go to work to earn his living and therefore mixes with men on the job and learns to speak workable English so that he can buy goods for his home and learn the value of our money. His children who migrate with him become bi-lingual because they go to Australian schools, are assimilated into Australian classes and learn to speak English, whereas at home they speak their native language, whether it be Italian, Greek, Yugoslav or Russian. The important thing for Australia is that when those children grow up either they become completely assimilated into the Australian race and marry Australians or they intermarry amongst their own race, and their children, who are born in Australia to bi-lingual parents, become true Australians in every sense of the word.

By way of illustration, I point out that I remember being introduced to an Italian and my friend acted as interpreter and told the Italian the reason for our visit. I broke into rather rapid and fluent Italian, only to be told by the Italian that if I spoke English he could understand me. It turned out that he was a third-generation Italian.

**Mr. Bennett:** I bet he said, "Arrivederci".

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** No, he did not say that. I would like to say it to the hon. member. Actually, he said to me, "come sta campare". (Laughter.)

That is a common happening with the third generation of migrants. The Minister would appreciate that. I am sure he will not mind my saying that probably no-one in the Chamber is better qualified than he to be the State Minister for Migration.

**An Opposition Member:** Why?

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** I am glad an hon. member asked me that, because he has given me an excuse to explain.

The Minister's daughter was married in Greece to an Italian. The couple now resides here. I am sure that the Minister, if he cares to comment on this aspect in his reply, will bear out, from his personal knowledge of the Italian community at least, that what I am saying is perfectly true.

The migration officials, be they Commonwealth or State, from my experience of them, have always been most sympathetic to intending migrants who desire to come to Australia. They have been very solicitous in ensuring that those who come to Australia are the best types offering in the country from which they wish to migrate.

When I was in Athens a couple of years ago I well remember calling on Mr. Tom Nulty, the Chief Migration Officer. He very graciously helped me on that occasion. He gave me very wise counsel when he spoke about the problems of Greeks migrating to Australia, and their understanding of the situation. I had an overnight stay in Rome and I hoped to call on the Embassy the following day. However, when I planned my itinerary I did not realise that the next day was a national holiday and public offices were not open. I therefore missed the opportunity to talk to the Chief Migration Officer there. I was sorry about that because I wanted to raise with him one or two matters that I had on good authority from Italian migrants about some misunderstanding in Rome of conditions in Australia.

Only a fortnight ago I spoke to a young Italian electrical engineer who is accepted in the trade out here. He told me quite frankly that he had been advised in Rome, at the office of the Chief Migration Officer that, with his qualifications, he would earn \$8,000 a year. He was quite adamant about this when I checked with him again and again. People who live here know that a big contractor who employs many men may earn as much as that, but obviously there was some misunderstanding of the situation.

**Mr. Davis:** He was told a lie, obviously.

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** I would not say he was told a lie.

**Mr. Campbell:** A truck driver would not earn that, but a skilled man would.

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** I am not sure if the hon. member for Brisbane is saying that the Italian was told a lie or that he told me a lie. As the Minister said by way of interjection, as a truck driver he would probably not earn that amount, but as a skilled electrical engineer he might do so.

**Mr. Bennett:** Did Caruso write this speech for you?

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** He has not written it or heard it, but he will have the pleasure of reading it and I hope that he will do me the honour of translating it.

I cannot let this opportunity pass without making special mention of the sterling service which was given to the department by the former State Migration Officer, Mr. Bill Rutherford. I am sure that his successor, Mr. Sheehan, will give equally sterling service.

What we should ask ourselves when we face up to this question of migration is just what the migrants want from us and what we want from them. I believe that in the post-war period, with the mass migration policy of the Commonwealth Government, which has come in for quite a bashing tonight by Opposition members, we saw development in this country as great as that in any country in the world in such a short period. It occurred without dislocation of industry or the creation of mass unemployment. Migrants were gradually assimilated so that they could make their contribution to our development.

**Mr. Hanson:** And you bash poor old Calwell all the way for introducing it.

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** I am sorry. If the former Leader of the Opposition in the Federal House, the Honourable A. A. Calwell, was the instigator of this, it was probably the only thing he did that he could be praised for.

Migrants have played and are playing a valuable part in the development of the country—industrially, with their culture, the richness that they have brought to our study of languages, the lustre that they have added to the community by their understanding, and the fact they are here bringing us a new point of view.

**Mr. Sherrington:** You can't house the ones that are coming here now.

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** This is the old cry from the "knockers". We were asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition why the Commonwealth Government has not come to our aid more readily. Perhaps the reason is that the Opposition in this State has so successfully "knocked" everything Queensland has done.

**Mr. Davis:** We haven't got good advocates down there; that is the problem.

**Mr. Bennett:** You can't find the Federal Government in Canberra these days.

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** I am not here to argue whether or not the hon. member for South Brisbane can find the Federal Government in Canberra. Lord knows, he has been missing long enough to have found it, and if he says it is not there, I accept his assurance.

When migrants come to Australia they are completely and utterly fed up with isms. This is probably one reason why the doctrine of socialism espoused by the A.L.P. does not appeal to them. They are fed up with Fascism, Nazism and Communism. All they want is the right to live their own lives as free people in a free country, with freedom of expression. And that is what they are getting in Australia.

**Mr. Houston:** Are you going to give them a drink in Brisbane on Sundays?

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** I am not going to be diverted. The Leader of the Opposition is adept at dragging red herrings across the trail.

When people come to Australia, they want security of employment, a home of their own, the right to earn a living and live with their families and freedom from all the isms that dominated them overseas.

There has been some criticism, of course, of the establishment of "Little Italys", "Little Greeces", "Little Yugoslavias", and the like, in our midst. I want to say, from fairly long and close experience with the Italian and Greek communities, that whether or not Italians and Greeks become assimilated is entirely up to the Australian community. Of that I am certain. If Australians hold out the hand of friendship to these newcomers and accept that hardship is created by differences in customs, laws, language, and culture, and go out of their way to make them feel at home, there will not be the "Little Italys", "Little Greeces", and "Little Yugoslavias". There will then be a solid, interracial community.

Recently when I was in Sydney I had the privilege, with others, of being entertained at the Apia Club in Leichhardt. It is an Italian club, and, as one would imagine, quite a lavish one.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I am becoming a little tired of the inane interjections from my left. If there are any more, I shall have to deal with those who are making them.

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** The Apia Club, at Leichhardt in Sydney, has a membership limited to 9,000, and one of its rules is that no fewer than 4,500 must be other than Italians.

**Mr. Houston:** How is it financed—by poker machines?

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** The hon. member ought to know how every club in New South Wales is financed. I hope he does not want to pursue that point at the moment. What poker machines have to do with racial integration and assimilation, I do not know. Apparently it has something to do with it in the mind of the Leader of the Opposition.

Those are some of the important points that I want to make on dealing with newcomers to this State. I now wish to make one or two other observations. I hope that professional organisations and institutes take another look at the professional standards required of migrants. It seems to me that a person who is well qualified in his own country is subject to great hardship when he comes to this country and for a couple of years has to work as a hewer of wood and a carrier of water. Although there may be some urgent and cogent reasons why he cannot be considered for full membership in trade or professional

organisations in Australia, I ask that the professional institutes and the trade-union movement give some consideration to this situation.

I should like to instance briefly two cases brought to my notice in recent weeks. One concerned a Yugoslav who was under Communist domination right from birth, and who fled across the border to Western Europe, leaving his parents and other members of his family behind the Iron Curtain. He came to Australia and settled in Queensland. Although he was a tradesman in Yugoslavia and has his certificates, which are written in the Russian language, he cannot be recognised as a tradesman here until he gets references from his former employer. How on earth a person who has fled his country as a refugee from oppression can do that, I do not know.

**Mr. Houston:** What is his trade?

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** I shall be happy to talk to the Leader of the Opposition about that case privately. I have forgotten his trade.

**Mr. Houston:** That is important in whether or not he is accepted.

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** I shall talk about it with the hon. member later. I do remember that the other man is a welder. His qualifications were recognised in his own country, where he had been a welder for about 10 years. He came to Australia and was employed in Brisbane by two of the biggest engineering firms in Queensland. They gave me personal references as to his efficiency and ability, yet I had to press again and again to have his qualifications accepted by the board which determines these matters.

The reason I was given by the board was that he was certified in his own country as a light welder, whereas in Australia there is provision only for welding in heavy industries. That may be perfectly true; but if it is true, surely it is time for us to examine the position and see whether or not some other form of certificate may be issued to entitle a man to earn his living.

**Mr. Bromley:** I completely agree with you.

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** I am pleased to hear that because it is obvious that some of the hon. member's colleagues do not.

The final point that I wish to make relates to the segment of the "Four Corners" television programme last Saturday dealing with migration and naturalisation. Those hon. members who saw it will recall that the programme brought forward a number of people, some of whom had been in Australia for as long as 20 years, who had applied for naturalisation and had been turned down year after year. One of them was a Greek who had had seven applications turned down. Of course, "Four Corners" made a song and dance about that and wanted to know why on earth a person who had lived here for 20 years could not become naturalised.

I suggest to the Minister in charge of migration that an approach be made to the Federal authorities on the basis that if, after three or four applications, it is decided that a man is not a fit person for Australian citizenship, he ought to be sent back to the country from which he came. I have no sympathy with the point of view expressed by "Four Corners" that a man can come to Australia, be totally unfit to be given Australian citizenship, and hammer the Government for not giving it to him.

**Mr. P. Wood:** I think you will agree that "Four Corners" presented a fairly impartial viewpoint.

**Mr. RAMSDEN:** I am expressing my opinion, but will not pursue the argument as I understand others want to speak.

**Mr. P. WOOD** (Toowoomba East) (9.3 p.m.): I think that all hon. members welcome the activity of the Government in the field of industrial estates. I hope that it will prove to be a step of great wisdom in encouraging both industrial development in the metropolitan area, where estates have been established, and decentralisation of industry into areas outside the metropolitan area. I know that people in Toowoomba are appreciative of the establishment of the estate at Wilsonton, which has been virtually complete for some time. I understand that there is one firm committed to establish an industry on that estate and prospects for the establishment of others.

When the estate was first established, I might have been a little naive in hoping for a quicker response than has been forthcoming. Perhaps these things take more time than I would like them to take, but I accept, of course, that one cannot push industrialists into these areas. I myself have shown one firm interested in establishing manufacturing facilities somewhere in Australia the Wilsonton Estate at Toowoomba but, because of the particular requirements of that firm and the special nature of the industry, it immediately decided that the area was too far from the centre of the city. I do not think that this will necessarily apply to other people seeking a site for a factory. This industry had particular problems.

Industrialisation is now becoming competitive between States and we have to face the situation that some industrialists at least, when the need arises for further industrial expansion, will look at the prospects, the offers and the opportunities that exist in Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria.

I know from my own experience that they balance the sort of assistance that is being offered through the Department of Industrial Development in Queensland, the Department of Decentralisation in New South Wales and through Government sources in Victoria. It is a perfectly reasonable and legitimate industrial activity to see where the benefits are the greatest. I understand that the New South Wales Department of

Decentralisation offers firms establishing outside of the metropolitan area financial assistance to train what might be called "green" staff. They pay some form of training allowance.

I think it can be appreciated that in provincial areas labour may well be available for industries but the likelihood will be that this pool of labour will be unskilled in the requirements of a particular manufacturer. The New South Wales Department of Decentralisation apparently recognises this and I am sure the Department of Industrial Development in Queensland does also. The New South Wales department provides some degree of financial assistance.

It may well be an expensive proposition for a manufacturer to train a staff that is completely "green" in his particular requirements; if he is going to employ a large staff it could be a very expensive proposition for him.

I think provincial cities would be far more affected by this sort of requirement than the metropolitan area where, although there may be a pool of relatively unskilled labour, there is also a reasonable supply of labour with a variety of skills.

I have already said that training costs may be high for an industrialist going into a provincial area, and he may well make a comparison of his establishment costs in Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria and come up with some sort of economic proposition that shows that it may be better, in view of the financial assistance offered (which I have already mentioned), for him to go to New South Wales instead of Queensland.

I mentioned this to the Minister a short while ago. I realise that these matters require quite a deal of consideration. They are matters of policy. However, if at this early stage, he has any information about the likely results in this matter, I should be very interested to hear it. I fully realise, of course, that it is a matter that may not be decided overnight.

I have had the opportunity to interest some people, I hope favourably, towards establishing a manufacturing plant in Toowoomba. One of the intangible things which really cannot be supplied by the Department of Industrial Development, and which seems to be tipping the scales in favour of Toowoomba in this case, is that the people who are going to work in this industrial concern would rather live in Toowoomba than in Newcastle or the environs of Sydney or Melbourne.

Toowoomba is a very pleasant and attractive town with many of the facilities that are available in large cities. All those features can persuade manufacturers who intend establishing factories that their executive staff would rather live in a place like Toowoomba than in Newcastle. Industrial firms cannot afford to overlook the financial

aspects of establishing factories in Toowoomba or in similar towns in New South Wales, so I ask the Government to consider granting financial assistance to train unskilled staff outside the metropolitan area.

**Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL** (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development) (9.12 p.m.): For the second time in two days the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has spoken on behalf of the Opposition on the Department of Industrial Development. I can only say in all kindness that it is no wonder, in the light of his contribution tonight, that people do not take him seriously. In winding up the debate on my department's Estimates, I made certain pertinent remarks about his shortcomings, so when he rose to speak tonight I was looking forward to hearing some worth-while contributions on the all-important matter of the development of secondary industries throughout Queensland. However, he spent a good deal of his time ranting about statistics. As the hon. member for Merthyr has pertinently observed, statistics can be construed to produce any result.

The remainder of the Deputy Leader's time was taken up with matters that bear no relationship to the Department of Industrial Development. It would appear that he would rather be in the Federal Parliament, because the matters that he raised were essentially for the Federal Government. Perhaps they could be related to the affairs of this House, within the realm of Commonwealth-States financial relationships. I was disappointed in that I did not hear an authoritative point of view from the Opposition on industrial development. One can only conclude that the hon. member for Townsville North resorted to those tactics because he could not offer constructive comments on the affairs of my department. He would have to admit that over the last few years Queensland has enjoyed phenomenal development in secondary industries. We should remind ourselves of that fact. I am not boasting when I say that. I am only acknowledging as a Queenslander what has taken place in Queensland in secondary industry development in the last few years.

If I refer to Amoco, hon. members opposite will say that I am delving into past history, but it is not long since we wondered if Queensland would ever get an oil refinery.

**Mr. Houston:** Your Government said you could never hope for two.

**Mr. CAMPBELL:** We did not get one refinery; we got two.

It is interesting to recall the debate of two days ago, which I do not wish to refer to in detail, and the way in which Opposition members attempted to denigrate the development that is taking place. The hon. member for South Brisbane seemed to think that a new industry in this State with a

\$2,000,000 investment was not worth commenting on. Only this morning the Ampol refinery—

**Mr. Bennett:** I did not say that at all. You are misquoting me. I said that we should have had the \$2,000,000 industry here instead of its going to Kurri Kurri in New South Wales.

**Mr. CAMPBELL:** I am amazed at the hon. member for South Brisbane. He may be a competent advocate in court, but he is not very persuasive in this House.

I was about to say that, even though we have acquired two oil refineries, Amoco recently completed a \$6,000,000 expansion and, today, Ampol announced an increase of almost 50 per cent. in its capacity. I could also refer to the investment by Austral-Pacific Fertilizers of \$37,500,000, which is certainly not peanuts. I could refer to Queensland Alumina, which now has—

**Mr. Davis** interjected.

**Mr. CAMPBELL:** I think I heard the hon. member for Brisbane say—he is very hard to hear—that it was chicken-feed.

**Mr. Davis:** I said that it is not chicken-feed.

**Mr. CAMPBELL:** I am sorry. As a former chicken-farmer, I agree that an investment of \$160,000,000 is not chicken-feed. That figure represents only the second instalment. It has already announced that a further expansion programme is contemplated.

The Mt. Isa development is typical of what is happening in Queensland. There seems to be no limit to what is happening there. Flowing from the production at the mine we have the Townsville copper refinery, which, again is expected to expand.

I could cite the expansion in Queensland United Foods and the expansion in Queensland Packages. These are the large industries—the big boys, the ones for which the hon. member for Logan expressed his distaste and abhorrence. In the last few years there would be, if not 1,000, almost 1,000 small and medium-sized new industries established in Queensland.

**Mr. Casey:** That does not show up in your factory lists.

**Mr. CAMPBELL:** The hon. member for Mackay is a new member. Perhaps he is not acquainted with past statistics.

It is interesting to recall that, in Queensland, the value of factory production between 1962-63 and 1967-68 increased by 72 per cent., whilst the average for Australia was 54.9 per cent. These figures are most significant.

**Mr. Casey:** You were talking about the number of factories. You said that there were 1,000 more but you cannot substantiate that figure because they do not appear in your list of factories.

**Mr. CAMPBELL:** What I said is completely true. Not only has the number of factories increased—

**Mr. Casey:** Not by thousands.

**Mr. CAMPBELL:** The hon. member is misinterpreting what I said. I said that there might not be a thousand small and medium-size new industries established in Queensland in the past decade but that the figure could approach a thousand because of the tremendous development and expansion that is taking place.

The hon. member quoted employment statistics to show that we were in an inferior position compared with other States. He used Western Australia as his yardstick and said that the average earnings in Queensland were \$5 less than the average earnings in Western Australia. I venture to suggest that the bulk of the earnings in Western Australia are derived in the developing projects in the north and north-western areas of that State where some fabulous and fantastic salaries and wages are being paid.

Employment in manufacturing industries increased by 17.6 per cent. between 1962-63 and 1967-68. This does not suggest that we are in a state of stagnation. We have a vibrant and dynamic developing economy which, with every passing month, sees us attain new plateaus, and this will continue into the future.

A significant comment made by the hon. member for Townsville North was that industrial development depends on an increasing capital investment. How true this is. It was at this stage that he got off the rails and started talking about Commonwealth-State relationships, which is not a matter for this department.

He spent quite some time talking about the Federal assistance given by way of railway grants. If Rockhampton were the capital of Queensland, under the legislation of the Commonwealth Government and its policy on standardisation of railway gauges, we would have a standard gauge railway line to Rockhampton.

We were again disappointed with the contribution of the hon. member for Townsville North.

**Mr. Bennett:** He seems to have worried you quite a bit.

**Mr. CAMPBELL:** No, he has not worried me. At one stage I was a little apprehensive, but I found I had nothing to worry about.

**Mr. Hanlon:** You would like to see more Commonwealth orders given to Queensland industry, wouldn't you?

**Mr. CAMPBELL:** For sure.

**Mr. Houston** interjected.

**Mr. CAMPBELL:** The hon. member is denigrating the sterling efforts of Queensland industry. In the New South Wales Parliament last week, a Labour member was moved to complain about Walkers Ltd. getting an order for 10 shunters for the New South Wales Department of Railways. In reply to the Leader of the Opposition I say that Queensland industry is enterprising in the way it goes after orders.

Only last week I was speaking to a local manufacturer who, 10 years ago, came to Queensland as the manager of the local branch of a company. This was called a branch State. He now has 120 employees on his pay-roll, and 50 per cent. of his production goes interstate. If time permitted, I could indicate the tremendous development that has taken place and the way that certain enterprising manufacturers in Queensland have obtained export orders, particularly for manufactured goods. I hope that more manufacturers appreciate this position.

I now wish to refer to the comments made by the hon. member for Merthyr, who is regarded as the patron saint of the migrant community not only in Merthyr but throughout the State. He has a very considerable knowledge of the problems confronting migrants from foreign countries, and he made several pertinent comments on the question of assimilation. It is all very well for the hon. member for South Brisbane to laugh. He may ridicule that point of view, but I wonder how he would integrate himself if he were a migrant in Yugoslavia.

It is interesting to note that the last year has been the best ever in migration to this State, and the figures of migrants coming here do not include those people who come to Queensland from the South to take part in the developing industries in the State. The hon. member was quite right in paying a tribute to the migration officers of both the Commonwealth and the State for the solicitous way in which they treat newcomers. The hon. member pointed out the tremendous vitality that Australia has obtained through the assimilation of people from overseas. The integration of their skills and culture is really changing the social climate in Australia, and is most beneficial to the community.

The hon. member mentioned problems arising in recognition of the skills of migrants. They are under consideration. He stated that mass migration to Australia is a modern phenomenon.

In the minute or two I have left, I wish to refer to the contribution of the hon. member for Toowoomba East. He, almost alone on the Opposition side, made a positive and helpful contribution. I appreciate the interest that he is taking in the establishment of industry in Toowoomba, and the assistance that he has given in our endeavours to bring

that about. No magic formula can be used to attract industry, particularly to decentralised areas.

The hon. member referred to the situation in Victoria. It is interesting to note that, with the exception of Wodonga, the Victorian Government regards decentralisation as being confined to cities and towns within 25 miles of the Melbourne G.P.O. Relating that concept to Queensland, towns such as Caboolture, Ipswich, Beaudesert and Southport would be regarded as decentralised areas. People in North Queensland would regard that area as the Brisbane complex.

The Department of Industrial Development has taken under its umbrella Crown land from the Department of Lands and, in cases where Crown land has not been available, land has been acquired by negotiation with private landowners. We have never had to use any strictures in our negotiations. At times negotiations have been long drawn out, as the hon. members for Ipswich East and Ipswich West know; there was some difficulty in negotiating a reasonable price in that area. The department is pleased indeed that in all areas of Queensland in which land has been acquired by private treaty there has been mutual satisfaction. The department is very happy to use local consultants and local contractors, and it has resort to local authorities for the construction of essential services only when these are not present.

At 9.30 p.m.,

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! Under the provisions of Standing Order No. 307, I shall now put the Resolution under discussion and all other Resolutions not already agreed to by the House.

Resolution 6—Department of Industrial Development—agreed to.

Resolutions 7 to 23, both inclusive, agreed to.

## WAYS AND MEANS

### OPENING OF COMMITTEE

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

**Hon. G. W. W. CHALK** (Lockyer—Treasurer): I move—

“(a) That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1969-70 a further sum not exceeding \$201,880,894 be granted out to the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland exclusive of the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

“(b) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1969-70, a further sum not exceeding \$307,185,060 be granted from the Trust and Special Funds.

“(c) That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1969-70, a further sum not exceeding \$53,980,000 be granted from the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

“(d) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1968-69, a supplementary sum not exceeding \$16,836,291.37 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland exclusive of the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

“(e) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1968-69, a supplementary sum not exceeding \$5,828,556.83 be granted from the Trust and Special Funds.

“(f) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1968-69, a supplementary sum not exceeding \$4,991,286.79 be granted from the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

“(g) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1970-71, a sum not exceeding \$68,000,000 be granted out of Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland exclusive of the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

“(h) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1970-71, a sum not exceeding \$68,000,000 be granted from the Trust and Special Funds.

“(i) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1970-71, a sum not exceeding \$14,000,000 be granted from the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.”

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions reported, received, and agreed to.

## APPROPRIATION BILL No. 2

### FIRST READING

A Bill, founded on the Resolutions reported from the Committee of Ways and Means, was introduced and read a first time.

### SECOND READING

**Hon. G. W. W. CHALK** (Lockyer—Treasurer) (9.34 p.m.): I move—

“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

This is the final Appropriation Bill for the current financial year. I point out to the House that it provides \$911,045,954 for expenditure in 1969-70, as provided in the Budget Estimates that have been under discussion by the Committee of Supply in recent weeks.

It also provides a total of \$27,656,135 for unforeseen expenditure in 1968-69 under various Vote headings, all of which have had Executive authority and now require Parliamentary authority; and a Vote on Account of \$150,000,000 to provide supply to the Government for the first two months of 1970-71 until the first Appropriation Bill for that year is passed.

I should like to take this opportunity of having something to say on Commonwealth-State financial relations because I feel that this is one of the most important public issues in Australia today. I would be failing in my responsibility if I did not indicate that I believe there is a sense of feeling that this issue is becoming more and more a matter of intense public concern. I also sense a feeling that the need for some basic re-thinking in Commonwealth-State financial relations is now widely accepted and there is a will to re-examine the issues with a view to the establishment of new principles.

I would be the first to admit that a State Government would naturally tend to see the issues with emphasis on the State's problems. That is only human nature. Be this as it may, I feel that there are some factors which, from the viewpoint of Queensland, require to be spelt out, and this I propose to do very briefly tonight.

The first issue on which I should like to comment is the tendency of the Central Government to use its fiscal powers in dispensing measures of economic control on a uniform basis without having sufficient regard to the differing situations applying in the various States. I readily accept the fact that the Central Government must exercise measures of economic control in the national well-being; my sole point of criticism is the manner of application of the control.

The Commonwealth's failure to take account of different circumstances in the various States was very pronounced following the credit restrictions in 1960. Similar situations, although on a smaller scale, have occurred since. At the Loan Council meeting last June, the Commonwealth Government was concerned that expenditure on public works should not rise to an extent that would cause undue inflationary pressure. I believe we would all agree with that. The over-all level of employment was low at the time and it was claimed that the economy was delicately balanced. I am sure that all hon. members would support the general need for adequate control and the Commonwealth desire to avoid rapid inflation. Inflation is particularly damaging in a country like Australia that is so dependent on trade. My complaint is not against the need to curb inflation. My complaint is simply this—that all States were treated alike although the economic pressures giving rise to the inflation threat were not equally distributed amongst the States.

At that meeting, Queensland presented figures to show that the Queensland economy was further from a stage of over-full employment than were the economies of the other States. For example, at that time Queensland had a ratio of about seven unemployed males for each unfilled vacancy registered with the Commonwealth Employment Service, or about four times the Australian average level. Nevertheless, no special action was taken, and Queensland's works programmes were increased only by the same percentage as those of other States. The Premier and I endeavoured to have this changed, and I have to say quite bluntly that we were unsuccessful. This failure, even in a conference of Premiers presided over by the Prime Minister, to adapt to the differing circumstances in the various States is even more difficult to understand in view of the drought effects upon the Queensland economy—effects which can only be partially offset by measures of drought relief financed by the State and Commonwealth Governments.

How has the situation developed since the Premiers' Conference in June? The latest unemployment figures published by the Commonwealth Department of Labour and National Service relate to the end of October. These figures show that in the States of New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia, the number of unfilled vacancies was in excess of the number of unemployed registered. This situation indicates a state of "over-full" employment, a situation which it is desirable to avoid in view of the encouragement of inflation under such conditions.

In the States of Queensland, South Australia and Tasmania, however, the situation remained one in which the numbers of unemployed were in excess of the numbers of vacancies. Queensland had the highest ratio of unemployed to vacancies with 2.4 unemployed to each unfilled vacancy.

Whilst I am not suggesting that the situation in Queensland is one that should cause any alarm—because the numbers involved are comparatively small—I quote the position to give point to any criticism that sometimes the central Government is not sensitive enough to the individual needs of the States as against the average needs of all States.

I feel, therefore, that there would have been room for an increase in this State's capital works programme without adding unduly to economic pressures. I feel this would have been an occasion on which the Commonwealth may well have differentiated between the States to take account of their economic circumstances.

During the election campaign, the Prime Minister said that Queensland had received a greater amount of special development works approved over the last 10 years than any other State except Western Australia.

I differ with him on that. In his figures, he has taken no account of expenditure on the Snowy Mountains scheme which of course has benefited mainly the States of New South Wales and Victoria, since it saved these two States expenditure from Loan Fund on generating plant that they would otherwise have had to incur. During the 10-year period, expenditure by the Snowy Mountains Authority amounted to some \$405,000,000. It is thus a very important factor in the over-all picture of capital projects. The amount of expenditure on stand-by generating plant which the States of New South Wales and Victoria would have had to provide had not the Snowy Mountains scheme come into operation would have been well over \$200,000,000.

The works approved for Queensland over the last 10 years amount to some \$142,000,000, compared with a total of \$183,000,000 for Western Australia on the same basis. However, when we compare these figures on a per capita basis, we get \$79.35 per capita for Queensland, or considerably less than half the figure of \$188.60 per capita for Western Australia. The \$80,000,000 approved for the Central Queensland power station would increase Queensland's figure per capita to \$124, still a third below the Western Australian figure. I believe that these are problems in Queensland in comparison with those in Western Australia that justify a more comparable level of developmental expenditure in this State.

I will not ignore the fact that tonight the hon. member for Townsville North said something about this particular matter. However, he failed to put the matter in its correct perspective. He mainly criticised the present Commonwealth Government and implied that if we had a Labour Government in Canberra it would have been more generous to Queensland.

**Mr. Houston:** You cannot prove otherwise.

**Mr. CHALK:** Let us examine the position. It is not a matter of what that Government would have done if it had been there. I am prepared to take the facts and figures under the Labour Government when it was there. (Opposition laughter).

It is easy enough to advance a hypothetical case about what would have been done for us if someone had been there. If the Opposition are "square dinkum" in their argument, and if they use figures as they apply at the present time—

**Mr. F. P. Moore:** That was 20 years ago.

**Mr. CHALK:** The hon. member was in short pants at the time.

If the Opposition takes what is happening today, it must be prepared to face a comparison of what happened when Labour occupied

the Treasury benches. When the Labour Party was last in power in Canberra its treatment of Queensland could only be described as shocking.

**Mr. Row:** It was not shocking; it was scandalous.

**Mr. CHALK:** That is so.

I challenge the hon. member to state the relevant figures under Labour's rule.

**Mr. Tucker:** That was during war-time.

**Mr. CHALK:** It might have been war-time. The hon. member will wriggle out of any situation. I have been trying, for the past fortnight, to pin this hon. member down. He has more wriggle in him than a black carpet snake.

The point of the matter is this: if the hon. member looks at the situation—

**Mr. Hanson:** You are coming in a bit late again.

**Mr. CHALK:** The hon. member was in the T.A.B. yesterday, and I know what he won.

Queensland received nothing, or close to nothing, in both financial and special capital grants. I invite the hon. member to look at the position. Although I am complaining, I will say that Queensland is really starting to obtain special assistance. That cannot be denied, and a good deal of it is being spent in the very area serviced by the hon. member who is interjecting.

**Mr. Hanson:** You want to kick someone in the stomach three years after he makes the initial complaint.

**Mr. CHALK:** If, by some misfortune, a Labour Government was ever returned to power in Canberra, and it treated Queensland as it did in the past, we could pull down the shutters in this State. The shutters were pulled down in this State industrially, while Labour was in power, and that cannot be denied.

**Mr. Houston** interjected.

**Mr. CHALK:** The hon. member is doing all right under the present Government and the hon. member for Mackay is doing all right. He gets more contracts under this Government than he ever got under Labour, and do not let him say that he has not done some of the work.

**Mr. Hanson:** You are a good Liberal, right behind Bolte, but you are three years behind.

**Mr. CHALK:** The hon. member is the greatest "knocker" of all. He has done better out of this Government than he ever did under Labour. Make no mistake about that.

**Mr. Hanson:** You never got me a "quid".

**Mr. CHALK:** I have had a look at the hon. member's licence fee, and he is doing all right.

**Mr. Hanson:** I looked at you in the share register and you are doing all right, too. You are a very good Liberal, like Bolte, but you are three years behind.

**Mr. CHALK:** Some day I hope to catch up to him, and I am trying to do that.

I do not propose to belabour the House with any further argument on this issue. It seems to be abundantly clear, by any standard, that special capital aid to Queensland has lagged, and I do not deny this. What I am saying is that we have to go before the Federal Government and put this argument forward as forcefully as we can. I am not hiding behind the Commonwealth Government. I believe that the people of Queensland should know the position. On the other hand, I say there is at least evidence that we have done better under the present Commonwealth Government than we did when Labour was in power.

It is not only on capital works that Queensland secures less than full justice. Hon. members will recall that, in 1965, the Commonwealth Government approved a special improvement in Queensland's Financial Assistance Grant to bring this State nearer to the other outlying States. I was privileged to be present at that meeting, and I believe that this was a move in the right direction. This allowed the State to provide a level of services more comparable with those in other States; in other words, our position was recognised. The States of New South Wales and Victoria are the richer States—and I cannot deny that—which serve as a standard by which other States may be judged. At one time or another, all the other States except Queensland have been judged by the Commonwealth Grants Commission against that standard. Only Queensland has received no special consideration for its low taxable capacity and its natural disabilities of size, sparseness of population and so on, which add considerably to the costs of administration.

While the special improvement to Queensland's grant has been of great assistance to us, it came at a period when our resources were strained to the limit by continuing drought conditions. In consequence, it has not been possible to increase our expenditure on social services, particularly education, at the rate that would have been possible had the Government encountered a series of good, or even normal, seasons.

I remind the House that our Financial Assistance Grants are still considerably below those of the other less-populous States. Taking the grants approved for 1969-70 on a per capita basis, including the grant recommended by the Commonwealth Grants Commission in the case of Tasmania, Queensland will receive \$97.39 per capita, compared with \$107.22 for South Australia, \$142 for

Western Australia, and \$172.48 for Tasmania. I need hardly point out that, with a population of 1,800,000, the difference of almost \$10 between this State and South Australia would mean \$17,400,000 per annum while the difference of approximately \$45 between this State and Western Australia would mean a difference of \$78,900,000 per annum. The figures speak for themselves.

The prime fact that requires to be emphasised is simply this: whilst Queensland has the same problem as other States in relation to the need for a source of "growth" revenue, it also has the problem of having insufficient revenue to provide a level of services comparable to those in the other States.

The difficulties confronting the States in their efforts to find a source of revenue that will combine growth and equity have unfortunately been highlighted recently by a decision in the High Court on the imposition of receipt duties on sales of goods. The imposition of receipt duty was a form of State taxation that was given approval by the Commonwealth Government. Now, of course, this tax field will be in jeopardy if a majority of the High Court decides against the States in certain test cases soon to be heard. However, discussions have been held between the Commonwealth and the States, and this is one field in which the Commonwealth is giving full co-operation in finding a solution to the problem facing the States.

I feel that the increasing tendency to centralism requires to be curbed. More and more moneys made available by the central Government to the States have strings attached.

**Mr. Hanson:** Why weren't you vocal against that at the Loan Council?

**Mr. CHALK:** What has happened to the hon. member for Port Curtis tonight? I have been vocal against this every time I have spoken on it in this House in the last three months, and I am still vocal about it. I am more vocal about it than the hon. member for Port Curtis has been. Everything that the hon. member is vocal about is at Gladstone. I have been vocal against the attaching of strings to money made available by the Commonwealth, because that is affecting this State.

**Mr. Hanson:** You should have been more vocal about it at Canberra.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The hon. member for Port Curtis is continually interjecting. The Treasurer is trying to make a speech.

**Mr. Hanson:** I am only trying to be helpful.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I particularly ask the hon. member to be helpful to the Chair and not interrupt when I am speaking. If the hon. member continues with his rowdy interjections, I shall deal with him under Standing Order No. 123A.

**Mr. CHALK:** What I am endeavouring to say is that the Commonwealth Government has made certain funds available, and I am particularly concerned about money being made available to this State, or to any other State, with strings attached to it.

**Mr. Bromley:** Why didn't you tell Gorton that?

**Mr. CHALK:** I told him, and I am telling the public of Queensland. I hope that every Queensland member of the Commonwealth Parliament also, whatever his political affiliations, will tell the Commonwealth Government what I am telling the House tonight.

The net offset of this type of conditioning is, of course, that the volume of funds in the State's discretionary use is dwindling. If we are given money with strings attached to it, undoubtedly we are in a position to match it; but if we match it, we are frittering away the funds that are within our discretionary power. I say with all the emphasis at my command that that is undesirable and can only lead to stronger central government and weaker State government.

It is not without significance that the same problems occurred in both Canada and the United States of America. Canada has already corrected the position to a substantial degree, and I had an opportunity in July last of studying carefully many of the suggestions that were put forward in Canada to overcome difficulties similar to those that have arisen in Australia in recent years. From my point of view, I propose to put them forward in the appropriate place at the appropriate time between now and the drawing up of the next agreement between the Commonwealth and the State because I believe that there is a need to overcome the problem.

**Mr. Bromley:** Ainsley Gotto would have fixed it.

**Mr. CHALK:** I do not know about Ainsley Gotto; I know what sort of a "gotto" the hon. member is. The point is that this is a serious argument, not one in which the hon. member for Belmont, or whatever his electorate is—

**Mr. Newton** interjected.

**Mr. CHALK:** The hon. member for Belmont is intelligent.

**Mr. Newton** interjected.

**Mr. CHALK:** I said the hon. member for Belmont is intelligent. I was praising him. Does the hon. gentleman object to my saying that? Is he denying it?

**Mr. Newton:** Make sure you know your electorates. Don't attack me.

**Mr. CHALK:** I said that the hon. member is an intelligent fellow.

**Mr. Newton:** Excuse me.

**Mr. CHALK:** I do not wish to continue that line of argument. The hon. member for Belmont is the only hon. member who has ever objected to being called intelligent.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. NEWTON:** I rise to a point of order. I accept what the Treasurer is saying about me, but I thought he said something in my absence.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. CHALK:** I have explained to the hon. member for Belmont that I think he is an intelligent fellow.

Let me return now to the point that I was making. About 10 years ago, Canada had problems similar to those that we are now experiencing in Australia. It is true that two other Australian States have sent officers or members of the Government to Canada to study the position and learn something of that country's experience. I believe that what I know of Canada's experience and the knowledge that was passed on to me by high-ranking officers will be advantageous in the argument to follow. I say "argument" because I believe that the States will have arguments not only with the Commonwealth but also among themselves to try to find a formula containing a built-in factor to provide for growth within the community. I know the needs of Western Australia; I know some of the needs of South Australia. But I know that, because of our sparsity of population, because of our over-all spread of development, greater sums are needed in Queensland. Western Australia has development, but it is in one isolated area and in one particular locality in the southern part of the south-west of the State. Queensland is developed throughout its length and breadth. Because of this, greater expenditure is required to enable development to take place.

This does not all take place because of Governments, but because we are living in a period when scientific development has unearthed many of our minerals. It has indicated how we can carry out activities in many far-flung portions of the State.

So when we go to Canberra it will not be a big fight with the Commonwealth Prime Minister but deliberations among the States to ensure, first of all, that a formula is arrived at that will enable the States collectively to argue with the Commonwealth. If we can get this, it will then be a question of the survival of the State, and it is the survival of the State that the Opposition should be fighting for as we are.

**Mr. Hanson:** What is your new formula?

**Mr. CHALK:** My new formula is not to add up with the hon. member. A formula has to be found. I believe hon. members will agree with that, and that formula has to be such that there will at least be some

give by the larger States. The larger States have to give something. The size of the egg depends on the formula but we must ensure unanimity among the States.

I want to assure the House that the Government will see that all relevant information is prepared and submitted to the Commonwealth to support an improvement in Commonwealth-State relations generally. We will do all we can to ensure that special consideration is given to the special needs of Queensland. The information that will be put before the Premiers will be based on the arguments I have put forward here tonight. If this is done, I feel that when the Premiers meet in Canberra we will be able to bring about changes that will ensure that more finance is made available to Queensland.

We have just finished debating industrial development. I believe that terrific industrial development has taken place in this State but I am not satisfied that it is enough. No matter what development is brought about or what activity we try to expand, it all involves the local authorities, transportation, and the building of townships, schools and houses. Those responsible do not get their wealth from immediate development. The development itself provides the income and working capital and the money that pours in wages to those actively associated with the industry. But to get all this money, either Government or local government funds have to be provided. Industry or development cannot get off the ground until something is done to provide roads, and the commodity cannot be got out without some form of transport.

**Mr. Bromley:** And you must have water.

**Mr. CHALK:** I agree with the hon. member. I would not mind some now. The point is, however, that all these things, including water and power, are very essential to development. Whoever is in charge of the Treasury benches of this State will have difficulty in providing money for those essential services. Our only source of additional loan funds is the central Government.

I have made those points because I believe they should be made before this House rises. Some time before Christmas the Premier and I will be meeting the Premiers of the other States, and I can assure hon. members and the people of Queensland that the arguments I have put forward tonight will be put forward just as forcefully at that meeting.

**Mr. Bromley:** Why are you the only Treasurer who accompanies a Premier to these Premiers' Conferences?

**Mr. CHALK:** Because the Premier is Premier and I am Treasurer. Sir Henry Bolte is both Premier and Treasurer of Victoria. Mr. Askin, the Premier of New South Wales, usually is accompanied by Mr. Cutler, the Leader of the Country

Party, as his deputy. Mr. Brand is both Premier and Treasurer of Western Australia. South Australia has a separate Treasurer, Mr. Pearson, who on many occasions accompanies his Premier. However, I believe that the combination that goes down from Queensland is capable of putting forward the arguments that should be put forward. I have put them forward tonight to acquaint hon. members and the electors with them.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (10.12 p.m.): At the outset I refer to the speeches that were made at this time last year so that there will be no misunderstanding about the right of members to speak on various matters. It is true that the Bill is a financial Bill, but it is true also that it relates to the spending of the State's finances on all matters that are the responsibility of this Government. The Bill mentions every activity of this Government and matters under its control; therefore, within the terms of the Bill, any member can speak on any matter of his choosing, whether it be a financial matter or otherwise. I believe that the Treasurer was completely mistaken last year when he indicated in his reply that I should have kept to financial matters. Naturally I concede to him tonight the right to speak on the Commonwealth-States financial relationships. Perhaps the weakness in the Treasurer's remarks is the fact that two or three years ago, if my memory serves me correctly, he made a similar speech on a similar matter; but unfortunately the results achieved by discussions with the Commonwealth Government were so poor that tonight he has had to speak in a like manner. Again if my memory serves me correctly, I supported him fully on that occasion and wished him well in his endeavours; however, as I have said, they proved to be unsuccessful.

No-one could argue that there is a great difference of opinion between the Government and the Opposition in the desire to obtain additional finance for the development of Queensland. The only complaint that the Opposition has is that the Government has failed miserably to convince the Commonwealth Government that Queensland should receive additional finance.

It is all very well for the Treasurer to say that the Labour Party would not have done better. Naturally, my colleagues and I, like many Queenslanders, are convinced that Labour would have done better if given the opportunity. I venture to suggest that at the next conference in 12 months' time the Premiers will be dealing with a Federal Labour Government. In the fighting and squabbling that is going on in Canberra at present, a Federal re-election is staring everyone in the face. I do not wish to engage in a discussion on Federal politics but I wish to reply to the Treasurer's statement that Queensland did better under the Liberal-Country Party Governments in both spheres than it did under Labour.

To give actual figures I will refer to the Treasurer's Financial Tables. It is a pity that the Treasurer did not hear the Minister for Industrial Development state, only a few minutes before he spoke, that he knew very well that figures could be twisted to suit anyone. He said that statistics did not really matter very much because so much depended on how they were used.

In 1948-49, the last effective year under a Federal Labour Government, Table 7 of the Treasurer's statements, headed "Payments Made Under the States Grants (Tax Reimbursement) Acts and the States Grants Acts Per Head of Population", disclosed that Western Australia received the largest amount, at \$17.22. Queensland was next, with \$15.48, followed by New South Wales with \$14.44; South Australia was next with \$13.82, followed by Tasmania with \$12.51, and Victoria with \$11.44. In other words, under a Labour Government, Queensland was second to Western Australia. Last year under the Government that the Treasurer is praising, Western Australia is still highest, at \$142, followed by Tasmania at \$116.69, South Australia at \$107.22, Queensland \$97.39, New South Wales \$81.22, and Victoria \$80.60. Instead of being the second State, as it was under a Federal Labour Government, Queensland has dropped to fourth place under the present Federal Government.

Table 21 is headed—

"Borrowing Programmes for State Works and Housing, and Loan Raisings by State Semi-Government and Local Authorities, Per Head of Population, 1948-1949 to 1969-1970".

On this occasion I will again take 1948-49 as the base year, when the position in relation to "Total State Works and Housing, Semi-Government and Local Authorities", was as follows:—

State	Amount per head of population \$
Tasmania .. .. .	37.98
Victoria .. .. .	28.70
New South Wales .. .. .	23.12
Queensland .. .. .	23.04
Western Australia .. .. .	22.92
South Australia .. .. .	19.83

In 1968-69 this was the position—

State	Amount per head of population \$
Tasmania .. .. .	173.81
South Australia .. .. .	118.61
Western Australia .. .. .	102.84
Queensland .. .. .	102.39
Victoria .. .. .	95.81
New South Wales .. .. .	83.92

Those records do not show a great change under the present Federal Government. It is not correct to say that the former Labour Government was not generous to Queensland compared with the present Government.

I have often said that I do not believe in living in the past. If the Treasurer wants to compare the present Federal Government with the Labour Federal Government, I do not think that many Liberal or Country Party members in this House would like to think that their performance was comparable with that of the A. E. Moore Government. We do not want to go back to that. If a comparison is drawn with one, it must be drawn with the other. What I am concerned about is: how will we be treated today? What are our future prospects under the relationship between the States and the Commonwealth?

It is true that Commonwealth Governments in the past have failed to take into consideration the matters the Treasurer mentioned, and I do not dispute this. It is true also that there is not a realisation in the Federal Parliament or in the Federal Government Caucus that Queensland desperately needs this money. The people who are really to blame in the first instance are the Queensland members of the Federal Government parties. It is to be regretted that State Government members went out and campaigned so vigorously for the return of those people who have let us down, and it is rather farcical that the leaders of the State Government are now condemning those whom, a few weeks ago, they were hailing as the great people to have in Canberra. The tragedy today is that there are not more A.L.P. members in Canberra representing Queensland.

It is true that the Commonwealth Government has made a practice, particularly in recent years, of allocating money to the States in the form of grants for various activities. We have seen this happen with universities, education, and particularly science blocks, irrespective of whether the State needs more science blocks compared with other fields of endeavour in education. I repeat what I said last year about education. Surely it should be left to each State to determine which facet of education it believes money should be spent on. In some States, owing to climatic conditions, most of the money is spent on certain types of building, whereas in other States it is spent on teaching aids. In Queensland, we might spend money on other forms of education. But we are not given the choice. That is what I object to most of all in the attitude adopted by the Commonwealth Government. It says, "If you do not take what we want to hand out to you, you get nothing at all." This happens with the matching grants for the university. The Commonwealth Government does not say, "Here is some money that you can use in your university. We believe that your university requires it." It says, "We will give you so much, if you put in so

much." That is wrong in principle. To put that amount in to get the money from the Commonwealth Government, we must take it from other sections that we, as a State Government, consider are more important at that moment. This is what I believe the Treasurer should fight for.

The Treasurer said that he did not like strings attached to the money. He is coming round to the thinking of the Labour Party. I, and others before me, have argued in the Chamber year after year in the debate on the Appropriation Bill that there should be no strings. We want co-ordination and co-operation. When the Premiers meet, they should say to the Commonwealth, "This is what we want. This is what we believe our States need." Then each State should have the responsibility of spending the money allocated in its best interests.

Recently, the Commonwealth Government has been inclined to say, "How can we pick up votes at the coming election?" One of the tragedies associated with this matter is the fact that there is an election of the Senate or House of Representatives in two out of every three years. This causes the Commonwealth authorities to offer a bait to get votes.

On issue after issue the Commonwealth Government dogmatically states, "You will take this because we think you need it." That is completely wrong, and I assure the Treasurer that the Opposition supports the argument that he put forward to have given to Queensland—and, for that matter, to other States—larger sums of money without any strings attached to them.

The Treasurer went on to speak of inflation. He mentioned, of course, that the actions taken in 1960 and 1961 were supposedly to stop inflation. One of the points on which I disagree with him was that, because there were more job vacancies in New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia than there were people seeking work, there was virtually "over-full employment." I think that that is what he implied; he can correct me if I am wrong, as I am not intentionally misquoting him. I do not agree at all with that. As I said a week or so ago in another debate, quite often the positions that are advertised as vacant could not be filled by those who are out of work. While it is true that in some cases the two run parallel, it is not always a complete parallel. When the number of vacant jobs advertised exceeds the number registered as unemployed, surely all it means is that those registered as unemployed do not fit the jobs that are vacant. If they did, surely it could be said that the Commonwealth's employment agency had fallen down on the job. If there were jobs vacant and persons out of work who fitted them, each would cancel out the other. That does not happen, because my inquiries show that in most cases the types of jobs vacant do not fit those who are out of work.

While people are out of work there cannot be full employment, and I condemn the use of the term "over-full employment", whatever it means. I interpret it as a way of saying, "We are getting inflation. Let us take action to ensure that people are put out of work."

**Mr. Lickiss:** What about those who are virtually unemployable? They are still counted.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** There are those who, for many reasons, are not capable of full-time employment. Surely they should be able to receive a pension in one form or another. They should not be classified as unemployed. We boast about our education system and the affluent society. Surely if a person is regarded as unemployable, there must be some mental or physical reason why he is not capable of earning a living.

**Mr. Lickiss:** He is registered for employment, and is therefore included in the figures.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Those registered as unemployed surely are employable. Does the hon. member want to throw on the scrap-heap those people who, because of physical or mental incapacity, cannot earn a normal living? Does the hon. member not recognise that if a person does not fit into the normal pattern of working and living, there must be something wrong with his make-up, that he requires attention and should not be included in the figures of those unemployed? He should be receiving attention and a pension of some form.

**Mr. Porter:** You are living in a Utopia.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** It is not a matter of living in a Utopia. The idea of regarding some people as unemployable is a lot of nonsense. If the hon. member spent a bit more of his time mixing with the people on the job, working and sweating as they do, he would change his mind.

I should not be side-tracked by the little fish. The point I wish to make—I am sure the Treasurer will agree with it—is that, while there is more unemployment in Queensland than in other States, this State should be treated accordingly. If there is an opportunity to carry out further development, the necessary finance should be provided.

The Commonwealth Government will not lose in the long run if it makes more money available to the State. It will get the money back in personal taxation, company taxation, stamp duty, sales tax, and other forms of taxation. Every dollar that is spent in Queensland to assist the development of an established industry, or to foster the development of new industries, will provide a greater return to the Commonwealth Government than to the State Government. In my opinion, the Commonwealth Government is taking virtually no risk.

What the Treasurer said relative to the figures supplied by Mr. Gorton during the Federal election campaign, when he spoke about Queensland being so well endowed, is true. My greatest regret is that the Treasurer did not then say what he is saying now. He may have done it privately; he certainly did not do it publicly. If he did it publicly, I will take any censure that is due to me for not seeing his statement and making it known more widely. Hon. members on this side of the Chamber expect members of the Liberal Party to say anything to try to win votes. The point is that the Prime Minister made certain statements and deliberately left out the work associated with the Snowy River scheme. If figures covering that had been included, a completely different picture would have been presented.

What worries me is that no final agreement has been reached about the Central Queensland power-house project. Since the House resumed earlier this year, I have asked questions about that. At this point of time, hon. members do not know what the cost of electricity will be, so the Government cannot go to prospective customers and say to them, "We will be able to supply electricity to you at so much a unit." That information was given to me by the various Ministers concerned in answer to questions that I asked, and I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of their statements.

Hon. members have been told that State money is to be used and that 1975 will be the approximate date of completion. I do not want to rehash this question, but what I want to know is: can we trust the Federal Government? It was said during the election campaign that the Federal Government would make the money available to Queensland. However, as I said earlier, no agreement has been signed, and it does not seem likely that it will be signed for some considerable time.

**Mr. Hanlon:** The Premier said that he hoped to renegotiate the agreement after the elections.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** That is correct. There have not been any negotiations, to my knowledge. If there have been, this is a glorious opportunity for the Treasurer to say so.

**Mr. Chalk:** I might do that.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** If the Treasurer does, I will, as I said during both the State and Federal election campaigns, give him full credit. I believe that we must have the new power-house. There will be a tremendous vacuum if we do not have it. The Commonwealth Government must come to the party with financial assistance, but 6.4 per cent. interest is ridiculous. Is it not our money? It is money that comes from this State. As I said earlier, the

money will go back to the Commonwealth in personal taxation and company taxation when the power-house is in operation.

The Treasurer mentioned also that he wanted a built-in formula. I suggest in all seriousness that, because the Commonwealth and State Governments are all of the same political colour, it would not do any harm to take from the Opposition benches the person best versed in financial matters. At least he would provide a new approach and a new view.

My main worry is that, as all the Liberals in Canberra bowed down to Gorton, all the State Premiers might likewise bow down when the heat is applied. Such an Opposition observer would let us know what is going on. I am sure that what the Treasurer really wants is that the State Parliaments of this Commonwealth, not the State Governments, be united. What is wrong with the Treasurer having with him—if not as an adviser, then as an observer—someone from the Opposition who can, as a result of knowing what goes on, take part at the appropriate time in constructive debates in this House and add something to our knowledge of what goes on at these conferences.

I have read the speeches of Labour Treasurers of the past and I have found that they were very capable men. On many occasions, members of the Liberal and Country Parties have paid credit to Labour Treasurers of the past for their actions and their knowledge. I see no reason why members presently in the ranks of the Opposition in the various Parliaments, particularly those who handle in a general sense the Treasury business, could not do likewise.

One of the main reasons we are not getting more money from the Commonwealth may be that the Federal Government believes the propaganda that is going out from the State Government. On thorough investigation we might find that the Commonwealth Government believes that development of such magnitude is going on here, evidenced by some statements by State Ministers, that they think, "There is no need to help Queensland; it is doing very well on its own."

**Mr. Ramsden:** Or alternatively, they hear so much "knocking" that they say it is not possible to do it.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** The hon. member said before that they are intelligent people. If they cannot tell the difference between constructive criticism and "knocking", then they give the lie to that statement. The hon. member has frequently proved that he does not know the difference between constructive criticism and "knocking", throughout his political career, he has obtained his majorities by "knocking" someone else.

In fact, it could be said that Queensland has boasted itself out of much financial assistance. I think I have covered that subject to a degree, though not as fully as I should have liked on such an interesting subject. I

think I have made it clear to the Government that the Opposition completely supports any case that is put up for more money for Queensland.

I want to make some short reference also to some of the statements the Treasurer made in reply to my speech on the Budget debate. In that debate he picked certain sections that suited his argument but that were not relevant to the whole story. The point I made at the outset was that he had made a statement 12 months previously that I should devote my time to analysing the figures in the Budget and coming up with certain answers. I suggested then that I would make my speech the way I saw it, and I still maintain that. But I want to show conclusively that the figures submitted in the Budget are only relative and certainly only estimates, as the word indicates. If we took the figures too seriously and endeavoured to argue that we should have an extra dollar for this and an extra \$10 for that, we could find that we had wasted all our time on something that is not a reality.

I wish to take as a starting point the financial year 1965-66 and trace the estimated income for each year through to the present time and compare it with the actual income. At the same time I wish to compare the estimated expenditure with the actual expenditure. The discrepancies that will appear are so great that the Treasurer's estimated deficit of \$2,000,000 on this occasion may be many millions of dollars out when the actual year's expenditure and income are analysed. Knowing what has happened in the past, I did not worry greatly about that at that time. Only recently we read in the Press that it was likely that Queensland could obtain a windfall of \$5,000,000 if the Commonwealth took certain action, so that overnight a possible deficit of \$2,000,000 could be converted into a surplus of \$3,000,000.

**Mr. Chalk:** It would not be in this financial year.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** That is correct, but when the Treasurer made his estimate he did not know anything about the possibility of receiving this extra money.

**Mr. Chalk:** I could lose \$1,000,000 under the same judgment.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Of course the Treasurer could. My point is that, although he shows a deficit of \$2,000,000, it does not mean very much. The following tables stress the point that I am making: first, income—

Year	Estimated Income \$	Actual Income \$
1965-66 ..	290,000,000	294,000,000
1966-67 ..	324,000,000	323,000,000
1967-68 ..	344,000,000	376,000,000
1968-69 ..	377,000,000	387,000,000

Then on the expenditure side—

Year	Estimated Expenditure \$	Actual Expenditure \$
1965-66 ..	293,000,000	298,000,000
1966-67 ..	324,000,000	323,000,000
1967-68 ..	344,000,000	376,000,000
1968-69 ..	377,000,000	388,000,000

Analysing those figures—in 1965-66 the actual income received was \$4,411,000 above the estimated income and the actual expenditure was \$4,939,000 above the estimated expenditure; in 1966-67 the actual income was \$1,000,000 below the estimated income and the actual expenditure was \$1,313,000 below the estimated expenditure; in 1967-68 the actual income was \$32,000,000 above the estimated income and the actual expenditure was \$31,000,000 above the estimated expenditure; and in 1968-69 the actual income was \$10,838,000 above the estimated income and the actual expenditure was \$11,765,000 above the estimated expenditure.

I am sure that on those figures the Treasurer will agree that accurate budgeting is so far from reality that it would be foolish to take them seriously. Certainly, estimates need to be made to give relativity, but they do not give an accurate picture. It is true that once an hon. member knows what the amounts are, he can debate the results, and it is equally true that he could argue that a greater sum should be spent in one field than in another. But to do that, he would need to know the financial requirements, which quite often unfortunately are not in the possession of the Opposition. We therefore confine our remarks to matters about which we have specific knowledge. During these debates the subject matters chosen by hon. members are those in which they are experienced or have devoted time to making the necessary research.

The Treasurer criticised me for not commenting on expenditure relative to last year's performance. I again suggest that he should look for a particular part of my speech and not take it as a whole. I spent considerable time on the fact that we are now spending \$47,000,000 of our income from Consolidated Revenue on repayment or servicing of loans. In other words 12.14 per cent. of Consolidated Revenue—the highest percentage for some considerable time—is now being used to service our loans. Surely that proves that unless we tie up completely a large amount of Consolidated Revenue in repaying loans and meeting interest charges, we must receive from the Commonwealth more money at very low interest rates or more money as free grants. If we do not, our financial position will become completely out of balance. If a person mortgages too much of his income, or buys too much on hire-purchase, his normal living, unfortunately, is interfered with and he has to do without essential items.

I am surprised that the Treasurer did not reply to some of my remarks about the percentage of our Consolidated Revenue that is channelled into repayments. Furthermore, he refused to comment on my criticism of the State's small income from mining although other Ministers have been very vocal in their claims that we are getting a lot more from mining than I have stated. Let me now point out the factual position, which, unfortunately, could not be given in the earlier debate because the Auditor-General's report was not then available. I now point out to the Committee that income from royalties this year is considerably less than it was last year, when it amounted to the lowly total of \$1,711,503. This year the income is even lower at \$1,544,417. Mount Isa Mines Ltd. contributed \$360,380; Mt. Morgan \$30,155; oil and natural gas \$592,503; coal, about which the Government boasts that so many tons are being exported, contributed a total of \$263,498. That is a mere drop. Royalties from bauxite amounted to \$226,940 and other royalties totalled \$124,941. That represented a reduction in royalties received from Mt. Isa, Mt. Morgan, and oil and natural gas. The royalty income from Mt. Isa decreased by 29 per cent.; the Mt. Morgan payments decreased by 73 per cent.; and royalty income from oil and natural gas decreased by 25 per cent.

It is worth recording that the income from royalties of \$1,544,417 is less than the income obtained from bookmakers and the turnover tax last year of \$1,675,829. That, of course, is apart from the increase received from the T.A.B. and the betting tax, which was just \$4,000,000.

It is significant that the Treasurer, in his reply, did not make any comment about my assessment of royalties and the relationship between income and expenditure in our Department of Mines, and the amount of money being spent by the Government in searching for minerals in the State.

The Treasurer did not explain why there has to be an increase in expenditure for miscellaneous services from last year's figure of \$63,517 to \$965,000 estimated for this year, nor did he explain why the State should still be loaded with an expenditure of \$384,944 as its share of the loss of the Commonwealth Bank.

I believe that I covered then, as I have now, many financial matters associated with our State Budget. As I said before, I regret most sincerely that this Government and its colleagues in Canberra have not been able to persuade the Federal Government to give Queensland a better deal, because, without this Federal money, we will not be able to do the things this Government boasts it is doing or would like to do—it pulls out of the hat names of companies that will possibly come here—and that we believe are so necessary for this State's progress and development.

A matter of great importance to many people is this Government's decision not to declare Saturday, 27 December, 1969, to be a public holiday. I shall confine my remarks to that date. The other date is just as worthy of consideration, although perhaps the same case cannot be made out for it. Most people work a five-day week. Certainly, members of Parliament work seven days a week, although we have a five-day operating week. I believe that our constituents would like to work a five-day week if it were practicable.

**Mr. Miller:** Barmaids, too.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** That is true. I do not deny anyone the right to work a five-day week, be they shipyard workers, barmaids, or professional men like doctors and dentists. If a service is required seven days a week, shifts should be worked. During the war, many people worked seven days a week. The order of the day then was to work six days a week, with two days off every fortnight. These days, a large percentage of our community have Saturday morning off.

In reality, this year, we will have Thursday (Christmas Day) and Friday (Boxing Day) off. We boast about our affluent society. Many people like to go away for that short break. However, those with grown-up families going to work like to keep their families together. If we want to progress as a nation without having young-people trouble, we must keep our families together. Therefore, would it not be much better to have the Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday off so that the whole family could enjoy the Christmas period together, whether they go away or not, in preference to the mother and father being able to go away and the son and daughter, who may be shop assistants or engaged in two other occupations, staying home on their own, or else the whole family staying home because this work is required?

**Mr. Murray:** I think we could organise milk and bread deliveries—that is all that would be required—and we would be set.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** That would happen in any case. This happens normally.

**Mr. Murray:** I quite agree with you.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** What makes the position ridiculous is that the Government says, "No, we cannot give it," and then the Retailers' Association of Queensland, which is the association of the employers, says that whether or not shops close is a matter for individual traders. The association goes on to state that many traders will close their shops.

Surely the Government will make up its mind and say whether it is in the interests of the people that the shops close. If the Government decides that they should remain open, they should be kept open. But surely the evidence supplied by the Retailers' Association is that on the Saturday there will

be no great demand for the services provided by the shops. Let us face the facts. If members of the Retailers' Association believe that there is a dollar to be made in that period, they will keep their shops open, but they know that all who can possibly get away will be away on that Saturday morning.

I know it can be argued that overtime rates would have to be paid to those who work on the Saturday if it were declared a public holiday, but that is only a minor matter when considering the advantages to be gained by the great majority. Those shops or industries that require people to work will, in any case, have to pay time and a half for the Saturday afternoon. Only a few hours would be involved, and not many people would have to be paid under the overtime provisions if the Government, by Order in Council, declared the Saturday to be a public holiday.

I urge the Government, even at this late stage, to reconsider its decision. I appreciate that stronger arguments would have to be advanced to obtain a holiday on the Friday also. I do, however, think there is every justification for declaring the Saturday a holiday. We hear much talk about ours being an affluent society. Let us show that we believe it to be affluent, rather than merely say that it is. The retailers say that they are prepared to close their shops so that employees who normally work on Saturday morning can have the day off.

**Mr. Murray:** I sincerely hope that you get it. I would like that time off myself.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Whether the hon. member and I have the time off will depend on what our constituents have to say about it.

**Mr. Chalk:** You won't get double time.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** No, but I get double pleasure out of helping people.

I trust that the Treasurer will pass on what I have said to his Cabinet colleagues. The Minister for Industrial Development is in the House, and I know that he will support my submission that Saturday be declared a public holiday.

At 11 p.m.,

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! Under the provisions of Standing Order No. 307, the sitting will be extended to enable the Treasurer to speak in reply.

**Hon. G. W. W. CHALK** (Lockyer—Treasurer) (11.1 p.m.), in reply: Naturally, I have to reply only to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. I am one who subscribes to the idea that possibly more time should be available to allow all members who wish to do so to enter this debate, but it is a principle laid down that this Appropriation Bill be passed at the conclusion of the Supply debate and a time limit is provided.

I do not think that there is much for me to reply to in the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. First of all, he accused me of making a speech tonight similar to the one that I made some three years ago. I do not deny that some of my utterances tonight were similar to those that I made on the occasion to which he referred.

The arguments that I have put forward tonight have also been put forward in the appropriate places on earlier occasions. However, there is an important difference between the argument now being advanced and that which was advanced three years ago. Commonwealth—State financial relationships have reached the stage where a new agreement has to be arrived at. No matter how much one "hollered" at a Federal level in past years, the reply of the Commonwealth was, naturally, "This is something that was agreed to on a five-year basis. Having agreed to that plan five years ago, you have to put up with it. If you want to come forward with a new argument, if you want to expound any new proposals relative to the formula, then do so when the agreement comes up for renewal or when a new agreement is written." That is why it is very important, not only from the viewpoint of the State of Queensland but also from the viewpoint of all other States, that we get together as States, or, accepting the words of the Leader of the Opposition, "as State Parliaments", and ensure that we do not fall into a similar situation in the future. When we meet the Commonwealth in February or March 1970 and hammer out a new undertaking, we must ensure that the States receive fair treatment from the Commonwealth.

Although I accept the Leader of the Opposition's suggestion that perhaps some of the tune I have tried to play tonight is the same as the tune I played three years ago, I submit that the circumstances are such that it is worth playing again. I hope that our deliberations will achieve some results.

The hon. gentleman said in passing that a Labour Government would be in office in the Federal House in 12 months. Naturally, I do not subscribe to that view. I believe that it is in the interests of the Commonwealth and the people of Queensland to keep the same Government in office in Canberra. Although perhaps I do not agree with all the things that happen in Canberra, the Government now in power there has built up a stability in the Commonwealth of Australia that is recognised the world over.

In July this year I had the privilege of addressing about 60 leading American bankers and industrialists at the University Club in New York. I began to say something about the State of Queensland. By way of interjection, a very prominent banker said, "Mr. Chalk, there is no need to tell us about the State of Queensland. We know all about it. We know its opportunities; we want to invest in it. There is one

thing that we, as Americans, are particularly interested in. Tell us that there will be a continuation of the stability of your Government. We are satisfied about the stability of the Commonwealth. Give us an undertaking that that stability, which has been the basis on which both American and British finance has come to Australia, will continue."

These people were wanting to invest out of their own countries. That applies to both American and British finance. They have been desirous of getting away from the problems that have built up in their own countries. They look to Australia because they see that it has the stability they require as a base for the sound over-all spread of their investments. For that reason, it is imperative for the future of the Commonwealth of Australia that we keep a Liberal-Country Party Government in Canberra.

**Mr. Hanlon:** You would not say they are very stable at the moment, would you?

**Mr. CHALK:** I will say that the Government is as stable as it could be. Do not tell me it could be stable under Mr. Whitlam. I have been in politics for 23 years and I know how hon. members opposite pull the curtains down at election time. The Liberal and Country Parties in the Federal House have their problems, and do not for one moment tell me that the picture within the A.L.P. is completely rosy.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Why don't you come in and see?

**Mr. CHALK:** The hon. member is the best example I could have; I have not to go anywhere else to see.

I come now to another point the Leader of the Opposition endeavoured to make. I want to be kind in this because I do not expect the Leader of the Opposition to have available to him the knowledge I have available to me as Treasurer of the State. I sat in Opposition for 12 years and I know how difficult it is at times to secure information for the purposes of debate. The only person I could ever upset in my days in Opposition was the then Transport Minister. I had one or two leaks, as it were, within the Railway Department and my information was usually correct.

**Mr. O'Donnell:** Schmidt, the spy.

**Mr. CHALK:** Schmidt, the spy.

The Leader of the Opposition referred to two financial tables and, listening to him, I thought that there must be something wrong somewhere, that someone had given him certain information. But that someone is not fully conversant with the basis on which those tables were prepared. First of all, he made a comparison on Table 7, which relates to the financial assistance grants. It is true that one can make comparisons between Western Australia, South Australia and Queensland, but in 1948-49 both of those States were under the Commonwealth Grants

Commission, and consequently, the figures that appeared on that occasion are entirely different from those that appear in 1968-69.

**Mr. Houston:** They still got the money.

**Mr. CHALK:** They got the money, but the position is that the comparison of figures takes into account the Commonwealth supplementary grants. Therefore, the whole argument in relation to Table 7 is void. The hon. member cannot possibly make a comparison between figures in 1948-49 when South Australia and Western Australia were under the Commonwealth Grants Commission and those in 1968-69 when they were outside of the Grants Commission altogether.

**Mr. Hanlon:** Their base entitlement included grants from the commission.

**Mr. CHALK:** Never mind advising! Again, let us have a look at Table 21.

**Mr. Hanlon:** They are your tables.

**Mr. CHALK:** That is so, but making comparisons is an entirely different matter. It is true that the tables are ours, and the figures are provided as they were for 1948-49. But members of the Opposition overlooked that fact that the figures for 1968-69 were outside of the Commonwealth Grants Commission and consequently cannot be lined up for the sake of argument.

On Table 21 the Leader of the Opposition failed to notice that in 1948-49 Queensland received less than one-sixth of the State average in total loans allocation. In 1968-69 Queensland received almost \$5 a head more than the average of the six States.

**Mr. Hanlon:** You are getting onto loans now.

**Mr. CHALK:** If the Opposition wants to try to twist figures it can have a go, but immediately I can prove the discrepancies in the figures that the Leader of the Opposition has put up.

**Mr. Hanlon interjected.**

**Mr. CHALK:** Some day the hon. member for Baroona may be on this side of the Chamber. If I happen to be over on that side I will know more tricks of the trade than he is trying to learn now.

The Leader of the Opposition claimed that the Prime Minister had deliberately quoted certain figures relative to expenditure in this State over the past 10 years. It is true that the Prime Minister used certain figures, and again it is possible that he believed them to be perfectly correct. It was not a matter of his deliberately misleading us. I wrote to him because there was a difference of opinion between us, and at that time I was endeavouring to put forward the argument for our power-house. I indicated that we were lagging in the amount of loan expenditure in this State, and he came forward with certain figures. In return I demanded the

figures include those for the Snowy Mountains Authority. I believe that they should be included, and I am on record as saying so.

Two matters remain to which I think I should reply. The Leader of the Opposition mentioned the proposed Central Queensland power-house and claimed that the Opposition was still in the dark about it. Certain private negotiations are proceeding between the Government and industry, and they must be kept private until completed. We cannot publish prices. If we did that we would be providing information to this State's competitors—and we should admit that there is competition between the eastern States of Australia. In this morning's paper we read that two New South Wales Ministers are going to America on Monday to endeavour to negotiate with a big coal organisation that is negotiating with Queensland also. They hope to obtain a large coal deal. That is New South Wales's right. But equally is it right of Queensland to negotiate with that particular company. If we play our cards face up for the public to see, we play them so that New South Wales can see. Anyone who has played poker and plays his cards face up to show the other player usually comes out the loser.

**Mr. Lee:** He is a fool.

**Mr. CHALK:** I did not say he was a fool but I said he would come out on the wrong side of the game.

**Mr. Houston:** You don't think that the companies, when they get your price, will go to New South Wales and say, "Can you do better?"

**Mr. CHALK:** No, because we are dealing with different companies except in relation to the sale of coal.

Negotiations have progressed considerably since the Federal election in relation to the Central Queensland power-house.

**Mr. Wright:** To the benefit of Queensland?

**Mr. CHALK:** Of course! Who the hell would it be for the benefit of?

**Mr. Wright** interjected.

**Mr. CHALK:** The hon. member is but a boy in small pants if he comes from Rockhampton and makes an utterance like that.

**Mr. Wright** interjected.

**Mr. CHALK:** It is time he went back into napkins making a statement like that. For whom would we be negotiating? Surely it would be in the name of Central Queensland! Surely Rockhampton can send us somebody better than that! He is the type of individual who makes utterances in this House that prove him to be one of greatest "knockers" of Queensland.

**Mr. Wright:** I am not "knocking".

**Mr. CHALK:** As far as I am concerned it is far better to keep negotiations away from individuals like him.

In Central Queensland this power-house project has gone a stage further since the Federal elections. I have had discussions with the Prime Minister about the loan. The Minister for Industrial Development, and the Minister for Mines, because of the industrial side, and the mining side, have had negotiations with three major industries that will, in my personal belief, spend at least \$400,000,000 in Central Queensland. We are not in the position to say to the public, "The price of power is such-and-such." But I will say that we have indicated to those people that the price at which we can supply power, even paying the 6.4 interest rate, will be competitive with the price of power on world markets. I believe that, within the next few weeks, these companies will give this State letters of intent that will enable us to proceed immediately. I have been told by the Prime Minister, and I have confirmed it in correspondence with him, that when we have these letters of intent, he will not only make the money available to us, but will be prepared to further negotiate the interest rate with me. These matters will cause one of the greatest possible changes in the State of Queensland.

The Leader of the Opposition indicated that 1975 was the year given to him as the date of completion of the project. It is true that this major station, in toto, will not be finished until 1975. But it is equally true that we will not be taking the total output from it until then. We hope that by 1973, under the agreement we enter into, we will be able to bring into the grid certain power from the south. Portion of the station will be operating, and even if the State has to subsidise power costs for a short period to major industries of the nature that I have referred to . . .

**Mr. Houston:** Aha!

**Mr. Hanlon** interjected.

**Mr. CHALK:** That is all right. There is a vast difference between subsidising total power and subsidising the cost of power to an industry.

**Mr. Houston:** What do you think I was doing—subsidising industry?

**Mr. CHALK:** The point of the matter is that we will ensure that power will be available the day that industry wants to get off the ground. I believe that we can speed up the building of the power-house. I am not one of those who subscribe to 1975 because I believe that we can do much better. On the other hand, our electricity advisers say, "Possibly you had better play safe." As far as I am concerned, by the time industry starts building, we will have built the power-house, and we will be able to provide power the day that industry wants it.

I regard Opposition members as honourable members and I believe that they want to get behind this as much as they can, so I ask them, for goodness sake, do not "knock" it. They hope some day to be the Government of this State, so they should get behind the progress of the State which, at the present time, depends largely on this major development in Central Queensland. I say to the Leader of the Opposition tonight, when he questions what is happening, "Yes, there is a degree of secrecy. There has to be." On the other hand, I say that what is being done is for the benefit not only of those undertakings but also of this State as a whole.

**Mr. Wright:** Why the secrecy about Sabina Point?

**Mr. CHALK:** Here is the boy in napkins again. Of course there has to be secrecy about Sabina Point.

**Mr. Wright:** There is no competition, is there?

**Mr. CHALK:** I have given the hon. member away and I am certain that Rockhampton will at the next State election. The point of the matter is that I have endeavoured to point out tonight the basis on which we have negotiated.

**Mr. Wright:** But you haven't answered the question.

**Mr. CHALK:** I do not talk to small boys. It is past his bedtime, I know, but I cannot help that.

The only other matter the Leader of the Opposition referred to was mining royalties. If I had had more time to reply to him in the Budget debate, I would have done so. I think, perhaps, I was being kind by not touching on all the things he said. However, I endeavoured, when replying in the Budget debate, to devote some time to every hon. member and, with the exception of two hon. members, I did.

I can say to the Leader of the Opposition—the figures are there and no-one can deny them—that there was a decline in royalties from certain commodities in the past 12 months. We must take the basis on which royalties are charged. The Minister for Mines draws my attention to the fact that Mount Isa is one. Mount Isa royalties are paid on the cost factor and on the taxable factor. We want that company to develop and, because of the total cost factor of development, its profits were down. It is equally true that our royalties were down. The figures for the first four months of this financial year indicate that Mount Isa royalties and royalties generally received by this State are completely up in the air.

**Mr. Houston:** Still less than the T.A.B.

**Mr. CHALK:** They might be less than the T.A.B. I cannot stop Marty Hanson, myself, or anybody else from betting. The profits from the T.A.B. are growing. Because of the prosperity of this State more money is in circulation. I do not deny that I gamble and I probably make a contribution to the T.A.B. Whether royalties are compared with the T.A.B. or anything else, the fact is that they are increasing. We get back to the old argument—what would we rather have? Would we rather have higher royalties, and less profitability of transport operations? They are things that have been argued in this House previously.

**Mr. Hanlon:** From now on at Moura I would rather swap our royalties for Les Thiess's agency fee.

**Mr. CHALK:** I know that; the hon. member is a gambling man.

**Mr. Hanlon:** He is getting 20c and we are getting 5c.

**Mr. CHALK:** The hon. member says that now.

**Mr. Hanlon:** I said it a couple of years ago.

**Mr. CHALK:** The hon. member said it now.

**Mr. Hanlon:** You said he was losing money then, but have a look at the position this year.

**Mr. CHALK:** Whatever might be Les Thiess's profitability, the point is that that was the undertaking. Anyone who criticises Thiess—

**Mr. Houston:** We are not criticising him.

**Mr. CHALK:** The Thiess organisation has done more to develop this State than any other organisation that I know of.

**Mr. Hanlon:** I am pleased to see him getting it as a Queenslander, but I want the Queensland Government to share with him and get something out of it, too.

**Mr. CHALK:** We are sharing with him, because we are getting our return from the transportation of the coal. As Treasurer of this State, I will never share the profitability of transport of coal. Those in Western Australia would go back to the Queensland way of doing it if they possibly could. There are two men going from New South Wales to talk to one of the coal-mining organisations in America. I know the scheme that they will put up, because they have already had discussions on it.

**Mr. Hanlon:** What are their royalties?

**Mr. CHALK:** Their royalties are higher than ours, yes, but, in the end result, I know who will be better off.

**Mr. Hanlon:** They are like the bookies; they like a bit of money in the bag.

**Mr. CHALK:** That is all right. The hon. member always wants to be on a certainty. The question of royalties is a matter that the Government looked at. It made its decision, and it stands by it. All that I can say is that the profit now being received as a result of the development of the State's coal resources is the very thing that is keeping the economy of the State going during this period of drought. That is what helped us balance the Budget last year, and it is what will keep us afloat during this year.

**Mr. Houston:** Are you going to give the extra Saturday holiday?

**Mr. CHALK:** The other point raised by the Leader of the Opposition was a completely hypothetical case. What was his argument? He said, first of all, that the craft unions do not work on Saturdays, and then he said that the retailers are going to give the holiday, anyway. He therefore presented a completely hypothetical argument.

This is a matter that Cabinet considered. We took the pattern followed when a similar set of circumstances occurred seven years ago. All that I can say is that, after looking at the situation carefully, Cabinet came to the conclusion that it was in the best interests of all to adopt the policy that was adopted on the previous occasion.

**Mr. Houston:** You were wrong.

**Mr. CHALK:** The hon. member says we were wrong. I say that his argument was a completely hypothetical one. The point is that the retailers have given the holiday to those who would normally have worked on the Saturday.

**Mr. Houston:** Not all shops.

**Mr. CHALK:** I therefore do not feel that there is any need for it to be declared a public holiday.

Motion (Mr. Chalk) agreed to.

#### COMMITTEE

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

Clauses 1 to 8, both inclusive, schedule and preamble, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

#### THIRD READING

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

The House adjourned at 11.32 p.m.