

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 8 SEPTEMBER 1970

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 8 SEPTEMBER, 1970

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

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed:—

Report of the Acting Chief Inspector of Factories and Shops for the year 1969-70.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

Water Act 1926-1968.

The Irrigation Acts, 1922 to 1965.

The Harbours Acts, 1955 to 1968.

City of Brisbane Act 1924-1969.

Regulation under the Irrigation Acts, 1922 to 1965.

By-law under the Dental Acts, 1902 to 1961.

Recommendations formulated by the Law Reform Commission in relation to—

(a) Amendments to the Criminal Code concerning abolition of the distinction between wilful murder and murder;

(b) Amendments to the Common Law Practice Acts, 1876 to 1964 concerning illegitimate children.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

UNIVERSITY AND VIETNAM MORATORIUM DEMONSTRATIONS

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier) (11.4 a.m.), by leave: Because a situation of some gravity, arousing considerable public concern, has emerged in the past few days, it is my intention this morning to inform the House of the Government's firm attitude to lawless incidents which occurred on the university campus last week and to the moratorium activity set down for 18 September. One of the campus incidents resulted in violence being used by some so-called radical students and their non-university associates against the representatives of law and order.

Right at the outset, I say firmly and unequivocally that any repetition of this type of violent activity will not be tolerated, and the full provisions of the law will be invoked where they apply.

I remind hon. members that this Parliament, our democratic institutions and our personal freedoms and liberties can only be safeguarded by the observance and maintenance—I repeat, the observance and maintenance—of law and order.

Today we are confronted with a situation where subversive elements in our midst, who owe allegiance to other ideologies and countries, are trying to force their views on freedom-loving men, women and children. We have a position where children and grandchildren of men who fought and died to preserve our democratic way of life in Australia, and the things that we hold dear, are being denied these rights by a small group of anarchists.

Unfortunately, some people are led into supporting their undemocratic activities through ignorance of the true position. Those who are organising the moratorium and those who participate in it will, in fact, be engaged in a blatant sabotage not only of the sacrifices being made by Australian troops in Vietnam but of the principles and ideals that most Australians hold dear.

It is the declared intention of these Communist-inspired activities to halt business and cause chaos in our community. While there are provisions for reasonable and lawful means of expressing disagreement, the Government will not condone breaches of the law and acts that deprive other citizens of their lawful rights.

Let me emphasise also that the Commissioner of Police and his officers have the full support of my Government in the stand they will take to carry out their instructions to uphold law and order. It is rather strange that the moratorium organisers not only want to demonstrate publicly but want, at the same time, to obstruct and deprive other citizens of their democratic rights and freedoms.

The intentions of the organisers and those participating in the moratorium are clear. They are not planning to protest publicly against the blatant acts of international crime such as the invasion of Cambodia or the murder of thousands of people by the Viet Cong and their supporters in South Vietnam and the countries that surround it. They do not protest against the Viet Cong's slayings of unprotected orphan children, of which the world learnt with horror only last month.

Do these murderous activities of the Communist Viet Cong have the support of the moratorium organisers, whose insidious methods and propaganda are really aimed at the people and Governments of this State and nation? Their attitude in this regard stands condemned. It is not only deplorable but quite unacceptable that the citizens of this great democratic community of Australia should be subjected to the dictates of dedicated supporters of Communist doctrines.

The great majority of the people in this State expect the Government to uphold the law on this issue, and here and now I urge all those who do not fully appreciate and understand the deep subversive activities underlying the organising of this moratorium to hesitate and reconsider before lending their support. These activities will have

wide repercussions, threatening the very foundations of our democratic way of life if they are allowed to go unchecked.

Recently I drew attention to the presence of certain Communists in trade unions affiliated with the Australian Labour Party, and today Communists are actively working in association with the Queensland Trades and Labour Council in organising moratorium demonstrations in Queensland to further their own anti-Australian philosophy. That is why I said last week that no loyal Australian should be associated with, or participate in, this moratorium.

Mr. Aikens: It is the official policy of the A.L.P.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: That is correct.

I reiterate that this Government will stand firm and is determined to protect the rights of the people of this State and, at the same time, maintain law and order within our State.

PRECEDENCE OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS ON THURSDAYS

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier): I move—

“That, unless otherwise ordered, Government business do take precedence on Thursday in each week.”

Motion agreed to.

MARGINAL DAIRY FARMS RECON- STRUCTION SCHEME AGREEMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. V. B. SULLIVAN (Condamine—Minister for Lands): I move—

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to ratify and approve an agreement between the Commonwealth and the State of Queensland in relation to a marginal dairy farms reconstruction scheme.”

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

POLICE SEARCH OF EMPLOYEES' BAGS, MERINDA MEATWORKS

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

(1) For what reason were employees of Borthwick's Merinda Meatworks subject to police interception and search of their bags and purses when leaving the works approximate to 4 p.m. on August 3?

(2) Was the name of each person recorded in police officers' books, despite nothing incriminating having been found? If so, for what reason?

(3) Were female employees subjected to embarrassing search by male police on this occasion? If so, for what reason?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) “At the request of the Management of the Meatworks conducted by Thomas Borthwick and Sons (A'sia) Ltd. at Merinda via Bowen, the bags of some employees of the meatworks were searched by two police from the Bowen Police Station on the afternoon of August 3, 1970, as it was suspected by the management that employees had stolen meat from the meatworks. I have been informed that the employees voluntarily and readily opened their bags and in fact were quite jovial about the matter. Those carrying large handbags inside of their large carrying bags opened up these bags quite willingly when requested to do so. About half the number who had their bags searched were female employees of the meatworks. There is nothing to indicate that these persons were embarrassed by the search. The names of the persons concerned were written in the note books of the police so that it would be known who had their bags searched, by whom and with what result. This was not done for any reason detrimental to the persons concerned. No stolen property was found in the bags of the persons searched but about five pounds of meat were found in the freezer section of the meatworks where it had obviously been discarded by some person after the search had commenced. The Commissioner of Police is issuing instructions to ensure that police exercise their power of search only on those occasions when definite suspicion is attached to a particular person or persons and that the customary procedure is followed when it is necessary to search females. By this I mean that no female should be searched unless the search is carried out by another female.”

ENFORCEMENT OF SPEED LIMITS ON BRISBANE RIVER

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to a letter in *The Courier-Mail* of August 31 headed “Damage on River”, wherein it was stated that fast cruising speeds of heavy-draught vessels on the Brisbane River must be stopped?

(2) Has action been taken against boat skippers who have exceeded speed limits in the river and, if so, how many have been prosecuted in the last twelve months?

Answers:—

(1) “Yes.”

(2) “Warnings have been given following reports of commercial river craft exceeding the speed limits close to moored craft. No prosecutions have been made during the last 12 months. However, three prosecutions are pending with respect to careless navigation by this type of craft on the Brisbane River.”

OPPORTUNITY SCHOOL, WARWICK

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

(1) When will the two-classroom opportunity school now being built in Warwick be ready for classes?

(2) When will a final survey be made to ascertain what children would be expected to attend this school?

(3) How will the survey be conducted?

(4) From which areas will children be permitted to attend this school?

Answers:—

(1) "It is anticipated the classes will begin operation from the beginning of 1971."

(2) "The week October 26-30, 1970."

(3 and 4) "Four officers of the Guidance and Special Education Branch will test children referred by all primary schools, State and non-State, within an approximate twenty-mile radius of Warwick. The parents of those children found suitable for opportunity schooling will be interviewed and arrangements will be made for their admission."

CONTROL OF LEGAL PRACTITIONERS

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

Has his attention been drawn to an article in *The Australian* of August 14, wherein some details are given of a new law gazetted by the Commonwealth Government, instituting a stricter conduct code for lawyers for the protection of the public and, if so, will he take similar action to protect the public of Queensland and also institute a single form of admission to practice both as barrister and solicitor?

Answer:—

"Yes. I have not yet been able to study the provisions in detail but they appear to cover three main matters, viz.—(1) Disciplinary control of legal practitioners. (2) A Fidelity Fund to protect clients in the event of defalcations; and (3) An amalgamation of the profession so that all practitioners are initially admitted as both barristers and solicitors. Queensland has always had disciplinary control of legal practitioners though it has not the one specific body such as is apparently being set up in Canberra. I will examine this further. Again the Commonwealth proposals for a Fidelity Fund appear to be almost identical with the provisions we have had since 1927 as added to by provisions of the Legal Assistance Act in relation to interest on trust funds. There are sound arguments both for and against the amalgamation of the profession. Victoria has such an amalgamation, but New South Wales has not. There does not appear at present to be

any compelling reason for such a move in Queensland, though it has apparently, perhaps because of the relatively small area of the Australian Capital Territory, been found desirable there."

OIL SUPPLIES, TOWNSVILLE HOSPITAL AND PRISON

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to an article in *The Townsville Daily Bulletin* of August 22, wherein it was stated that, from time to time, water and sludge had been delivered by the oil company's tanker to the Townsville Hospital, with resultant serious trouble and delay to hospital activities and, if so, what action is proposed to avoid a recurrence?

(2) As similar trouble occurs with sludge-impregnated oil delivered to the laundry at Stuart Prison, will he confer with the Minister for Justice and other Ministers affected so that this serious problem may be dealt with at Cabinet level?

Answers:—

(1) "My attention has been drawn to the article referred to by the Honourable Member. The Secretary of the Townsville Hospitals Board has advised that this matter has been pursued with the Oil Company concerned who have recently inspected the facilities at the Townsville Hospital and made enquiries into the complaint lodged by the Hospitals Board. The Board is presently awaiting further advice from the Oil Company."

(2) "I would suggest that the Honourable Member refer this matter to my colleague, the Honourable the Minister for Justice."

SALARIES OF FOREMEN AND CLERKS, RAILWAY DEPARTMENT

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

What salary is at present received by (a) second-grade foremen in the railway workshops and (b) fifth-class clerks, and what were the relative salaries in 1954?

Answer:—

"Present Salary—(a) \$4,717–\$4,792 per annum; (b) \$4,340–\$4,710 per annum. Salary in 1954—(a) \$2,065–\$2,119 per annum; (b) \$1,719–\$1,813 per annum."

ROBBERY OFFENCES

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

How many daylight robberies were reported during the twelve months ended August 31 and of these how many have been solved?

Answer:—

"The following information is supplied in respect of undermentioned offences committed between 6 a.m. and 6 p.m. during the period September 1, 1969, and August 31, 1970, inclusive.

—	Number Reported	Number Cleared Up
(1) Breaking, entering and stealing from dwelling houses, flats and residential, and also the stealing from the aforementioned premises	1,522	323
(2) Breaking, entering and stealing from premises other than dwellings. These include shops, service stations, warehouses, factories, &c.	237	132
(3) Stealing from motor vehicles	1,079	190 "

DRINK-DRIVING OFFENCES

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

(1) How many motorists were arrested on drink-driving charges in each of the years 1967-68, 1968-69 and 1969 to the latest available date?

(2) Of those arrested, how many were found guilty and punished?

(3) What was the total amount of fines imposed on these motorists in each of the above years?

Answers:—

(1) "The number of motorists charged under section 16 of the Traffic Acts with being in charge of or driving a motor vehicle whilst under the influence of liquor or a drug in each of the years 1967-68, 1968-69, 1969-70 were:—1967-68, 2,079; 1968-69, 3,575; 1969-70, 3,976."

(2) "Of these so charged the number convicted and punished were:—1967-68, 1,908; 1968-69, 3,456; 1969-70, 3,856."

(3) "The total amount of fines imposed on motorists charged with the above-mentioned offences in each of the years referred to is as follows:—1967-68, \$380,000; 1968-69, \$687,820; 1969-70, \$785,280."

AERIAL AMBULANCE

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

In view of a need for the speediest possible ambulance service, will he streamline procedures in his Department so that any ambulance centre requiring an aerial ambulance for a patient may receive the necessary authority with a minimum of departmental contact?

Answer:—

"My Department has no control over the use of an aerial ambulance by any ambulance centre for transportation of patients. Where the medical superintendent of a public hospital considers the condition of a patient is such that urgency is attached to his transfer to another public hospital for specialist treatment the Director-General of Health and Medical Services or his deputy may immediately authorise the use of the aerial ambulance if he is satisfied that the patient's condition warrants transfer by air. If the patient is not a contributor to an ambulance brigade and his financial circumstances indicate assistance is necessary, this Department meets the costs involved."

NEW BLOCK, TOOWOOMBA BASE HOSPITAL

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

(1) Did he see an article in *The Chronicle*, Toowoomba, of August 27, stating that a new \$2 million block would be built at the Toowoomba Base Hospital for the treatment of medical, pediatric, psychiatric and geriatric patients?

(2) How many beds will be made available for each type of patient and when will building commence?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "The number of beds and the type of patient to be accommodated in the proposed medical block are at present under consideration. Date of commencement of building will be dependent on the time involved in the preparation of necessary plans and specifications and on the availability of finance."

FIREMEN, ROCKHAMPTON FIRE BRIGADE

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

(1) How many firemen are presently employed at the Rockhampton Fire Station and what are their daily hours of duty?

(2) Do these hours exceed the normal rostered hours usually worked by firemen and, if so, how can they be expected to adequately fight a fire after so many hours of duty, particularly if the fire is a major one?

Answers:—

(1) "Apparently the honourable member is of the opinion that his two Australian Labour Party colleagues representing Rockhampton North and Rockhampton South are not competent to look after their electorates.

Mr. BOUSEN: I rise to a point of order. I am getting sick and tired of these facetious references by the Minister. I ask for a reasonable answer to my question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

Answers (contd.):—

"Thirty-three firemen are employed at the Rockhampton Fire Station, eleven of whom are either on leave or under training. Some firemen are working up to 61 hours per week although not all men are working overtime. Despite the long weekly 'on duty' period of some firemen, much time is spent at rest at the station. During the last week, the firemen held their normal daily demonstration during Capricana Week and two firemen worked outside the area for ten hours without desiring relief. In addition the brigade has 18 officers who work a prescribed award period of 56 hours per week."

(2) "I am assured by the chairman of the Rockhampton Fire Brigade Board that the firemen under the present situation can adequately and competently fight fires of all types and that the duly registered industrial union, the Australian Workers' Union has no objection to the present conditions of employment. Finally I am informed that Mr. Bleney, the Rockhampton Branch Secretary of the unrecognised Firefighters Union who was on leave at the time of the industrial dispute has been employed by the Rockhampton Fire Brigade since his return from leave and has not refused to work overtime."

CHILD-MINDING CENTRES

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

(1) How many child-minding centres have made application to become official creche and kindergartens?

(2) How many of these are expected to qualify by the end of this year?

(3) How many of those whose applications are extant have had their applications in for three years or more and what are their names?

Answers:—

(1) "The Creche and Kindergarten Association grants affiliation to kindergartens which meet its full standards. Neither the Creche and Kindergarten Association nor the Department of Education are concerned with child-minding centres."

(2) "It is anticipated that the number of kindergartens granted affiliation with the Creche and Kindergarten Association will increase from 99 in 1969-70 to 110 in 1970-71."

(3) "All kindergartens maintain contact with the association and are aware of the requirements for affiliation. It would not occur that a kindergarten would apply year after year and have its application for affiliation rejected."

ENROLMENTS AND TEACHERS, BRISBANE STATE HIGH SCHOOL

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

Regarding the Brisbane State High School—

(1) What was the enrolment and the number of teaching staff, exclusive of supply teachers, as at August 1?

(2) At the same date, what were the enrolments and teachers for each of Grades 8, 10 and 12?

(3) How many of the teaching staff have degrees?

(4) As at August 1, how many of the teaching staff were (a) under 25 years and (b) over 55 years?

(5) At the same date, how many classes had 40 or more pupils in Grades 8, 10 and 12?

(6) Is his Department having difficulty in holding teaching staff at this school?

Answers:—

(1) "Total enrolment—August 1, 1,961; total number of full-time teachers excluding principal and deputy principal and supply teachers, 86."

(2) "Grade 8, 415; Grade 10, 407; Grade 12, 395; teachers are not appointed to teach specific grades."

(3) "Number of staff with degrees, 45."

(4) "(a) Number of staff under 25 years, 11; (b) number of staff over 55 years, 14."

(5) "Grade 8, 2 (40 each); Grade 10, 4 (3 of 40, 1 of 41); Grade 12, nil."

(6) "No."

PORT PHILLIP DEMOLITION ORGANISATION AND C.I.A.

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

(1) Will he consider having his special squad investigate the activities and members of the Port Phillip Demolition Organisation and the C.I.A. in Queensland?

(2) If it is found that they are, to any extent, the same organisation with the same membership, will he give the details?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "The Honourable Member evidently has more knowledge than I of the activities of the Port Phillip Demolition

Organisation as my information is identical with that provided the House last week by the Minister for Labour and Tourism. However, I have already informed the House this morning of the Government's views on illegal activities on and off the University Campus, and any further comment would be redundant."

SMALL-BOAT HARBOUR, CAIRNS

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

Following Cabinet's announcement in August, 1969, what is the present position concerning the provision of a small-boat harbour at Cairns and what are the latest developments and progress?

Answer:—

"I refer the Honourable Member to my Answer to his Question on March 11, 1970. Final planning of the Cairns Boat Harbour is still in progress. At the present time studies are in hand reviewing the possibility of incorporating within the boat harbour development a preliminary reclamation scheme able to be extended in the long term to a major reclamation scheme for tourism and real estate purposes."

RAIL SERVICES TO BRISBANE EXHIBITION

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

(1) How many passengers were carried to the Brisbane Exhibition by rail in 1968, 1969 and 1970?

(2) How many trains were run and what amount was taken in ticket sales for the same years?

Answer:—

(1 and 2)—

" Year	No. of Trains	No. of Passengers	Approximate Revenue
1968	1,057	318,735	\$ 30,300
1969	1,213	275,831	24,600
1970	1,280	330,640	30,600"

SUBURBAN RAIL SERVICES

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

(1) When new time-tables are being considered this year, will he give attention to the possibility of running more frequent suburban services both during and outside peak hours?

(2) Will he consider the use of more 2000-class rail motors on suburban runs where practicable?

Answers:—

(1) "The operation of suburban services is regularly reviewed and schedule adjustments made where necessary and practicable."

(2) "Yes."

PUBLIC ADDRESS SYSTEMS, RAILWAY PLATFORMS AND TRAINS

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

(1) As many instances have occurred where people farewelling passengers on an air-conditioned train have been still on the train when it commenced its journey, has he considered any means of preventing this and possible consequential accidents by the use of public address systems on the trains and all important platforms?

(2) Will he have those who do use existing P.A. systems receive instruction in the correct use of a microphone?

Answers:—

(1) "I am unaware that there have been many such instances. Warnings of the impending departure of air-conditioned trains from principal stations are issued and repeated by means of a public address system. It is also the responsibility of conductors to proceed through the train five minutes prior to the time of departure announcing departure and requesting all non-passengers to leave the train."

(2) "I understand that this is the practice."

COMALCO AGREEMENT

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

In view of the provisions of the 1957 Comalco Agreement covering the feasibility of the company constructing an aluminium smelter in Queensland and the restriction of the export of raw bauxite—

(1) What were the circumstances which influenced Government approval of the company's original contract with Japanese interests to supply raw bauxite from the Weipa deposits?

(2) What circumstances influenced the Government's decision to meet the cost involved in constructing the township and harbour at Weipa, at a time when the company was exporting raw bauxite and had taken no action in the seven years of the Agreement to commence construction of an alumina refinery in Queensland, but had negotiated with a consortium of companies to accept the obligation of the company in this regard?

(3) What are the details of Government approval or otherwise of the proposal of Comalco Industries Pty. Ltd. to export

1,200,000 tons of bauxite per annum to a new alumina plant on the island of Sardinia, for which Comalco Industries Pty. Ltd. has set up a shipping company, Sardanavi Societa Di Navigazione Maritima, to transport the bauxite, with specific reference to the rate of royalty to be received by the Government and the present progress of negotiations with the company in regard to the establishment of an aluminium smelter in Queensland?

(4) Is Comalco Industries Pty. Ltd. a partner in the Sardinia Alumina Refinery?

(5) Will the proposed new alumina refinery at Weipa be constructed by Comalco Industries Pty. Ltd. or does the company intend to assign its rights to this work to another company already formed or about to be formed?

Answers:—

(1) "The Government fully supports the view that a reasonable proportion of bauxite production should be exported, along with a reasonable balance of processing of alumina and of primary metal. It does not accept the extreme view that all mine production should be fully processed in Australia, or that companies should be compelled to undertake processing if it is not economic to do so. On the one hand, there will always be countries which need to import bauxite for their own processing plants and if Australia abdicates this market there are other bauxite producing areas which would be delighted to fill the gap. On the other hand, it has recently been pointed out that, to convert to metal, all of last year's bauxite output in Australia, would require another 2,400 million dollars to be spent on alumina refineries and smelters alone. In addition, it would require the installation of power generating facilities equal to another two Snowy Mountains Schemes. It may be mentioned in passing that the biggest single customer for Weipa bauxite continues to be the Gladstone Alumina Refinery and approximately 50 per cent. of output of Weipa bauxite is being processed in Australia."

(2) "The Government regards the establishment of the Alumina Refinery at Gladstone as a complete and more than full discharge of the requirements under the 1957 Lease Agreement to establish an Alumina Refinery within the State of Queensland. Nobody ever expected that an Alumina Refinery of such size would be set up within Queensland. From contemplating originally a 240,000 long tons per annum output, Comalco managed by setting up a consortium of significant world users of alumina to start off initially at 600,000 tons per annum. It was hoped that a first expansion might be achieved by 1970 but in fact by 1972 the plant will have an installed capacity of 2 million

tons and have an output twice as large as any other alumina plant in the world. By persuading a number of leading world producers of aluminium to join together in the Gladstone Consortium (between them they account for something like 35-40 per cent. of world aluminium production) Comalco achieved a permanent part for processed Queensland bauxite in the world pattern of alumina consumption. Planning for this consortium was proceeding in the early 1960s at a time when the Government fully endorsed the company's enterprise in catering for both bauxite and alumina markets and was happy to contribute to the financing of certain housing and harbour facilities—the whole cost of which is being recouped from the company. The policy that this Government has pursued has produced developments for the State of Queensland beyond anyone's wildest expectations."

(3) "Queensland now has a reasonable share of world alumina production facilities. It is understood that Comalco has tried to persuade aluminium producers within the European Common Market to take Australian alumina but there are severe limits on this because of a 9 per cent. tariff within the European economic community. There are special problems if Australia is to secure a footing among aluminium producers in that area. However, there is no tariff on bauxite and this has led Comalco successfully to form a consortium with a number of Common Market companies to build an Alumina Refinery in Sardinia. The benefits for Australia will be twofold: All of the participants have undertaken to purchase their bauxite from Weipa and Comalco, as an Australian company, will have at its disposal initially about 100,000 tons of alumina for placement within the Common Market. Any restrictive view, aimed at limiting raw bauxite exports and insisting on alumina exports, would have made the Sardinian venture impossible and achieved nothing in its place. Similar ventures would undoubtedly have been developed, based on bauxite from areas other than Australia. The decision of Comalco to take a share in the Shipping Company mentioned is an attempt to get for Australia some part of the shipping that will be needed—which otherwise would go to other countries. Negotiations in regard to establishment of an aluminium smelter in Queensland are proceeding."

(4) "Yes—except that the company's correct name is Comalco Limited."

(5) "It is too early to say whether the proposed second Alumina Refinery in Queensland will be constructed at Weipa or at another location but, if the company follows the previous successful methods which have already led to alumina production on a remarkable scale, it will have the full support of the Government."

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

APPOINTMENT OF MATRON AT "EVENTIDE", ROCKHAMPTON

Mr. V. E. JONES: I wish to ask two questions without notice. I direct the first one to the Minister for Health—

(1) Has a new matron been appointed at "Eventide", Rockhampton?

(2) If so, what is the name of the successful applicant?

(3) If not, when is it expected that the position will be filled?

Mr. TOOTH: The appointment has not yet been made. I expect that it will be made within the next fortnight.

EXPORT MEAT RAILED TO BRISBANE FROM CENTRAL QUEENSLAND

Mr. V. E. JONES: I direct the following question without notice to the Minister for Transport—

(1) Have meat products from Central Queensland been railed to Brisbane for export in recent times?

(2) At whose request were these consignments arranged and what were the freight rates?

Mr. KNOX: The question refers, no doubt, to the railing of meat products from the C.Q.M.E. Company to Brisbane. It was the C.Q.M.E. Company which requested that the rail service be provided. It also requested a reduction in the freight rate, which was granted. I am not prepared to reveal the actual freight rate.

VIETNAM MORATORIUM MARCH

Mr. McKECHNIE: I direct the following question without notice to the Premier: As the Vietnam Moratorium Committee is reported to be bargaining with Cabinet in an endeavour to obtain approval to hold a march in Queen Street on Friday, 18 September, is Cabinet naive enough to accept an assurance of orderly behaviour from this committee or any other Communist organisation?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I did see in a Press report this morning that a representative of this organisation said that if they could get a permit to march down Queen Street there would be no sitting down, or any actions of that type. My Cabinet colleagues and I are not prepared to accept that assurance because those giving it have neither the authority nor the ability to give such an undertaking, particularly when one has in mind what happened when Brian Laver took part in one of the Labour Day processions. As hon. members will remember, he was uncontrollable.

All I want to say is, as I have already said this morning, that Cabinet has given full and careful consideration to this request, and we are determined to uphold law and

order. We have also made it quite clear that the Commissioner of Police and his officers have the full support and backing of the Government. It is, of course, the Superintendent of Traffic who receives all applications of this type and makes decisions on them, and I am quite sure that in coming to a decision in this case he will have due regard to all the necessary factors.

ENTRY OF POLICE TO UNIVERSITIES

Mr. AIKENS: I should like to ask the Minister for Works and Housing a question without notice. Notwithstanding the proposed inquiry, or any other odoriferous red herring, will the Minister give the House an unqualified assurance that the police will, of their own volition when they consider the circumstances warrant it, enter and enforce the law at the two Queensland universities, as they unhesitatingly do in all other places within the State?

Mr. HODGES: The answer is "Yes".

PRECAUTIONS AGAINST CHOLERA

Mr. R. E. MOORE: I should like to ask the Minister for Health a question without notice. Will the Minister inform the House what precautions the Government has taken against an outbreak of cholera in this State? Is sufficient serum available to immunise the public in the event of a major outbreak, and are the present food regulations adequate to exercise control of an actual outbreak?

Mr. TOOTH: Cholera is a "quarantinable" disease—if I may coin a word—and the responsibility for enforcing quarantine provisions rests with the Commonwealth Department of Health. I understand that anybody coming from an area where cholera is either endemic or pandemic must either possess a valid vaccination certificate or undergo the requisite period in quarantine.

With regard to serum, the Commonwealth Serum Laboratories are responsible for producing the serum or vaccine that is used in Australia, and I am sure that they will have sufficient in stock.

I understand that the hon. member is also desirous of knowing whether the various regulations are in force to prevent the spread of cholera in the event of its becoming a problem or a danger in Australia. People become afflicted by cholera through the mouth and the alimentary canal, usually from polluted water or food. The provisions under the public health Acts and the public health administration in Australia are very rigid in respect of that matter, and I think that the hon. member can rest assured that every precaution is taken.

PERMITS FOR MARCHES IN INNER-CITY STREETS

Mr. HUGHES: I ask the Premier: In view of the alarming trend to lawlessness by dissident malcontents and members of the Labour

Party in the conduct of demonstrations and marches, will the Premier give an undertaking that the Government will not give permits for such marches to take place in inner-city streets but provide permits for marches to take place in streets other than city streets and in areas in which the public will be least inconvenienced?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I believe that the question has already been answered, but I shall leave it to the Premier.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: As you indicated, Mr. Speaker, the question has largely been answered. It is one that the Cabinet has looked at very carefully. The Superintendent of Traffic will issue the permit, and I am quite sure that he will take into account all aspects not only of this projected march but also of future marches.

PAID AGITATORS AT QUEENSLAND UNIVERSITY

Mr. MELLOY: I wish to direct a question without notice to the Premier. Will he investigate the possibility that paid agitators have been planted at the Queensland University to foment disruption of law and order, and that these agitators are employed by the Federal Government?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: That is the sort of question one would expect from the hon. member. Had he asked me a question relating to the "treason room" at the Trades Hall, I would have been able to give him a very clear and concise answer.

BY-LAWS TO CONTROL SURF-BOARD RIDERS

Mr. PORTER: I direct a question without notice to the Minister for Local Government and Electricity. As large crowds at all surfing beaches last week-end suggest that this summer there could be a threat of severe accident or even death to an ever-increasing number of bathers, especially children, from the actions of selfish and oafish board riders, knowing the Minister's concern in this matter, can he assure the House of the early drafting of model control by-laws, which have been long awaited by concerned surfside local authorities?

Mr. RAE: I appreciate the question from the hon. member for Toowong. It is a very good one. However, to permit of my acting in accordance with his wishes, I should be pleased to receive from him a written submission on which I can take appropriate action associated with the introduction of legislation to comply with his wishes.

BLUE NURSING SERVICE

Dr. CRAWFORD: Following the answers of the Minister for Health to a question that I asked a fortnight ago about the Blue Nursing Service, I now ask him: Has the investigation into the finances of the Blue Nursing Service now been completed? If so, could he give the House the information? If the necessary finance for sick aged beds is not to be provided, where can the

hundreds of sick aged patients be housed if the Blue Nursing Service has to cease functioning?

Mr. TOOTH: The inquiries have not yet been completed. I regard the hon. member's second question as hypothetical, as I do not think that such a situation is likely to arise.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING JUDGES

Mr. BENNETT: I wish to ask the Minister for Justice a question without notice—

(1) Is he aware of a circular dated 24 August, 1970, sent by 10 members of the Queensland Bar Association, claiming, by way of notice of a special meeting of the Bar Association—

(i) That the view of the association is that when a judge of the Supreme Court or District Court is, because of his appointment as Administrator, his absence on leave, the sittings of special tribunals, or for any other reason whatsoever, likely to be unable to participate in the ordinary sittings of the court of which he is a member for a period of four weeks or more, an acting judge should be appointed to that court for that period.

(ii) That the view of the association is that there is no obligation of any kind whatsoever on the Government to appoint as a judge of the Supreme Court or District Court any person who has been an acting judge of the court in question.

(iii) That the committee take all necessary steps to bring the view of the association expressed in (i) and (ii) above to the attention of the Attorney-General as soon as possible.

(2) In view of this feeling expressed by several members of the Bar Association, what does he propose to do in regard to the appointment of acting judges?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I am unaware of the existence of such a circular.

LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF QUESTIONS

Mr. BENNETT: I desire to place my last question on notice.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Minister did not ask for it to be placed on notice. The question has already been posed, and an answer given. If the hon. member wishes to place the question on notice he will have to wait until tomorrow morning. He has asked three questions, one of which has been answered.

FORM OF QUESTION

Mr. WRIGHT (Rockhampton South) having given notice of a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The question is out of order. It will have to be rephrased before it is acceptable.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—
EIGHTH ALLOTTED DAY

Debate resumed from 3 September (see p. 516) on Mr. Heatley's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, on which Mr. Houston had moved the following amendment:—

"Add to the Address the following words:—

'However, it is the opinion of this Legislature that your advisers have, by their actions, shown themselves unworthy of the high office they now hold and, as a result, they no longer hold the confidence of the people and this House.

'For the following, and other, reasons they show they are unworthy of their high offices:—

Acceptance by some Ministers of a preferential share offer by Comalco; expressed satisfaction by the Premier of the Commonwealth's treatment of Queensland at the last Loan Council and Premiers' Conference in the face of the fact that there is a grave need for more money for housing, development of electrical power, water conservation, drought relief, flood mitigation, provision of adequate hospital and dental services, provision of more normal and special schools and kindergartens and modern teaching aids; their failure to bring industrial harmony to our State; their failure to take active steps to halt the sharply rising costs of living and exploitation of consumers; failure of Ministers to obtain for this State a just return for the State's natural resources and allowing exploitation and destruction of many of our natural assets, such as the Cooloolo Sands Mass and surrounding areas; their failure to curb rising costs and take practical steps to find payable markets for our primary products; their failure to take effective steps to stop pollution of our air, water and land; their failure to resolve the question of freight discrepancies throughout the State and to implement a system of encouraging decentralised development; failure of your advisers to provide security for all Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders and to recognise them as fellow Queenslanders; their failure to deal with the intolerable situation which has developed within the Police Force under their administration; their failure to conduct a full public inquiry to allay public disquiet over the operations of the T.A.B. and its investments; failure to legislate to give long service leave conditions to all workers in industry, irrespective of their employer or calling.'

Mr. LICKISS (Mt. Coot-tha) (12 noon): On this, the occasion of the Address-in-Reply debate, I have pleasure in joining with the citizens of the electorate of Mt. Coot-tha in pledging our loyalty to Her Sovereign Majesty and in thanking His Excellency the Governor, Sir Alan Mansfield, for his devoted service to this State.

I congratulate my colleague the hon. member for Albert, Mr. Heatley, on so ably moving the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and the hon. member for Burdekin, Mr. Bird, on seconding the motion.

One merely notes, with passing interest, the political acrobatics of the Leader of the Opposition and his cohorts in relation to the amendment moved to the motion. I dismiss it forthwith for the cheap political gimmick that it is.

The previous speaker in this debate, the hon. member for Logan, delivered his usual type of speech—a type of speech for which he is becoming noted in this place. He devoted some time to the subject of education and then, as usual, soon lapsed from any semblance of logical thought and wound himself up into what appeared to be some sort of uncontrolled frenzy as he issued tirade after tirade of words which did little credit to him, wasted the time of the House, and I believe, must have been of acute embarrassment to his colleagues.

Mr. BALDWIN: I rise to a point of order. I find those personal remarks objectionable. I think they are irrelevant, and I ask for their withdrawal.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha has cast a personal reflection on the hon. member for Logan, and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. LICKISS: If the words are offensive, I certainly withdraw them. But I shall go ahead and prove that what I said is true. Let him be the judge of his own activity and reflect on his own contribution during this debate. Surely his performances in this place in advocating the causes of education, teacher service and other matters do him little credit. One can be forgiven for wondering what the teaching profession generally thinks of his representation as a former teacher, and of his advocacy. One presumes that he would consider himself an expert in this and other fields of Government activity, and that his utterances would stem from years of educational training and research and thus be based on proper concepts; an example, as it were, of education at its best.

What are the aims of education? Surely one would not be incorrect if one understood that education involves the training of the mind in an orderly manner so that it can establish the faculty to research, to record, to report, to draw conclusions and concepts, and to think on important issues; in other words, to seek the truth. Certainly one would

hope that it would aim at ensuring that one did not go off half cocked, as it were, and thus carelessly and needlessly mislead.

Surely these must be at least some of the aims of education. Yet here we have the self-professed advocate of proper education—and I place the word “proper” in inverted commas—in my view breaking the very basic rules which one would expect him, of all people in this place, to uphold and follow. If the hon. gentleman wishes to take me to task, let me refer to some of the points which he made relative to milk supplies in commenting on certain changes proposed by the Government. His utterances on this issue obviously stem from lack of knowledge and research.

Mr. BALDWIN: I rise to a point of order. I did not mention any proposal by the Government. My remarks related to information that I had received from milk producers.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LICKISS: The Government has already made a statement in relation to these matters, so I take it that the hon. member is not abreast of the times.

In his confusion, the hon. member referred to a price decrease by competition being offset by increased delivery and handling charges. On that point, he is near the kernel of the matter, and I find myself somewhat in agreement with him. However, in the next breath he virtually leaves the figurative rails and says that the people of Brisbane want more and cheaper milk, and in fact not more brands, deliveries and “preservatised gut-rot.”

Let us pause and relate that profound statement to the area of education—that is, facts and truth. It is a fact that milk in Brisbane is cheaper than it is in any other capital city in Australia, and of unsurpassed quality. If the hon. member had undertaken any research he could have ascertained those facts for himself. Research would also demonstrate to the hon. member that the per-capita consumption of milk in this city is higher than it is in any other capital city in Australia. Where, then, is the basis of his cry for cheaper milk and more milk, and where does he find justification for his term “preservatised gut-rot”? What rubbish!

If the hon. member for Logan is serious in what he has said, I should like the Minister for Primary Industries, as a matter of public interest, to make a ministerial statement on the quality of milk that the people of Queensland, particularly those in the Brisbane area, consume. Has the hon. member, for instance, drawn any serious comparison between milk and artificial soft-drinks for which, on the basis of quantity, the people pay higher prices?

The hon. member went on to refer to dairy farmers on the outskirts of Brisbane who are yearning for markets, and he implied that

standing between them and families are giant blockages in the form of monopolies and boards which he referred to as “artificial bottle-necks” and “price boosters”. Interesting indeed—but let us turn to the facts. Brisbane consumers, and those in the hon. member’s electorate, enjoy the cheapest milk of any capital city in Australia, and have the highest per-capita consumption rate. I have already mentioned that, and it has been shown by research. In addition, dairy farmers supplying the Brisbane milk district receive payments for their milk that are among the highest paid in Australia.

Also of particular interest for the hon. member for Logan is the fact that the margin between the price paid to the producer and the price paid by the consumer in the Brisbane milk market is the lowest in Australia. What does he say to that? In his crazed hatred of what he terms a monopoly, he has foolishly chosen a situation that was created by a former Labour Government. He has singled out for criticism one large Queensland company that not only finances the whole of the milk-supply operations in Brisbane but co-operates to such a degree that it allows itself to be part of a completely controlled system of price arrangement.

Mr. BALDWIN: I rise to a point of order. I did not single out any company by name, or mention any private company as being specifically involved. The hon. member must have a guilty conscience.

Mr. LICKISS: I am talking about what the hon. member referred to as a monopoly—and he was referring to Brisbane.

When compared with the position in the rest of Australia, the efficiency of the operation of this organisation speaks for itself. In relation to the points of order taken by the hon. member for Logan on things that may seem to him to be offensive, let me say that the truth speaks for itself, and I withdraw nothing of what I have said.

I could go on shooting the hon. member’s statements down in flames, but I shall refer to only one other statement that he made—without any research, I suggest—wherein he referred to the Government toadying to milk monopolies for political gain, and suggested that, under the guise of bringing cheap milk to the housewife, many small vendors and processors will go to the wall. What a stupid statement! Has the hon. member asked himself: where are these small processors? For his information, they do not exist. They went to the wall years ago in the interests of the economics of the dairying industry and the supply of quality milk to the people. So much for the hon. member for Logan putting into practice the end result of an expert on education and its progress.

Whilst on the milk issue, I noted with interest three measures proposed by the Government: firstly, the establishment of a

quota committee; secondly, the appointment of the president of the Q.D.O. to the Milk Board; and, thirdly, the variation of the Brisbane milk district. The first two proposals I believe to be a move in the right direction. However, I think that the third should be approached with a great deal of caution. I have outlined previously the advantages of the present system and, if time permitted, I could point out from my research the pitfalls that exist in the Government's proposal to invoke the third measure that it has raised. Perhaps on another occasion opportunity will be given for a debate on this subject. Let me suggest at this stage that the Government should exercise caution on this point. The proposal will not, in my opinion, assist the producer or the consumer in any way, nor will it assist any other section of the industry, either in the short or the long term.

I turn now to a matter that I believe to be of the utmost importance to this State and to the nation, and it has particular reference to Queensland. The tempo of our times and the problems, both present and future, are now demanding, not merely indicating, a need for the acceptance of a proper concept of town and regional planning for this State. Town and regional planning, backed by competent legislation, is a matter that can no longer be merely a talking point; it is a necessity right now. Lip service can no longer suffice because, in terms of planning, it is later than we think.

The post-war period demonstrated a definite world-wide trend to urbanisation. Planners were talking of the problems in the late 1950's and into the 1960's, as the accompanying problems of this trend were first projected and then witnessed. The trend is gathering momentum, and it can confidently be expected to accelerate to an extent where man now has to turn to such issues as environmental control and pollution prevention even to survive. This applies even in large countries, such as Australia, with a relatively small population.

Indications are that we are grasping at measures to alleviate, and in some instances to prevent, man damaging his environment beyond repair. The protection for future generations of a human environment in which they can live in a healthy state is our obligation right now, and we must accept that obligation. But are we properly organised not only to combat present problems but also to plan ourselves out of likely problems which can confidently be expected in the future? I believe that the simple answer is "No". We are not equipped to cater adequately for our present problems, which, by comparison with those that lie ahead of us, are of little consequence.

The basic requirement in all matters pertaining to a State or country is to plan adequately for people, because in the final analysis it is people who count. I call to mind a few instances, simple though they

may appear, which could, and would, have benefited from the deliberations of a properly constituted planning authority. For instance, I look to the reports of Wilbur Smith and Associates, firstly relative to transportation studies, and, secondly, to public transport studies. In themselves they are very satisfactory reports, obviously effected by competent people. But for the reports to be beneficial in the long term, we must realise that, in effect, Wilbur Smith's deliberations and findings have now set a pattern for development.

Has Wilbur Smith correctly interpreted the real planning needs of Brisbane, or the South-East Queensland region, in the interests of the people, or, conversely, has the servant—in other words, the motor vehicle—assumed the major role and become the master of our deliberations? Did Wilbur Smith decide, or was it a basic premise of his proposition that the present city sprawl would continue as policy, or at some stage was it indicated that the Government would, in the interests of proper planning concepts, step in to permit buffer zones between metropolises, connected by systems of rapid transport?

Who is advising whom and where are we going? I suppose the year 2000 is a good round number in the scheme of things, but does it have any special significance or merit? We have no real land-usage scheme planned for that period, but we have a transportation system proposed to cater for it. Indeed, under the present piecemeal system of planning, apart from some purely obvious trends, to my knowledge we have not even in the embryo stage a plan for land usage to cover this period. So that, to come out with his recommendations, Wilbur Smith had to make some sound guesses, and only posterity will determine how accurate they were.

It is a basic concept in planning that traffic movement is merely a means to an end. The motor vehicle must remain the servant; we must not allow it to become the master. Surely this issue alone demonstrates planning in isolation and the futility of it, when everybody knows, or should know, that planning, to be successful, must co-ordinate and be done primarily for people.

Another instance can be found in relation to this Brisbane Town Plan. I have here various Press cuttings. In "The Courier-Mail" of last Saturday, 5 September, we see a heading, "Clash on City Plan Looms. Study Group Seeks Revision." I compliment these people for devoting their time to examining the proposals in the city plan and making certain suggestions thereon to the Minister.

On Monday, we saw the headline, "Ald. Jones hits at Town Plan critics"—quite rightly so. I respect Ald. Jones for defending his council and the council planners in this matter. Again, in today's "Courier-Mail" the pot is still boiling with the headline, "Plan Criticism Unreasonable"—and so it goes on. But where does the Minister who advises the

Government stand on this vital issue of the capital city of Queensland, without planners and research facilities to advise him?

In my view, we are floundering. It is almost a case of the blind leading the blind in planning in this State. The solution must finally come from a competent body to advise government. At the moment, no such body exists and thus the Minister must be pressured by advice of various competence and be without the capacity to determine the issue on a proper basis. However, a decision has to be made and it has to be made soon.

Another example that one could quote is Cooloola. A planning authority should and would cater in advance for such matters. I sincerely trust that at this moment we are looking at similar situations that could arise and are designating well in advance areas that will be required to be set aside for national parks and reserves for the common good. All that development entails, such as land usage, transport, services generally, conservation, pollution protection and, in fact, everything under normal circumstances that affects man's environment, involves planning at one stage or another. We cannot escape from that fact.

To be successful, planning must be adapted to an accepted and proven policy. It must assume unlimited growth. We cannot plan now for a period and then plan from that period to another.

How planning is to be catered for is a matter for policy determinations and a study of trend patterns here and elsewhere. Decisions taken this day could have a profound bearing on future generations. Thus the year 2000 is merely a spark in time and means little in real terms. We tend to think of the future in terms of the present and often of the past, but a projection into the future of history in planning man's future environment must surely be largely a wasted exercise. We must project into the future. This is part of the task of competent planners and it is what Queensland needs right now.

In the past planners have tended to get the kicks, mainly because of intrusion by inexperienced politicians and the immediate pressures exerted by big business to move ahead. I would suggest that neither is acceptable. Within the scope of responsibility of Government, values must be correctly established in relation to planning. In the light of the anticipated population growth it is the task of planners to expand and adapt existing cities and to plan new centres. Planners must look forward beyond today's needs.

What are some of the problems of cities at the moment? Owing to the trend towards urbanisation, the problems must of necessity shift gradually from the shoulders of local government to the shoulders of the sovereign Government. This is an inescapable fact. As presently constituted, local government will find it increasingly difficult to cater for its own needs and development. Assistance at

various levels to local government from the State Government will be necessary, and this involvement will increase as time goes by. The day when planning can be determined at local-government level alone has long passed. We should acknowledge and accept this. Indeed, at this very moment in Brisbane we are witnessing this situation. Planning needs to be in partnership at the very least.

In broad terms of planning, what can Queensland look forward to? The answer is interesting. The State has a coastal belt with an assured rainfall, which is the prime requisite for supporting the State's future population. Therefore, we can envisage the coastal belt sustaining large centres of population. Next, we have the matter of resource development, which must be correctly orientated for maximum benefit to the economy and also to the people who will live in and around these centres. This, too, will be the responsibility of properly constituted planning authorities. All this spells planning in advance. Brisbane must not be allowed to develop, as Sydney has, into a costly sprawl. We can learn from the mistakes made in other places.

What are the signals to be recognised? First, the post-war trend towards urbanisation is accelerating on a world-wide basis. In the 1950's and 1960's urban problems became an issue. In the 1970's something will have to be done to resolve the issue. To ignore the present needs of proper planning in relation to man's environment and ultimate survival would be as foolhardy as trying to circumnavigate the world on a 44-gallon oil drum. Any political party that does not read the signs and grasp the nettle by instituting proper planning methods, and still hopes to meet with success, in my opinion is more optimistic than a clucky hen sitting on a china door-knob—and the results would be just as successful.

I make a plea for the early implementation of a town and regional planning authority. I trust that it will not be long before we see the implementation of the Government's policy relative to regional planning, as was adopted in our policy speech. I stress that proper planning is no luxury. Indeed, we can no longer afford the luxury of not planning man's future environment. All round us we can see the results of lack of planning. If we turn to Los Angeles and other cities similarly situated, we can see the problems they now face. Surely a common-sense approach would be to avoid what has happened elsewhere which has been to the disadvantage of man and his environment. We have a very direct responsibility to generations unborn to pass on this country in at least as good a state, if not a better state, than that which we have enjoyed during our lifetime.

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough) (12.27 p.m.): In opening my speech in this debate, I join with other hon. members in recording my loyalty to the Crown and my respect for

the Governor of this State, whom I thank for the service he is rendering to Queensland. However, one cannot use the word "loyalty" or express one's loyalty to the State, the Crown, and Australia as a whole, without desiring to register a protest against the scurrilous, muck-raking attacks levelled by Government members against members of the Australian Labour Party and top officials of that party, and to express disgust that a major political party—the combined Liberal-Country Party—should stoop to such methods in an effort to cover up an inglorious record of administration in this State. On the evidence that is available, members of the A.L.P. take second place to none on the Government side in their work in the community in Queensland, Australia and overseas. During the war years particularly, A.L.P. members took second place to no Government member.

It should be remembered that the Labour Governments in both State and Commonwealth spheres built a magnificent record by introducing monumental legislation which has been of great benefit to this country in its developing years. We look to a Labour Government for legislation such as that promulgated by the Commonwealth Labour Government in its early days when it placed on the Statute Book the Commonwealth banking legislation, the note issue legislation, legislation relative to the establishment of the Australian fleet and legislation providing forms of military training for young people.

In the State sphere, we hope that the present Government will follow the grand years of legislation in the interests of rural industry in Queensland on which the Labour Party can look back with pride. Any progress that the Government can claim to have made in this State can be attributed only to the investment of money from overseas. This Government did not place in the ground the oil that was discovered. Work was being done by the Australian Labour Party in this direction when it was in power. The bauxite agreement was almost ready for signing; it certainly would have been much tighter under a Labour Government, and would have ensured the establishment in this State of an aluminium refinery, and not simply an alumina works.

In supporting the Leader of the Opposition's amendment, I point out that each item in his amendment is sufficiently important to be used as the basis for a motion for the adjournment of the House or for moving a vote of no confidence in the Government. It has not often happened in the past that there have been so many issues that could be included in an amendment of this type. It is because of this that the loyalty of the Australian Labour Party and its political machine is being questioned.

It was the Australian Labour Party that gave its service in Government to this country during both world wars. What a grand

record it has in work done in the Commonwealth sphere by the Governments led by Mr. Curtin and Mr. Chifley during the second world war. If the A.L.P. had any desire to engage in treasonable activities or to be disloyal to the country, what a wonderful opportunity it had then. This has been the form of attack on the A.L.P. throughout the years. The Australian Labour Party was not responsible for the actions of directors of companies which ordered dummy bolts to be put into ships built during war-time. It was not responsible for the companies which had rotten leather placed in soldiers' boots, resulting in the Government of the day having to step in. Neither the A.L.P. nor its official organisation was responsible for the unmerciful profiteering that went on in this country during both world wars.

When the Labour Party was being established and there were strikes in the 1890's, orders went out from a Tory Government to use Gatling guns on the strikers and to fire low and aim straight. As the result of some of those strikes, many union leaders in the western areas were imprisoned for long periods.

Then came the Boer War, and the A.L.P. was branded as being pro-Boer.

Then the first Labour Government, led by Andrew Fisher, came to office. It was claimed that the Labour Party would introduce free love and destroy religion. When the note issue was made for the Commonwealth Bank, advertisements appeared in the Press, and statements were made, that "Fisher's flimsies" could be bought on the street corner for a song.

Then came the first world war and we were accused of being pro-Kaiser. Then came what the Tory Party in this State considered to be a blessing, namely, the Russian Revolution. We were attacked as being pro-Bolshevik and I.W.W., and this sort of thing has continued throughout the years.

I believe that the people who do the greatest disservice to this country are those who endeavour to smear either of the two major political parties in this State as being guilty of treason or other actions subversive to the interests of the country. After all, there are certain principles basic to the development and safety of this country on which there must be agreement.

Mr. Murray: Let us not confuse smearing with legitimate criticism.

Mr. DAVIES: That is the way it has always been regarded. I advise the hon. member to study the political history of this country. The problem of today is one that has arisen before. When legislation to set up the first Council of Agriculture was before the House, the Labour Party was accused of endeavouring to "Sovietise" rural industries, and of following in the steps of Russia. Those remarks are recorded in "Hansard".

That attitude will persist whilst there is in office a Government such as the present one, which endeavours to cover up its ineptitude and failure to legislate satisfactorily in the interests of the State. It must be remembered that the present State Government has been in power for 13 years and the Commonwealth Government for 20 years, so the Labour Party cannot be blamed for any failure to maintain order. Governments make laws, so, if there are signs of treason, let them prove their capacity to control such activities in this country and see that nothing is done to the detriment of Australia as a whole. Governments must accept full responsibility for that task.

The present State Government has been guilty of many actions that have not been in the interests of the State as a whole. It is a Government that is squabbling internally, and lacking in stability. Recently Cabinet, meeting at Longreach, considered the reduction of the voting age to 18 years. I do not know what happened there, or what influenced their judgment—I do not know whether they drank too much goat's milk—but they decided that 18-year-olds should have the vote.

Mr. Row: It was at Hughenden.

Mr. DAVIES: Hughenden—that is so.

On Cabinet's return to Brisbane, caucus voted against that decision. A report was supposed to have been produced. Over the years Cabinet, through Government departments, has been in a position to make inquiries into the wisdom of reducing the age of voting, and information on that subject was available from all countries. Surely members of Cabinet would at all times have consulted with their caucus and given them all the information they had. It was certainly a blow to the Government to have to admit to the people of this State, particularly the young people, after all the articles that had appeared in the Press and the discussions that had taken place among groups of young people, that the decision had been reversed. There have been other instances of reversed decisions, too.

Then there is the gerrymandering of electoral boundaries that took place when they were last re-arranged, and is no doubt taking place now. I always thought that a judge or a commission would be appointed to look into this matter, but it appears that the Government is doing all the searching and endeavouring to arrange a compromise between the parties. If such a commission is to be independent and able to make decisions without Government influence, why all this behind-the-scenes intrigue? It is quite evident that the Government is going to appoint a commission that will do as it is told. It will be handed the rearrangement of the boundaries on a platter and told that that is what they must be.

Mr. R. E. Moore: You are looking at Labour's past record.

Mr. DAVIES: It is surprising that, whenever the Government is faced with something that is embarrassing to it, it looks back into the record of former Governments and says, "You did that." The argument is that it must be all right because somebody else did it, which is rather a stupid argument. I notice that the hon. member for Windsor has not denied the truth of what I am saying, and the people of Queensland will watch with great interest the Government's endeavours to rearrange the boundaries to suit both Government parties and keep the Labour Party out of office. I remind the house that at the last election A.L.P. candidates secured more votes than did the candidates of both Government parties combined.

Mr. Jensen: Do you think they will alter the boundaries to keep the hon. member for Windsor in? I do not think that is very probable.

Mr. DAVIES: The people will take care of that, no matter what the boundaries are for the next election, and the hon. member will not be returned.

There is one matter on which I wish to touch briefly before dealing with the treatment of the Blue Nursing Service in this State, which is a very embarrassing problem for the Government. I remind hon. members that the Government is led by a Premier who claims to have certain principles relative to gambling, drink and many other matters. One would have thought that, with the introduction of certain legislation, he would have resigned rather than remain as Premier of the State. Evidently the honour and glory of his position mean more to him than his principles.

When the hon. gentleman was sitting on the Opposition benches, he frequently stood up and stated his views upon these questions; yet when he is Premier of the State he supports everything that is brought forward relative to them. The activities of the T.A.B. make that obvious. I do not intend to deal with those activities from the same angle as that argued by the hon. member for Barooma, but I do point out that the Premier must hold himself responsible for the expansion of opportunities for gambling in Queensland.

The Government changed from an S.P. betting system to a T.A.B. system—I shall not argue the merits of that change at this stage—and it is now endeavouring to establish a T.A.B. agency wherever possible. Even at the big Woolworths centre at Southport there is a T.A.B. agency round the corner in the building. The Government cannot claim that it is not endeavouring to exploit the people of this State by encouraging gambling. Not only are people encouraged to gamble on the T.A.B. on Saturdays, and to some extent on Wednesdays; there is no doubt that the Government is encouraging a big build-up of interest in racing at many centres throughout Australia to increase gambling on the T.A.B.

Turning to the Blue Nursing Service, I believe that the council of that service is now engaged in a struggle for its existence against the Country-Liberal Government in this State, and I shall proceed to prove my point. Never in the political history of Queensland has a Government revealed a similarly callous attitude towards a Christian organisation such as the Blue Nursing Service. All members of the Government, including Cabinet, should be fully aware of the position. Or is the Minister for Health failing in his duty to draw the attention of Government members and Ministers to what is happening? Is he in error in the allocation of funds? Actually, the Premier of the State must accept full responsibility for this because he has been aware of the situation, if not prior to 1970, at least from the beginning of this year. He realises the full implications of the withdrawal of the \$1.50 subsidy from hospitals, not only hospitals run by the Blue Nursing organisation but others run by charitable and church organisations, which provide intensive nursing care.

Whatever the reason for the withdrawal, the Government must accept full responsibility for this neglect of the aged. Speaking in the Address-in-Reply debate, one Government member—the hon. member for Mirani—expressed regret at the Government's neglect, but as a member of the Government he must accept his share of the blame.

Instead of indulging in a tirade of abuse against the Australian Labour Party, which, as I said before, is one of the two great political groups in this country, and false accusations and wicked insinuations, the hon. members for Yeronga and Redcliffe, the Minister for Main Roads, and the Premier would have been better occupied in placing before the House problems associated with financing the great work of this grand Christian order, the Blue Nursing Service, and in pointing out the horrible financial future facing the hospitals for sick aged and other departments run by this service.

The hon. member for Redcliffe spent his full time in the debate, as he did a number of years ago, in labelling innocent people in the Labour organisation in the State as Communists, which they are not. His time would have been better spent in protesting against the Government's neglect of the hospital for sick aged in his own electorate. I will have to do this on his behalf. The hon. member for Mirani mentioned that a home for the sick aged, known as Nazarene, was built at Redcliffe last year. The hospital committee was assured by this Government that the subsidy of \$1.50 would remain. As a member of the State council of the Blue Nursing Service, and as one who heard the arguments and discussion on the necessity for, and the wisdom of, building this hospital, I am quite confident that had this guarantee not been received the hospital

would not have been built. But, approximately three months after it was opened on 16 October, the subsidy was withdrawn.

Mr. Houston: That would be done deliberately.

Mr. DAVIES: I would say it was done deliberately. The Government deliberately deceived the committee of the Blue Nursing Service which built the "Nazarene" home.

In support of my argument I refer to some of the statements made by the hon. member for Mirani in this debate. I took particular note of them and I think I copied them down correctly. He said—

"I have often wondered why the Government withdrew that subsidy? I believe it was because the Government claimed that the payment of the subsidy was no longer necessary in view of the increased Commonwealth subsidy of \$5 a day."

In January 1969, it was raised from \$2 to \$5. The hon. member continued—

"To me my Government adopted a short-sighted policy."

I might add, led by a short-sighted Premier. I should like to know how this neglect fits in with the moral code this Government claims to have. The hon. member for Mirani also said—

"Although it is my Government, I am not prevented from criticising the action that it took. It is evident that an investigation was not made before action was taken to withdraw the subsidy of \$1.50 per bed per day."

What is the Premier doing about matters such as this? What is the Minister for Health doing? Is it any wonder that a prominent medical man in this House rises and draws attention to the weaknesses in the administration of the present Minister?

Mr. Houston: The Liberal Party fully supported the Government's action of withdrawing the subsidy.

Mr. DAVIES: So did the hon. member for Windsor. He yells inane interjections across the Chamber, but not once has he raised his voice on matters like the plight of this State's rural industries or the Government's neglect of the Blue Nursing Service, which I am exposing now. By the time I have concluded my speech perhaps he will want to keep very quiet.

The hon. member for Mirani continued—

"That increased cost (that is, wages), together with the loss of the State subsidy of \$1.50 a bed a day, or \$10.50 a week, will be disastrous to the Blue Nursing Service if it cannot be given some relief."

He said that it was very difficult for the Nazarene hospital to carry on. It is situated in the electorate of the hon. member for Redcliffe, but even he has not raised his voice on the matter. The Blue Nursing Service has appealed to hon. members for assistance, and,

as it has been neglected by Government members, I have been asked by our A.L.P Opposition to raise the matter in parliament.

The hon. member for Mirani said that the Nazarene hospital had been let down badly.

Mr. Melloy: Who said this?

Mr. DAVIES: The hon. member for Mirani. I said that on 1 January, 1969, the Commonwealth Government raised its subsidy for intensive-nursing patients from \$2 a bed to \$5 a bed. It was not until one year later that this Government saw fit to take away the \$1.50, and at a time when it knew that large increases would be granted in nurses' wages, and justifiably so. The Government must have expected those wage increases, yet it withdrew the subsidy at that time. I should like the Minister to tell us the reasons for that delay. Was the Government conducting negotiations with other hospitals, which led it to continue with its deceit for 12 months? I suspect that it was, and perhaps it was justified in doing so, but the Government was dishonest about the Blue Nursing Service and other church organisations that were maintaining intensive nursing beds.

Let me look at the desperate situation in which the Nazarene hospital is placed.

Mr. Lonergan: You are in a bit of a desperate situation yourself, the way you are floundering.

Mr. DAVIES: Despite the endeavour by the hon. member for Flinders to ridicule the Opposition's case, we will continue to fight the injustice perpetrated on the Blue Nursing Service by the Government.

Mr. R. E. Moore: Why haven't you mentioned it before?

Mr. DAVIES: As even the hon. member for Windsor, with his dull mind, could understand, I am the foundation patron of the service in my electorate and also on the State Council, so I should know a little more than the ignoramus from Windsor.

The Nazarene hospital for the sick aged at Redcliffe is in a sad financial plight. Of the 40 patients, 39 are pensioners. At June, 1970, six months after the removal of the subsidy and following increases in costs generally, the hospital faced a deficit of \$8,000. Its budget for 1970-71 has been drawn up, and it reveals that the increased wages and removal of the subsidy have resulted in an anticipated deficit on operational expenses of \$31,000. In addition to that, the hospital has a capital debt of \$120,000. The hospital charges pensioners \$14 or \$15 a week, and in order to make ends meet it would have to increase that charge by \$10. Whether or not the hospital will be forced into making that decision is on the head of this Government.

The hon. member for Windsor asked, "Why wasn't this brought up in the House before?" I point out that under this Government a long time passes between sittings of Parliament. From the beginning of the year

until now, intense negotiations have been under way between the Blue Nursing Service and the Minister in an attempt to overcome the problem. When they found that they were up against a brick wall, they decided that they had to bring the matter under the public gaze. Five hospitals in the Blue Nursing organisation are affected, as are other hospitals associated with different organisations. I shall have some comments to make later about Greenhaven, at Southport, which is in a very serious plight. I hope the Premier is in the House when I make them.

Mr. Jensen: The Pioneer Home has been hit.

Mr. DAVIES: The Pioneer Home in Bundaberg has been hit hard. Lauriston at Ipswich, Kewarra at Coolangatta, the Good Samaritan at Cairns, and Nazarene at Redcliffe have all been affected. These five hospitals were given only one day's notice of the cessation of the subsidy payment of \$1.50. That was a callous, inhuman act, because it affected people in a desperate plight. All people associated with these hospitals that care for the sick aged, including those belonging to the organisation, and those who visit homes for the sick, were staggered by the Government's action.

The "Gold Coast Bulletin" of Tuesday, 25 August, contained this statement by Mr. Rod Blair, manager of the Southport-Surfers Paradise Blue Nursing Service, about Greenhaven, the Blue Nursing Service hospital for the chronically-ill aged—

"Mr. Blair said the subsidy affected about nine non-profit making church or charitable organisation hospitals throughout the State, five of them Blue Nursing Service hospitals, two of them...on the Gold Coast.

"The \$1.50 State Government subsidy had been withdrawn in a letter from the Department of Health dated December 29, 1969...

"Withdrawal of the subsidy, which amounted to \$27,000 a year, was effective from January 1, 1970..."

They had exactly one day's notice to find a sum of money that they had already budgeted for, and that they had to wipe off their budget. Mr. Blair is then reported as saying—

"...because for weeks intensive negotiations..."

I know that to be true. The statement continues—

"... was going on between the board, the Department of Health and the Minister, in the hopes of reinstating the \$1.50 subsidy."

No drive was made to put pressure on the Government in this regard. The Premier played a very inglorious part in the happenings at this centre, because it was he who saw committee members of the Greenhaven

Nursing Home just before the Albert by-election and pleaded with them to keep the matter quiet because he knew there would be public reaction that would affect the by-election result. No doubt it would have, too, as the voting was very close.

How does that fit in with the moral code that the Premier and Government members claim to practise? They attack the Labour Party on various issues, yet the Premier deliberately deceived the people in that area by telling the committee, which was depending on Government help, to rebuild the top floor at Greenhaven, which had been declared unsafe as a fire hazard. Of course, his statement would amount to a command—"Keep this quiet; keep it from the public that we are taking the \$1.50 from you."

Mr. Blair was reported as saying—

"The Premier said to me he would appreciate it if no news release concerning the withdrawal of State subsidy were made for the time being."

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

Mr. DAVIES: The article continues—

"... Mr. R. Ashton ... asked him if he realised how such a news release would embarrass the Government."

"The Premier replied, "I realise that.""

The Premier said that 'something would have to be done' about rebuilding Greenhaven."

The fact that the Premier wanted this information withheld from the public just prior to a by-election speaks very little for the Government's moral standards.

Mr. Blair also said—

"Since absolutely nothing has been done by the State Government, the Blue Nursing Service is wondering whether the Premier's concern was for Greenhaven or for the by-election."

In the "Gold Coast Bulletin" dated 25 August, 1970, the editorial reads—

"Crux of the problem is withdrawal of the \$1.50 a day State Government subsidy. . . . it is scandalous that the needy aged should be confronted with a situation which adds to the worry of their struggle."

I shall now draw attention to another hospital for the sick aged, namely, Lauriston Home. In "The Queensland Times" dated 26 August, 1970, the following article appears:—

"A letter from the Ipswich General Hospital Medical Superintendent (Dr. Michael O'Rourke) regarding the Blue Nursing Service's Lauriston Home was read at yesterday's meeting of the Ipswich Hospitals Board.

"Dr. O'Rourke's letter stated: 'The Ipswich General Hospital has been extremely dependent upon the Blue Nursing Service at Lauriston for the care of a large percentage of geriatric patients. Both the hospital and Lauriston have

worked together in extremely close liaison, certainly over the past three years during my stay at this hospital and presumably for many years before.

"We tend to work together as a unit rather than two separate units, and they have taken a large percentage of our geriatric and invalid cases which require heavy and continued nursing care. This, of course, has given us freedom of beds and of nursing staff.

"On many occasions over the past years, I have spoken with senior members of the Health Department, expressing our gratitude towards Rev. Moore and his colleagues at Lauriston and, with the continued activity at this centre, we have not required a geriatric unit at this hospital.

"Should this institution close through lack of funds, there would be no possibility of this hospital having sufficient room to handle the 80 or so patients requiring maximum nursing care, who should suddenly appear on our doorstep.

"I think it is incumbent upon this hospital and this Hospital Board to call upon the Health Department to help in all possible ways. Without a shadow of doubt, should they not be able to carry on, the hospital would be forced to build a geriatric block running into hundreds of thousands of dollars and, of course, these blocks are not built overnight. I do not know what we would do in the meantime. We could either become a geriatric centre with no beds and transfer all acute cases to Brisbane (really unthinkable for a hospital draining a population of 100,000) or financial assistance be made available to this organisation.

"We have eight patients at present awaiting transfer to Lauriston who have nowhere else to go."

In the same newspaper, the following statement appears:—

"The Premier, Dr. Udy went on, had said, 'Having regard to all the circumstances it is considered that the additional Commonwealth benefit will more than compensate for the loss of State subsidy and I do not feel there is any justification for reintroducing the payment of the State daily maintenance subsidy.'"

I say that is just a lot of rubbish, and that the Premier is misguided and ill-informed.

I now pass quickly to some particulars of Lauriston. There are 111 people in this home for the aged, 104 of whom are pensioners. Ninety per cent. of them are incontinent, which means that they have lost control of bowels or bladder. Almost all have to be assisted with feeding, and are bed patients. Some cannot eat at all without assistance.

When the hospital was in receipt of \$3.50 for each bed, \$2 from the Commonwealth and \$1.50 from the State, the cost a week for

the maintenance of each bed was \$20. It is now \$56. How can the Minister expect the hospital to maintain its service on only \$5 a week from the Commonwealth? There are 79 heavy intensive cases in the hospital, and 32 light cases. No subsidy is received from the State for the light-nursing beds.

I pass now to another rather serious matter. Some time ago 14 patients were discharged from Lauriston by direction of the Department of Health. The word had gone around that, as a result of loving Christian care by the nurses in blue, some patients had shown marked improvement. The Government therefore decided on a blitz, and 14 patients were declared by the Department of Health to be well enough to be discharged. The health of those patients had improved, and the fact that the Department of Health ordered their discharge, which means that they would receive no further subsidy, indicates that the Government is devoid of human feeling for the frail aged.

It is generally recognised by those who understand geriatrics that there is an improvement in the general well-being of many patients as a result of devoted, dedicated and loving care. The Blue Nursing programme is, naturally, patient centred, and aimed at giving efficient nursing care to patients and relief to relatives, and to provide an atmosphere of "home" where love, compassion and understanding bring joy, peace and contentment to our aged friends. It seems beyond the understanding of the Government, particularly the Minister for Health, that patients who appear to be so improved will deteriorate once they are removed from that special care. The Minister said, "No more subsidy for them." This amounted to saying, "They can be passed out into the street as far as we are concerned."

The committee of the Blue Nursing Service built an annexe into which, after homes were found for three of the patients, the remainder were taken. Not one cent has been received in subsidy from the Commonwealth or State Governments for that annexe, and not one cent is received in subsidy for the beds that those patients still occupy.

(Time, on motion of Mr. Thackeray, extended.)

Mr. DAVIES: I thank the House; I shall not take up much more time.

At present Lauriston is losing \$10 a week for every patient receiving intensive nursing, and \$800 a week for all patients. On the light-nursing annexe, \$300 a week is being lost. The 1970-71 budget provides for a deficit of \$45,000. Lauriston is charging patients less than the pension, and the board is determined not to go beyond that amount.

One of the reasons why Lauriston can keep costs down is the work done by volunteers who make their services available as a result of the splendid image that has been created in the community mind. Some 100

volunteers, who receive no wages or allowances, give their services at Lauriston; they go into the hospital and help feed the patients, many of whom cannot feed themselves.

Wages for nursing staff present a big problem. We do not dispute recent increases granted to nurses; we believe their wages to be fully justified. For a full-time sister, the increase granted was \$12 a week, bringing her wage from \$41.14 to \$53 a week. The council of the Blue Nursing Service is asking for an increase of \$500 in subsidy from the State for each sister, and that would be met \$1 for \$1 by the Commonwealth. In fact, the Commonwealth Government is willing to go far beyond a \$500 increase on \$1,100, but if the Government of Queensland would grant an increase of even \$400 or \$500 for each sister, that would be matched by the Commonwealth and would relieve the situation considerably. The door-knock appeals that the organisation holds simply go towards meeting the cost of wages.

In addition to its homes for the sick aged, the Blue Nursing Service has homes for the aged—Pleasantville, at Wynnum; Gold Coast Garden Settlement, at Southport; "Salvin Park", at Carina—and there is no subsidy for these. It did have other plans for development, but these, of course, will have to be put aside until it receives more sympathetic treatment from the Government.

To quickly give hon. members some idea of the tremendous development that has taken place in the Blue Nursing Service in this State, I point out that in 1966-67 the number of calls, 317,338, was 10 per cent. higher than that in 1965-66. In 1967-68 the increase was 10.7 per cent., and in 1968-69 it was 14.3 per cent. I am informed that the increase in 1969-70 was similar to that in 1968-69. In 1958-59, 10 years earlier, the number of calls was 85,758; in 1968-69 it was 400,632—an increase of 367 per cent. in 10 years.

Taking the number of miles covered, in 1966-67 there was a 4 per cent. increase over the previous year, an increase of 8.9 per cent. in 1967-68, and an increase of 6.4 per cent. in 1968-69. Again, I am informed that the increase in 1969-70 was approximately the same as that in 1968-69. From the commencement of the service to the end of the last financial year, the total mileage covered by cars of the Blue Nursing Service from the 19 centres in the State—from Cairns in the north to Coolangatta in the south, out to Mt. Isa, and in the many centres along the coast—was 5,370,953, or 2,685 times the mileage from Cape York to Wilson's Promontory. That indicates the tremendous growth in and need for such a service in the State. It indicates also the load that would be placed upon Queensland's hospital system but for the Blue Nursing Service.

It must be remembered that the Blue Nursing Service is a home service, established especially, but not exclusively, for the sick

aged. It is a seven-day-a-week service during the day, and it is available to all members of the community, irrespective of class, colour, or creed. It is a ministry of healing offered in the name of the Christian church to people of all denominations, and it is free of charge. I point out that it is staffed by fully trained sisters. Those who have experience of their work know that there is something special about these cheery sisters. As a result of their work with the Blue Nursing Service, their dedication to their job and their cheerful approach to it, they seem to bring with them a ray of sunshine. The people whom they visit certainly derive tremendous comfort from them.

I am sadly disappointed at the attitude of some doctors and some matrons in this State. It is quite evident that these people, though small in number, are having an influence on the Minister for Health. It is known that some matrons say that the Blue Nursing Service should have nursing aides instead of fully qualified sisters in the various hospitals for the sick aged and doing the work that the Blue Nurses do in visiting so many patients each day. That is an attitude which I find difficult to understand, and I hope that the Blue Nursing Service will never depart from the principal that they must be fully trained sisters. Of course, many of them—as many as the council can arrange for—have special training in geriatric work. I think that the few medical men who pull back on the traces and do not encourage the service are afraid that their incomes will be affected by the fact that they will receive fewer calls from the people who are assisted by the Blue Nurses. I regret having to place that view on record.

Mr. Jensen: You would not consider that the Government is thinking of legalising euthanasia to avoid paying out this money?

Mr. DAVIES: I am so shocked by the actions of the Government that I am—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Frankly, such a foolish remark as that emanating from the hon. member for Bundaberg adds little to the lustre of this Chamber. His remark imputes improper motives to the Government, and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. Jensen: Mr. Speaker, I must withdraw—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! It is not a matter of must; I am asking the hon. member to withdraw. I do not want any comment in the matter.

Mr. Jensen: I withdraw.

Mr. DAVIES: I did not hear what the hon. member said.

I was saying that I was shocked at the Government's approach to this problem, and particularly at the actions of the Premier during the Albert by-election. They were

not in keeping with what one might expect not only from a Premier but also from any member of Parliament canvassing an election. When asked during the campaign to help finance the improvements to Greenhaven, the Premier pleaded that the fact that the \$1.50 subsidy was being taken away be kept secret. I hope that the manager of the home in Southport will not be victimised in the same way as the Premier has victimised members of the Press. It is well known that he has placed a black ban on reporters of "The Australian" and also the television series, "This Day Tonight". I have every reason to believe that this is correct. If it is, it savours of dictatorial ideas and principles.

I regret that this matter has had to be brought into the political arena, but the council of the Blue Nursing Service has been patient for several months and it is time that publicity was given to this matter and the Government exposed for its inhumanity and lack of sympathy with the problems of aged people who are unable to care for themselves. On behalf of those people who work so hard on women's auxiliaries and in other ways to raise funds, I make this protest on behalf of the Opposition against the Government's neglect and plead with it to reconsider the whole position and to realise that the Blue Nursing Service, just as is the Pioneer home in Bundaberg and many other homes run by religious bodies and other organisations, is saving the Government tremendous sums of money. The Government would not be able to face up to the situation if it was confronted with the closure of these various homes.

I leave the matter at that and hope that this publicity will so shame the Government that it will respond to the appeal of the Opposition to increase the present subsidy from \$1,100 to \$1,500 or \$1,600, an increase of \$400 or \$500 which will be met \$1 for \$1 by the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth Government has stated that it is willing to go beyond that. It is simply a matter of the State deciding on a figure. With the increase in wages, which we say is justified—and which we are pleased to see—because these sisters are doing such a magnificent job, we plead for an increased subsidy and also for the restoration of the \$1.50 a head for patients receiving intensive nursing care, not only in the five Blue Nursing Service homes but in any other home in the State that is doing similar work.

Mr. DIPLOCK (Aubigny) (2.34 p.m.): Until the Treasurer, on Thursday last, replied to a question without notice by the hon. member for Toowong, I did not intend to speak on this motion. The hon. member for Toowong asked the Treasurer—

"In view of the attitude attributed by the Press to Senator Gair, which casts some considerable doubt, I would think, on eventual Federal Government passage of the receipt-duty legislation, is the Treasurer

in a position to indicate what effect this doubt will have on his budgetary considerations?"

I have no fault to find with that question. In fact, if I were in the seat occupied by the hon. member for Toowong probably I would ask a similar question.

The Treasurer replied—

"I have no knowledge of what was said last evening by Senator Frank McManus other than what appeared in the Press this morning. The report indicates that, after consultation with Senator Gair, the D.L.P. has decided to oppose the receipt-duty legislation in the Senate. Based on that opposition, no doubt it is expected by the D.L.P. and others that the receipt-duty legislation will be defeated.

"I cannot quite understand the attitude adopted by Senator Gair in this matter. Undoubtedly the defeat of the receipt-duty legislation will cause chaos not only in the finances of this State but also in those of other States. In all other States this tax is already being paid at the rate that is desired by the Commonwealth, at the request—let me emphasise this—of all States. The situation now is that South Australia has included receipt duty in its budget; New South Wales and Victoria have also included it; and I have taken it into consideration in preparing Queensland's budget.

"All I can say to the hon. member is that I propose to proceed on the assumption that receipt duty will come into operation. If it does not, the matter will have to be discussed between the Commonwealth and the States as chaos will be caused in the finances of all the States of Australia."

I take objection to the Treasurer's answer because in it he gave a wrong impression of the D.L.P.'s attitude towards the Commonwealth Government's endeavour to validate the receipt-duty tax. The Treasurer said that Mr. Gair made up his mind on this matter after a discussion with Senator McManus. Everyone knows that that is not true. This matter came before the Federal Parliament previously, and the D.L.P. made its position very clear. Its attitude has been constant and has not changed at any time.

The Treasurer said that he could not quite understand the attitude adopted by Senator Gair in this matter, and added that his attitude would cause chaos in the State's finances. The States were well aware that the legislation would not be passed and that, if they introduced their own legislation in the belief that the D.L.P. was bluffing or would not stand with the A.L.P. in the matter, they would not have the right to blame the D.L.P. for the chaotic state of their finances. The States knew very well that the D.L.P. had not changed its attitude.

The Treasurer continued—

"The situation now is that South Australia has included receipt duty in its budget; New South Wales and Victoria have also included it; and I have taken it into consideration . . ."

He did not say that those States had included it with the full knowledge that it would be validated only until 1 October. But the Commonwealth Government—the Prime Minister—knew this, and I feel quite sure that, despite the overtures that were made to the D.L.P., no State had any doubt about the D.L.P.'s stand on the proposed tax.

The Treasurer knows as well as I do that, when the High Court ruled that the States did not have the power to collect this tax, the tax collected by certain States was five times as great as that levied in this State. It was in his power prior to the High Court's ruling to increase the Queensland tax to the level of the similar tax in other States. Why didn't he do it? He was not prepared to do it for fear of political repercussions.

The Treasurer is well aware, too, that if the Federal Government were given the authority it seeks it would have to impose the tax uniformly in all States. If the tax were imposed in Queensland at the same level as in some States before the High Court ruling—and this would mean an increase in this branch of taxation of 400 per cent.—it would be a particularly grievous burden in rural areas because of the size of our State and the consequent freight rates to country centres.

The Treasurer claimed that the revenue from this tax is indispensable, but this did not seem to concern him when he had to accept the political odium for levying such extra taxation. Now that the Federal Government will bear the odium and he will get the benefits, he finds that this revenue is most necessary. It was interesting to read a day or two ago that his colleague the New South Wales Premier, Mr. Askin, was reported as being much more frank. He publicly condemned the tax by saying that he did not think it was fair. I feel personally that there is surely a way by which equivalent revenue can be found from Federal revenue.

I conclude my thoughts on this matter by saying that the D.L.P. is not alone in its opposition to this proposed legislation. If it were alone the legislation would be passed. I am sure that all members would have received a copy of a letter which I received a few days ago from the Taxpayers' Association of Queensland, a reputable body whose council consists of men who have proven themselves in business, men who are as well qualified to express an opinion on this matter as anyone in this House. What

did they have to say in this letter which they sent to all Federal Parliamentarians prior to the Budget? They said—

"This Association is deeply concerned at the suggestion from many quarters that in an endeavour to combat the inflationary tendencies there will be an increase in taxation in the current Federal Budget.

"We deplore this illogical reasoning.

"Any taxation which increases costs of those engaged in production, distribution or rendering service in any way must have an adverse effect on the charges to be made and therefore must encourage rather than inhibit incipient inflation."

Later this statement appears in the letter—

"Earlier this year this Association and the Queensland Chamber of Manufactures mounted a strong campaign against the action of the Commonwealth Government in its endeavour to validate the obnoxious State Receipts Duty and we again take the opportunity of stressing our vehement opposition to such a tax.

"We submit that Receipts Duty which will be nothing more or less than a Turnover Tax is basically wrong in concept, costly to administer and extremely inefficient.

"It has to be paid irrespective of whether the payer makes a profit on his deal.

"It is cumulative in its effect because each time goods in process of manufacture or distribution change hand, tax is attracted."

I ask hon. members to visualise how receipt duty would mount up by the time something produced in southern Queensland was sold to a distributor, then to a wholesaler, thereafter to a retailer, and then to a man on the land at Burketown. The letter continues—

"Every person in any form of business will have to submit returns which will have to be checked and recorded by the department.

"The amount expected to be raised in the next three years is greater than the income tax Mr. Gorton hopes to remit to middle and lower income earners—yet these people will eventually have to bear the burden of turnover tax.

"The Commonwealth already has adequate revenue for its purposes as has been demonstrated by the great surpluses it has enjoyed for many years. If the States need to be compensated for the inability to levy receipts duty, the Commonwealth can find the funds without additional tax.

"The average cost to each Australian family (say 3,000,000 plus) will be over 50 cents a week if the revenue is as estimated by the Federal Treasurer (in the vicinity of \$90,000,000 a year)."

This association of, I should say, big businessmen and leaders of business and industry, ended by saying—

"We urgently implore you to oppose any increase in imposts on trade production and commerce and particularly as regards Turnover Tax."

Like many previous speakers in this debate, I must say that, viewed realistically, the Budget presented by the Federal Treasurer was most disappointing and did practically nothing to relieve the conditions of pensioners and large families whose bread-winners are in the lower-income bracket. The 50c increase in pensions was particularly disappointing and, I feel sure, caused the Government to lose the respect of all who are sincerely interested in the welfare of our senior citizens.

What the 50c will purchase is, to my mind, of little account. The gesture—and that is what it was—is akin to that of a miser who hands a meatless bone to his faithful old dog. It is an insult to our old folk, many of whom have rendered valuable service to this State and the community generally and whose present financial position is in no way due to their own actions or way of life. The cost of living is increasing continuously, and surely if it is found just and necessary to increase the salaries and wages of those who are presently living in comparative luxury, it is at least equally necessary to increase the pension for the same reason.

There will always be criticism of the Budget. I do not intend to join those who cry for more funds for this purpose or for that purpose. The revenue will be allocated according to the policy of the Government of the day and that Government must stand or fall on the wisdom of its allocation. It is obvious that the Government cannot allocate more funds than it has, and if outside bodies pressure the Government into granting income tax reductions to the tune of \$228,000,000 in one year, then expenditure must be cut in many directions, and, because of this colossal cut, the most vulnerable people—the pensioners—inevitably suffer to the greatest extent. I believe that the D.L.P. policy of taking the pension out of politics and creating an independent tribunal of experts to review and determine the pension rates from time to time is obviously the only just solution.

The effects of drought are, I think, apparent to more people now than at any time during the past 50 years. Perhaps the only section of the community which does not understand how the economy of the State has been affected comprises many of those—I do not say all—in the metropolitan area who have not suffered financially in any way. They have no appreciation of the hardship and ruin suffered by many primary producers, or of the anxiety of many of their counterparts in rural areas who have the thought of retrenchment ever in their minds.

Apart from financial assistance there seems little that can be done now for those engaged in the breeding of sheep and cattle in a large area of the State, and one wonders how many years it will take for those people to recover from the losses they have sustained. I have always been of the opinion that sufficient importance has never been placed upon the necessity to prepare for drought by all means possible. Surely it would be wiser, and more in the interests of the economy of the State, for the Government to assist producers in every possible way, so that they will be able at least to minimise drought losses, rather than wait till drought strikes, when the cattle and sheep have reached a weakened condition, before coming forth with aid. In most instances aid when given is too late. The cattle and sheep die, and all that the primary producer has achieved is a bigger bank overdraft.

As yet pig and poultry farmers do not qualify for drought relief, and I have been requested to bring under the notice of the Government the situation in which these producers will be placed unless something is done to assist them. Both these industries are important, and play their part in stabilising the economy of the State.

During the year ended 30 June, 1970, 798,000 pigs were slaughtered in Queensland. The approximate average weight was 115 lb. a pig. Based on an average price of 25 cents a lb., these pigs returned revenue of \$23,000,000. Based on the Lane Fox Commission's conclusions, those pigs would have consumed feed to the value of \$16,500,000. That gives an idea of the extent to which this industry has grown.

In No. 5 division of poultry farmers in Queensland, which embraces the Downs and adjoining areas, there are 374 growers registered with the Egg Marketing Board. These growers own 902,200 pullets and layers, and the approximate earnings from them for the year ended 30 June, 1969, were \$4,600,000. That number of birds consumed feed to an estimated value of \$2,500,000. These figures relate to one division only, and do not take into account income from broilers, etc.

The feed position for the coming year looks grim. There is not going to be any wheat or barley of any consequence harvested on the Downs this year—I do not think anyone will argue with that—and indications are that there will be no grain of any consequence harvested in New South Wales north of the Riverina. For that reason, grain will have to be brought from Victoria and South Australia.

Under present conditions, pig and poultry farmers cannot claim concessional freight rates under drought relief, nor can the feed-processing companies upon whom the majority of farmers depend, because individual farmers are not equipped to mix their own feeds.

The cost of transporting grain from Victoria to any processing company is approximately \$30 a ton. With the 75 per cent. rebate allowable under the drought-relief scheme, that grain could be brought in at a freight rate of \$7.50 a ton. Obviously, if the feed companies have to pay the full freight, this amount must be added to the present price paid by the farmer, and \$30 extra a ton will certainly mean that many of the farmers will not be able to continue. Many of them are on the bread-line now.

I consider that now is the time to ensure that these two industries are preserved, and I suggest very strongly that, because of the feed position for next year, pig and poultry farmers become eligible immediately for drought-relief freight concessions to enable the processing companies to purchase grain now.

Before concluding, I urge the Government to do something of a practical nature to prove that it really means to foster and encourage decentralisation as promised in its election policy. Country towns are mainly service centres for the districts in which they are situated, and depend almost 100 per cent. on the business that they do with people in their particular areas.

Obviously, when there is a severe drought in a grain or dairying area, business is at a very low ebb in the town. It is most disheartening, and certainly not very encouraging for those who are in business in these drought-stricken areas and who are finding it most difficult to carry on without retrenchment of staff, to learn, when there is a large Government project under way in the town, that the whole of the material required is being brought from Brisbane. I refer to work being carried out by the Department of Works at Dalby. There are businesses represented in the town which I know can buy just as well as Brisbane merchants can, and I strongly suggest that on all future occasions the Government give the businesses concerned the opportunity to at least tender for supplies. The little extra business could stave off retrenchment for at least a short period. That is one way in which the Government could prove it is sincere in its plea for decentralisation.

Mr. LONERGAN (Flinders) (2.56 p.m.): I say at the outset that I am opposed to the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Davis: Why?

Mr. LONERGAN: That amendment has been well canvassed on both sides of the House, and I do not propose to weary hon. members with tedious repetition. I say merely that some of the subjects mentioned by the hon. gentleman have been debated during the present session and that generally the amendment has been well dealt with by hon. members on this side of the House. I do not propose to single out any hon. member in particular, because all those whom I

heard did a very good job. In saying "those whom I heard", I agree with a Minister in the Federal House who said that it would drive him up the wall to sit in the House all day and listen to all the speeches and all the various points of view expressed by hon. members.

It is the duty of the Leader of the Opposition to try to pin-point the shortcomings of the Government—and there are shortcomings. There are in every Government; no Government is perfect. On the other hand, the hon. gentleman's amendment mentioned other matters that I think he was obliged to put in and that were not based on fact. However, one cannot expect a Leader of the Opposition always to be factual.

I do not propose to go over any of the ground traversed by other hon. members. I propose to confine my remarks to my own area and to a few small matters. Some hon. members may say that these matters are indeed small and that the time of the House should not be wasted in bringing them here, but that is purely a matter of opinion. In particular, one concerns the livelihood of about 25 men, and I think all hon. members will agree with me when I say that is something that cannot be overlooked.

As a back-bencher, one of the things that troubles me is that I do not believe that back-benchers are shown the consideration that they deserve. They are not consulted on matters of importance in the areas that they represent. They should be, because they are conversant with them.

Mr. Houston: Are you referring to the Ministers, or to the public?

Mr. LONERGAN: Without a doubt, to the Ministers. I say also that Ministers should show similar courtesy to members of the Opposition in matters that are of any importance.

Mr. Casey: That is right. They are very discourteous.

Mr. LONERGAN: No. They are 1,000 per cent. better than Ministers in former Labour Governments. They were tyrannical.

I might be said to be an idealist—possibly I am—but I strongly resent it when matters of importance happen in my area and the first intimation I have of them is the receipt of a letter from a Minister. I am not condemning all Ministers, but a couple of them are bad offenders in this respect.

Mr. Houston interjected.

Mr. LONERGAN: He is a thorough gentleman—and a scholar, too.

Turning now to another point, I do not know whether Ministers observe such a thing as protocol. I do not know whether we are obliged to send ornate invitations to them to visit our electorates. If we have to, I am afraid several of them will never come into Flinders while I represent the electorate,

although if they do come, they will be welcome. After all, I am only one individual. I merely represent the people. Ministers do not come to see me personally.

I feel that it should be part and parcel of every Minister's job to travel the length and breadth of the State—and not by air, either. They should travel in rail coaches, just as Ministers did when we first became the Government. At that time Ministers were possibly a little younger and more active and eager than they are today; nevertheless, Ministers should get to know the people and their problems. In those days we had plenty of problems, many of which, with the passage of time, have been eliminated. However, for some of the things that have happened, to a certain extent, I blame the Cabinet as a whole.

I refer in particular to several sawmills in my electorate which were closed with the resultant loss of employment for 25 men. The Minister for Transport has stated in a letter that they will be absorbed into the maintenance section of the Railway Department. Where? Hundreds of miles from their homes. If timber to keep these mills going was not available, I would go along with the Minister and say, "Providence decrees that you shall close them and I will defend you." Unfortunately, on this occasion the first I knew of the closure of a mill was on 13 January, when I was given the following reasons by letter, portion of which I will read—and I ask the Minister to take particular note of this—

"The decision to take this action has become necessary because of the lack of adequate and suitable timbers for cutting into sleepers in the respective areas."

I approached the Minister on the matter and he decided to hold his hand for a while. He then contacted the Minister for Lands, and that worthy gentleman consulted his Conservator of Forests and sought his opinion as to whether there was sufficient timber in the various areas to keep these mills going. Once again, I will not quote the Minister's letter, dated 8 March, in full but only those parts that apply to my case. This is what he said—

"The matter has been discussed. . ."

I emphasise the word "discussed"—

". . . with the Conservator of Forests and the position is that departmental officers consider that Crown areas within 80 miles of Pentland have been cut out of sleepers."

I also emphasise the word "consider". The officers merely consider. The Minister did not say that any survey had been carried out. No survey was carried out, and I challenge either the Minister for Lands or the Minister for Transport to produce a letter to that effect.

Mr. Houston: Was the matter discussed with you?

Mr. LONERGAN: Not at all.

Going a little further, to bolster his case the Minister for Lands said—

“Harvesting is understood to have been generally by part-time operators who have held other jobs. These operators have not used snagging equipment, have loaded blocks by hand, and have used light vehicles for haulage. In these circumstances, the handling of blocks containing more than three sleepers is impracticable, and there would be a quantity of such larger blocks on the areas cut over.”

That is deliberate misrepresentation, and I say that quite advisedly.

Mr. Houston: What? By a Minister?

Mr. LONERGAN: In a sense. He says that these men have had other jobs, which is quite true, but they have other jobs simply because they could not get sufficient orders from the Railway Department store-keeper to keep them employed continually. The Minister said that the operators have not used snagging equipment. How many would need it for sleeper-blocks? Anyone who knows anything about sleeper-blocks realises that snagging equipment would not be needed.

Mr. R. Jones: That is how much they know about it.

Mr. LONERGAN: We agree on one thing, anyway.

The Minister said that the blocks were loaded by hand. Many of the operators have cranes erected on their trucks, as decrepit as the trucks themselves are. They could not ask their bank managers for overdrafts to purchase new trucks. If they did the bank managers would ask, “What contracts have you with the Railway Department?”, and the operators would have to reply, “A lousy 400 blocks.” That is the way those operators have been treated for years.

The Minister said that any log with more than three blocks could not be handled. Anyone who knows anything at all about handling timber—I have handled a little—knows that if a man cannot use skids to load a block with half a dozen sleepers onto a vehicle he should not be in the bush.

In spite of the fact that the letter of 13 January says that there is a lack of suitable timber for sleeper-blocks, the Minister for Lands said—

“It is believed that the Railway Department is prepared to offer orders for bush-sawn sleepers to persons who were supplying blocks to the mill at the time of closure.”

In one letter the Minister for Transport says that the timber is unsuitable, yet eight weeks later he is prepared to offer contracts to the operators, provided they cut the sleepers themselves. If that is not inconsistency, I would like to know what it.

Mr. Jensen: They were taking timber from Bundaberg down to Ipswich.

Mr. LONERGAN: It was State-wide, I believe.

The hon. member for Gregory would probably know that this matter was raised in Cabinet. I feel that I should have been called into Cabinet and asked for my opinion on the matter.

Mr. Jensen: You should be in Cabinet.

Mr. LONERGAN: Thank you. The hon. member is a fine gentleman, although I am not going to say I agree with him.

I feel that I should have been invited to the Cabinet meeting, although I know it is rarely that anyone gets inside the doors of Cabinet. Cabinet could have said to me, “State your case,” but instead, unfortunately, Cabinet heard the case put forward by the Minister for Transport, who had made up his mind, I feel, months before to close the mill, irrespective of any evidence that I might bring forward to warrant a continuation of its operations. Matters like this irritate me.

Mr. Houston: Why didn't you ask the “hon. member for Nundah”? He presents a better case than the Minister for Transport.

Mr. LONERGAN: I've never heard of him!

A Mr. Shepherd, who owns a large property in the Pentland district, has assured me that there is plenty of timber growing on his property, and he has also assured the Premier to the same effect. Experienced timber-cutters have told me that the district has enough timber to supply the State for 10 years.

Mr. R. Jones: How does the timber hold out around Torrens Creek?

Mr. LONERGAN: I would not know.

This is nothing but a dastardly outrage. When I hear hon. members on this side of the House speak about decentralisation, I believe that some favour it. However, I think that the Minister for Transport's idea of decentralisation is elimination—wipe them out! I regret having to say that, because the hon. gentleman is not present. But if he were here it would make no difference; I would say it just the same.

I had several interviews with the Minister, who assured me that the position would be reviewed. In all sincerity, I went back and said to the men cutting the blocks, “I feel that your jobs are safe.” Little did I know that whilst I was speaking to them the mill machinery was being loaded onto railway wagons. As hon. members know, it takes quite a lot to upset me, but I was very annoyed on that occasion because I regarded it as an act of disloyalty and a callous disregard for the livelihood of these men, all

of whom are battlers. My feelings—I “kid” to no-one—and my sympathies are with the battler.

I repeat that, irrespective of any facts that I might have presented to the Minister, it was a foregone conclusion that this mill would be closed. In my opinion, there is a certain element in the Railway Department that is anti-country areas. In particular, I say that such an element exists in the Northern Division. As a result of the closure of this mill, the Railway Department is having considerable difficulty in getting sleepers.

Mr. Hanson: They won't pay the men who produce them a good price, either.

Mr. LONERGAN: The hon. member is quite right.

The Railway Department advertised in every leading newspaper in Australia and, I believe, overseas as well. Although the Minister did not mention the overseas advertising, he did say that he appreciated the co-operation of the hon. member for Condamine and the hon. member for Aspley, who assisted him in getting all the sleepers the Railway Department needed. It is most unusual that members have to go around canvassing contractors to get them to tender for sleeper-blocks.

Many people overlook the fact that the sleepers now have to be carried 1,200 miles. There will be no freight charge; the invoices will be marked “Free”. However, while a train is carrying 200 tons of sleepers it will haul 200 tons less of paying freight.

Mr. Houston: This would be gross inefficiency, wouldn't it?

Mr. LONERGAN: I would say so, without a doubt; inefficiency of the highest order.

I do not know whether the Minister is advised by his departmental officers. But my point is that, as the elected representative of the people, I should have been consulted. Despite the fact that we had several discussions on this matter, he did nothing about it, and today the Railway Department is paying twice as much for sleepers as it used to. I challenge anyone to deny that assertion.

At least the prompt action of the department on this occasion dispelled the thought that there are only two speeds in the Railway Department, namely, slow and stopped. Of course, I do not agree with that. The mill had hardly stopped working when the machinery was shifted, and the following week the buildings were advertised for sale. Those responsible were afraid the mill might open again, which would cause them to lose face.

I shall quote a classic example of delay and procrastination by the Railway Department. More than two years ago, with the rearrangement of gangs in my area, a number of married railway men's cottages became vacant. One of them was at a small siding

called Powlathanga. I do not know how many times I wrote to the Minister asking that it be shifted to Homestead or Pentland, where men were living in bondwood huts. Finally, after half the cottage had been stolen—almost all the louvres had gone, the windows were broken, and I think the doors had been taken—it was decided to shift it. But that is only one. There are still many others. Is it any wonder that I get steamed up and become a little critical of Ministers? Possibly, in that regard, Opposition members are envious of me, because they cannot criticise their bosses.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. LONERGAN: That is a very true statement. Opposition members should not become alarmed, because I do not intend to deal with the “treason room”, or anything like that. We know it is “fair dinkum”, but I do not like flogging it nor do I like embarrassing Opposition members.

This is only a small matter, but it indicates the insignificant part played by those of us who think we are somebody in this Parliament.

Mr. Wright: Do you agree with the amendment?

Mr. LONERGAN: I have made it quite plain that I do not agree with the amendment. The hon. member was asleep at that time. He is excused.

Unfortunately, the Minister for Transport has visited my area by rail coach only once. On that occasion he did a very good job, despite the fact that he was on the verge of hepatitis. I am obliged to refer to him as the Minister for Transport, but I think it would be more appropriate to refer to him as the Minister for Air, because if he wants to go only a few miles he hops into a charter aircraft. Quite recently he flew to Coorabulka, Springvale, Marion Downs and Monkira, in the Channel Country.

Mr. Houston: What for?

Mr. LONERGAN: For what reason, I do not know. There is no railway there. I have heard around the corridors of Parliament House that some good may come of it, because one of the historic stations in that area could have its name changed in honour of his visit. It has been suggested, I understand, that it be named “Fort Knox”. I do not know whether that matter has yet been raised in Cabinet. The hon. member for Gregory may know something about it.

Whether what I have heard is right or wrong, I do not know. However, it would be more appropriate, and of more help to the people of North Queensland and the area in which I live, if the Minister got into his rail coach and went out there to see the conditions under which his men work, and the conditions that the people of western Queensland have to put up with as a result of high rail freights. Goodness knows

when the report on freights will be produced. If those preparing it are being paid on the basis of time spent on it, this State will be bankrupt for the next 20 years.

Mr. Houston: When do you expect the report? Have you any idea?

Mr. LONERGAN: The Minister for Works and Housing will answer that question. I see that the Minister is now in the House. He need not worry, because I am not going to "have a go" at him. I say quite sincerely that he is one of the Ministers who have gone to my area without being invited, and he is quite welcome there. Indeed all Ministers are welcome in my area, because, although some of them are more concerned about travelling interstate, I feel that many of them have much to learn about Western Queensland. If there is a party to be held in Perth, Adelaide, Sydney or Melbourne, a battalion of commandos would be needed to keep them away. However, if we say, "Come to Western Queensland," they are not very interested.

The Railway Department is a department of inconsistency. On the one hand it wastes money, yet, on the other hand, when a battler puts up a good proposal it goes down to Townsville, where Charlie Hutchison will have a look at it and then pass it on to Jock Lettuce. It is then passed on to the traffic inspector, and someone will be sent out west on an investigation costing about \$200 into installing an electric kettle somewhere. That sort of thing happens. I shall give a classic example of inefficiency in the Railway Department. The railway wagon shop at Hughenden has been there for 50 or 60 years, and the floor is so heavily covered with grease from drippings from hot-boxes that the men cannot work there as their clothes become too soiled. Recently I applied to the Minister for Transport to have a small portion of the floor concreted, and he wrote back saying that the department could not see its way clear to do that because all the work there was done out in the sun. It is done in the sun only because the men cannot work under shelter as it is too dirty there. That is the only reason why they do not work there. A cleaner at Nonda (anyone who has been there knows how dusty and dirty it is, especially when a southerly blows) applied for a vacuum cleaner. And what did the department do? They "knocked her back". One thing in which the department is consistent is inconsistency.

I would be failing in my duty to the electors if I did not say a few words on the subject of health. I am sorry that my old friend the Minister for Health is not in the House. At the outset, I may say that I agreed with the hon. member for Nudgee when he said, amongst other things, that instead of going overseas the Minister for Health would have been better employed visiting hospitals throughout Queensland. Despite the fact that I have invited the

Minister on several occasions, he has never visited a hospital in my area. Being the busy man that undoubtedly he is, he has not found the time. However, I am sure that he will get round to it one of these days.

I do not see the hon. member for Burke in the Chamber. I do not know whether he is in a position similar to mine, but I know that most members representing western electorates are faced with the serious problem of a grave shortage of dentists. In the days of our late lamented friend Dr. Noble, there was a wonderful dental system. There was an excellent travelling dental car and the hospitals were well staffed. Today the position is exactly the reverse. Admittedly, the situation is similar in other Australian States, but there is an answer to the problem.

Mr. Houston: May I ask you a question?

Mr. LONERGAN: I do not want any assistance from the hon. gentleman. I ask him to allow me to proceed with my speech.

Between Townsville and Julia Creek, a distance of over 400 miles, there is not one Government dentist. There are hospitals at Charters Towers, Richmond, Julia Creek and Hughenden, each of which has a dental clinic but no dentist. The last visit from a dental car was in June, 1969; the next visit will be in the next school year, 1971. By my standards, that is not good enough.

As hon. members well know, Queensland trains more dentists than any other Australian State. But immediately they complete their bond, away they go. There are, of course, reasons for this, and I suggest that they are, firstly, conditions and, secondly, salary. Even if there were 100 dentists and the Government gave them an additional \$1,000 each per annum, that would be only \$100,000. That is "peanuts" today. Is it not better to spend money in protecting the health of young people and adults than to see trained dentists go interstate?

It is quite easy to rise in this Chamber and criticise the Government, as many hon. members opposite have; but at least I am suggesting a remedy. These are matters that trouble me.

Mr. Bennett: Wally Rae nearly went interstate, and we almost lost a jackaroo.

Mr. LONERGAN: We will not lose the hon. gentleman. He is our brightest Minister. I am dealing with matters that affect the ordinary man, who is the one who counts with me.

The people of the West are getting a raw deal in the field of dental treatment. When I raise the problem with the Minister, what does he say? He says it is the responsibility of the hospital boards. If the Townsville Dental Clinic was short of a dentist or the hospital was short of a doctor, the Department of Health would soon have one there. I expect similar treatment for the people of western Queensland, but I shall

be surprised if they receive it. Quite recently I asked a question in the House of the Minister for Health as to the cost of his overseas visit. He evaded the question. His answer sounded rather weak and I did not bother reading it. I was very disappointed when he said that he had been unable to recruit dentists and doctors in England. What was the purpose of his going? He was away for three or four months. It has been said that it might have been the "golden handshake". I do not think it was, because he is too good a man to lose.

However, this is a matter that requires attention, and I hope that when the Minister reads my speech in "Hansard", or when his friends tell him about it, he will have a conscience and realise that amenities such as these are needed in western Queensland. At least I hope to see him travel through my electorate by rail-car. He will be very welcome, and I am sure that his visit will be very illuminating for him.

Another matter that I feel I should mention concerns the rather large base hospital in Charters Towers. I forget just how many beds it has, but at present—and this has been so for some years—it only has the services of a second-year doctor without any assistance. Unfortunately the hon. member for Nudgee is not in the Chamber, but I will quote figures showing the average number of in-patients and out-patients treated during the months of May, June and July. The number of in-patients averaged 19.09 for May, 23.33 for June and 25.66 for July. Although out-patients were seen on only four days a week, I do not know whether the figures I have are based on four days a week or seven days, but the average for May was 37.33, for June 41.88 and for July 44.66.

I think everyone must agree that no man should be called upon to work the hours entailed in looking after so many patients, and, in addition, this young doctor has to look after 200 patients at Mossman Hall. He is only a young fellow. He is doing a good job, but I think he is being imposed upon. When I raised this matter with the Minister, he again told me that it was the board's responsibility to find a doctor.

I had intended to touch on a Trades Hall statement to the effect that Mount Isa Mines Ltd. should be nationalised. However, as my time is running out, that will have to keep. I am rather disappointed that I have not the time to deal with it at some length, because I have some knowledge of Mount Isa in the very early days.

I hope that what I have said has not fallen on deaf ears. Before I resume my seat, I repeat that I take a very dim view of the action of the Minister for Transport and also of Cabinet's failure to seek my opinion in this very important matter. It resulted in 23 men who were employed directly by the Railway Department losing their jobs, as well as I would not know how many cutters and carters. These are matters that should

be given publicity. They are important as they affect the people. I am very happy to have had the opportunity of making my views public and letting the people know what is going on in the Northern Division of the Railway Department in particular.

Mr. B. WOOD (Cook) (3.34 p.m.): I am pleased to support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition and seconded by the hon. member for Nudgee. It expresses a lack of confidence in the Government. It is not simply an expression of the opinion of this Opposition; it is an expression of the opinion of the great majority of people in Queensland who are dissatisfied and disgusted with the actions of the Government.

Mr. Tucker: Especially the hon. member who has just resumed his seat.

Mr. B. WOOD: That is right. The hon. member for Flinders was severely critical of his own Government. I do not know how he will vote, but in his heart he supports the amendment that has been moved.

This is the last day of the debate. I have listened with interest as it has proceeded and almost all of the Government members who have spoken have avoided the very difficult task that was set them. They have avoided defending their Government. They have obviously been embarrassed by the actions of their leaders and have not come to their defence. Instead, they adopted tactics similar to those adopted by a notorious American lawyer who said, "When I wish to win a case I set about abusing the opposing lawyer and then trying to confuse the minds of the jury by dragging in as many irrelevant things as I can. Above all, I avoid the real issues." The tactics of that American lawyer are those of this Government.

Mr. R. Jones: A very pertinent point.

Mr. B. WOOD: It is, and those tactics have been adopted at election after election for as long as I have been interested in politics since my early teens. The tactics of members on the opposite side of the Chamber, whether in Government or in Opposition, have always been to abuse the Australian Labour Party.

I will pay Government members this tribute: they are working in a field in which they are particularly competent and in which they have shown an interest for many years. It is a field in which they have displayed considerable natural ability. In fact, it is about the only ability they have. They have displayed their ability in distortion, deceit, slander, smear, untruths and evasion. This is what they have indulged in in this debate, and I acknowledge their expertise in those fields. Obviously the Government is in trouble. That fact is revealed when its members bring these tactics to the fore.

During this session the word "Communism" has been mentioned once again. Government members try to evade the real issues

by bringing that one forward. It is significant that on the day after the Premier made a speech in this House the Deputy Leader of the Country Party made his speech, and on that same day the "Telegraph" carried the headline "Premier Faces Revolt". On that day the Deputy Leader of the Country Party, who seems to be setting himself up as the Country Party's strong man, made a vicious attack on the Labour Party, and since then a great number of other Government members have continued with that attack.

The Minister for Mines and Main Roads spoke about complete co-operation and collusion between the Labour Party and the Communist Party and said that the Labour Party was coming to the defence of the Communist Party.

Mr. R. Jones: Shocking!

Mr. B. WOOD: The statement is also very inaccurate. The Minister also mentioned the complete dominance of a once-great political party. The Labour Party is not a once-great party; it has always been great, and in this State it is as great and effective today as it has ever been.

In response to a challenge by the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier read out a list of 31 names of alleged Communists who were infiltrating the Labour Party or exercising some sort of influence over the Labour Party. Like many of the Government's allegations, the list was quite inaccurate. If the Premier knew anything about pure politics he would realise that by reading the list he was defeating his own propaganda and arguments. Perhaps the Premier has acquired some sort of knowledge of administration and parliamentary procedure, but he is quite ignorant in purely political matters. After mixing with the present leaders of the Government, Dame Zara described Queensland as a hillbilly State. Bearing in mind the people with whom she mixed I suggest that she was quite right.

Mr. Davis: It is a hillbilly Government, too.

Mr. B. WOOD: That is so. Early in this session the Premier said a good deal about Communists in the Trades Hall who are supposed in some way to exert an influence on the Labour Party. When challenged by our Leader, he cited 31 names. However, he did not expect that challenge and it was found that there was no strength at all in his argument.

I want to examine the situation to show how ineffective the Communist Party is in Queensland. I repeat that the Premier cited 31 names. Of those people one was the president of a union and three were secretaries of unions. The remainder occupied various positions, most of them relatively minor and unpaid. Of the 50 unions mentioned by the Premier, one had a Communist president and three had Communist

secretaries. Of approximately 1,600 minor positions, 13 were held by Communists. In a membership of approximately 150,000 there were approximately 14 other Communists whom he mentioned. The Premier has shown nothing other than the complete ineffectiveness and complete lack of power of the Communist Party. It has no power at all and there is no strength in the Premier's argument.

As I said earlier, his deputy made some remarks about complete co-operation and collusion. What nonsense! He referred to the strength of the Communist Party. Again, what nonsense! The Leader of the Country Party and the Deputy Leader made fools of each other by their statements, but that would not be very hard to do.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I think this is becoming tedious repetition. Attacks on members' personalities are not permissible. Attacks on parties can be condoned but attacks on members, irrespective of whether they are Cabinet Ministers, the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, or any member of Parliament, cannot be condoned, and I ask the hon. member to please desist from such references and to withdraw the remarks.

Mr. B. WOOD: I withdraw the remarks, but I am rebutting remarks emanating from the Government benches.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member has cast disparaging remarks about members of the House. I ask him not to persist in that strain, otherwise I will have to ask him to resume his seat.

Mr. B. WOOD: Because of the actions of the Labour Party, which is the greatest defence against Communism in Queensland and Australia, the strength of the Communist Party is now less than it has ever been. It has always been the Labour Party and the Labour movement that provides the best defence in any country.

Mr. Campbell: By nourishing Communists.

Mr. B. WOOD: The Minister made an incorrect interjection. The Labour Party does not nourish Communists. As I was saying before the Minister entered the Chamber, the Labour Party is the party that rids the unions and other movements of Communists. Wherever there is a strong, united and effective Labour movement, the Communist Party remains weak. In European countries where the Communist Party is strongest, the Labour movement is weak and disorganised. In Australia, where we have a strong Labour movement, the Communist Party remains ineffective.

Mr. Houston interjected.

Mr. B. WOOD: That is right. It is very interesting to note, in answer to that interjection, that the present Minister for Justice is elected to this Parliament on the votes of the same people who once voted in a Communist candidate. The Communist Party

remains weak because of the Labour Party. It is the Labour Party which effectively represents the aspirations of the workers. The Premier's inaccurate list of 31 names demonstrates clearly the ineffectiveness of the Communists in this State, and their influence is naturally much less than their numbers.

Mr. Porter: Can you explain what is happening in Victoria at this very moment?

Mr. B. WOOD: The hon. member for Toowong sometimes stands up in this House and tries to give the impression of delivering a learned speech. But he remains essentially a party secretary and is still bamboozled by the propaganda that he used to disseminate.

Unfortunately, the Premier was too ignorant of political matters to see the mistake he was making. I do not know whether he did not know or did not want to know.

Government members who are busily interjecting claim to be authorities on the Labour Party. Like the hon. member for Toowong, they are bamboozled by their own propaganda disseminated over the years. They set up for the Labour Party a policy and an organisation that they want to see. However, it is totally false, because what they see is not what is actually there. They have fallen into the trap of believing their own propaganda.

In fact, it is the Country-Liberal coalition which does most to advance Communism in this State. By its attacks on unions, the contempt in which it holds unions, and its efforts to reduce the strength and authority of unions, it is encouraging the Communist Party. It is significant that, in this session, Government members, while attacking the Labour Party on alleged influence from the Communist Party—totally wrong though it is—have themselves been adopting the methods used by the Communist Party, and I shall refer to one of them.

There exists, in this State, a Special Branch of the Police Force. I cannot say very much about the organisation of the Special Branch because I do not know much about its organisation.

Mr. Miller interjected.

Mr. B. WOOD: I am totally opposed to it myself.

Mr. Porter: If you do not know what it is, how do you oppose it?

Mr. B. WOOD: I said I do not know a great deal about its organisation. I have some knowledge, insufficient though it is, of what it is doing.

I asked a question about this last year and I was told to mind my own business. The Leader of the Opposition asked a question recently and he was told to mind his own business. We are told that we are not to know anything about the Special Branch. I think that this should concern Government back-bench members. I do not know that

we need a Special Branch in this State. In the Federal sphere the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation has certain limited powers. I do not see any need for a similar body in the State.

Mr. Murray interjected.

Mr. B. WOOD: Obviously the hon. member does not mind if there are spies and pimps in our midst.

Mr. Miller: Are you calling members of the Special Branch spies and pimps?

Mr. B. WOOD: They certainly rely on them. The fact is that there is a Special Branch in Queensland. I hope that when the Labour Party comes to power the Special Branch will be seen as unnecessary. However, while we have it, there are, in the interests of democracy, certain things that we should know about it. Obviously, if it is to be kept in existence, certain things that it does must be rather confidential, but there are a number of things about it that Parliament should know.

We should know, for example, how much money is allocated to it each year. We should know its staffing, but not necessarily the names of all staff members.

Mr. Dean: All the crooks know who they are.

Mr. B. WOOD: That is right. They mix with them.

We should know from where they are recruited, and what training they undergo. We should know the general purpose of the Special Branch. We should know, in general, its fields of activity. We should know if it investigates political matters and industrial matters, without going into further detail.

Mr. Murray: What utter nonsense!

Mr. B. WOOD: The hon. member for Clayfield may think so. He, with his whole background, may think it necessary to have spies in our midst.

Mr. Murray: It would certainly be a "special" branch if their activities were published.

Mr. B. WOOD: The hon. member is being quite foolish about this.

Mr. Murray: I am not.

Mr. B. WOOD: If we must have a Special Branch, obviously some of the work that it does would necessarily be secret, but we should know generally where it works.

Mr. Miller: Where it works, and how many there are in it?

Mr. B. WOOD: No. We should know, for instance, if the Special Branch is being used to compile dossiers on members of this Parliament.

Mr. Houston: Of course it is.

Mr. B. WOOD: Of course it is, and also of other members of Parliament in this State. I do know that that is being done. I maintain that that is not a field of activity for the Special Branch.

It has no purpose in spying on members of Parliament—and not only Opposition members, I might say. I do not think that there should be any spying on the life of a member of Parliament. We have seen the Treasurer stand up in this House and wave a sheet of paper containing information prepared by the Special Branch. He was referring to a Federal member of Parliament. Members of the Special Branch have no right to spy on members, and they do it only to try to stir up some mud to throw at members on this side or the other side of the House.

Mr. Miller: We cannot put ourselves above everybody else.

Mr. B. WOOD: In the last day or two the Minister for Justice has been proclaiming loudly and piously in the Press that he is going to introduce legislation to stop the bugging of telephones, and the use of other similar devices.

Mr. Houston: He encourages it.

Mr. B. WOOD: Of course he does. It is all right to tell other people to stop spying, but he is not going to do anything to prevent the Government from spying. In fact, he used the words, I think, "pimps" and "spies". Yet he is encouraging his own Government to spy. There is a special word to describe that type of attitude. There is no place in this State for spies and pimps, and I hope that the Government will take certain steps to let us know, within the bounds that I have stated, what the Special Branch is doing.

Recently an hon. member—I think it was the hon. member for Chatsworth or the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt—quoted from a letter written by a Czechoslovakian woman who said what a great country Australia is, that in Czechoslovakia demonstrations are not allowed. The hon. member said that Australia is a great country, yet in the same speech he was very critical of any demonstrations that might be held. He was as critical of demonstrations by church people as he was of the moratorium. The only criterion that he and other Government members have is: if it suits their warped ideas it is all right; if it does not it is to be condemned.

The attacks by members of the Government have been very poor form, and not the least of those attacks have been certain remarks by the Treasurer and by the Minister for Labour and Tourism. The Treasurer was severely critical of a man because he Anglicised his name. He adopted what was, in effect, a racial attitude to some people and scorned many thousands of migrants in this State who have done precisely the same thing.

Mr. Baldwin: Spiro Agnew did the same thing.

Mr. B. WOOD: Of course he did. A former King of England did the same thing.

Recently the Minister for Labour and Tourism had something to say about Federal members of Parliament who did not take the oath on the Bible but made an affirmation, as if to say that by doing that they were unworthy men. I do not think hon. members want such racial and religious attacks in this House. They are unwarranted. I make one thing clear: when I am elected at the next election, I am going to make an affirmation up there, rather than take an oath.

Mr. Miller: That would not surprise us.

Mr. B. WOOD: The hon. member has an attitude similar to the Treasurer's.

These attacks have caused considerable concern to the Opposition because the attacks on hon. members on this side of the Chamber have been of a very personal nature. The Premier was sitting on the front bench recently muttering about loyalty. Hon. members on this side of the House are no less loyal than hon. members opposite. They have served their country and their State as well as anyone else. I should say, after associating with members on this side of the Chamber, that they have served their State better than any other band of men that I can imagine.

Mr. Miller interjected.

Mr. B. WOOD: The trouble with the hon. member for Ithaca is that he was born with a most unfortunate affliction. He has an automatic switching device in his head. When he opens his mouth, he switches off his brain, and he talks all day and snores all night.

Last Wednesday an hon. member opposite stated that Australia is a prosperous country. I agree with him. Australia is a prosperous country. It has good resources that have been used, though not always to the best advantage, over many years and that have resulted in Australia's reaching a degree of prosperity. However, let us be quite clear on this point. I agree that Australia is a prosperous country. In making his statement, the hon. member opposite probably had some different things in mind. No doubt he is doing quite well—I think it was the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha—and his friends are doing quite well in this country; big companies are doing quite well. But the majority of the people in this country are not doing as well as they should. The pensioners, the basic-wage earners, those on low incomes and those with large families would not describe Australians as prosperous. It is ridiculous to suggest that everybody in Australia is experiencing any sort of prosperity. The statement made by the hon. member was an indication of his lack of concern, his sheer lack of interest, at what is

happening in this country. He showed what a Parliamentarian should not be. The people have suffered under members such as that for far too long.

Mr. Miller: Have you lost your place?

Mr. B. WOOD: No. I notice that the hon. member reads his speeches. I do not read mine. I use only brief notes.

Many Australians are suffering agonies to keep abreast of their fellows. I want to make one thing quite clear. Ideally, I want to see no great differences between Australians. We all say that we should have equal opportunities and should be as nearly equal as possible, but, at the moment, this is not so. The policy of the Country and Liberal Parties is for the big to get bigger and the small, or poor, to fall further behind.

The people in Australia are not prosperous. Some of them can drive big motor-cars; they can build big homes; they can go for trips overseas and they can buy facilities for their homes without any particular financial difficulty, but the majority of the people in Australia have to make tremendous sacrifices to try to keep up with the wealthier ones. In order to do this they have to pay extortionate hire-purchase charges and in many cases have to send their wives out to work.

It is strange to think that because wives are working Australia is a very prosperous country. Working wives in Australia have helped to create its prosperity, yet they do not get anything out of it. Families in which the wife has to work make some gains, but very often they are illusionary. They work for others who make great profits but they themselves benefit very little. They still cannot reach the standard of living they desire because, when a wife is working, income is lost in other ways. Often the wife's wage is poor and she has to pay out additional fares; she has to buy additional clothing; the husband loses tax concessions and, of course, they have none of the tax lurks that are open to so many of the wealthy people in this country. A wife often has to pay for child care, and this is one point I particularly wish to raise.

Mothers who have done so much for this country and who get so little out of it, who are required to work because of their standards at home, should receive from the State something of the prosperity they give to it. First of all, I believe that they should have available public facilities for the care of their children, not just to make it easier for them, although they certainly deserve it, but because of their contribution to the economy. This work-force is essential to our economy. We cannot do without it, and we should do something to assist these people. Some of the prosperity that has been created should be shared by those who have helped to create it.

The State should provide day-care centres. A suggestion has been made in the past that schools could be better utilised for this purpose, and I think there is some merit in providing nurses or child-care assistants in the case of large families if the mother is working. A mother could then go out to work and have someone at home, paid or subsidised by the State, to care for the children. Recently in America women were talking of depriving their men of certain privileges. I do not think the same thing should happen here, but seriously, if the women in Australia were to go on strike from their work, the economic repercussions would be quite serious. It is time that the people who are responsible for running the country paid portion of the debt that is owed to women.

Mr. Chinchen: You can pay your wife a wage if you want to.

Mr. B. WOOD: No, I cannot. She works for me at home, she answers the phone while I am away for the week, and she answers it while I am away for three weeks touring my electorate, yet I cannot pay her a wage and claim it as a tax deduction. She works for this Parliament and gets nothing for it.

In the time left to me I want to refer to a number of matters that affect my electorate. The hon. member for Flinders expressed discontent about certain things that the Government has done in his electorate. I wish to complain about its deficiencies in my electorate. The hon. member for Flinders referred to the Minister for Health and the Government's attitude on decentralisation. The town of Mt. Molloy, which is in my electorate, has a small hospital, with a trained sister in charge. The town has seen better days and once had a bigger population than it has now, but it is starting to come alive again. However, its hospital needs certain repairs, and the Health Department is about to look at it. The residents of Mt. Molloy and I fear that the hospital might be closed.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: This Government took the railway line away first, and now it will take the hospital.

Mr. B. WOOD: That is right. If the Government has its way there will be nothing left at Mt. Molloy. So much for its policy of decentralisation! As I said, the population of the town is growing, and tourists pass through it on the way to Cooktown. The town's sawmill has reopened on a small scale, and, as well, cattle-raising is on the increase. If the Government closed the hospital it would be taking a retrograde step. Nothing could be gained from the hospital's closure.

I turn now to the town of Weipa. To my knowledge, no doctor has practised in that town. It is growing rapidly, and its population, including the Aborigines at Weipa South, is approximately 1,700, with another 600 to 700 people only 25 minutes away by

air. Once a fortnight a doctor from Cooktown visits Weipa for a few hours. Weipa is an industrial centre and, consequently, contains more hazards than most towns. A number of accidents have occurred there, and victims of serious accidents have to be flown to Cairns either by the flying doctor's aircraft or by the company's plane. That flight takes several hours.

Recently a man in Weipa spoke to me about his boy aged 10 or 11 years, who fell from a water tower and broke his arm and suffered shock. The boy died on the way to Cairns. If medical attention had been available on the spot he would probably be alive today.

On many occasions the hon. member for Toowoomba East has expressed anxiety about the health of the Aborigines. A great advantage could be gained from stationing a doctor at Weipa to attend to the needs of almost 1,000 Aborigines who live nearby. Of course, as the hon. member for Flinders pointed out, the Minister for Health passes the buck to the hospital board and will do nothing on his own account to try to improve the situation.

I wish to refer now to a matter that I have raised previously, namely, the provision of a helicopter service or an efficient emergency service in Torres Strait. The Islanders want it and the other people who reside in the area want it. The provision of this amenity is not beyond the Government's capability, but no interest has been shown in it.

I wish to refer now to a conservation matter. Earlier this year the "Oceanic Grandeur" struck an uncharted rock—the vessel's name was rather ill-chosen considering what happened to it—and Queensland was extremely fortunate to escape major pollution as a result of this accident. However, that cannot be attributed to prompt action by the Government under an alleged pre-emergency plan that the Premier spoke of. We were saved only by the kindly intervention of nature in that the sea was unusually calm for an unusually lengthy period. The Government did not know what to do, but the sea saved the day.

The Premier referred to a pre-arranged emergency plan, but the Queensland Littoral Society said that the only visible sign of the Queensland Government's plan was the rapidity with which politicians and public servants arrived at Thursday Island—and it was right. I hope the Government has learnt a lesson from this incident; I hope it has learnt that nothing is achieved by pretentious statements; I hope that it is now preparing preventive measures in case of another unfortunate similar occurrence. One day the Government may learn that words are no substitute for action. The Government's lack of ability to do anything constructive, its sheer incompetence, has brought about the state of affairs that is condemned in my leader's amendment, which

I support, which the Opposition supports, and which the majority of the people in Queensland support.

Mr. DAVIS (Brisbane) (4.12 p.m.): I support the amendment so ably, capably and competently moved by the Leader of the Opposition, and I take this opportunity to associate the citizens of the electorate of Brisbane with the pledge of loyalty to Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II.

I will now deal with some of the statements about the Opposition and challenges issued in this House in the last couple of weeks by Government members. I have been a member of an industrial union for the greater part of my working life, and I am proud of it. I was an official of the Transport Workers' Union for five years prior to entering this House, and the office of that union is located in the Trades Hall. On Wednesday, 5 August, when making his speech, the hon. member for Yeronga read out the names of certain people employed at the Trades Hall and by the Trades and Labour Council and stated that they were Communists. When he did that, he was also able to supply their work classifications. That seemed rather sinister to me. The first thought that came to my mind was, "Where would someone like the hon. member for Yeronga, who is a well-known anti-unionist—as a matter of fact, he was a rather poor employer—get that sort of information?" He had obviously had the information only for a short time because, as hon. members will recall, he had some difficulty and mispronounced several of the names he read out.

This brings me to the realisation that there is a secret organisation in this State. I was glad that the hon. member for Cook referred to this matter. As a democrat, and as one who believes in democracy, I am loath to think that a political and secret organisation, which is obviously approved and applauded by the Government, should invade the privacy of John Citizen in this State. It was obvious from the hon. member's remarks that a file is kept on everyone employed at the Trades Hall, irrespective of his political beliefs. Apparently there is a file on me. Like the hon. member for Cook, I want to know something about this Special Branch.

When I was first employed as a union official, I was informed by other union officials at the Trades Hall that they believed their telephones were tapped. I have always believed that we had a democratic system of Government, and when I heard these claims of telephone tapping and bugging devices I was cynical and thought that the people who made the claims had been watching too many second-rate spy dramas on television. I did not believe that such things could occur in a democracy. However, I must admit that whenever there was an industrial dispute I heard unusual sounds like clicking noises on my telephone. This left me with the belief

that union officials' telephones, not only in the Trades Hall but also at their homes, were tapped.

Mr. Bromley: I'll bet a million dollars mine is tapped.

Mr. DAVIS: For sure.

I have had only one encounter with the Special Branch, and that was during the 1966 Trades and Labour Council campaign for an increase in the basic wage which, I am happy to say, was successful.

Mr. Bennett: No doubt due to your advocacy.

Mr. DAVIS: I did assist. I must admit that, quite modestly.

A meeting was held in Queen's Gardens, and the then Premier, Sir Francis Nicklin, looked out of his window in the Executive Building and saw what was happening. He promptly got the Special Branch on the job. The unionists assembled there were told to get out of the park, and those who did not leave were thrown out bodily. It was decided to have a meeting in the Botanic Gardens. However, anyone who tried to speak there had his name taken and was booked.

Mr. Ahern: Did you have a permit?

Mr. DAVIS: No. That brings me to another point. Did D.L.P. Senator Condon Byrne and the Liberal member have a permit to hold a political rally in the Botanic Gardens on two public rostrums erected by the A.L.P. civic administration? We did not have them when the C.M.O. was in power. I have seen members of the Special Branch near these rostrums in Centenary Park and at Roma Street, where a new one has been provided by the A.L.P. Brisbane City Council.

We talk about free speech. Are the people who speak at these gatherings interrogated by the police? I call on the Premier, who is now in the Chamber, and the Minister for Works and Housing to inform the people of Queensland what is so special about the Special Branch, how many members it has, if it is allowed to use tapping or bugging devices, how much it can intrude into the privacy of Queenslanders, and what protection private citizens have against such intrusion.

My stand against Communism is well known. Anybody who does not know it can get the Premier to check with the Special Branch. I won my position as a trade-union official against a Communist—and I won handsomely, too. I have never believed in resorting to Gestapo or Russian police methods as this Government has done and is continuing to do.

We have heard the word "treason" mentioned frequently during the past few weeks. I went to the trouble of checking the meaning of "treason", and the definition that I found is, "Violation by subject of allegiance to sovereign or to chief authority of State." If there has been any violation, I, like so many

other members on this side of the House, ask what the Government is doing about it. By the definition that I have just read, it would seem that the public relations officers of the Liberal and Country Parties are using the same methods as were used by Herr Goebbels, who was propaganda chief of a now-defunct regime.

The centre that has been established at the Trades Hall is purely and simply an office at which persons eligible for National Service are notified of their legal rights if they wish to object to service under the infamous National Service Act. One may wonder why the Trades and Labour Council has gone to the trouble to set up such an office, and also why the policy of the A.C.T.U. is against conscription, as is also the policy of a section of the World Council of Churches. I believe that the unions are fed up with seeing workers' sons conscripted. They are always in the majority among those called up. It is a well-known fact that when the sons or relatives of members of the Country Party and Liberal Party come within the age group for conscription, they immediately rush to Federal members and senators to find where the strings can be pulled to ensure that their young people are not affected. They do this so that they can claim to the whole world that they are all for National Service, conscription, and involvement in Vietnam—as long as it does not affect them or their kin.

Has this not been the situation in Australia for a number of years? Was not the Prime Minister who introduced the National Service Act in the last 10 years, namely, Sir Robert Menzies, a well-known military man and, as Eddie Ward stated in Federal Parliament on many occasions, a person who had a brilliant career that was interfered with by war? He was a well-known stay-at-home.

Let us now come a little closer to home. In "The Australian" on Friday, 28 August, 1970, under the heading, "Premier was draft objector", this appears—

"The Queensland Premier, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen, revealed last night that during World War II he had successfully objected to being called up for military service.

"Speaking outside Parliament, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen was answering a challenge made earlier in the Legislative Assembly by Mr. F. P. Bromley (A.L.P. Norman).

"Mr. Bjelke-Petersen said he had been called up and had applied for exemption from service on the grounds that he was a farmer and the only person able to run the property.

"He said he had not been previously declared exempt as being in a reserved occupation—that of a farmer.

"The Premier said he could not quite remember the exact year of his call-up, but it was towards the end of the war.

"I must say that I did not volunteer, but at that time of the war you couldn't get into the Army if you wanted to", he said.

"Mr. Bjelke-Petersen said at the time he was a farmer and contractor, country areas were seriously depleted in manpower."

Government Members interjected.

Mr. DAVIS: It hurts hon. members opposite a little to know that their leader objected to National Service.

On the same date, 28th August, the Premier also said in "The Courier-Mail", obviously in reply to another reporter, "My age group was not called up until well into the war." The Premier, who, according to this newspaper, will be 60 years of age next January, would have been 28 when war broke out in 1939, and he would have been 34 at the end of the war.

Mr. Lickiss: What were you doing about the time of the Korean war?

Mr. DAVIS: This is the person who said that his age group was not called up and that he would have been too old to go to the war. What a lot of rubbish! I am not denying the Premier the right to stay out of the war. He had his own reasons for doing so. But nothing makes me sicker than hearing such remarks from righteous people like the former Prime Minister and the Premier. The hon. member for Landsborough is the youngest member of the House. If he supports the war in Vietnam, why does he not join up and go over there?

Has there ever been a Government more two-faced than the present Government that has been forced upon the people by devious means? On the one hand it applauds the involvement against Communist forces overseas; on the other the Leader of the Country Party in the Federal Parliament, McEwen, banquets with Russians. It sells wheat and wool to what it calls its enemy, Communist China, but it calls trade unionists who implemented a black ban on the export of merino rams to Russia Communist-inspired agitators. It is rather difficult to follow, but that seems to be the logic of the present Government.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr. DAVIS: The hon. member for Griffith is another one who is good at that.

I will answer an interjection that was made a short time ago. An hon. member opposite asked where I was when the Korean war began. Our family is quite proud of its war service, and in 1951, at the age of 17 years, I joined the forces to serve in Korea. It seems a shame that one has to spend so much time in this House discussing Federal matters when there are so many vital State issues to be discussed.

I cannot let this opportunity pass without offering my views on the inflationary trends that are apparent throughout the country. There have been some amusing contributions from the Government side relative to trade unionists and what they are doing. I see that the people who ask for curbs on wages are always members of Parliament, Cabinet Ministers, chairmen of chambers of manufactures, and managers of big combines. They ask industrial unions to show some restraint in their wage demands. It is amusing to note that the people who ask for the control of wages are almost always in the \$7,000-\$8,000 to \$20,000 wage bracket. It is very easy to say to a person in the \$2,000 a year wage bracket, a person who receives about \$45 a week, "Let us have a bit of restraint in wage claims. If we do not, I will not be able to have my wage increased, because it will interfere with the firm's profit."

There is one way of stopping inflation. If hon. members opposite will listen, I will tell them from a practical point of view the way to stop inflation. Allied with Industrial Commissions, there should be a price control section and a research bureau. When a union approached the Industrial Commission for an increase in wages, the research bureau would be able to ascertain the profitability of the industry and its ability to pay. I think that most unions would subscribe to that idea, but it would mean, of course, a complete revision of the Government's thinking.

The free-enterprise, competitive system, has completely and utterly broken down. One of my colleagues in this House always refers to a particular member opposite as "Mr. Free Enterprise". We are told that competition brings prices down but other hon. members on this side have convincingly proved how farcical this claim is. I will cite one instance of how free enterprise works in regard to spiralling prices that are blamed, of course, on increases in wages.

The bread manufacturers agreed with the Transport Workers' Union to an increase of \$2 a week in the wages of the carting trade section of the industry. One firm, which employed 70 bread carters, as a result of this increase, had its payroll for carters increased by \$140 a week. In their usual competitive manner, the bread manufacturers then met and agreed to increase the price of all varieties of bread by 1c a loaf. As always, the justification advanced for this was the increase in carters' wages. The firm that had to pay an extra \$140 a week forgot to mention the fact that its turnover was 70,000 loaves a week. A simple arithmetical calculation would disclose that the increase, ostensibly to cover carters' wages, meant an additional profit for this firm alone of \$560 a week. Is it any wonder that such companies do not mind agreeing to wage increases for workers.

I have here a newspaper article which throws some light on why Country Party members are anti-union. Since I have been

in this House, I do not think I have ever heard from the other side one word favourable to a union, particularly from Country Party members. I shall read parts of this article that throw some light on Country Party policy.

Mr. Murray interjected.

Mr. DAVIS: The hon. member who interjects is always rubbishing the Country Party, so this might help him.

Mr. Murray: Never.

Mr. DAVIS: We all know that the hon. member for Clayfield has been a member of two or three different parties.

I do not know how true this article is, but the person responsible for it is a member of the Country Party in the Treasurer's electorate. It is headed, "A 'superboy' wanted for farm work", and reads—

"Kids today don't want to work, that's their trouble," said Forest Hill farmer, Laurie McIntosh. Mr. McIntosh is the farmer who advertised in 'The Courier-Mail' last week, 'Boy, 15-16, wanted, start work 3.30 a.m., 7 days week, 2 days off at Xmas, \$10 week and keep.'"

(Laughter.)

This might seem comical, but only last year in a reply to a question I asked the Minister for Labour and Tourism about industrial inspectors doing their job, he referred to me as a tool of my Communist-prone masters. I want to know why his department does not investigate this sort of person.

Mr. Bromley: Is this Farmer Petersen?

Mr. DAVIS: No, this is Farmer McIntosh. We have been told how busy Farmer Petersen was during the war. Anyway, Farmer McIntosh, when the reporter asked him if he was kidding, said—

"It does not bother me what city folk think. I don't want any city slickers up here. I've always got up at 3.45 a.m. myself and I'd want the lad up first to stoke the boilers. It sounds a bit hard but my bite isn't as big as my bark—I wouldn't drive a man."

The article continues—

"Farmer McIntosh, a stocky grey-haired man with a pronounced stockman's walk comes from 'out Windorah way' and bought the 80-acre farm four months ago. He runs a few cows and 45 pigs, and grows barley and lucerne."

He said—

"I would expect the lad to concentrate on the pigs, drive the tractor and a utility. I wouldn't let him drive the crawler. But I would not expect him to work long days. There would be an hour or so when he could just sit around and read the paper."

When asked if he thought seven days a week was a bit much to expect, he replied that he did not think so. He said—

"I have always worked seven days a week, and work does not hurt anybody."

A number of hon. members have said that work does not hurt anybody and that they would like to see the hours of work increased. Farmer McIntosh continued, "Anyway, I would take him whenever we go to the dance." Did Farmer McIntosh think that a wage of \$10 a week was enough? He certainly did. He said, "We live on the best here. I always have good tucker, and there is always bacon and eggs for breakfast." Asked, "How about the two days off at Christmas?", he replied, "He would get Christmas Day and Christmas Eve and Boxing day, but he would still have to do the pigs."

I refer to that article to acquaint hon. members with the attitude adopted by the Country Party.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. DAVIS: I would not try to "rubbish" anybody, but I am led to believe that he is one of the persons seeking the position of secretary of the Country Party.

I wish to refer now to a question that I asked the Minister for Health. I was led to believe that an hon. member who asks a Minister a question can expect a truthful answer. On 28 July of this year I asked the Minister for Health—

"(1) Is he aware that unwrapped bread is being delivered on Sundays by vehicles which do not comply with 'The Health (Food Hygiene) Regulations of 1957'?"

"(2) How many prosecutions were undertaken by the Health Department in relation to this matter for the six months ended June 30, 1970?"

"(3) As bread is being carted in the rear and boot sections of cars and also in the company of household pets, if no prosecutions have been undertaken what is the reason?"

The Minister replied—

"(1) 'No.'"

"(2) 'Nil.'"

"(3) 'I would appreciate the Honourable Member making available full details of the alleged breaches.'"

Two days later I asked him—

"Further to his Answer to my Question on July 28 in which he requested full details of alleged breaches of 'The Health (Food Hygiene) Regulations of 1957', as such details were forwarded to his Department by the Transport Workers' Union on March 20 and June 12 and the letters were acknowledged by his Department on June 16, what action did his Department take to investigate these matters?"

The Minister replied—

"The correspondence referred to contains no reference to unwrapped bread. The other matters raised are being attended to."

This matter is very important to the health of the community, and is not treated lightly by the union of which I am a member.

On 20 March, 1970, this letter was written to Mr. C. J. Murray, Chief Inspector of Foods, Health Department, Brisbane—

"Dear Mr. Murray,

"I am reliably informed that bread is being transported from Hauslers Bakery at Capalaba in vehicles that do not comply with the requirements of The Health (Food Hygiene) Regulations.

"The offences against the Regulations are said to occur regularly between daybreak and 9.00 a.m. on Sundays.

"I am instructed to request that investigations be made as a matter of urgency and that if the allegations are found to be correct that appropriate action be taken to end these unhygienic practices."

Mr. Tucker: Who wrote that letter?

Mr. DAVIS: The secretary of the Transport Workers' Union. The practices referred to are those followed by storekeepers, who arrive at the bakery in their private sedans or station-wagons and load unwrapped bread into them. The bread shares the company of either the pet Alsatian or cat or would be placed in the greasy boot of the car. The complaint is a legitimate one.

On 12 June, 1970, a letter was sent to the Under-Secretary of the Health Department, reading—

"On two occasions recently, officials of this union have observed unwrapped bread"—

I emphasise the word "unwrapped"—

". . . being carted in vehicles which did not comply with the Health and Hygiene Regulations. The breaches of the regulations occurred on a Sunday morning at the premises of Hauslers Bakery,"

and so on. Later on, it refers to unwrapped bread. I have here the reply, dated 16 June, from the Department of Health, signed by the Acting Under-Secretary. It reads—

"Dear Sir,

"I have to acknowledge your letter of the 12th instant concerning the cartage of unwrapped bread from certain bakeries.

"The matters mentioned have been referred to the Director-General of Medical Services."

That was signed by the Acting Under-Secretary, but the Minister made a big "galah" of him in this House by saying he had not heard of it. Either the Minister does not know anything about his department or someone in it is not giving him the right idea. Since March this year, when it was lodged, this serious complaint against unhygienic and unwholesome carting of

bread has existed, yet I did not get a decent or sensible reply from the Minister. That is shocking.

Mr. R. Jones: He is trying to cover up.

Mr. DAVIS: I think he is.

Before I finish my speech I think I should acquaint the House with a little story I heard the other day concerning Billy Hughes, a former Prime Minister of Australia and a former member of the Australian Labour Party, who was expelled from it because of his conscription beliefs.

A Government Member: A correction; he walked out.

Mr. DAVIS: In any case, I ask the hon. member to listen to this: he then became a member of the Nationalist Party, and from the Nationalist Party went to the United Australia Party, and from the fragments of the United Australia Party he went to the Liberal Party. In each party his membership ended in a "blue". While he was in the Liberal Party he had a "blue" with the then Leader of the Liberal Party, who is now Sir Robert Menzies, and it seemed as if he would have to leave the Liberal Party or be expelled from it. At this time, a friend of his approached him and said to him, "Mr. Hughes, there is only one party left that you can join and that is the Country Party." Billy Hughes, who was only a little fellow, jumped, ranted, raved and said, "Join the Country Party! What do you take me for, a rat?"

Mr. Porter: The Country Party was not formed until 1920.

Mr. DAVIS: Rubbish!

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (4.42 p.m.): Like other hon. members on this side of the House who have spoken, I certainly support and endorse the amendment moved by my leader and seconded by the hon. member for Nudgee. I am sure that if there are any honest members on the Government benches they will support the amendment when a vote is taken.

The technique has been made manifestly clear during the conduct of this debate. The issues raised by my leader have been evaded and avoided in the prevarications of the various Government members and in their desire to avoid the real truth and necessity to deal with the inefficiencies of the Government and its lack of control of the fundamental affairs of State.

Virtually, we have heard only one honest speaker from the Government benches. That was the hon. member for Flinders, who said this afternoon that the Government has in its ranks a couple of dishonest Cabinet Ministers. He certainly was not exaggerating, and I suppose other Government members could tell us some more of the truth about what is going on in the coalition parties.

In spite of what has been said—and some rugged, unfair and dishonest accusations have been made against A.L.P. members, both inside and outside the House—and in spite of the cloud, the smear and the dishonest innuendoes that have been levelled against us, I do not think it is necessary for me or any of my colleagues to underline our loyalty to Her Majesty. She realises that what Government members have been saying is a lot of hog-wash and balderdash. Her deputy in this State, the Governor of Queensland, is known to me as a former Chief Justice and a man who has practised the law. He knows when his Cabinet advisers are engaging in dishonesty; he knows only too well that they have not the evidence to support their erroneous allegations; and he would consider the remarks made by Ministers and back-bench Government members about the loyalty of the A.L.P. as a lot of drivel. I do not propose to waste too much time trying to assert what is a fundamental truth, namely, that we can hold our heads proud and high for what we have achieved politically, industrially, and internationally in our service in two world wars.

I listened with interest to the allegations and charges being trumped up by Government members about the “treason room” at the Trades Hall. I suppose Government members would like to accuse me of the self-same treason because, as a legal man, a politician, and a parliamentarian, I am prepared to advise people of their rights. I do that regularly each afternoon. However, my job is becoming too difficult because of the number who attend, and I would welcome the assistance of anybody else who is prepared to make his services available to help citizens who perhaps do not understand their legal rights.

One is entitled to advise people on any law or legislation and to tell them their rights, for instance, under the National Service Act. Not only have I done that, but I have also appeared for various people who have been brought in, sometimes by fathers who had distinguished records in the second world war, who were known to me personally, who in some instances were decorated, but who, for various reasons which are valid under the National Service Act, wanted certain applications made to our recognised courts for exemption from or deferment of service for their sons, and I have been successful on a number of occasions in keeping within the National Service Act and the provisions thereunder.

Are we to be charged with treason because we exercise our rights under Commonwealth and State legislation? Are we to be charged with dishonesty because we tell our constituents and supporters what they are entitled to under existing legislation? These allegations and charges relative to the so-called

“treason room” are so much poppycock. It is a room where people receive certain legal advice on existing legislation.

It would be equally fair to say that we are entitled to comment on or criticise the policy that is contained in particular legislation, which I do. Are we to be charged with treason because of that conduct? We are still upholding the rich traditions of our democratic instrumentalities that have been built up over the years by the loyalty of A.L.P. members. We are entitled to object—I say this as a proud father whose son will voluntarily join the R.A.A.F. on Friday—to the lottery basis on which men are called up simply because their marble happens to roll out. And I am not satisfied that it always rolls out in a fair fashion, either. Because I hold that opinion and because I want to and do make comment on it both here and elsewhere, are the charges and allegations of Government members justified? If National Service is essential, there should be no differentiation under any circumstances or conditions between youths of a given age.

Whether we agree or disagree with the service that is being provided at the Trades Hall, we must concede that it is being provided at the expense of the union membership who voted in support of providing it. On the other hand, this Government refuses to maintain standards and traditions that would preserve our democratic instrumentalities, and I refer in particular to the University of Queensland. Government members have been side-stepping and shilly-shallying in their obligations and responsibilities, and they do not speak about what they should be doing in regard to university activities. They do not charge certain people with treason as a result of nefarious practices and activities, and we are more entitled to deal with that aspect because the university is an instrumentality supported by public moneys. It is a vehicle into which large sums of the taxpayers' money are directed each year, and we, as representatives of the taxpayers, have an obligation to see that their money is spent wisely and fairly.

I have raised this issue previously. I believe it important that when Parliament has certain obligations, Parliament should shoulder them. I realise that, for political purposes, it is easy to criticise and castigate the trade union movement, because the Government knows that it will never get any support from decent, well-meaning and honest trade unions. If I may refer to preservation of democratic standards, the Government seems to conceal the corrupt practices of some of its Cabinet Ministers in obtaining secret profits from Cabinet negotiations and contacts. That type of conduct undermines people's respect for democracy much more than some of the hare-brained, wild-cat demonstrations that take place from time to time. Cabinet members, of course, are not necessarily corrupt, but if people

believe that some of them are, that undermines and white-ants the people's respect for democracy.

I can assure the House that there are many people in Queensland today who are not satisfied that we have an honest Cabinet; they believe that some Cabinet members are using their office for the purpose of obtaining personal profit.

Mr. Hinze: What do you think?

Mr. BENNETT: I share their opinion. I like to be objective and not give my personal opinions, as I am here as a representative of the people and try to express what they believe. However, if I am asked for my personal opinion, I am prepared to give it.

As a graduate of the Queensland University, I suppose I have some nostalgic feelings for an institution at which I received some of my learning, and, in observing its development over the years, I have been rather pained and disappointed, sometimes alarmed, at the Government's fear of interfering in any way in university activities. By adopting this attitude, the Government is doing a great disservice to the State.

I say that it is for two reasons that the Government has failed to interfere. One is that it is fearful of interference, and the second is that it likes to see some demonstrations by a very small minority of so-called university students. Not all who demonstrate at the university are university students. The Government likes to see demonstrations so that they can make use of them at election time by claiming that there is some affiliation between the demonstrators and the Australian Labour Party.

That is, of course, far from the truth. The A.L.P. has proved both this year and last year that it has the guts and the goodwill to get rid of subversive elements who flout the law. The Government is not prepared to do anything about them. Two conflicting reports have been made by two senior and allegedly responsible Cabinet Ministers, namely, the Premier and the Minister in charge of the Police Force. Certainly the public is in a state of disquiet because, having read carefully the public pronouncements of those two Ministers, they are still not clear on the Government's attitude to these matters.

I have been the victim of the sort of business that occurred at the Queensland University last Friday, and as a graduate of the Queensland University, I resent it bitterly.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: You resent the fact that you were not allowed to speak freely?

Mr. BENNETT: Sometimes I have resented not being allowed to speak freely in this Chamber, too.

I realise that episodes such as these relate to a very small minority of university students, because I well understand that the

roll call is a large one and that the vast majority of decent students are interested only in obtaining a good education and equipping themselves for their professions so that they can become the leaders of society for future generations, and we have a tremendous obligation to these students.

I do not believe in being sectarian or partisan, nor do I believe that there should be any differentiation or distinction between sections of the community. I realise that the craftsman, the apprentice, the man working with a pick and shovel, is doing just as much for his country as the man who acquires education, largely at the expense of the taxpayers, at the Queensland University. There should not be any differentiation between people in any of these categories. But I certainly believe that the person who is receiving an education is perhaps acquiring a weapon that can either be of tremendous value to the State or, alternatively, a source of destruction to the State, because ordinary, genuine, decent men in the community who have not had the privilege and advantage of a higher education are prepared to respect men of education and, usually, to accept what they do and what they say on matters in which the ordinary man is unskilled. Equally, of course, a professional man will accept what a craftsman tells him about his work. It would be a foolish man who would tamper with electricity if he had not served his apprenticeship in that field and did not understand it fully. So each man, naturally, must and should respect the other in his particular field of learning and training, and we should insist that those who are to lead us in the educational world—and we are moving into a scientific and technological era—have high professional standards.

One hears talk about the generation gap and the age gap. That is a lot of hooey, too, in my opinion. There has always been a difference in age groups, throughout history. However, I agree that, with the advancing years, when progress is made and greater skill and knowledge obtained, people are entitled to discuss and express their opinions, volubly, if they see fit, and by way of conduct, provided they do not flout the law, on the morality of conscription, the morality of conscientious objection. They are entitled to meet and say what they think about police treatment of suspects. They are entitled to demonstrate, provided they demonstrate without flouting the law and interfering with the liberty of others.

In recent years there has been a tendency towards what might be termed autocratic government. I have made my views fully and widely known in this Parliament, at the university, and in other places, about people who deliberately flout the law. I think I said on one occasion—nothing has since happened to change my view—that university students in particular could get much farther with the matters on which they wish to convince the university by using their brains rather than their boots and rather than by

becoming violent. On the other hand, I do not agree that a Government should be autocratic, and I think that some of the statements made by the Premier this morning are unfortunate. He is inviting and provoking trouble that may not arise. I am sorry that the Premier did not leave this matter to the Minister in charge of police, whose duty it is to see that the Traffic Act and other laws of this State are policed by the Queensland Police Force. The Premier obviously is provoking trouble and, incidentally, making the task of the Queensland Police Force much more difficult. I have no doubt that Mr. Whitrod would like to send a telegram to the Premier, or to get him on the telephone, and say, "Why don't you shut your big mouth?" I know that Mr. Whitrod could not say that, but that is no doubt what he is thinking.

A Press article that I have here reads—

"When the Premier was asked what action would be taken if the demonstrators decided to defy the Government and attempt to march along Queen Street, he said, 'They will be met with the full strength of the Police Force.'"

What a stupid, tactless remark for any Premier to make! I can only say, without being personal or disparaging, that it could only come from a man who has not mixed with men or who has not been in uniform. His comment was most unfortunate and could create quite an unnecessary and ugly situation. I, with the president of the Queensland Police Union, certainly do not believe that the police should be made punching bags on occasions such as this. I believe that violence should be overcome or avoided where possible, and I do not think that inflammatory remarks should be made by people in high authority.

Mr. Tucker: It looks as if he is itching for a confrontation.

Mr. BENNETT: As my deputy leader says, it looks as if the Premier is itching for a confrontation. He obviously thinks that, because of his lack of capacity as a Premier and the Cabinet's reputation in share dealings, publicity should be given to some other matter to attract it away from Cabinet activities.

There appears to be a lack of consultation in decision making. I believe that the dignity of the individual should be paramount. It is the individual, not the crowd or mob, who must be guaranteed the right of self-determination and, in the policing of our laws—indeed, in the making of them—we should insist on retaining the dignity of the individual and the individual's self-respect. I do not believe in any mob or group activities, and I think that the freedom that is bandied around so much these days is not an end in itself. Freedom is only of value when it affords an opportunity to get things done. Freedom from restraint is a negative thing. True freedom is the

state or system that gives us the opportunity of building up the community of man, and although, because of the wrong impression some people have of me, hon. members might think this strange coming from me, the greatest single factor guaranteeing freedom is a good, clean, decent Police Force.

I am satisfied that last Friday the Police Force was done a great disservice by somebody. It was probably the Government, but a lot of shilly-shallying is going on about it. Members of the Police Force, under their oath of office, have an obligation to go where they are needed and to be on duty where they are directed. It would seem that it was necessary for them to visit the university on Friday, whoever called them there. Quite frankly, perhaps not solely from the point of view of my own personal preservation, on the night when I was attacked at the university I had my wife with me and the situation was ugly. I do not like people thumping on the hood of my car and standing around. My temper might become frayed and I might get out and do things that later I would regret. Obviously, at times it is as necessary to use the services of the Police Force at the university as it is at any other public place.

How ridiculous it would be if the water-side workers said, "We will police the wharves ourselves. If we suspect any of our members of doing a bit of pilfering or lifting of cargo, we will police it. We do not want the police coming onto the wharves and searching our bags." What a ridiculous situation that would be. Yet a number of Government members and people at university level believe that the police have no right whatsoever to go onto the campus at the university.

I cannot see why the university should enjoy asylum or be sacrosanct. Of course, the university has its regulations and laws which are approved by Cabinet, but they are weak and ineffective and have led to a farcical situation.

The police were called in. That aspect is important. If a constable refused to go to the university he would be dismissed from the Police Force. He has no choice. If he was on duty in the city and was directed to the university he could not say to his superior officers, "I won't go there." If he said that, he would be dismissed. In keeping with their oath the police went to the university, and what happened? They were told, "Get out, pigs."

It is shocking that an extreme minority in this society will tolerate that sort of conduct. The police should not be expected to put up with such derision and insult. If the police are called to the university to help an hon. member or a leader in the community leave it, are they to be called pigs? I certainly do not think so.

A photograph appeared in the Press of an injured detective, and, although I think the look of anguish on his face was slightly exaggerated, apparently his ribs were broken and he had suffered bodily harm. It is a shocking indictment of the Government if the person who did bodily harm to a member of the Queensland Police Force, and whose identity is known, goes scot-free. Over the years I have had a good deal to say about policemen, and I believe that some members of the Police Force, particularly detectives, are dishonest. But they are in the minority, and I hope they will be weeded out in the near future.

Mr. Hodges: Has he gone scot-free?

Mr. BENNETT: Perhaps the Minister knows better than I do whether he has. On the day of the incident he certainly went scot-free. I point out that if I walked over to the Bellevue Hotel and thumped a policeman in the ribs I would be in the watch-house within 10 minutes. As a matter of fact, I have been on a charge of that nature after I was provoked sufficiently to retaliate. I received no asylum or protection from the law, so why should a university student be given protection? More particularly, why should a scruffy university student be given protection? Up till now the student involved has gone scot-free. Certainly he has not appeared in court. Under the law and the Criminal Code the police have the right to arrest him and charge him summarily. He should have been in the watchhouse right away.

Mr. Hodges: You admit that he could be summonsed?

Mr. BENNETT: He can be proceeded against by way of complaint and summons. Normally that procedure is reserved for the less-truculent members of the community, such as women and children, whom the police do not wish to see detained in the watchhouse. As well, it is reserved for those whose identity is not known at the time of the commission of the offence.

To my knowledge, in all circumstances if a person does bodily harm in the presence of police he must be arrested on the spot. That instruction is given to the police, yet when one of their colleagues was subjected to that same indignity, according to the Press—and I can be guided only by the Press until I hear a ministerial statement or receive authentic information—the Commissioner of Police called his men off.

They had to run away like dingoes to the jeering of these jackals. What a terrific blow to the standards and self-respect of the Queensland Police Force. I do not know the new Commissioner very well but I agree with many of the decisions he has made. That was a shocking decision which could have been made only on a Governmental instruction, although it may not necessarily have come from the Minister for Police. Certainly

he must have received a Government instruction to call off the police, and force them to suffer the terrible embarrassment of having to run away like dingoes. I am not suggesting that they were dingoes, but they were called off, and this grubby mob jeered at them while they left. That is one of the most scandalous happenings in our community since I became a lawyer.

When criminals are on trial in our courts judges often say to juries, "Now, you are dealing with a policeman, a respectable member of the community." Yet, the Government is now undermining their morale and well-being by calling them off in such a situation.

I am not attacking Professor Zelman Cowen, who is new in his position and has to operate under the laws prevailing at the university, but we now have the spectacle of a shocking farce in the form of an investigation. I would be in the watch-house by now if I had taken part in the demonstration last Friday, as would any ordinary citizen such as a waterside worker. But what is happening? Before anything can be done the University is to conduct a tedious investigation that may extend over three or four days or a fortnight. It will then be decided whether or not someone should be charged.

Mr. Hanlon: One of the terms of reference relates to who called the police and why members of the Special Branch arrived. In effect, that committee is inquiring into the Police Department, which is ridiculous.

Mr. BENNETT: That is so.

There will be charges and countercharges. We know what the Criminal Code states. The police know what was done, and there were several spectators or bystanders. Why does not the law follow its normal course rather than adopt this farcical investigation presided over by a Supreme Court judge to determine whether the police were justified in being there and who called them?

Mr. Hanlon: And what section was sent by the department.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes. It is a great waste of public money.

I have the utmost regard and respect for His Honour Mr. Justice W. B. Campbell who was an outstanding lawyer. He completed a distinguished course at the university and I think he graduated with first-class honours. However, he was taken off the Supreme Court—I do not know whether with the consent, approval or knowledge of the Government—even though this week he was to be a member of the Full Court, the highest court in the State, to investigate the presence of the Police Force on the university campus.

What drivelling administration is in charge of this State when Mr. Justice Campbell, a Supreme Court Judge, who takes his turn in presiding over a criminal court with a jury, is called on to listen to evidence on which a charge may be framed against a university student or even a policeman? There we have

the embarrassing spectacle—in my opinion the insidious situation—of a judge of our Supreme Court being taken from the top court in the State, the Full Court of Queensland, to undertake investigation work that would normally be carried out by a skilled detective.

Mr. Hanson: Some of these people are not university students at all.

Mr. BENNETT: As the member for Baroona points out, some of these people who were out there are not even university people.

It is suggested by some university authorities that a person can get sanctuary, whether he is a university student or not, by rushing out to the university and causing trouble. If he did it in King George Square, he would be arrested. But he can run out to the university and vent his spleen on some individual or body of individuals, and it is suggested that the university will protect him whether he is a student or not. I cannot understand how the Government has been so misguided in this matter for such a long time. I could find, by research, the question I asked last year of the Minister for Education. In his answer, he adopted the self-same attitude.

These people are in the minority. I have had children at the university and I hope to have others there. I want them to go there to learn, to be disciplined, and to become decent citizens, and not to be calling police officers whom they do not know, "Pigs". They would not be justified in calling them pigs even if they knew certain of them had bad reputations. When young constables in uniform, who do not have a spectacular job to do, are sent out there, it is a damning thing that they are called pigs by people who look so scruffy, dirty, and smelly that a decent, self-respecting pig would leave the pen rather than stay in it with them. The whole system at the university is becoming completely inverted. We are not making the vast majority of decent university students happy by what we are doing.

I suppose that this farcical investigation will go on and will publish findings. I imagine that a skilled criminal defence lawyer will argue that the university has already dealt with these students, who will plead *autrefois acquit* or *autrefois convict*, and that our criminal courts will not be able to deal with them because they have been dealt with by a university tribunal. It is high time something was done in this regard.

Mr. Hanson: The Government is on trial.

Mr. BENNETT: The Government is on trial, and it is being tried by a body appointed by an individual, not a statutory body. I respect him as an individual, but, after all, he is only an individual. This Government and its Police Force are being put on trial by a committee. It is not a commission or

a Supreme Court judge sitting as a Supreme Court; it is a committee appointed by an individual to investigate the policy of the Government in relation to Police Force activities, the Queensland Police Force, its presence on the campus, whether it was entitled to be there, and who got it there. In other words, it is a "whodunit" question.

It becomes extremely and imperatively important that we investigate many of what could be termed by-laws and regulations. The Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition have dealt with this subject often. Documents are laid on the table and nobody ever gets to know or understand their full import, their weaknesses or their anomalies. We might find that we have legislation similar to that in Victoria under which a parliamentarian was barred, after leading a good and honest life for 20 years, because of a conviction in the Children's Court. As leaders of the community and as parliamentarians, we have a tremendous responsibility to insist that our laws are such that people will respect them.

One further point relative to this matter is the university's desire, claim and demand that it should operate to clean up its campus. It has not done anything in the past to clean up the campus. With whom will it clean it up? The university has only one security officer, who would be knocked down by six or seven of these louts or thugs in one brawl. They would not care; they would kick him or smash him or attack him in pairs or as a mob. They would not give him a fair fight. Therefore the security officer at the university is virtually powerless and would have no authority whatsoever.

Also, in matters of this nature, if it is necessary to effect an arrest or to put offenders off the campus, they have to call in two poor old cleaners who no doubt are there because of their inability to engage in more active physical work. If an ugly situation arises, the best that the university can do is to call in two cleaners. It is not their duty to see that the law is enforced.

I might mention that the A.L.P. takes its responsibilities in this matter seriously. It is to be noted that during this Address-in-Reply debate 28 of the 31 A.L.P. members have spoken. That percentage is in sharp and disappointing contrast to the awful record of Government members, of whom only 25 of 45 have spoken. It is quite plain who are carrying out their duties and obligations.

The people who engage in the type of activity seen recently at the university regard themselves as highly intellectual. In fact, some of them have never passed a university examination in their lives, and have been responsible for the failure of others. They are suffering from what might be termed arteriosclerosis of the intellect, and they are menacing the liberty of others.

I should like to refer to an article that I read recently which dealt with the so-called generation gap, and in which George Orwell was quoted as saying—

“Each generation imagines itself to be more intelligent than the one that went before it, and wiser than the one which comes after it. This is an illusion . . . but one ought to stick to one’s own world-view, even at the price of seeming old-fashioned: for that world-view springs out of experiences that the younger generation has not had, and to abandon it is to kill one’s intellectual roots.”

Mr. Murray: You are quite a philosopher.

Mr. BENNETT: I have always been a philosopher, because hon. members opposite intrigue me. I am also a psychiatrist trying to find out how their minds work.

(Time expired.)

Question—That the words proposed to be added to the Address (Mr. Houston’s amendment) be so added—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 28

Baldwin	Jones, R.
Bennett	Jordan
Blake	Marginson
Bousen	Melloy
Bromley	Newton
Casey	O’Donnell
Davies	Sherrington
Davis	Thackeray
Dean	Tucker
Hanlon	Wallis-Smith
Hanson	Wood, B.
Harris	<i>Tellers:</i>
Houston	Wood, P.
Inch	Wright
Jensen	

NOES, 41

Bird	Kaus
Bjelke-Petersen	Knox
Camm	Lee
Campbell	Lickiss
Chalk	Loneragan
Chinchen	McKechnie
Cory	Miller
Crawford	Moore, R. E.
Delamothe	Muller
Diplock	Murray
Fletcher	Newbery
Heatley	Rae
Herbert	Ramsden
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Row
Hewitt, W. D.	Sullivan
Hinze	Tooth
Hodges	Wharton
Hooper	
Houghton	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hughes	Ahern
Hungerford	Porter
Jones, V. E.	

PAIR

Moore, F. P. Armstrong

Resolved in the negative.

Motion—That the Address in Reply be adopted (Mr. Heatley)—agreed to.

SUPPLY

CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEE

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier): I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.”

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS

CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEE

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier): I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.”

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.31 p.m.