

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 1971

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 1971

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

Industrial Development Act 1963–1970.

City of Brisbane Act 1924–1969.

Regulation under The State Housing Acts, 1945 to 1966.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

SALE OF CROWN LAND, MORETON ISLAND

Hon. V. B. SULLIVAN (Condamine—Minister for Lands) (11.3 a.m.): The honourable member for Wynnum, in a state of pique or for some obscure reason best known to himself, has seen fit to stand up in this House and level the serious charge of fraud at my department. Apart from airing his abject ignorance of land-law procedures governing the sale and lease of Crown land, he has achieved nothing except to gain for himself the dubious reputation as a commentator on land matters.

Mr. Bennett: Cut it out. This is a personal attack.

Mr. SULLIVAN: He set out to tell—

Mr. HOUSTON: I rise to a point of order. The Minister asked leave to make a ministerial statement. However, he now appears to be making a personal attack on the honourable member for Wynnum, and I strongly object to such tactics.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I uphold the point of order taken by the Leader of the Opposition. A ministerial statement should be used not as a means to engage in personalities but only to deny or refer to a statement made by another honourable member.

Mr. SULLIVAN: The honourable member for Wynnum set out to tell us that there is something very much amiss with the sales of Crown land on Moreton Island. The facts are that 38 allotments on Moreton Island were offered for sale at the Land Office, Brisbane, on 9 April 1970. About 90 people attended that sale, and bidding was brisk. The upset prices aggregated \$15,800, at an average of \$416 per allotment. The prices realised aggregated \$38,415, at an average of \$1,011 per allotment.

A sale of 36 allotments on Moreton Island was conducted by the Land Agent, Brisbane, on 9 September 1971. It was attended by about 150 people, and all lots offered were sold at auction. The upset prices aggregated \$26,300, at an average of \$730 per allotment, and the prices realised at auction aggregated \$58,775, at an average of \$1,632 per allotment.

A further sale is to be held on 16 September 1971. So that the public would not be confused by the rash and confusing statements by the honourable member, the officer conducting the sale, on 9 September 1971, advised prospective purchasers as follows, immediately before the sale—

“Roads indicated on the lithograph relating to today’s sale of 36 allotments in the town of Koorringal are dedicated but have not been constructed. The Crown is under no obligation to carry out any road construction works in respect thereof. As the town is not situated in any local authority area, the matter of road improvement for access purposes is one for the landholders themselves.”

The honourable member may know something of a chalk line on a piece of cloth, but obviously he knows absolutely nothing about lines or marks on plans or maps.

Mr. HOUSTON: I rise to a further point of order. I do not want to interfere with the Minister’s right to make a statement to this House, but you, Mr. Speaker, have already ruled that he was out of order in something he said earlier. I am suggesting that he is now completely out of order

again. I would like to know whether this type of statement is to appear in “Hansard”. I ask the Minister to withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not read the speech made by the honourable member for Wynnum, but I understand from the lead-up to the Minister’s statement that the honourable member for Wynnum made certain accusations against the Minister’s department.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Shocking accusations.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is only right and proper that the Minister should be allowed to answer those accusations, but he should omit personalities.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Ministerial statements and personal explanations can be made quite clearly and concisely without engaging in personalities.

Mr. SULLIVAN: The honourable member for Wynnum tells us that the Lands Department is guilty of fraudulent practice in that the defined roads in the locality are not trafficable. The Land Act definition of a road is—

“Any road, whether surveyed or unsurveyed, dedicated, or notified or declared in any manner howsoever to be a road for public use, and any road comprised of land taken pursuant to any enactment, for the purpose of a road for public use”.

The definition does not make any mention of construction, bitumen-sealed surfacing, vehicles, or, for that matter, “Harris’s pony”. The published lithographs were structured in accordance with current law and a practice which has been in force and adopted by successive Governments for more than 100 years.

The roads or streets to which the honourable member refers have been delineated on plans and opening lithographs or by gazettal in the Government Gazette, and the legal requirements in regard thereto have been fully complied with.

The honourable member is patently so naive as to believe that every road shown on a map is a constructed road. Probably he envisages that the thousands of miles of road shown as surveyed or defined on maps of Queensland are all formed and perfectly trafficable. How ridiculous of him. If this had to be the case, we would not be able to make available one piece of Crown land that was not serviced by a formed road.

The construction of roads is not, as such, a function of my department. In a situation such as this it would normally be the responsibility of a local authority. However, the land is not in a local authority area and it is important to note that the purchasers do not pay rates. I ask the honourable member: who should provide the money to construct roads? The allotments were made

available to meet public demand—the demand of people who are reasonably expected to know local conditions or are prepared to make appropriate inquiries and to participate in bidding, fully cognisant of the disabilities of the allotments, as well as their attractions. There have been no complaints from bona-fide purchasers. Access to the area is by small boat, a fact well known to everybody except, apparently, the honourable member for Wynnum.

I cannot be responsible for the honourable member if he cannot agree with me on this point, but certainly he must understand that the roads shown on the lithograph are indeed roads, and no wild claims of his will validly establish that the actions of the Lands Department and the information shown on the published lithographs were fraudulent or even suggestive of fraudulent practice.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

MINERAL PRODUCTION

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

For each of the periods July to December, 1970 and January to June, 1971, what was the value and tonnage of (a) coal, (b) bauxite, (c) copper, (d) lead and (e) zinc produced in Queensland?

Answer:—

“—	Half Year to 31-12-1970		Half Year to 30-6-1971	
	Tons	\$	Tons	\$
(a) Coal	5,475,017	35,213,597	5,495,062	35,021,169
(b) Bauxite	3,296,908	18,792,375	3,209,538	18,294,366
(c) Copper	54,719	61,156,649	54,016	55,961,414
(d) Lead	81,331	20,969,814	63,716	15,357,684
(e) Zinc	50,095	13,955,465	39,844	10,870,156

BUDGET MEETING, MONTO SHIRE COUNCIL

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

(1) Does the clamp of secrecy put on its August 26 budget meeting by the Monto Shire Council meet with the approval of his Department as constitutional?

(2) What steps are open to the rate-payers of this or any other shire which debates and decides matters of vital public interest behind closed doors and then denies residents the knowledge of such matters which are usually obtained through the news media?

(3) Has some form of official endorsement been given that details of local government expenditure are taboo to rate payers, as can be inferred from the allegation by the shire chairman that such secret meeting procedure is becoming general practice among public authorities?

Answers:—

(1 and 2) “I am informed that the Monto Shire Council adopted the Budget for the year 1971-72 at a General Meeting of the Council. The law provides *inter alia* ‘Every budget adopted by the Local Authority shall be open to inspection’. ‘Open to inspection’ is defined in the Local Government Acts.”

(3) “No.”

LICENSING COMMISSION HEARINGS

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

For the last twelve months for which figures are readily available, how many applications to the Licensing Commission, affecting areas in North Queensland, were heard in the areas concerned and how many were heard in Brisbane?

Answer:—

“Over the past twelve months, no applications affecting districts in North Queensland were heard in the several districts concerned. During this period, 42 applications relating to premises in North Queensland districts were heard by the Licensing Commission in Brisbane. I would mention again to the Honourable Member that in any case where a request is made to have a particular application heard at a main centre outside Brisbane, the Licensing Commission is quite prepared in an appropriate case, to co-operate and hear such matter at a place and date suitable to the applicant and to the Licensing Commission’s commitments in Brisbane which are booked weeks in advance at all times. In such a case the applicant should make known his request when lodging the application, as the relevant newspaper advertisements would have to show the place and date for the information of possible objectors or petitioners.”

SABBATICAL LEAVE, JAMES COOK UNIVERSITY STAFF

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

As he disclosed in his Answer to my Question on September 8 that nine applications for sabbatical leave had been approved by James Cook University and that ten wives will be granted expenses to accompany them, which staff member will be taking two wives overseas and for what purpose?

Answer:—

“The Honourable Member will remember that in giving my Answer on September 8, I indicated that at the James Cook University there were 11 applicants for sabbatical leave, nine already approved and two yet to be considered. The Registrar has advised that, in order to give a full and

accurate total picture for 1971, it was assumed that the two applications under consideration at the time would be approved."

CRIMINAL CHARGES AGAINST G. M.
DRUMMOND, TOWNSVILLE

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

Will consideration be given to the appointment of a Royal Commission or other form of public inquiry into all the circumstances surrounding the delays in bringing a man named Drummond to trial before the Northern Supreme Court on charges of burglary and the rape of a woman over 80 years of age, with particular reference to his release on bail on his own recognisance of \$250, to face the two charges each of which carries a penalty of life imprisonment and to determine whether this could be construed as an incitement to Drummond to abscond, which he has done?

Answer:—

"I refer the Honourable Member to the Answers already provided him in this regard by the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General on August 4 and September 8. I would add there is no justification whatever for the enquiry action now suggested by the Honourable Member. It should be borne in mind that it is completely within the discretion of the Judge as to whether a defendant will be granted bail and if bail is granted, the circumstances and amount upon which bail will be granted."

TEACHER-TRAINING, RADFORD REPORT
PROPOSALS

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

(1) Has he read the claim made by Mr. Clive Kings, Brisbane Grammar School science master, as published in *The Courier-Mail* of August 13, to the effect that the Radford Report proposals could fail if teachers did not receive additional training?

(2) If he agrees with this contention, what arrangements have been made to give teachers the necessary additional training?

(3) If there is to be in-service education for teachers, where will it be conducted and by whom?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2 and 3) "Through chief moderators, district moderators and school moderators, in-service education has been going on since April in all parts of the State. In addition, inspectors have visited a large number of schools and made themselves

available to discuss emerging problems with teachers. It is to be expected in such a far-reaching change that there will be problems arising from time to time. Information reaching me however, confirms my belief that the recommendations of the Radford Report are being implemented in a satisfactory manner."

JUVENILE AID BUREAU, POLICE
DEPARTMENT

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

(1) Has he read the claim made by Detective Senior Sergeant T. Lewis, as published in *The Courier-Mail* of August 17, that the Juvenile Aid Bureau had failed to make a sufficient impact on the volume of work going before Queensland courts?

(2) Why has the policy of his Department failed in regard to crime prevention amongst the youth of the community?

(3) What staff is presently attached to the Juvenile Aid Bureau?

(4) Is it intended to increase this staff and, if so, when?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "It is very difficult to isolate and measure the effectiveness of any Departmental Crime Prevention Programme."

(3) "One detective senior sergeant; one detective sergeant 2/C; two detective constables; six plain clothes constables; two uniform constables; one sergeant 2/C (policewoman); six constables (policewomen); and four clerk-typists."

(4) "This matter is related to and is receiving consideration in conjunction with the overall police staffing requirements."

OVERSEAS VISITS, LAW REFORM
COMMISSION MEMBERS

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

(1) What was the cost of the overseas trip of the Law Reform Commission earlier this year?

(2) Did Percy Raymond Smith accompany the Commission on this trip?

(3) Has the Commission reported on the trip and, if so, will the report be tabled?

Answers:—

(1) "An allowance not exceeding \$3,500 was made available to the Honourable Mr. Justice W. B. Campbell, chairman of the Law Reform Commission of Queensland to cover the cost of fares, accommodation and out of pocket expenses to

enable him to make an investigation into the British and American systems of law reform. An allowance not exceeding \$1,000 was made available to Mr. P. R. Smith, a Member of the Law Reform Commission of Queensland, who attended the United Kingdom as a guest of the British Institute of International and Comparative Law, to cover the cost of expenses incurred in a study of the loose-leaf statute systems in the United Kingdom, Kenya, Malawi and Tanzania and in an investigation of the operating techniques of law reform agencies in North America."

(2) "Mr. Smith did not accompany the Honourable Mr. Justice Campbell."

(3) "It is not intended that any report in relation to these visits overseas be tabled in Parliament."

CONTRACT FOR RAILWAY WAGONS

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

Further to the Minister for Transport's Answer to my Question on September 7, wherein it was stated that 70 per cent. of the manufacture of 290 G-class wagons will be carried out at Dalby by Farm Implements Pty. Ltd.—

(1) Under what award conditions is this firm working?

(2) Are all award conditions being complied with?

(3) Is preference for employment given to financial members of the union or unions applicable to the industry and, if so, what are the unions?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) "I am informed by the Department of Railways that the conditions of contract provide that the rates of wages and the terms and conditions shall be as prescribed by the relevant awards or industrial agreements under the laws of the Commonwealth or of the State."

ESTABLISHMENT OF REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY

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

What steps have been taken to set up the Regional Transport Authority to co-ordinate public transport in accordance with the Wilbur Smith Report?

Answer:—

"This is a matter involving Government policy which will be announced in due course. However, I should assure the Honourable Member that the study, the evaluation of the study, and advice of the officers of Departments concerned, are under active consideration."

REMOVAL OF HOUSING COMMISSION HOUSES, MOUNT GRAVATT

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

Further to my Question of August 4 concerning the removal of Queensland Housing Commission houses for the building of a petrol station at the corner of Cavendish and Creek Roads, Mount Gravatt—

(1) For how long has the land been leased to the petrol company concerned?

(2) What payment, on a yearly or other basis, is received by the Commission for such lease?

(3) What was the price received for the State rental house involved?

(4) What was the price received for the three houses, in each category, which were being purchased under contract of sale from the Commission?

Answers:—

(1 and 2) "The lease is a Perpetual Town Lease at an annual rental of \$750 subject to reappraisal by the Land Court after ten years."

(3) "Eight thousand dollars."

(4) "The price paid for each property by the company is not known as such is a matter of private business between the parties concerned."

INCIDENCE OF RAPE OFFENCES

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

For 1968-69, 1969-70 and 1970-71, how many cases of rape, in all categories, were (a) reported to the Police Department and (b) successfully prosecuted?

Answer:—

"(a) 1968-69, 33; 1969-70, 39; and 1970-71, 74. (b) A total of 64 for the three-year period in question."

CONFINEMENT AND TREATMENT OF DRUG ADDICTS

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

How many so-called drug users are presently confined to institutions and what kind of rehabilitation treatment do they receive?

Answer:—

"Five persons are currently under treatment at Wolston Park Hospital as the result of orders issued by the court for the care of these persons in an approved institution. Three are nursed in open ward conditions in Noble House attending daily

group meetings with other psychiatrically disturbed patients and receiving individual psychotherapy from a qualified psychiatrist at varying depths. Two are in closed wards, attend group discussions led by a psychologist and are individually supervised by a psychiatrist. A common misconception appears to be inherent in the Question, namely that drug dependence is a single disorder requiring a single type of treatment situation. Drug dependent persons vary in their treatment requirements because of the underlying condition responsible for the development of their dependence."

DRAINAGE NUISANCE, SOUTH-EAST FREEWAY EMBANKMENTS

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

As I have received many complaints from people residing near the South-east Freeway and particularly from those in the vicinity of the southern portion from O'Keefe Street, on the eastern side, that their yards and the areas under their homes became quagmires after heavy rain, particularly after the downfall on September 4, will he have the matter of the washing of dirt from the walls of the freeway investigated with a view to ensuring that suitably deep channels are excavated at bottom ground level inside the fences of the freeways to eliminate this nuisance?

Answer:—

"I regret any inconvenience that may have been caused to residents in this area. Within the last few days the contractor has tidied up the area between the toe of the embankment and the man-proof fence and constructed some drains. Additional drains will be provided and a close check will be kept on the area during rainy periods. It is also proposed, in the near future, to grass the banks in troublesome areas, using the hydromulch process. This process generally ensures a quick strike with resultant reduction of wash from the embankment."

DISSEMINATION OF PORNOGRAPHIC LITERATURE

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

(1) With reference to my Question of September 1, relating to an article in Erica Parker's column and her further rightful complaints concerning pornographic literature sent through the post, what action has been taken and has heed been taken of my advice to have the specific post-office box number watched?

(2) If investigations have taken place, what are the results?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "Investigations have been carried out and these investigations are continuing. Appropriate attention is being given to the matter of the post-office box referred to by the Honourable Member."

DISPOSABLE CUPS FOR RAILWAY REFRESHMENT ROOMS

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

(1) With reference to his Answer to my Question concerning the provision of disposable cups at railway refreshment rooms, will he explain why hot beverages are always served in disposable cups on the Railway Department's most recent refreshment arrangement, the griddle car?

(2) Will he provide similar arrangements for other refreshment rooms?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "The use of disposable cups is not peculiar to the Railway Department and with the covering which is available with them, they are superior to china cups for 'take-away' service. In addition they obviate costly replacement of china cups and reduce the storage room required which, in the griddle car, is limited."

LOCAL READERS SERVICE PTY. LTD., SOUTHPORT

Mr. F. P. Moore, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Justice,—

(1) Has his Department received complaints concerning Local Readers Service Pty. Ltd., Southport?

(2) As a constituent of my electorate has requested a refund of a subscription for 30 issues of "Children's Playmate" because the company has not supplied any issue since November, 1970, and as the company has replied that it will supply the issues in November, 1971, and will not recognise the request for a refund, will he have the company investigated and endeavour to have the request for a refund fulfilled?

Answers:—

(1) "No. I am informed that a complaint against the company has been made to the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs."

(2) "To enable appropriate enquiries to be made, I suggest to the Honourable Member that full details of his constituent's complaint against the company be communicated to the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs."

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

INQUIRY INTO ALLEGATIONS OF GRAFT,
POLICE FORCE

Mr. TUCKER: I ask the Premier: In view of the many astonishing statements and innuendoes made by the Minister for Works and Housing in respect to his claim of police graft and corruption, will the Minister be personally responsible for any writs which may be issued in consequence of this verbiage, or will the costs of successful writs have to be borne by the people of Queensland?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: In asking such a question, the honourable member would obviously know that no-one has any information as to the outcome of the inquiry, nor can anyone arrive at a decision as to what may or may not be the circumstances at that particular time.

SEX BROCHURES POSTED TO SCHOOL
CHILDREN

Mr. P. WOOD: I direct a question to the Minister for Education, and, in doing so, refer to a question directed to the Minister for Justice last week by the honourable member for Townsville South in which it was implied that certain teachers had been paid to provide lists of school children's names to Hamlyn House Pty. Ltd. I now ask the Minister: Has the honourable member for Townsville South supplied any information to substantiate the allegations in his question, as he was invited to by the Minister for Justice?

Mr. FLETCHER: Not to my knowledge.

GOVERNMENT POLICY ON ABORIGINES

Mr. MURRAY: I ask the Premier: In view of the significant statements that have been made over the last few days relative to the future of our Aborigines, is he prepared to tell the House now what is the Government's policy concerning Aboriginal people? Is it one of assimilation, or of integration? If the Premier does not wish to answer that question now, will he or the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs make a statement to the House in the very near future about the course the Government intends to take?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: This question covers a wide area. If the honourable member cares to put it on notice, either I or the relevant Minister would be glad to give him detailed information as to what the Government is doing in this very vast area of work with the Aboriginal people of this State. Within the past few days I have had the interesting experience of seeing afresh the tremendous progress that is being made in this area.

Mr. Murray: Would you make a statement?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: If the honourable member puts the question on notice, I will be happy to comply with his request.

RAILWAY POLLUTION OF BREAKFAST CREEK

Mr. DAVIS: I ask the Minister for Local Government: As he has frequently been quoted as being concerned about the pollution of Breakfast Creek and other creeks in the Brisbane area, will he have investigations commenced into the pollution of Breakfast Creek by oil flowing into it from Railway Department operations?

Mr. RAE: This matter is of great concern to me, and possibly there is some measure of truth in the allegations. It is a matter with which my officers are quite au fait, and they frequently make inspections not only of Breakfast Creek but of the Brisbane River generally. The aim is to clean up all Brisbane watercourses, including Breakfast Creek, but this cannot be done in five minutes. The honourable member may rest assured that adequate action is being taken in an effort to cope with the problem of pollution in the Brisbane River and Breakfast Creek.

ALLEGATION OF BRIBERY, MEMBERS OF
PARLIAMENT

Mr. R. JONES: I ask the Premier: Has his attention been drawn to a letter in "The Australian" of 13 September alleging, in a general statement, that members of Parliament are subject to bribery? If so, what action will he take to protect and exonerate members of this Assembly from such a blatant and unwarranted charge?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I saw something in today's Press about this matter. It applied to the Federal Parliament. I think that would be the statement to which the honourable member refers.

Mr. R. JONES: It originated in Townsville.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I understand that it referred to the Federal Parliament, not to members of this Assembly. From my experience in all the years that I have been here—I will shortly have been here for 25 years—I would not for one minute agree that such an allegation could apply to members of the Queensland Parliament.

WAGE RATES ON ABORIGINAL RESERVES

Mr. B. WOOD: I ask the Premier: Can he say what progress is being made to pay a level of wages on Aboriginal reserves that is at least more than is paid elsewhere by way of unemployment benefits?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: This matter would be dealt with by the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs, and the Minister for Conservation, Marine and Aboriginal Affairs would be able to obtain this

information for the honourable member. As I do not deal directly with this issue, I could not give the honourable member an accurate answer. However, I know that there is 100 per cent employment of both men and women at Bamaga, which I visited very recently. The honourable member is no doubt aware of what is taking place and what the department is doing throughout Queensland in this field.

GOVERNMENT CROCODILE FARM

Mr. CASEY: I ask the Premier: As it has recently been announced that he carries a boomerang in his aircraft to ensure good luck, is the main purpose in establishing a Government crocodile farm the ensuring of an adequate supply of crocodile tears for the people of Queensland?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! It is a facetious question. The honourable member is wasting the time of the House.

FORM OF QUESTIONS

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) having given notice of a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Certain sections of the question are out of order.

I have noticed recently a practice among honourable members to include in what is otherwise a pertinent question a section that refers to what could be termed Government policy. I cannot rule the whole of such a question out of order, for the simple reason that parts of it are quite allowable.

To avoid the constant need for editing and the wasting of time by the clerks, I ask honourable members on both sides to please be more careful in framing their questions. This morning, for example, there were at least four or five questions dealing with Government policy. I cannot rule the whole of such questions out of order, and my attitude in future will be to leave it entirely to the departments or the Ministers concerned to decide whether or not to answer them.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—SIXTH ALLOTTED DAY

Debate resumed from 9 September (see p. 475) on Mr. Muller's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. KAUS (Hawthorne) (11.51 a.m.): It gives me great pleasure to join in this debate. In the first place, I should like to take this opportunity to reaffirm my loyalty, and the loyalty of my constituents, to Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II. I also extend congratulations and support to the mover and the seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

I welcome, too, the two new members, namely, Mr. Don Lane, representing Merthyr, and Mr. Gil Alison, representing

Maryborough, whose victories in the recent by-elections expressed the people's approval of the stand taken by the Government in maintaining law and order. I commend the Government on its stand.

I also wish to pay a tribute to the Governor, Sir Alan Mansfield, and Lady Mansfield, on the way in which they have carried out their duties, and for the interest they show in the welfare of the people of Queensland.

Today I wish to speak in particular on the training of new members of this House, and on parliamentary practice and procedure. I hope to set an example by getting up, saying my piece, and sitting down. A noteworthy development in the work of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association has been the expansion of seminars on parliamentary practice and procedure. It is of special significance that some State Parliaments arrange such training seminars for new members.

Following the last general election there was a heavy influx of new members to the Queensland House, and recently there has been the addition of two new members after the by-elections that were won by the Government. When elected to represent one or other point of view, members find themselves unsure about how to represent their constituents most effectively, within the forms of this House.

Mr. Davis: Use common sense; that's all.

Mr. KAUS: Because of a lack of understanding of parliamentary machinery and how it works, the newcomer to Parliament is at a distinct disadvantage. I know that I was in this position when I was elected to Parliament. Naturally, I had to move round and find things out for myself and, as someone mentioned a moment ago, use a little common sense. This situation could be overcome by training seminars.

If, as a result of ignorance of parliamentary procedure, a new member innocently offends against the rules and practices of the House, it may take considerable time for him to regain his confidence. It is surely best, for the effective working of parliamentary democracy, that members be properly equipped for their important role, and I think they should be so equipped as early as possible in their parliamentary careers.

A general election will be held in Queensland next year, and the creation of new seats will mean that a number of new members may find the procedures and general arrangements in the House of Parliament rather complex and difficult to follow.

Mr. Bennett: You won't be here.

Mr. KAUS: The honourable member for South Brisbane should not worry about me. He should be worrying about himself.

I think it would be a good idea to offer all new members some training, thereby giving them the opportunity of learning some

of the basic procedures and workings of the House. Such a scheme could be extended and developed to give serving members of the House the opportunity of attending also.

It would be presumptuous of me to suggest topics to be discussed, but, as a comparatively new member of this Assembly, I should like to make a few suggestions. Topics for discussion could be: Parliament in general, its component parts and its functions; the sources of parliamentary procedure; the Constitution and Standing Orders and the place of "May" and of Speaker's rulings; the role of the Chair in presiding over proceedings; and—this is important to new and old members alike—conduct within the precincts of Parliament. Some honourable members opposite could well take note of that now and learn a few good manners.

Other topics could be: Observance of the Standing Orders; movement in the Chamber during debate and restrictions on movement during divisions; seeking the Speaker's call; pairs; the rules relating to the manner and place of speaking; interjections; and the rules of debate. All these subjects could be discussed at a short seminar when new members are elected to this House.

In addition, the following matters could be discussed: Basic procedure in moving motions and putting the question; the relevancy of types of motions; and the requirements regarding notice.

To conclude on a good note, there could be a discussion on a day in Parliament—a quick summary of a typical day from beginning to end, including question time and the rules relating to questions (I am sure many honourable members opposite do not understand them); standing and select committees and their powers, functions and operations; and an outline of the history of the office of Speaker and those held by the various officers of Parliament.

Question time is very important in the procedures of the House. When conducted with the necessary flexibility, it can make a major contribution to the democratic process. In modern times and modern societies, the bureaucratic tentacle of Government reaches into every home and touches every person. It is for this reason that the existence of a question time in which members have the fullest opportunity to criticise the executive Government, to ventilate grievances, and to press for action, is of vital importance.

Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker would not agree with you on that one.

Mr. KAUS: The honourable member will have plenty of opportunity to speak.

In such proceedings, Parliament can be seen to be acting directly in the interests of the citizens, and in this way it can command their respect.

I turn now to the clerks of the Parliament and their several functions. Although they receive little prominence and are virtually

unknown outside the parliamentary circle, the clerks of the Parliament play a fundamental part in the functioning and maintenance of parliamentary government. They are officers and the servants of the House. The Chair looks to them for guidance on procedure, and members depend on them to ensure that the machinery of Parliament functions with efficiency. They are completely impartial, and are trusted servants of their Parliament. Without them, the parliamentary system could hardly function.

The objective of the seminars would be to impress upon members, particularly new members, that when they enter Parliament as the representatives of the people they must understand the rules of practical politics. It is of immense value to the parliamentary institution that its members become parliamentarians in the real sense, and that they recognise the need for and the value of Parliament as a forum where ideas are exchanged and contrary views are expressed prior to a decision being taken which ultimately changes the law of the land and affects the citizens of the State. I feel certain that in this way a new member would settle into his new environment more quickly, and such training would ensure the smooth running of Parliament.

We should give consideration to the reintroduction of the system of select committees for which 50 per cent of the Standing Orders in the booklet "Queensland—Standing Rules and Orders of the Legislative Assembly 1951" exist as a method of Government action along certain desired lines, or for the purpose of obtaining proper information before a decision is made to initiate legislative or other action.

Select committees are of considerable importance in many respects. Primarily, of course, the use of select committees enables parliamentarians burdened with heavy legislative programmes to carry out their important function of examining and checking the work of the Executive. The Australian Senate Committees and the Select Committees at Westminster provide excellent examples of this method of parliamentary supervision. Another point to be noted in the development of the committee system is that it involves the back-bench member more directly in the work of Parliament than is otherwise the case.

Looking back over the post-war years, I have realised that private members in many countries feel that they are no more than chess-pieces to be moved by the Whips. Our effective service on important committees would certainly allay such an impression.

The growth of the power of the Executive and the apparent decline of the influence of Parliament as an institution have aroused widespread concern ever since World War II. Many back-bench members have voiced a sense of frustration. I have in mind some honourable members opposite with their little problems. Political scientists and journalists

have written extensively on this subject, and debates at Commonwealth Parliamentary Association conferences have dwelt on it.

If there has been a decline in the influence of Parliaments—this is far from being conceded—the urgent need is for Parliaments to review their procedures and to take steps to ensure that the power to examine and, where necessary, reverse the decisions of the Executive is not eroded but is strengthened.

It would seem that in the post-war period the dramatic growth of governmental activities and the resulting demands on parliamentary functions have delayed consideration of procedural reforms. However, the need to devise new procedures which increase the efficiency of Parliament has established some priority—for example, a revised system of question time. It has also resulted in a far greater use of committees. As I mentioned previously, the use of Australian Senate Committees and the latest recommendations by Westminster to create a select committee on expenditure indicate that there is apparently a fuller recognition that Parliaments must evolve procedures to ensure that their influence is not diminished and that they carry out their real function of supervising and checking the activities of government.

I should like to deal also with the times allotted for debates and to advocate the institution of adjournment debates. Of course, every Wednesday in this Parliament we have grievance debates in which 10 minutes each is allotted to members to discuss any matters of public interest they may wish to raise. However, the present time allocated for debate on the Address in Reply, should, I think, be pruned to 30 minutes for each speaker, and speaking time on the Financial Statement, or Budget, should be cut to 45 minutes in lieu of the 60 minutes now allowed. My point in saying this is that any time deducted from these general debates could be redirected to providing additional time for grievance and adjournment debates.

I should also like to say a few words about the Library, and to advocate the addition of a research unit to its present facilities. There was a time when a famed American historian and philosopher could say with considerable justification that practical politics consisted of ignoring facts; but that time has long since passed. Some honourable members might ignore facts in their constituencies if they happen to hold blue-ribbon seats, but I doubt whether any honourable member today would be silly enough to ignore some problems which arise in his electorate.

Any member who ignores facts today will surely risk defeat at the polls tomorrow. The art of political survival now requires a full and often an intimate knowledge of the facts that underlie issues of concern in his electorate.

One of the most troublesome problems facing a member of Parliament today is that of becoming knowledgeable and informed on

current issues, whether they be national, State or local. For example, if the Legislature is going to initiate a programme to combat water pollution, members have to know the causes of water pollution, the various methods of preventing it, the advantages of one method over another, the cost, and so on. Where are these facts to be found, and how does a member become informed on them? There are many sources of such information.

Mr. Wright: Is this a criticism of your own Government?

Mr. KAUS: No, I am certainly not criticising the Government.

Every member brings to the Parliament his own particular background, education and experience. As a body, the Parliament represents a good cross-section of the Queensland, or Australian, way of life and a member learns much about local matters through frequent and direct contact with his constituents. However, at some point members of Parliament need a place to which they can go for a balanced, unbiased and fair presentation of all the relevant facts. This is where the Parliamentary Library, with its legislative-research service unit, comes into the picture.

I am advocating a legislative-research service unit because many members require the opportunity to draw on improved research facilities. As the content of government becomes more involved, it is increasingly important that research assistance should be available to help members with material for their speeches and for committee work, which will expand and become specialised as and when the select-committee system is introduced and extended. Such a unit would cater for the special projects and interests that members will pursue.

If the back-bench members are to understand the complicated policy and legislative detail laid before them and be able to act as a responsible check on government, they must have excellent supporting services, including good research facilities.

Mr. O'Donnell: I hope you realise that the onus is thrown on members of the Opposition to do their own research work—and they do it very effectively.

Mr. KAUS: The honourable member would not know it, but that applies to members on both sides of the Chamber. I am trying to help members on both sides, not only the Government side.

Finally, good facilities and services should mean that the time-consuming aspect of an M.L.A.'s work will be cut, thereby leaving him more time to pursue directly matters of State importance. I envisage improved services and facilities that will make members of Parliament more outward looking and more knowledgeable than is possible under today's system.

Mr. NEWTON (Belmont) (12.11 p.m.): The Address-in-Reply debate gives honourable members on both sides of the House the opportunity of speaking on many and varied subjects, such as that dealt with by the honourable member for Hawthorne. Naturally, in their contributions Opposition members attack the Government and its legislation and, as well, deal with problems that arise in their electorates. During a session of Parliament before a State election, Government members usually rise to support the Government's legislative programme and commend the action taken by it over the preceding three years. However, during this debate such commendation has been lacking from the Government side. Owing to the vacancies that will occur in Cabinet before the next State election is held, particularly that of Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party, a number of Liberal members have used their time to speak from dossiers and briefs prepared for them, in the hope that they will secure one of the positions that will become vacant in Cabinet. Government members have used this Address-in-Reply debate for the purpose of conducting a smear campaign against the Opposition and the Australian Labor Party in this State. Time and time again since I have been in Parliament I have seen Government members who aspire to Cabinet raise the "Red" bogey and deal with "Red-baiting" issues. Invariably, when Government members are elevated to Cabinet a long period of time elapses before they are able to adapt themselves to handling their portfolios and the many Acts that come under their jurisdiction.

Last week the honourable member for Yeronga read from a dossier that undoubtedly was prepared for him by either one of the Ministers or the honourable member for Merthyr. Never have I heard so much garbage in my life. He indulged in "Red-baiting" and asked Opposition members if the Treason Room was still in operation at the Trades Hall. Apparently he could not obtain that information from the political section of the Police Force, which is quite willing to give free advice to back-bench members of the Liberal Party on that type of subject. It is a shame that the Press ignores many of the worth-while contributions of honourable members to debates, yet publicises speeches made from dossiers and briefs that have been prepared. Matters of importance affecting the State and the people are completely blacked out by the Press. And in that regard there is no need for me to traverse again the points recently made by the honourable member for Rockhampton South in referring to what members of this Parliament should talk about.

I now turn to the subject raised by the honourable member for Mt. Gravatt and the honourable member for Chatsworth, that is, the establishment of a parliamentary privileges committee. They indulged in a lot of "hogwash" in saying they wanted such a committee for the protection of

honourable members on this side of the House. It is well known that their primary purpose is to bring about the defeat of as many Opposition members as possible. Their statement that such a committee would protect Opposition members was nothing but a blind. They are worried by what has happened in the Liberal Party in recent years, and by the way in which they have been chastised. They are worried also about their position in the Liberal Party. That is why they raised this smoke-screen of a parliamentary privileges committee to protect members of Parliament.

The honourable member for Chatsworth made a scathing attack on the Opposition over the number of speakers on this side of the House who had dodged the issues of the day, including the state of emergency. I remind him that, when the state of emergency was introduced, he made a Press statement indicating his feelings, but the other day in his Address-in-Reply speech he did not say one word about his stand on that matter, although he had an opportunity to do so.

Since 1957, in the Opposition's view, the Government has been notorious for its declaration of states of emergency. In this respect the Government has set an all-time record. We have been told that a state of emergency is declared only after all other avenues have been exhausted. That principle was ignored during the Springbok tour. All avenues were not exhausted. The Government did not attempt to gauge what the position would be in Queensland. It simply abused its powers by declaring a state of emergency by Order in Council.

On previous occasions when a state of emergency was declared, the Government said that the action was taken to maintain production and minimise effects on the economy of the State. However, a state of emergency is not declared when there is widespread unemployment in the State, as there is at present. Unemployment is increasing daily, and looks like becoming very serious in the year ahead. Nothing is ever done about that, despite its serious effect on production and the economy of the State.

Mr. Lane: What about the effect of political strikes on the economy?

Mr. NEWTON: Evidently the honourable member for Merthyr, who belonged to the political section of the Police Force, is now worried about political strikes. If anybody should know anything about them, he should. He now has the opportunity to make any contribution he cares to make about them, which, of course, will be answered very capably from this side.

States of emergency in Queensland have been declared to protect the employers' interests, but they were not used to alleviate destruction at Killarney or Kin Kin. When I consider the powers conferred by a state of emergency, I wonder why a state of

emergency was not declared after those two incidents, yet was invoked during a football tour. Having read the papers that were tabled in this matter, we ask: was the state of emergency introduced by the Government to gain control of a particular ground or to protect the administration of the Royal National Association? Nobody has told us so far, and we have to read into it that possibly one of the main reasons for the state of emergency was that this Government, irrespective of cost, was determined to provide a ground on which the Springbok matches could be played in this State.

Was the Government concerned about the low morale in the Police Force at that time? The state of emergency could not have been introduced for that reason. The Opposition was forwarded a copy of a letter to the Minister in charge of the Police Department from the secretary of the Queensland Police Union, which indicated quite clearly that every member of the Police Force was fully aware of the nature of his oath of office. The letter also indicated, quite rightly as it came from the union representing these people, that the union expected certain conditions to be observed when this special force was brought to Brisbane from country areas. There was no need for the state of emergency to be declared on the ground that the Minister or the Commissioner was concerned about the loyalty of members of the Police Force, because the union, on behalf of its members, had made the matter quite clear.

What we are concerned about is that the Government showed contempt for Parliament by avoiding the issue in debate and in questions asked in this Chamber. The Opposition decided that the only questions to be asked relative to this matter would be lengthy ones asked by me so that the Parliament and the people of Queensland would know the true position. All we received was a complete avoidance of the issue by the Minister in charge of the Police Department. The only result of the declaration of this state of emergency was the creation of a police State. We have said this before and we say it again.

Mr. R. E. Moore: The public were in agreement.

Mr. NEWTON: The R.N.A. was not in agreement. It did not want its ground used. But the Government used its powers to create a police State and take over this ground to aid the Springbok tour. The police were required to do jobs quite outside their normal duties. After all, they are trade unionists and do not like carrying out work that should be performed by other trade unionists. But they were required to do this work under the state of emergency. In addition, bloodshed was wanted over this particular issue, but thank goodness it was avoided to some extent.

Mr. Lane: Who threw the rocks up at the Tower Hill Motel?

Mr. NEWTON: The honourable member would not know. If he had been up there, he would have been at the back of Anzac House to make sure he was out of the road and did not get hit by them.

Honourable members recall differing statements made by the Premier and the Minister in charge of the Police Department on the alleged brutality at the Tower Mill Motel on the occasion when the police, at the direction of an inspector, turned on the demonstrators. The Premier is on record as saying that an investigation was not wanted or warranted. That proves my point that the Premier has some answers to give on this question. We know what happened on the visit of the Springboks to Toowoomba, and questions have been asked in this House as to why action was not taken by the police following that incident. We are still receiving letters dealing with it. One person forwarded a letter which included "The Sunday Australian" statement that the police witnessed an incident in which a person was seriously injured, yet no action was taken.

I also have copies of a number of statements forwarded to the Minister in charge of the Police Force by Mr. Barry A. Cotterell, J.P., chairman of the Anti-Apartheid Steering Committee. He forwarded to the Minister a number of statutory declarations dealing with incidents that occurred at Ballymore Park. Although they were submitted to the Minister on 16 August 1971, to date no reply has been received.

Let us look carefully at the position. The dissenting member of the Police Force, Detective Sergeant A. T. Walker, has probably told us, in his address to university students, what is going to happen as a result of all these things raised by the Opposition. He said that, because of the number of police officers returned to their districts before the state of emergency was lifted, and those who have since been returned, nothing will be done.

Mr. Lane: Is Walker writing your speeches now?

Mr. NEWTON: Walker does not write my speeches. If the honourable member stays here long enough, he will find out that I do not need anybody to write my speeches. I am quite competent to make a speech off the cuff at any time, either here or anywhere else.

The charges made by this member of the Police Force have gone unanswered by the Government.

Topping it all was the final announcement by the minister that, because of their excellent work, the police officers engaged in the Springbok tour activities were to be given an extra week's leave. Let the industrial workers of this State keep in mind that, coincidentally, that announcement was made on the same day that a commission decision was handed down giving to members of the Police Force all the wage increases for which

they had applied. This means, of course, that whilst some police officers were given an extra week's leave, others were expected to carry on with the many tasks required of them when the State was left unprotected during the state of emergency.

I say on behalf of the Opposition that it is about time the Government had a close look at the use of its powers in the declaration of a state of emergency. We say that the declaration of a state of emergency during the Springbok tour was a straight-out abuse of power.

The other matter I wish to raise is the present situation confronting the Police Force. The Opposition considers it to be very serious. When Parliament was debating the Bill under which power was given to bring about a re-organisation of the Police Force, Opposition members requested that an inquiry be held into the whole of the workings of the Police Force in Queensland, as the morale of its members was at its lowest ebb. I say again today, because the position has not improved, that such an inquiry is warranted.

When the recent allegations were made known, honourable members were told that an inquiry was to be held into the operations of massage parlours on the Gold Coast. Then we found that the Minister, or the Government—when I say “the Government” I mean Cabinet—having not checked out thoroughly the particular charges about massage parlours and being afraid that the inquiry could collapse around their ears, added S.P. betting and the activities of tow-truck operators to the list of matters to be inquired into. The Opposition welcomes an inquiry into those matters, because it will prove to the people of Queensland how bad the legislative programmes of Country-Liberal Governments have been since they first came to office in 1957.

One has only to go back to what a Country-Liberal Government did relative to the “legal houses” that were operating. It padlocked them, and today the number of cases of rape is at an all-time high.

Mr. Lickiss: What “legal houses”?

Mr. NEWTON: If the honourable member does not know, I do not intend to tell him. It is not my practice to abuse the privileges of the House by using filthy words; I try to keep my remarks on the highest plane.

As the honourable member for Baroona has pointed out on a number of occasions when legislation touching the T.A.B. has been under consideration, one of the main reasons why S.P. betting is still in being in Queensland is that the Government did not take the opportunity, when introducing the T.A.B., to ensure that a person could receive a pay-out after each race instead of having to wait till the programme was complete. As long as the T.A.B. legislation remains as it is, the police will have a continuous job in trying to prevent S.P. betting.

The activities of tow-truck operators are a matter of concern to the Opposition. About 18 months or two years ago the matter was raised by various honourable members on this side of the House, and one would expect that it would have been cleared up by now. But what do we find? As I said, the Minister has included the activities of tow-truck operators in the list of matters that he and the Commissioner think should be inquired into.

If an inquiry is to be held into the Police Force, let us have a full inquiry. If it is said that graft and corruption are taking place—and there must be evidence to prove that it is—let there be an inquiry into that; but let there be an inquiry also into the many other matters that have been raised. One of the main points requiring investigation is the strength of the Police Force in Queensland. That question has been raised time and time again by the Opposition and by the Queensland Police Union. What is the reason for the large number of resignations from the Police Force in the last 12 months? Up till 30 June 1971, 129 members of the force had resigned.

Let there be an inquiry into why Parliament was not told that there were to be first-class and second-class superintendents and that the rank of sub-inspector was to be abolished. Neither this Parliament nor the people outside, including members of the Police Force, were told that there were to be first-class, second-class, third-class and fourth-class inspectors appointed in this State. These are all matters that should be inquired into. Why are fourth-class police inspectors expected to carry out the work that was previously done by an inspector and sub-inspectors? When a fourth-class inspector is sent to an area, why is he not appointed there permanently but told that he is only there on a trial basis to see if he can do the job?

There should be an inquiry into the closing of police stations throughout the State. Why are new police stations not being provided in quickly-growing areas? There should be an inquiry into the hours during which police stations are manned. Why are some of them closed from 5 p.m., and others closed for staggered periods, until 5 a.m.? Why should one policeman be called upon to look after other districts as well as his own from 11 p.m. onwards, areas that in some cases have a population of 150,000? One man on his own is expected to do all this.

Mr. Dean: Unprotected.

Mr. NEWTON: Unprotected, as the honourable member for Sandgate says.

Why has there been no implementation of the promise made by the Government some time ago, following a certain incident, that in future car patrols would be made by two members of the Police Force?

There should be an inquiry into promotions within the Police Force. Is the present arts and science course going to override all other examinations to which police personnel submit themselves for the purpose of promotion? When a senior sergeant applies for promotion to inspector, why does he have to supply his own medical certificate to prove his state of health?

Let there be an inquiry into extraneous duties. A searching investigation is needed in this field. Time and time again we hear about the need for safety on the road and efforts that are being made to reduce the road toll. It is essential that police motorcycle patrols be sufficient in number to supervise the transport of heavy and wide loads that are being shifted all over the State, particularly from the metropolitan area to Gladstone. Unless these patrols are maintained, the road toll will be higher than ever.

An inquiry should be made into the Juvenile Aid Bureau. Those in the legal field tell us that there is a shortage of police personnel for this work. Better buildings and facilities for the maintenance of equipment used by the Police Force are long overdue. The Government announced that police patrol cars would operate on the highways for seven days a week in an endeavour to reduce the road toll, particularly in country areas, but instead of being out on the highways police vehicles are standing all week in the Government garage.

Another matter that needs looking into is the recruiting of more policewomen. Already we have evidence that wherever policewomen are attached to a centre they are able to assist considerably with the clerical work involved in ordinary day-to-day charges. It has been clearly established that, when policemen return to their station to finish duty for the day, the clerical work required in connection with any charges that have been laid can be performed by a policewoman. While dealing with policewomen, I point out that in new police stations that have been built—and those that have been provided by this Government are very hard to find—no facilities have been incorporated for policewomen. This needs looking into.

The fact that the Queensland Police Union will not, even today, agree to change its policy of advising people not to join the force in Queensland is a clear indication of a very serious demarcation issue between the union and the Government on the question of recruiting personnel.

The rule about checking of diaries is another matter on which we have had no explanation. Announcements have been made that police have to hand in their diaries for checking. This, of course, means that each member of the force must have two diaries, one to hand in and one to use while the other is being checked.

Another matter which shocks me is the statement made quite openly that the surest

way any member of the Police Force who desires promotion can get it is to go out and make arrests, and this applies particularly to traffic breaches. Figures supplied to this House over the years have indicated a considerable increase in the toll of the road and this, of course, is because the Queensland Police Force has not sufficient personnel to properly police traffic laws. The most serious matter requiring investigation is the rate of solution of crime in this State, which is as low as 35 per cent. This must indicate to any thinking Queenslander that it is not safe to leave his home unattended. The number of crimes of burglary, breaking and entering and so on being committed in this State is alarming.

Another serious matter that should be investigated is the amount of sick leave taken annually by members of the Police Force. The information was given in reply to a question from this side of the House. These figures should prompt any Minister or Government to do something about the matter.

Since it assumed office in 1957, this Government has, in many ways, neglected this portfolio. If my memory serves me correctly, in that period six Ministers and one acting Minister have held the portfolio, and the only one who seemed able to do anything about establishing harmony in the Police Force was the late Jack Pizzey. In spite of his success in this portfolio, he was relieved of it. However, because a serious situation arose he took over the portfolio again and retained it even while he was Premier.

From 1957 to 1962 the portfolio of police Minister was held by the Hon. K. J. Morris; from 1962 until 1963 it was held by the Hon. J. C. A. Pizzey; in 1963 it passed to the Hon. A. T. Dewar, who held it till 1965; in that year Mr. Pizzey took back the portfolio, and he held it until his death in 1968; in that year it was taken over by the present Premier and held by him until the following year; and from that year until the present time it has been held by the present Minister for Works and Housing. In addition, for a short time in 1962 Sir Harold Richter held the post of acting Minister in charge of police.

Surely to goodness the Government realises by now that a department as important as the Police Department cannot function properly when control of it is changed as frequently as I have enumerated. Other than the Hon. J. C. A. Pizzey, the various Ministers in charge of the Police Force have blundered and been unable to create harmony among police officers.

As all honourable members are aware, the present Minister in charge of police has made certain statements on the inquiry that is being held. Whatever the Government's motives and intentions, the Opposition will not let it get away with holding an inquiry along the lines indicated by the Minister. Owing to the

time lapse involved, members of the Opposition are suspicious. Clearly something is wrong. Perhaps because an election is near the Government wants to call off its witch-hunt and avoid any inquiry, let alone a royal commission, into the activities of one of its departments. But if, as has been claimed by one detective, his life has been threatened and the lives of other police officers have been threatened on the issues of massage parlours, S.P. betting and tow-truck operations, a full and proper inquiry must be held.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Mulgrave) (12.49 p.m.): I am grateful to have this opportunity of joining in the debate on the motion so ably moved and seconded by my colleagues the honourable member for Fassifern and the honourable member for Windsor. I congratulate them on their contributions to this debate, and wish them well in this and subsequent sessions.

I should like to pledge the loyalty of my constituents to Her Majesty the Queen. One wonders whether the present time marks the closing phase of her reign. I am sure we all earnestly hope that it does not, and that we will do everything in our power to see that she is long spared to rule over us.

I congratulate the Governor and his good lady on the interest they have taken in the State, and commend Sir Alan on the way he is discharging his duties. As honourable members know, he has travelled extensively throughout the State, and recently I had the privilege of having him in my electorate for a very short time. Of course, we made him very welcome and hope that it will not be long before he returns. I thank him for the time and effort he devoted to us.

I add my congratulations to the two members who entered this Chamber shortly after the commencement of the present session, namely, Mr. Lane, the honourable member for Merthyr, and Mr. Alison, the honourable member for Maryborough. The honourable member for Maryborough deserves congratulations on the great effort that he made to win that seat, which, as honourable members are well aware, was held by the Opposition for many years. I am sure that the Opposition did not expect to be defeated on this occasion, but the result of the by-election proved that there are many sensible people in that electorate. I wish both new members a long and successful career in this Chamber. I hope they will be spared for many years to serve this State.

Every member of this Parliament must be very concerned about the trends in our great rural industries, which, over the ages, have been responsible for maintaining our standard of living and in many instances have provided the very living of those engaged in them. At the same time, they have made a substantial contribution to the overseas earnings of Queensland, and also of Australia as a whole. It is true to say that virtually every rural industry is feeling, to

a lesser or greater extent, the onset of a recession. I do not think any of us thought we would live to see the day when our great wool industry would be in its present tragic plight.

While we all recognise the effect of drought on this great industry and, indeed, on our other rural industries, depressing as the situation may become it can be overcome to some extent by bountiful rainfall. Unfortunately, however, that is not the case with the wool industry. The price of wool has steadily declined, and the present position is so bad that I do not think anyone knows what will happen. Many people would like to know what is to happen, what the future of this great industry is to be, and what will be the effect of its ultimate fate on the nation as a whole. Our other primary industries should watch very closely what has happened to the wool industry, because it can happen to them as well. In fact, it is already happening to some of them.

I am particularly concerned about our wonderful sugar industry, which has played such a large part in developing the coastal areas of this State from the southern border to Mossman. It has played no small part in creating townships and provincial cities along the coastline. The very liveliness of the people of many of these cities, and particularly of the small townships, is determined by the welfare and prosperity of the sugar industry.

With that in mind, I have a few comments to make on the present trends in the industry. It has had to meet drought problems in various parts of the State. Those areas which have suffered from drought have my deepest sympathy and concern. It is to be hoped that, before long, this suffering will be relieved by the provision of irrigation. What has happened in the field of irrigation over the past 20 years in some sugar-growing areas has been really fantastic, and we hope that in the not too far distant future droughts in the sugar industry will be a thing of the past. Many areas are fortunate enough to be able to obtain the wherewithal to establish irrigation schemes.

The problem in the sugar industry is ever-increasing costs. With the present inflationary trend it is not possible for any industry to survive, and in this regard the future does not look very bright. It appears that costs have increased by up to 7 per cent, and the increase may even surpass that figure. It is not possible for the sugar industry, or any other industry that has made an effort to stabilise its prices, to live with this sort of treatment.

I do not want to retrace the history of the sugar industry. However, it will be recalled that several years ago very low prices prevailed. The industry had to approach the Premier, and, through him, the Commonwealth Government, to borrow some \$23,000,000 to keep itself, and particularly many growers, in business.

Mr. R. Jones: How much interest are we paying on it?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: We will pay a fair amount of interest. However, I am sure that if the honourable member for Cairns was lending money, he would not do it for nothing. While such a spirit would be commendable, I have seen no evidence of it. Low rates of interest for rural industries is an ear-tickling phrase. Whilst I should like to see this type of money made available, I do not know where it would come from.

Mr. Casey: The Federal Government made subsidies available to other primary industries, but it only gave the sugar industry a loan.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: There is a certain amount of truth in that statement, although it is not completely correct. For a start, the sugar industry enjoys a total embargo on the importation of sugar, which has enabled the industry to establish itself. Of course, as the honourable member says, other industries enjoy a good deal of assistance in various ways.

I have always been one to commend the sugar industry for its policy of self-help. I do not know that this has done many of us in the industry very much good, as the result of our efforts to become more efficient is passed on to the consumer, or somebody else, rather than to a section of the people within the industry. However, we must be fair to those Governments that have held office down through the ages. I have no recollection of the sugar industry ever asking for a great deal in this regard. It has spent many millions of dollars on research in all fields. This cost is, and always has been, borne very substantially by the sugar industry itself.

The first grant to the sugar experiment stations was one of approximately \$14,000 or \$15,000, and it has remained at that level over the years. This is another good reason why the sugar industry should do a little more to help itself. On most occasions we have had a very good hearing from the various Governments that have been approached. I think everybody knows this Government's policy. It looks for a partnership with the sugar industry and other industries.

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

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Before the suspension of the sitting I was dealing with the way in which the sugar industry has helped itself. What I am particularly concerned about at present are the industry's ever-increasing costs; the fact that it has to repay the money borrowed during the years of low sugar prices; and, for good measure, the threat of the loss of the British market. This threatened loss is, of course, important not only to the sugar industry but also to other rural industries that are the victims of increased costs.

The effect of a recession on some rural areas would be serious. Every sugar mill has adjacent to it a township, the people of which depend substantially for their livelihood on the prosperity and welfare of the industry in that area. They also serve the industry by supplying it with the skilled labour it needs. As the purchasing power of cane farmers decreases, these townships will be adversely affected. I feel that something should be done about this situation as quickly as possible. My remarks, of course, do not apply only to the sugar industry, although it is the one that I am concerned about now.

From time to time community leaders have told us how important the sugar industry is, what a valuable contribution it has made to the State in many ways, and how it is among the world's most efficient industries. Unfortunately, its undoubted efficiency has not done much to help those engaged in it. All the benefit seems to be passed on to the consumer. I think it is too much to ask the industry to try to overcome the disadvantages of increased costs and low overseas prices for sugar. A substantial quantity of sugar today finds its way onto the world market, and, although that market is reasonably stable at present, it does not return a very high price. If anything goes wrong in the operation of the International Sugar Agreement and cane-growers find themselves back to where they were after the collapse of the last agreement, the industry could well disappear, as it could not possibly continue to operate.

There have been increases in the costs of almost everything. For instance, there has been an increase of approximately 33.9 per cent in wages since the last increase in the price of sugar. I might also mention that that price increase applied to only one-third of the sugar produced, which is the sugar sold on the home market, and not even to all of that. And, what is even worse, the rate of increase in wages during the last two years has been even greater. Another wage increase was granted only the other day.

I have frequently said in this House that I am not against high wages, but I do not like to see one section of industry living on another. If the present trend is not stopped, there will be nothing in the industry for the wage-earner or anybody else. This is a situation that should be worrying those who profess to be looking after the people who earn their living, by wages or salaries, from the sugar industry.

Over the last two or three years many farmers have endeavoured to get better equipment. As a result, they have increased their debt to the bank, or to the financial institution from which they obtain money. More sophisticated equipment enables them to do more work in fewer hours. However, one notices also that more wives and families now go out into the fields to work at weekends, while other people are enjoying themselves. In recent times, many people in the

sugar industry have been living on depreciation. That is very undesirable. If it continues for much longer, efficiency will decrease instead of increasing.

It is interesting to look at No. 1 Pool raw-sugar prices over the past few years, as they show the actual return to the industry. The figures are—

Year				\$
1960	100.88
1961	100.24
1962	106.06
1963	122.59
1964	98.20
1965	86.58
1966	85.69
1967	86.00
1968	89.29
1969	101.59
1970	104.39

It will be seen that the price dropped sharply in 1964 and 1965. I remind honourable members also that 1966 and 1967 were the years when money was borrowed from the Commonwealth Government, and that is included in the figures quoted.

Sugar-growers are expected to produce a commodity for almost the same price as they were getting 10 years ago, but there is a vast difference between the wage structure as it was then and what it is today. In fact, I think wages have almost doubled during those 10 years, and the price of farm equipment of all descriptions has also risen very substantially.

Mr. F. P. Moore: Much more than wages.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Not at all. The honourable member should always remember that wages are a very big component in the cost of any article, no matter which field one is in. Wages cannot be increased without a commensurate increase in other costs. As I have frequently said, the only fair way of offsetting wage increases is by increased productivity. Unfortunately, some of the men who are using their influence on trade unions do not subscribe to that principle. They think it is their duty to try to take something out of the other fellow's pocket. That might be all right in the short term.

Mr. R. Jones: You should get Bob Hawke to negotiate the sugar agreement for you.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The honourable member should reserve judgment on Bob Hawke for a year or two, until it becomes obvious where he is going. He is one of those to whom I am referring. He will not buy in on productivity; he wants to take something from his fellow man.

Mr. Harris interjected.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: He seems to have the happy knack of stirring up trouble for honourable members opposite and then, when

things become too hot, fluttering out of the country. We have seen how he operates. He does not impress me, and I am sure he does not impress many other people either.

Mr. Tucker: I do not think he will lose any sleep over that.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The honourable member, and others, might lose some sleep if they do not take some action to curb Mr. Hawke. In fact, I should say that he is a political asset for the Government parties. I think he will lose many friends in the not-too-distant future.

It is interesting to note also the average price for cane paid to growers throughout Queensland. Again I am referring to No. 1 Pool. In 1960 the average price was \$10.05; ten years later it had dropped to \$9.88. I referred earlier to all the increases in costs that the growers have been called upon to meet, and it is easy to see why the standard of living of cane farmers and their families, and, indeed, of some of the other people associated with the industry, has declined fairly rapidly. They are getting very near the point where something will have to be done about it.

I have mentioned previously that in 1968 a Ford 5000 tractor could be purchased in my area for \$4,270. The same tractor today costs \$5,798, an increase of almost 30 per cent in a couple of years. If that sort of thing is to continue, manufacturers must ultimately find sales falling off, with a reduction in income. Some of them are now getting into trouble.

Cane farmers are also faced with the ever-increasing demand for higher wages, and it is very unlikely that all these increased costs can be met by increasing efficiency. The industry has spent a lot of money—it is all its own money—on bulk terminals at the major ports of the State.

An Opposition Member: I am glad you said it is their own money.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: It is their own money.

I repeat, the industry has provided bulk terminals at the major ports throughout the State in an effort to contain costs. It has also introduced mechanical harvesting, again in an effort to contain costs. What it does from now on, I would not know. It is very hard to know.

Mr. R. Jones: You didn't know 10 years ago.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: That is debatable. With due respect, I think I might have had a better understanding in this field than the honourable member.

In 1962 there were 6,975 sugar-growers in this State. After the last expansion the number increased to 8,028, but a survey last year revealed that the number had dropped to 7,507. I do not suppose that there is anything new in this, because over the years we have

seen farmers buying out their neighbours, forming partnerships and the like, and those figures would include partnerships. The part that does not make me very happy is that out of the 1,250 new growers that joined the industry following the last expansion, about 270 have now left the industry. I do not think they did so because they wanted to; they left because they were forced out.

Mr. Jensen: They might have been poor farmers.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: It is a pity that some honourable members opposite did not have a go at cane farming, otherwise they might now hold different views. It does not make much difference whether a person is a good worker or a bad worker when it comes to receiving wages. Honourable members opposite believe in this all-on-one-level idea—that all humans are born equal and that sort of thing. They believe in everybody getting the same reward whether he works well or not. What I have outlined is what happens to farmers. I have not seen too many bad farmers in the industry. I think my colleague the honourable member for Isis would be inclined to agree that there would only be a few of them.

The industry's last expansion was made on the basis of the equivalent of about 1,300 tons of cane, or a little less. That was on average c.c.s. That figure was not pulled out of the air at the time. It was arrived at by the wise men in the industry. They were wise and the Government took notice of them. The Government accepted that figure as a reasonable one at the time. Now we find that the average peak throughout Queensland is 2,000 tons of cane. But when we have another look at it we see that 64 per cent of the farmers do not grow 2,000 tons, which again changes the individual picture.

These days we hear the phrase, "Get big or get out." I do not care for that phrase. If we allow this to happen, it will not be long before we have large plantations. This is something I do not think any of us looks forward to. We are all mindful of the fact that there are enough empty parts of the State now without our purposely setting out to empty those that are presently occupied. As I said earlier, if the position worsens, those small townships that are dependent on sugar mills will become ghost towns. I think the industry has many problems ahead of it.

Referring to the other partner in the sugar industry—the mills, both co-operative and proprietary—I realise that many of them have diversified and are in fact earning incomes from other avenues in which they have invested money. They do not appear to be doing too badly. Of course many mills are still entirely dependent on the sugar industry, but it appears to me that, particularly since the last expansion, the division of sugar moneys in the industry has become somewhat

out of balance. I know that we, as a Government, cannot do much about this because, under acts and regulations governing the industry, the growing section has the right, just as the mills have, to appear before a tribunal and put forward a case, and, of course, rely on the tribunal's fair judgment in ruling on the division of sugar moneys.

Mr. Jensen: That should not affect the co-operative mill areas.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: It does.

Mr. Jensen: They get it back in profits.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: If the mill makes a profit they do, but what happens if it does not? The honourable member should know this. He has had a long association with mills, and I am surprised that he should make such a claim.

I feel that the time has arrived when the industry itself must attack these problems. I feel sure that if it put a case to this Government it would be listened to very sympathetically.

Mr. O'Donnell: That is about all that happens; they only listen to it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I do not want to go back over history at this stage as I have not much time. But when I do have time I will bring the honourable member up to date on just what has happened down through the years—that is, if he is interested and wants to be taught something.

I think it is time the sugar industry had a look at itself. We have seen what happened to the dairy industry and how it is facing up to its responsibilities in this regard. While those responsible for it still have many problems, they are working to a basis that we hope may restore some measure of prosperity to that industry. Nobody knows what to do with the wool industry, but for heaven's sake do not let us allow another great industry, upon which this State is so dependent, to get into such a mess that we do not know what to do with it. The time has arrived when we should have a look at the legislation under which the sugar industry operates. I think it was first introduced in about 1915. The skeleton of it was introduced in 1913. Although the legislation has been amended from time to time, there is a vast difference between the situation that existed in 1915 and that which prevails in 1971. In other words, the industry has grown up and there are many things that in my opinion should be done to improve it.

One of the things I should like to see happen in the sugar industry is a correction of the position which restricts its right of appeal, virtually from Caesar to Caesar. This is not good in any industry. At the present time two boards operate within the industry, and I sometimes doubt the wisdom of this. One controls production and the other is charged with the responsibility of selling the

product. I believe that it might be wise for whoever controls one end to control the other end as well. As I said a while ago, the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board, as we know it today, is the only authority to which the growers or the millers have recourse, and its decision is virtually final. They can approach the board again if they so desire, but I do not think it is much use appealing to the people who have made the original decision, or going back to them a second time. It is 50 years since that legislation was passed, and it is time that it was brought up to date.

Not long ago a very useful piece of legislation was passed to enable a reconstruction of rural industry. No doubt it will help farmers to amalgamate, but it is to be hoped that the situation will not get out of hand. Although the legislation will be a help, it is certainly not the answer to the problem. If a reconstruction is to be carried out in 1971, it might be found necessary to have further reconstructions in, say, 1973 and 1975, and the end result will be that instead of the sugar industry having 6,000 to 7,000 cane-growers it will have as few as 200 to 300. Such a small number of producers is not good for any primary industry.

In the main, our secondary industries, particularly the mining industry, appear to be booming. At the same time, however, costs have risen in many fields simply because secondary industry has the money to meet them. Unfortunately, these increased costs have the unhappy knack of rubbing off onto those industries that are adjacent to secondary industry.

Mr. Hughes: Mining is the only thing that has kept this State going.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: As the honourable member for Kurilpa has said, mining has made a major contribution to the prosperity and development of this State. However, there is evidence of some disturbance to the world's monetary system, and if, as a result, mining development is slowed down, other industries will be adversely affected. I would hate to think what sort of a state Queensland would be in if the industries that are presently carrying the economic burden collapsed. Tourism could fall into that category. It appears to be doing well at present, but it could suffer as a result of any further major change in the world's currency system.

Queensland has a sort of dual economy, in which people in secondary industries are doing well, whereas almost all of those in rural industries have their backs to the wall. It is not easy to find a solution to the problem, but I believe that the necessary machinery exists to deal with many of the problems on an industry basis. As well, we have the men who are capable of examining the problems closely, realistically and courageously.

Anyone who, in the face of rising prices, thinks that he can simply sit back on his previous level of income will find that things

do not work out the way he expects them to. From time to time the Premier and his various Ministers confer with their Federal counterparts, so surely to goodness there is among those men the ability to do something to overcome the problems that arise.

A country that is self-contained does not suffer from the same economic problems as those experienced by nations, such as Australia, that look to overseas markets for a large portion of their earnings. Every increase in costs closes the gate to a market. Prices can be stabilised without any reduction in a nation's standard of living. Very often it would be far better to use the fruits of productivity in reverse. By that, I mean that instead of increasing wages we should decrease costs. That could be done very easily so that people could enjoy a value of 100c for every dollar instead of, as with increased wages, paying higher taxation.

Mr. P. Wood: How are you going to reduce costs?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: If we had sensible trade-unionism in Australia, our costs would not be continually increasing. In these days, when the powers-that-be see fit to call men out on strike for any dubious cause at all, when all the machinery is greased and functioning rapidly and easily, costs can only be increased. This, in turn, affects all of us, including pensioners, people on fixed incomes, and so on. Only chaos can follow such nonsense.

Each of us is heavily dependent on the export prices received by our primary industries, and the day is not yet in sight when we can live without them. We should not fail to realise that if the present recession in industry continues, or gets worse, it will not be long before we all realise its effects.

I wished to deal at length with the repayment of the loan made to the sugar industry, but time will not permit me to do so. The approach made in this field seems to be very strange. On a quick examination I find that 18 sugar mills in Queensland will be called on to repay much more than they borrowed. Indeed, some new growers in the industry who got nothing under the loans will be called on to help repay them. If we cared to check, we could easily ascertain how much each mill and each grower received.

Something will have to be done. I know that certain sections of the industry have been trying to get something done, but their approaches have fallen on deaf ears. It is amazing that an industry that is as efficient as the sugar industry cannot see the injustice in the fact that the 18 mills that were without doubt the most deserving of benefit find themselves worse off than when they started. Repayments are to be made over 10 or 12 years. If a mill area was hit by a low-production year, caused by drought or flood, when the loan was originally made (particularly in the first year, when most of the money was lent), and if in the years in which

repayments are being made its production has doubled, under the system of taking the sum out of a pool and dividing it, that mill area must be worse off. I can see nothing just in that, particularly from the cane-growers' point of view, or even from that of the mill. I know that many approaches have been made to have something done about it, but, as I have said, they have fallen on deaf ears.

There are several other matters that I should like to deal with, but time is beating me.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Perhaps the honourable member would care to give me an extension of time.

I wish that the Minister for Main Roads was present to hear my comments on one difficult problem. It will be recalled that we had a very severe wet early this year. Parts of my electorate, which is fairly wet over all, did not see the sun for 50 or 60 days. The long wet was very hard on our highways. The one I am most concerned about is the Palmerston Highway which connects Innisfail with the Atherton Tableland. This highway was constructed nearly 40 years ago. Those who constructed it did an excellent job. Indeed, I know of no road in Queensland that has stood up so well, considering the traffic it has carried. However, any road that was built 40 years ago would not be designed to take the type of traffic using it today. It is now at the end of its economic life, and it will be called upon to carry even heavier traffic in the years ahead. Greenvale is now about to come into production, and I hope that many of the products needed to feed the people who work there will come from the Tableland. Increased milk supplies will come from the area. I concede that this highway passes through some rough country. Although the Main Roads Department has been giving this matter serious consideration for a number of years, as yet nothing appears to be taking place.

(Time expired.)

Mr. DEAN (Sandgate) (2.45 p.m.): I should like to join with the electors of Sandgate, and the people generally, in reaffirming loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen. I also express our appreciation to His Excellency the Governor and Lady Mansfield for the way they have represented the State and the people. I have always expressed appreciation to His Excellency, not only because he is Governor, but also because he is a Queenslander. I have known Sir Alan and Lady Mansfield for many years in other circles and have always found them to be of the highest calibre. I knew, when Sir Alan was appointed to this high office, that he would be a success, and he is a success. He is a man of very even temperament and displays great courtesy and consideration not only to members of the legal profession,

from which he came, but to the people generally. I feel sure that all honourable members will agree with me when I say that he has the full approval of all sections of the community.

I am greatly concerned at a statement made recently in this House by a member of the Government. I hope the honourable member expressed a personal point of view, because I am sure that many honourable members would not agree with what he said. He claimed that we, on this side of the House, displayed discourtesy at the garden party held by you, Mr. Speaker, at the opening of this session of Parliament. I attended, and so did many of my colleagues. In fact, I was not far from the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and their parties. I trust that the honourable member was not questioning our loyalty to His Excellency and Her Majesty the Queen whom he represents. I take strong exception, and I am sure every honourable member on this side of the House joins with me, to the honourable member's reflection on members of the Opposition in claiming that we showed disloyalty to Her Majesty and the Governor. This is a very serious matter. The statement could be misconstrued in other places if I did not correct it here.

I listened intently to His Excellency's Opening Speech to this Third Session of the 39th Parliament of Queensland and I have since perused a copy of it. Certain items have attracted my attention. No doubt many honourable members feel satisfied with the contents of the Speech. However, certain aspects of it were a disappointment to me. It is common knowledge that it is prepared by the Government, and it is His Excellency's duty to present it at the opening of Parliament.

His Excellency made reference to the activities of the Government and of people in the community in regard to water pollution control in this city and in the State as a whole. This is a very serious and important subject. Sufficient is not being done to mitigate and eventually eliminate this great problem. Many years ago, in another place, I raised the matter of the pollution of the Brisbane River. I am sad to say that that pollution continues. Action should have been taken long before the appointment of the present Minister for Local Government and Electricity, and I am casting no reflection on him in what I say at this stage. I hope that the committee which has been set up to deal with this problem will attack and eliminate it.

I think it is worth recording that not long ago, when speaking to an organisation in London, Prince Philip said, "Pollution of the environment is today's most vital moral problem, and calls for a change in moral outlook." In fact, it is more than a moral problem; it is a problem that affects the general health of the people. It has been quite rightly said that, to a greater or

lesser degree, everyone has a responsibility not only in the creation of pollution, but also in its prevention.

I was rather surprised by the answer to a question that I recently asked the Minister for Local Government and Electricity concerning litter, which is a vital part of the whole problem of pollution. I do not agree with the answer that I received. On 9 September, last Thursday, I asked the Minister—

“(1) How many prosecutions have been taken out by local authorities since the anti-litter law has been in force?”

“(2) If the new legislation is not being policed by Queensland local authorities, will he ascertain why no action has been taken by them, bearing in mind that they have had at least six months to set up the staff of litter-abatement officers?”

I have been reliably informed that some councils, excluding the Brisbane City Council, do not intend to do anything about this matter. If legislation is passed and we cannot police it, who will police it?

Mr. Rae: It has only been in since 1 September, and many councils have made it quite clear that it is something that they desire and that it has been accepted by the people in their areas. They are policing it, according to the submissions made by the Local Government Association.

Mr. DEAN: I gained the impression that some were rather timid about implementing the legislation because it might offend so ne people or industrial concerns. I do not want to make any unnecessary problems for industrial establishments, but they have had plenty of warning of what was to be required. Pollution has been under discussion for many months, and even years. There is no doubt that the legislation will be very helpful in reducing pollution, but it will not be if it is ignored by some councils. The Minister said in his reply to my question that he could not do anything about it, and did not know anything about it.

Mr. Rae: It is in the hands of the local authorities concerned. I do not direct local authorities.

Mr. DEAN: If they fail to implement the legislation, what happens?

Mr. Rae: The thing is that it is left entirely to local authorities. If they have a job to do, they should do it.

Mr. DEAN: Time will tell. I sincerely hope the Minister is right.

Mr. Rae: They will be shamed into doing it by their neighbours.

Mr. DEAN: I do not want to be a pessimist, but the problem has existed for a long time and now that legislation has been passed to deal with it, it is up to local authorities to ensure that the legislative provisions are carried out.

Mr. Rae: A good bid by one would set the others going.

Mr. DEAN: His Excellency's Opening Speech also refers to air pollution and noise pollution. In pollution of the air, the modern motor-car is one of today's greatest offenders. I fail to see why action has not been taken against the owners of vehicles that are continually polluting the atmosphere. I follow such vehicles every morning, and I have reported the numbers of some of them because their exhaust fumes are almost choking in their effect. Unburnt gases pour from their exhaust pipes morning after morning. I feel that these vehicles should have been pulled up long ago, and orders should have been given to have the engines put into good order or take the vehicles off the road. They are great contributors to air pollution. I think that the legislative machinery is too slow in dealing with some of those who are creating a considerable nuisance.

His Excellency also referred to noise pollution, which is another great menace that the people have to put up with today. Again one finds that the commercial world is doing a great deal to encourage noise pollution. Many motor accessory departments sell to young people—in some cases, also, to older people who do not seem to become more sensible as their age increases—gadgets to be attached to the exhaust pipes of their motor vehicles. Sometimes these gadgets are activated when the motor starts, and in some instances the noise from the exhausts is ear-shattering. In my opinion, restrictions should be imposed to prevent the problem arising. Many of the gadgets should not be on the market for sale. They are a menace, but they are sold in great quantities. People should not be allowed to attach them to their motor vehicles.

Mr. Hughes: There are already provisions in Acts that allow the police to take action, if only they would take it.

Mr. DEAN: I have yet to see one case in which police action has been taken against the persons to whom I am referring. I live beside a main road, so I know only too well the noise that emanates from motor vehicles to which these gadgets are fitted. Although some of them are, I believe, very costly, they are sold in large numbers.

It appears that, once again, Queensland is lagging behind other Australian States in this field. In “The Courier-Mail” last Thursday, an article was published stating that in Sydney, New South Wales, motorists guilty of some road breaches are asked by police to undergo tests at the Police Driving Centre. When a vehicle is tested at that school, it is often found that additional appliances have been fitted to it. That is one way of checking. I do not know whether the police do it here. If, for example, a policeman finds a baldy tyre on a vehicle, I think that he should make a thorough inspection and find out whether anything else is amiss and impairing the efficiency of the vehicle.

I think I have said enough on that subject. I intended to speak about the matter referred to by the honourable member for Belmont. However, he covered it far more effectively than I could, so, rather than indulge in tedious repetition, I shall pass on to something else.

In his Opening Speech, His Excellency referred to transport, and particularly to the Railway Department. Before dealing with that subject in detail, I wish to say how happy I was—I am sure that many other honourable members were happy, too—to see Mr. Kev Seenev appointed Commissioner for Transport. Those who know him are well aware that he has proved over the years that he is one of the State's leading and most efficient public servants.

Mr. Hughes: One of the best.

Mr. DEAN: There is no doubt about that. I am not speaking derogatorily in saying that he will rank as highly as any previous Commissioner for Transport. They have all been very efficient, but Mr. Seenev, as I said, has proved himself an outstanding public servant. He has a very difficult task. The position to which he has been appointed brings him into close contact with the public daily, and an officer of his calibre, ability and integrity is needed to fill it successfully.

Mr. Hughes: He has common sense.

Mr. DEAN: Mr. Seenev has all the qualifications to fill the position, and I am glad that he has been appointed to it.

Although the Governor's Opening Speech referred in some detail to the railway system of Queensland, I wish to deal particularly with transport in the city of Brisbane. Transport in this city is in a very bad way indeed. It is not really the fault of the Brisbane City Council, because the job is, and always has been, too big for it. In my opinion, the transport system in Brisbane and in the whole of Queensland should be under one State authority.

Mr. Hughes: Do you think that Clem Jones is deliberately wrecking the city's transport system so that the Government will take it over?

Mr. DEAN: I say that the transport system in Brisbane is too big for the Brisbane City Council to operate from the resources that it has available to it. The trouble started many years ago when previous councils took over certain things that they should never have taken over.

An Honourable Member: Are you talking about Alderman Chandler?

Mr. DEAN: It goes back to that era of the Brisbane City Council. However, the past has gone; it is the present and the future that we have to be concerned about. The sooner the whole of the transport system of the State comes under the one authority, the better it will be for everyone concerned.

Rail transport and road transport should be co-ordinated and controlled by one authority. Not a day goes by that I do not receive a telephone call from someone who wants to tell me about his problem because of the transport system. People wait for a long time for buses that never come. They do not come because of the curtailments in service. I suppose that curtailments have had to be made for economic reasons.

The city transport system has reached the serious stage where the Government should take over as the public transport authority and co-ordinate all services so that the needs of the public can be met. It seems that these days the needs of the travelling public are the last consideration. I realise that over the week-end there is not a heavy demand for public transport. At the present time people are being educated away from the public transport system by the diminishing services. They are banding together with their neighbours and travelling in private motor vehicles. This, in itself, creates another problem.

Mr. Davis: How is the Black and White Bus Service going?

Mr. DEAN: That is one problem in itself. I do not think I should be led into that one because I could talk for the rest of the week if I started on the Sandgate Black and White Bus Service. I would certainly be in deep water then. The tide would not have to be in for me to be in deep water on that one.

The suburban railway system between Sandgate and the city has been very successful. It is a very good service and I am pleased to say that many people are taking advantage of it—so much so that I think the Railway Department will be embarrassed sooner or later in providing the required facilities. All we want now is adequate space for off-street parking near the railway station so that people who travel in private motor vehicles to the station can leave them there with some degree of safety. I was assured by the Minister for Transport that the matter was being investigated, but it seems to be taking a long time. An area has been set aside in Sandgate, but it is far from safe to leave vehicles there, particularly at night-time. I make a plea to the Minister to have completed the survey that he promised me over 12 months ago. If it takes much longer to provide adequate off-street parking near suburban railway stations another problem will be created by vehicles cluttering up the station approaches. That problem is not very far off in places like Sandgate.

I was disappointed that the Governor's Opening Speech contained no mention of a public hospital in my area. For many years we have been asking for public hospital facilities there. The hospital that was established at Redcliffe is doing very good work and playing a very important part in that community. Many years before that hospital was established, land was set aside for a public hospital in the Sandgate electorate,

but the powers-that-be did not see fit to establish one there. I thought that by now we would be getting close to the time when we would get a hospital in my area, but, unfortunately, there was no mention of it in His Excellency's Opening Speech. I sincerely hope that it will not be long before the Minister for Health realises that the demand placed upon the Royal Brisbane Hospital by northside electorates such as mine could be considerably relieved by the building of a hospital which would cater for most of the cases from the area.

Mr. Harris: What about one for Wynnum?

Mr. DEAN: I am sure the honourable member for Wynnum will see that that area is serviced by a hospital at the first opportunity.

I was about to say that in my electorate the Queensland Ambulance Transport Brigade travels an extra 24,000 miles a year taking residents of Sandgate "Eventide" to the Royal Brisbane Hospital. This work would be reduced considerably if these people could attend their own local hospital.

I was also disappointed at the absence from the Governor's Opening Speech of any mention of a new "Eventide" for Sandgate. There are over 900 residents in the existing home. Admittedly, they could not be better looked after. They could not have better service from the staff, but it is the old buildings about which I am always complaining. They are maintained as well as they can be, but it costs a great deal of money to keep these old Air Force buildings in a fair state of repair.

I think the time has long passed when we should have considered building a new type of "Eventide" complex, on a much smaller scale. The Minister told me some time ago that in the new scheme of things for "Eventide" homes the top number of residents would be about 500, and this, I think, would be very sensible. At the present time, with 900 or more residents, the Sandgate home is too big. It is somewhat cumbersome. Nevertheless, the staff, the manager (Mr. Bliss), the assistant manager (Mr. Murray), the sisters and the matron all do a marvellous job. They would certainly be able to do their jobs under more comfortable circumstances if they had a modern building to work in, with not so far to walk and all the amenities that go with modern architecture in an institution of this kind. Although it is not mentioned in the Governor's Opening Speech, I sincerely hope that it will not be too long before a start is made on rebuilding the Sandgate "Eventide" home, to give these old people the greatest degree of comfort in their declining years.

Also missing from the Opening Speech was any mention of a new police station for Sandgate. This is another department that is doing a tremendous job at Sandgate. Honourable members no doubt realise that road-accident problems today are enough to

keep any police station busy without giving any attention at all to crime. The sergeant in charge at Sandgate, Sergeant Breen, and all the officers are kept fully occupied; but they work in a very antiquated building, which, ironically enough, is alongside a modern court-house building. We have this up-to-date court-house, but we want a new police station where police officers will have the degree of comfort to which they are entitled and which they need in order to carry out their work efficiently. As I have said before, I have no complaint about the police; they do an excellent job.

While talking about the police, I should like to express my appreciation of the Commissioner, Mr. Whitrod. I have met him from time to time at various functions and in varying circumstances and have had the opportunity of studying him to some extent. I have found him to be a very good conversationalist and a gentleman. He is a very knowledgeable man and I think we are very fortunate indeed to have a man of his calibre as Police Commissioner in this State. I think he does a very good job. It is a very difficult one, and it is impossible to please everybody.

Since Mr. Whitrod took up his appointment he has proved himself to be a man with common sense and stability and one who does not allow himself to be carried away by his emotions. We do not know the facts of the case that occurred recently in America, but I do not think that such an incident could occur in Queensland while Mr. Whitrod is Commissioner of Police. He will remain cool and calm and will not allow himself to be thrown out of gear.

It is only right that we should commend the top public servants—and, for that matter, all public servants—on the way in which they carry out their duties, because from time to time they are criticised.

Mr. Sherrington: And they work under a great handicap with some of these Ministers.

Mr. DEAN: They work under many handicaps. However, I repeat that we are indeed fortunate to have Mr. Whitrod as Commissioner of Police.

In foreshadowing the legislation that will be introduced during this session, the Governor referred to amendments to the Valuation of Land Act. I think he mentioned valuations in local authority areas in which certain anomalies exist. This subject could be discussed at great length. Although my area does not experience the valuation problems that arise in other areas, it is evident that there are many anomalies. From time to time it has been suggested that the Valuer-General's Department should be abolished and that there should be a reversion to the old system. I do not agree with that contention, because my mind goes back to the time when the Valuer-General did not have as much power and influence in the community as he has today. I commend the

Valuer-General and his officers on the manner in which they have performed their very difficult task.

The role played by local government is a very important one, and I hope that the anomalies that arise in certain areas will be eliminated. The city of Brisbane is a very large local authority area and is in a different category from shires in that it suffers problems of greater magnitude than those that confront shire and provincial town councils. I make a plea on behalf of all local authorities, especially those in country areas that are in financial difficulties. They are burdened with many responsibilities that they should not be called upon to bear. Local authorities should deal purely and simply with local matters that affect local residents. The role played by local government in our community is important, and the image of local government depends to a large extent on the ability of council officers to meet the challenges that arise every day and to carry out developmental work that will provide not only material benefits but also a satisfying environment and, therefore, a satisfactory living standard for the people in their areas.

In my opinion the State and Commonwealth Governments must provide more practical support. That statement has been made frequently and I suppose it has become a little boring. However, those who have been in the local authority sphere will understand fully what I mean. Unfortunately, State Governments are limited, too, in the help that they can render because they depend on hand-outs from time to time from the Commonwealth Government. They can only reallocate finances given to them by the Commonwealth Government, but they will have to provide more practical support so that local government can enter into a stronger partnership with the higher levels of Government and public authorities generally. In other words, any hand-outs with stringent conditions attached will not be an answer.

In my extensive travels throughout Queensland while looking into the problems of various local councils, I have thought that the physical amalgamation of council areas in some cases and, in others, the severance of certain areas for attachment to adjoining municipalities could be considered as ways of relieving the problems of some shires. If they could get together and pool their resources, they could help one another much more than they are doing at present. An important factor is the lack of population in certain areas, and I emphasise that nothing can be done without people.

This suggestion has been considered, but there always seems to be a certain reluctance to implement it. That is understandable. The councils have had autonomy for a long time. Each council considers its very existence in the light of its history and environment and, doubtless, a great deal of sentiment is involved. If two councils were to merge,

it might be thought that each would lose its identity. It would not be in the best interests of the people that they should lose their community interest, but I think we must face reality. We are living in modern times and, if the councils cannot keep going on their own, they should realise that the time has come to consider merging with others.

I repeat that the main problem is lack of finance. This is where the Queensland Government has failed in its endeavours to help local government. It has refused to examine the finances of local government in Queensland. The time has long passed for a thorough examination of the local government scene in Queensland, to determine what councils really require assistance and those that do not require very much assistance. Some councils, no doubt, are better off than others. As has been said so often, the establishment of a regional planning authority, representing all local authorities in Queensland, is long overdue. It could consider the many problems of local government in Queensland. I am sure that any examination by such an authority would reveal that the securing of additional finance is the main problem of shire councils.

Some time ago I received a copy of an address by Mr. Gerry France, Senior Lecturer in Public Administration in the Department of Government, University of Queensland. I intend to quote only one paragraph from the long address he made to ANZAAS in Brisbane in May this year. The title of his address was, "The Betterment of Local Government". Towards the end of it he said—

"Although several States in Australia have carried out local government reviews in the 1960's (though none has yet made a radical overhaul as a result) Queensland has not subjected its own local system to a major investigation since 1928."

Other portions of his address are well worth reading and noting. He pointed out that one of the shortcomings of this State is that we ignore the problems of local authorities. He pointed out that, by not having an investigation, we were not discovering the real causes of their plight. He pointed out that we have not studied the problems of local authorities since 1928, and this is not good enough.

For many years, local authorities have been the victims of rising costs and the present inflationary trend has forced them into a state of bankruptcy. State Parliaments will have to take a more realistic view of the responsibilities of local authorities and will have to exert greater pressure on the Commonwealth Government to make direct grants to local authorities instead of making advances to State Governments and leaving it to their discretion to make token hand-outs to local authorities. This is not good enough, particularly with today's demand for modern amenities such as electricity, water reticulation and sewerage. Local government, as we know it today, was created by the State

Government in 1902. It has been said from time to time that it has been the Cinderella department of successive State Governments since its inception.

During the past 12 months, the Leader of the Opposition and I have toured the State. We found that local authorities in the central, northern and north-western areas were in a very precarious position indeed. They were becoming greatly concerned at the high percentage of rate revenue which was absorbed in loan interest and redemption. This was rather crippling in many cases. It is not right that these local authorities should have to use ordinary rate revenue, which is paid by ratepayers for the maintenance of services, to pay interest on loans entered into many years ago. In some cases, 70 per cent of rate revenue had to be earmarked for this purpose; in other cases the percentage was higher. Local authorities everywhere claimed they were starved for money.

The Government should realise that the Queensland ratepayers represent only 20 per cent of the population, yet they supply all of the amenities in the areas in which they live. No council can be expected to continue to supply these amenities and services and to meet the ever-increasing demands that are being made and will be made in the future unless the State Government contributes larger annual amounts to local authorities, without, of course, the restrictions that are usually applied.

We were asked why the ratepayer should be required to provide general amenities to both Commonwealth-owned and State-owned premises. This has been a bone of contention for many years, and the time is long overdue when something should be done in this regard. There is no valid reason why this should be tolerated any longer.

It must be remembered that, apart from charges for special services in certain benefited areas, the only real cash a council has is derived from general rates. Interest and redemption payments on loans take between 60 and 80 per cent of their total general rate revenue and administration costs take between 20 and 30 per cent, so there is little or nothing left to meet the cost of any work that has to be done. All liquid cash is absorbed by those two items.

Nearly every council has been existing on the system of borrowing and passing the debt on to future generations. Many councils now find they have overreached themselves, and instead of future generations paying the interest and redemption bill, they are faced with a commitment which, in some cases, is not their own making.

(Time expired.)

Mr. MURRAY (Clayfield) (3.25 p.m.): I, too, wish to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and to congratulate the new members, both of whom have now made

their maiden speeches. I hope they have a long and happy association with this Parliament.

In February of this year I was nominated as the Government member from Queensland to attend the Eleventh Australasian Area Conference of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, held at Wellington, New Zealand. My friend from Belmont, Mr. Newton, was the Opposition nominee, and we were fortunate to have with us, as the officer representing the Queensland Legislature, Mr. George, the Clerk of our House and the honorary secretary of the Queensland branch of that association. I should like to emphasise that it would have been impossible to have finer travelling companions than Mr. Newton and Mr. George.

Happily, each of us decided to take his wife to bear him company. Any honourable member who has made this rather expensive decision would, I am sure, be charitable enough to agree that the extra-curricular activities at these conferences are such that a wife can not only enjoy herself immensely, even if she only lightly takes part in the many functions organised by the hosts for the benefit of wives, but she can also lighten the burden and worry of travel in many ways.

Our travel arrangements to New Zealand were rather interesting, particularly in this jet age, and they seemed to me a little odd. Perhaps I have not yet adjusted from the DC-3 mentality. We were booked to travel from Brisbane direct to Wellington. Mr. George, I know, went to great trouble with all our arrangements, but the intentions of mice and men are sometimes laid aside. As I said, we were booked to travel from Brisbane direct to Wellington. Instead, we left from Sydney and arrived in Auckland. It was there that we found airport arrangements a little primitive, even by our standards. Although we arrived at about midday, it seemed any chances we might have of boarding a flight to Wellington were nil. In fact, we had no more influence than any migrant arriving in a strange country. We felt extremely lonely indeed. I could not even get a cold beer. Whilst my friend from Belmont has not the slightest interest in beer, I would have welcomed a cold one. It seems to be served hot in New Zealand.

However, most of our experiences were extremely happy indeed. It was in Auckland that a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association tie, of all things, saved the situation. We were alert enough in our travels to spot somebody wearing one, and we descended on that tie in great force. I think Mr. Newton was in the lead. Its wearer happened not only to be Chairman of Committees of the House of Representatives and Deputy Speaker, but he was also on his way to Wellington. He was a local M.P. from the Auckland area and was on his way to Wellington to chair the conference, which he did most competently. His name was Mr. Allen, and he was a very fine fellow indeed.

I mentioned that a tie saved the situation. One rarely sees such a tie worn here, but I can now quite understand it to be true that, when travelling abroad, it becomes a most important and significant emblem of the great brotherhood of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association of serving and former members of Parliament within the Commonwealth.

This brings me back to where I started by saying that I was nominated from Government members to attend this conference. In case anyone should be naive enough to imagine that my nomination was some benevolent act of preferment (perhaps some future student of "Hansard" may be foolish enough to think that), let me record the way it happened.

When advice is received by the parliamentary party that a trip to an association conference is in the offing, the choice is made, under our system, strictly on seniority—that time-honoured and foolproof system. Everyone then starts looking around and saying, "Who went last? Who is senior to whom?" Determination of seniority is very simple indeed, I think all would agree, in a case where one member entered Parliament in 1957 and another in 1960. But when three members enter the Parliament in the same year, the position is a little blurred. It then becomes a matter of the wisest choice of parents and, therefore, an alphabetical test. In this instance, Murray comes out junior to Lickiss, and Lickiss junior to Chinchin, which is probably the correct order, anyway. But being in that sort of a triangle tempts me to exercise—and there is some precedent for this—a deed poll that would transfer me simply to "Mr. A". I would then be in a much better position in future. So the nomination is made not because one might be one's parliamentary leader's snowy-haired boy, or because one is an active executive member of the branch of the association in Queensland. Because of dear old seniority, even I was assured by time that my opportunity would arrive, and I am very grateful indeed for it.

Mr. Hughes: It just shows.

Mr. MURRAY: It shows that, if one waits long enough, time ensures the event.

I wish to address a few remarks to the House relating to some matters on the agenda at the conference, and to say that I think it is about time it was made mandatory for anyone who is financed in any way by the State to attend such a conference, whether travelling singly or as a member of a delegation, to report to Parliament within a reasonable time. Some parliamentary groups led by Ministers have travelled quite extensively at considerable cost. We constantly have Ministers travelling, but seldom, if ever, do they report to Parliament and give some account of their observations and the benefits that have accrued. I think we are singularly lax in that respect and that we spend the people's money in a somewhat

cavalier fashion. Most of us know the value, in both direct and indirect terms, that travel at home and abroad can bring. No-one disputes that; we would all, I am sure, wish that there were more opportunities for it and would give encouragement to any move to bring it about. But surely we have a duty to report to the people who send us, who make it possible for us to go, and who are, in the final analysis, the beneficiaries—the people of Queensland.

As I said earlier, ours was a very rewarding experience. We were looked after wonderfully by our hosts. After a week of conference, we were taken on a very interesting tour of the North Island to see and to learn a great deal about New Zealand. I think the honourable member for Belmont will agree with me when I say that, standing on the rocky, heaving areas at Rotorua and on other volcanic areas, we decided that there was no place like terra firma in Queensland. In fact, one of the guides was heard to announce that the ground moved to such an extent that when sheep in the area wanted to bite a blade of grass they had to put a foot on it. That indicates the extent to which the ground heaves.

Now let me make a point or two about the conference agenda. The conference continued over the week. On the first day, after it was opened by the Prime Minister of New Zealand, Sir Keith Holyoake, the first serious discussion was on—I seem to have heard the appointment of an ombudsman advocated in the Parliament of Queensland before—"The Ombudsman—An Officer of Parliament". The address was given and subsequent questions were answered by none other than New Zealand's ombudsman, Sir Guy Powles, K.B.E., E.D., who is known as the Parliamentary Commissioner, and I think it is relevant for me to say a few words about that address and repeat some of the observations he made.

He stated first—I think this will be of interest to honourable members—

"The basic characteristics of the Ombudsman are roughly these: first, he is an independent and non-partisan officer of the Legislature, completely free from control by the Executive; secondly, he deals with specific complaints from the public, who should have direct unimpeded access to him, against administrative injustice and mal-administration; thirdly, he has full power to investigate administration, including right of access to all files and papers; fourthly, he has authority to criticise and publicise administrative actions; fifthly, he has no authority to direct—he may only recommend and persuade; and, sixthly, he is required to report regularly to the Legislature."

Sir Guy further observed—

"It seems that with the world-wide growth of complicated administrative systems which are becoming progressively more remote from individual citizens in the sense of access and sympathy, although

with ever more knowledge about the private life and possessions of citizens, the Ombudsman offers a relatively speedy and cheap means of direct high-level consideration of personal complaints about administrative injustice, of remedying irritation in the national life, and of encouraging better and more human administration.

"A subsidiary effect is that the Ombudsman acts as a safety valve for pent-up frustrations so often developed by citizens in their dealings with the great impersonal administrative machinery—frustrations of the sort that are otherwise customarily vented on the heads of hapless political representatives."

This is Sir Guy Powles, addressing the conference of representatives of all the Parliaments in the Australasian area.

An Honourable Member: Does this go as far as the local government area?

Mr. MURRAY: My friend from Belmont asked that very question. The Commissioner said he felt that it could well be extended to local government areas.

I think it is of interest to observe that the office of ombudsman has been in existence in New Zealand for a little over eight years. To 31 December 1970 the complaints received totalled 6,100, and the complaints fully investigated numbered 2,781. The difference between those figures is accounted for by several factors. Firstly, complaints are received that are outside the jurisdiction of the office as set out in the statute, and they cannot be dealt with. Then there are those complaints that are withdrawn by the complainant because he does not want to go on with them, and, in quite a large number of cases, other investigations are discontinued because some remedy has already been found for them, perhaps contemporaneously with the application to the ombudsman or perhaps merely because an inquiry by the ombudsman of the department concerned set in hand immediate departmental procedures which rectified the complaint and made any further complaint unnecessary.

The total number of complaints found to be justified was 551. Sir Guy said that it was interesting to note that the figures compared similarly with those of Parliaments in other countries that had established this ombudsman type of officer.

Mr. Wright: Does he handle all the complaints himself?

Mr. MURRAY: With a staff. Sir Guy said—

"The records of the office show at least 551 rectified grievances, and I suggest that that is a substantial figure, because if the office had not existed there would be 551 unsatisfied grievances in New Zealand at the present time."

Even if there were only a small number of satisfied grievances, that alone would justify the creation of such an office.

We have heard these arguments before, so it is interesting to note that Sir Guy said—

"The introduction of the Ombudsman institution into the Westminster type of parliamentary system was not effected without opposition. One critic said that the Ombudsman did violence to the three great concepts of the Commonwealth style of Government. These three great concepts, this holy trinity of Commonwealth Governments, were said to be parliamentary supremacy, the rule of law, and ministerial responsibility—and the Ombudsman was said to run counter to each of these."

Sir Guy, dealing with the first matter, said—

"It seems to me that as the Ombudsman is an officer of Parliament accountable to and removable by Parliament, he is an aid and not a hindrance to parliamentary supremacy. He is, either expressly as he is in New Zealand and some other countries, or impliedly as elsewhere, an officer of Parliament, a means whereby Parliament reaches out and places a restraining finger upon an erring administration, or raises a warning hand to it."

These, I think, are tremendously significant words.

I come now to that portion of Sir Guy's address in which he dealt with the role of members of Parliament, in which he says—

"Now we come to the question of members of Parliament. It is said that an Ombudsman usurps the functions of members of Parliament. An article in the 'New Zealand Law Journal' some years ago gave very rude and inaccurate expression to this view: 'If members of Parliament all did their jobs and earned their salaries, no Ombudsman would be needed.'

"Members of Parliament all over the world are giving increasing care to the individual interests of their constituents. Of course, they naturally and properly like to maintain contact with them, and members of Parliament often provide the only ready means of approach to authority that the constituent has. They have in many cases become most efficient and active 'complaints men'."

This might ring a bell for honourable members—

"There is no doubt that in our various systems this is a very healthy and useful activity. Yet it has severe limitations. Apart from the practical limitations, which vary a great deal in different countries, such as size and remoteness of constituency, length of sessions of Parliament, and so on, it must be clear that no member of Parliament has an investigating power such as the Ombudsman has.

"It is not the general practice for members of Parliament to take complaints direct to departments—at least it is not in New Zealand. Here a member normally

communicates either personally or in writing with the particular Minister concerned, who in due course delivers to the member the departmental reply. In some cases the Minister may be able to study the case himself but very rarely is it practicable for him to examine files and consider the whole matter de novo to satisfy himself that his department's action on the matter is sound.

"In all normal cases the constituent receives, through the channel of the member and the Minister, the departmental reply. This may well suffice in a number of cases—and of course it does—but cases do arise where the full and free operation of the party system may inhibit, first, the approach of the constituent to his member and, second, the influence the member has with the Minister."

Sir Guy went on to say—

"What I mean is that, while I know a member of Parliament is always willing to help any constituent regardless of party, the constituent himself may in some cases feel reluctant to approach a member whom he may have actively but unsuccessfully worked to unseat."

Let us be practical. Many of us know that this situation sometimes occurs in our own electorates.

Sir Guy continues—

"Further, a member of an Opposition party will perhaps not feel inhibited in pressing a Minister on behalf of a constituent, whereas a Government back-bencher might be.

"However, the important point is the limited scope of investigation available to a member. There can be no effective comparison between this method of operation and an investigation by the Ombudsman. Consequently, there is room for both methods, and I have had many cases referred to me by or through members of Parliament because they feel that a full investigation should be carried out."

I believe that a transcript of Sir Guy's speech on the role of the ombudsman and the tremendous number of questions that follow is very educational and illuminating, and I recommend that, if possible, any member of Parliament interested in the role of the ombudsman should study it.

Mr. Chinchin: I spoke on this subject six years ago.

Mr. MURRAY: It has been advocated for a long time. It is true that the honourable member for Mt. Gravatt has spoken on it previously.

The next day, another very important matter was discussed. Its title was, "The responsibility of Australia and New Zealand in the Pacific." This was a very wide and embracing conference, and I cannot do any better than to quote a few of the remarks

made by a present Federal Minister, the Honourable Peter Howson, who, addressing himself to the role of Australia and New Zealand in the Pacific, said—

"To my mind this is one of the most important items on the agenda. The key words were spoken by the delegate from Hong Kong when he said that from now on Australia and New Zealand must play a dominant role in this part of the South Pacific. This year of 1971 is a unique year. In 1970, as the delegate from Fiji has just said, his country was weaned from the British influence. Britain is also negotiating a new constitution for the British Solomon Islands and the Gilbert and Ellice Islands. With these changes taking place it will not be long before Britain's responsibilities in the South Pacific are at a minimum, and a completely new strategic situation is emerging in this part of the world."

We in the sovereign State of Queensland may well feel that we should leave the responsibility of relationships with other countries, particularly emerging countries, in the Pacific to the Commonwealth Government. This is not good enough. There are many ways in which we can hold out the hand of help and friendship to these emerging nations. We could send delegations, Ministers or departmental officers to them, but, whoever we send, we should send somebody to establish contact with them in our own right as the sovereign State of Queensland.

As well, we should join with New Zealand and other States in the Commonwealth in extending the hand of friendship and help to those emerging countries. If we do not help them in this new and strategic concept, someone else will. If we look at the Pacific area as a whole and the extent to which new, independent countries are emerging, we will see that we have a vital responsibility in this regard. Nearly all of these countries are basing their rule on the democratic processes of Westminster. This, we cannot ignore.

On the following day the conference dealt with another tremendously important matter, namely, Parliamentary committees, which was raised by one of the delegates from South Australia. This matter has frequently been broached in this House, but it was very refreshing to sit back and listen to the contributions made by so many members of the association on the role played by committees and the work done by them in parliamentary institutions.

Mr. Newton interjected.

Mr. MURRAY: I think it is fair to say that the honourable member and I were a little embarrassed by the fact that, whereas many members from other Parliaments spoke on this item, there was no way in the world that we could make a contribution to the discussion. Honourable members are fully aware of the non-existence of parliamentary committees in this place.

Mr. Banfield, who is a member of the South Australian Upper House, in opening the discussion on this matter, said—

“The appointment of select committees was first recorded in the Journals of the Mother of Parliaments in 1571—just 400 years ago. Since then the United Kingdom and all other Parliaments patterned on Westminster, and indeed many other national Parliaments, have found it necessary to appoint committees to advise, inquire, legislate, administer and control various matters entrusted to their care by the people whom they serve.

“It is appropriate that this discussion should be held here in New Zealand, where the Parliament appoints approximately 19 select committees each session.”

I shall repeat those words: “. . . in New Zealand, where the Parliament appoints approximately 19 select committees each session.”

He went on—

“This is according to the listing on the back page of its ‘Hansard’.”

Mr. Banfield went on to say—

“This must be almost a record for any Commonwealth country, I believe, and it is more remarkable when it is remembered that the membership of the Parliament totals only 84.”

It should be remembered that New Zealand has only a single House. I quote New Zealand as a country parallel to the State of Queensland. New Zealand has 84 members serving 2,700,000 people in a single House of Parliament.

Mr. Banfield then said—

“On going through the list we wonder just how these committees serve, and I am not here to criticise the system of the New Zealand branch. We have come over here to learn something about the system of parliamentary committees.

“We find that four members serve on five separate committees in the New Zealand Parliament, 12 members serve on four committees, 16 members serve on three committees, 26 members serve on two committees, and 22 on one committee, and I believe there are four members who are not on any committee. So it will be interesting to me, and, I guess, to a number of other delegates, to find out just how these members get through their work, and I will be interested later on to hear from the New Zealand delegates what effect service on parliamentary committees has had on some of them. I wonder if it takes away any of the time during which they might be serving in their electorates.”

An Opposition Member: Are they paid?

Mr. MURRAY: I understand that they are.

Mr. Banfield then said—

“I do not know how many members of Parliament miss out on election as a result

of not paying sufficient attention to the work of their electorates, through having to serve on these committees.”

He observed also—

“The President of the Legislative Council of New South Wales presented to the Second Conference of Presiding Officers and Clerks in Australia in April 1969 a paper on the desirability of extending the committee system. The resultant discussion brought out many interesting points of view on the subject . . . Subsequently, in a report to the Senate Standing Orders Committee, contained in Federal Parliamentary Paper No. 2 of 1970, the Clerk of the Senate stated, amongst other things: ‘The essence of the report is that a standing committee system is standard and essential equipment of the modern legislature. Work load alone is a compelling reason. Equally important to Parliament in its consideration of public affairs is that the Legislature may, through its committees, call upon scholarly research and advice equal in competence to that relied upon by the Government.’”

That is an interesting observation.

Mr. Banfield then told us something about the South Australian situation, particularly with reference to the committee on Subordinate legislation. He said that it had done sterling work since its inception in 1938. He went on to say—

“It is the duty of the committee to examine all regulations, rules, by-laws, orders or proclamations laid before Parliament which are subject to disallowance by the resolution of either or both Houses of the Parliament.

“The work of the committee continues into the recess.”

The South Australians also have a Public Works Committee. Dealing with that, Mr. Banfield said—

“The Act setting up the committee states, inter alia, ‘it shall not be lawful for any purpose to introduce into either House of Parliament any Bill (a) authorising the construction of any public work estimated to cost when complete more than \$300,000; or (b) appropriating money for expenditure on any public work estimated to cost when complete more than \$300,000 unless such public work has first been inquired into by the committee . . .’”

South Australia is not unique. It is but one of the numerous Parliaments that value the work of a Public Works Committee.

All in all, it was a very illuminating discussion. These 19 select committees in New Zealand, apart from the normal House committees that we know of, report to Parliament. The last time one of our ordinary domestic committees reported to Parliament was in 1911 or 1913. In Queensland there is no report to Parliament from

these committees. However, all these important New Zealand committees report to Parliament, and there is an availability, on motion, of discussion in Parliament on those reports.

Mr. Lee: Are they all-party committees?

Mr. MURRAY: Yes. They are standing committees comprising members from both sides of the House. This is the important thing about them. The small Government committees that we have in Queensland are of little benefit, or none at all. In the main, they are back-scratching committees.

Not one of the New Zealand committees is permitted to meet when the House is in session, unless by authority of the House itself. According to the New Zealand parliamentarians, the work of these committees is of tremendous value to them. It makes them better informed, insulates them against all sorts of criticism, and allows them to adopt far better roles in debate. In general, they are better informed and better members as a result. Members from both sides of the House sit on the committees, and party politics rarely enter into their discussions. It is not competent for a committee to give a minority report. Government numbers outweigh Opposition numbers, but the fact that a member has served on a committee does not prevent him from dissenting from its report when discussion on it ensues in the House.

I made only a small and insignificant contribution at the conference because we had very little ground for making any comment at all. But, with a little prodding from one or two on the situation in Queensland, I told them perhaps how to get along without committees.

Mr. Newton: We were embarrassed because each of the other States meets as a branch of the C.P.A., which we in Queensland do not do.

Mr. MURRAY: That is correct. All of us, as members of Parliament and members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, should really insist on meeting and making our branch effective. This could enable us to play a tremendous role. I have been blameworthy in the past as I have taken no interest in the C.P.A. However, the trip to New Zealand enlightened me tremendously. I am sure that, in the future, I shall take a very positive interest in the C.P.A.

I assert with some sadness and concern, but with very definite conviction, that no Parliament within the C.P.A. is so completely dominated by the Executive as is the Queensland Parliament, nor does any other Parliament contain as many Government members who are so lethargic in accepting the status quo and so indifferent to the consequences, which are very grave. I say this openly to my Government colleagues.

Many individual and some small collective moves have been made by Government members to effect some change here. Speaking of change, I remember the maiden speech of the honourable member for Mt. Gravatt on the philosophy of change. That speech is recorded in "Hansard", which is about the only effect it has had. It was an excellent contribution. The honourable member for Mt. Gravatt, like me, was starry-eyed enough to believe that something would happen as a result of his speech. As I have said, moves along these lines have been made not only by Government members but also by Opposition members.

On looking back over all those years, I see that the Opposition's record in this regard is not good. But why look to the past? What about looking at the present and the future, and deciding what has to be done? I say to honourable members on both sides of the House, "Start working as actively as possible for change in this direction." The late Mr. Pizzey went very close to setting up a committee on subordinate legislation, but unfortunately he passed on. I feel that he would have given us that committee.

I know that the honourable members for Mt. Gravatt, Chatsworth and Landsborough have spoken in similar vein. The honourable members for Mt. Gravatt and Chatsworth have spoken strongly on privilege. The honourable member for Toowong has also raised this matter, and the honourable member for Baroona has spoken positively and strongly on committees, and the necessity for them, in the parliamentary system. The Opposition is making some useful noises. I say, "Make strong noises and try to jolt the Government, if that is possible, out of the lethargic situation that it has allowed us to lapse into." The Executive, from the Premier down, resists any change in this direction and, by the simple old method of divide and conquer, there is a continuation of the status quo.

If possible, I should like us to view this situation in the role of members of Parliament rather than as politicians, and to ask for change. I urge those who feel the need for change to get up in this House and say so. Please take every opportunity available to jolt the Government into accepting some change which might bring us to the state that parliamentarians normally accept as desirable.

Mr. MARGINSON (Ipswich East) (4.2 p.m.): I listened with interest to the previous speaker when he was asking for change in the Parliament of Queensland. I do not think it inappropriate for me to say that I believe there will be a change in the Queensland Parliament in 1972. From my short experience in this House, I also concur with the previous speaker's statement about the Government being lethargic.

I looked in vain in the Governor's Opening Speech for contemplated action against the ever-increasing upward trend in prices,

particularly of basic commodities. I refer mainly to foodstuffs and clothing. Once more I was disappointed. I have heard other Opening Speeches by Sir Alan Mansfield, and on one occasion I heard one by the Administrator, and on those occasions also no action was foreshadowed in this very vexed question of increased prices. I was not surprised to find no such reference in the last Opening Speech, because I am convinced that the Government does not intend to make any attempt to even reduce the tempo of price rises, let alone halt them. Even if the Government wanted to do something about this very serious problem, I doubt if it has the ability to tackle it successfully. Many Queensland people in the lower-income bracket are today endeavouring to provide reasonable living conditions for their families. Many people on fixed incomes—and I refer particularly to pensioners—are the first ones to suffer.

Almost daily announcements are made of increases in prices of foodstuffs, and no attempt is being made by this "lethargic Government"—I adopt the words of another honourable member—to stop this trend. While it is allowed to continue, the gap in our economic structure between the higher-income earner and those in the lower-income bracket will become wider and wider. One leading wholesaler said only recently—

"Prices have just gone haywire. It is no wonder there is widespread pressure for rises in wages. The way things are going, I would like to see price control again, if only to keep prices on a reasonable, stable basis."

It is no wonder that we have a restless community; it is no wonder that we have industrial unrest. Every day the family budget is being reduced by increases in prices. What a profiteering paradise has been, and is being, created at the expense of the man in the lower-income-earning bracket and the man on the fixed income.

What an astonishing story—I will give honourable members opposite something to interject about now—came out of Mr. Hawke's investigations into the practice of retail price maintenance. Full credit must be given to the president of the A.C.T.U. for probing into this very serious problem. Manufacturers were insisting that retailers sell their goods at a price far in excess of their value or face the consequence of non-supply of the articles to them, even when the retailers admitted, and admitted positively, that they could sell at a much lower price and still make a satisfactory profit. That is the sort of thing that is happening to the consumer today, but the Government is taking no action to prevent it.

Mr. F. P. Moore: They condone it.

Mr. MARGINSON: Yes, they condone it. In effect, the reverse is happening. The Government and those associated with it endeavour to ridicule Mr. Hawke's attempts to give

to the consumer and to the people of Australia—I speak particularly of the people of Queensland—some justice in the field of price control and prices.

Only a few days ago, when the Appropriation Bill was before the House, I heard the Treasurer, in speaking of rising prices and wages, refer to the problem—many of us have done it before—as "the dog chasing its tail". No doubt he believes, as most Government members believe, that in this case the dog is prices. That is where I differ from him and his associates, because undoubtedly the trend for a long, long time has been for wages to chase prices, and it is about time that we in Queensland had a change. What about some action by the Government to see that such a change comes about?

In the local paper in Ipswich, "The Queensland Times", last Saturday an article headed "More price increases next week" appeared. It said—

"Queensland housewives face a mixed grill on the domestic price front next week—"

Mr. Bromley: They have secret agreements, too.

Mr. MARGINSON: That is correct; they do have secret agreements. The newspaper article continues—

"Ham and bacon are expected to rise by 6 cents per lb., from Monday.

"Beef and pork sausages will rise by 3 cents per lb. bulk."

This is only one of the weekly bulletins that are issued. It indicates that there is to be a further increase of 5c a lb for pre-packed beef and pork sausages, and that cooked meats will also rise in price. I will not quote the article in full but it states that the price of silverside will rise by 4c a lb and other cooked meats by 3c a lb. The smallest rise in the price of cooked meats will be 2c a lb.

Government members could have used part of their allotted time in this debate to draw attention to some of the problems that the people of Queensland have to face today, such as increases in prices and the lack of finance for hospitals.

One Minister spoke wholly and solely on what he thought was law and order. He spoke for his full 40 minutes on that subject when he should have been telling us how he was going to overcome the problems of the hospital service today. Honourable members opposite should have devoted a little more time to the lack of finance for hospitals and education, but, almost without exception, they spent a large portion, if not all of their allotted time, in condemnation of the Australian Labor Party.

Mr. Lee interjected.

Mr. MARGINSON: The honourable member was one of them. They spent their time in elaborating on what they alleged were

directions to honourable members on this side of the House. They endeavoured to capitalise on some imaginary internal troubles that they hoped would exist within this party. One honourable member considered that some person or persons should be brought to the Bar of the House, and another alleged that the freedom of members was being interfered with.

Mr. Bromley: Some of them have to be dragged from the bar of the House.

Mr. MARGINSON: That is quite true. All of them would want it believed that such alleged happenings occur only within the Australian Labor Party, and that they are free from any internal bickerings and quarrels.

I should like to place on record some of the incidents that have occurred within the Liberal and Country Parties during the last few years. Only last year, for example, four Country Party members in this House set about the task of removing the present Premier from his position as Leader, and consequently from his position as Premier of this State. They planned, connived, and undoubtedly lobbied for support to remove him, because they considered, apparently, that he was not a suitable person to retain the office of Premier. They were rehashing a quotation that comes to my mind. The late William Morris Hughes once said of Sir Robert Menzies, as he now is, "He couldn't lead a flock of homing pigeons."

Unfortunately for them, and unfortunately for the people of Queensland, their plans were made known too early. They jumped from the barrier too quickly. When the Premier got a whisper of it, he rallied his forces and, with a couple of proxy votes, he retained his position. They are the people who do not have any internal differences whatever! According to them, internal differences are to be found only in the Labor Party.

Mr. Wright: And the Press continually protects them.

Mr. MARGINSON: That is so. I can remember a man whose son is presently in this House, a man I met on many occasions, a man who was a Minister of the Crown in the State of Queensland. He was a man I highly respected, a man who worked well in his electorate, a man who, I understand, was a keen debater in this House. I refer to the late Mr. Muller, former honourable member for Fassifern.

Mr. P. Wood: They kicked him to pieces.

Mr. MARGINSON: They did. It is common knowledge that he had certain opinions about our land laws and that some of his colleagues—mainly in the Liberal Party—were anxious to see him go. They looked for an excuse and eventually found one, and Mr. Muller was immediately deposed from his office. He left the Country Party and stood for the seat of Fassifern as an

Independent. His former colleagues placed against him their endorsed Country Party candidate, but Mr. Muller defeated him and won the seat. In order to retain the status quo with the Liberal Party and to remain the major party in the Government of the State, the Country Party then welcomed him back to its ranks. That is the sort of thing that goes on in these two political parties.

I believe that some time ago a man named Dewar was in this Parliament. The Liberal Party looked for an opportunity to get rid of him. There are no internal quarrels amongst these people; they are to be found only in the Labor Party! The Liberals looked for an excuse to get rid of Mr. Dewar and they succeeded, but I have no doubt that, had he been successful in the 1969 election, the Liberals would have acted just as their Country Party colleagues did. They would have got down on their knees to get him back to give them another vote in this Parliament. What principles these people have!

We all remember the scene when the first redistribution Bill was before the House. Government members talk about law and order, but what went on that night within the ranks of the Government? I could not possibly explain it in great detail, but those who are present know what went on. Eight members of the Liberal Party crossed the floor of this House. And what happened the next day? At the airport the next day, the Premier, when asked what he thought of them, said, "I have nothing but contempt for them." These were people in his own Government. Remember also the part the president of the Liberal Party of Queensland played in issuing to members of this Chamber directions as to what they should or should not do in respect of the redistribution Bill. They say, "We do not get direction; that applies only in the Labor Party."

Then, of course, the masterpiece of intrigue within the Liberal Party occurred on the death of the late Harold Holt, who held the position of Prime Minister of this Commonwealth. The Leader of the Country Party, now Sir John McEwen, made it quite plain that the Country Party would not have any part of Billie McMahon, would not have any part of the Liberal's Deputy Leader at that time.

Mr. P. Wood: He probably had good reasons.

Mr. MARGINSON: He had good reasons, because he said, relative to Mr. McMahon, "We could not trust him." The Federal Liberal members then pulled out of the air, for the sake of political expediency, one John Grey Gorton. They plucked him from the Senate as a compromise choice, because the Liberals, without the support of the Country Party could no longer form

the Government in the Commonwealth Parliament of Australia. I think I have reached the stage where I could quote this very apt saying—

“O what a tangled web we weave, when first we contrive to deceive!”

I say it is very apt because since that time Australia has had round its neck a very tangled web as far as the Prime Ministership of Australia is concerned. Mr. Gorton, in setting out to maintain his position as Prime Minister, began chopping off the heads of those Ministers and people who had opposed him, and while he was doing that Mr. McMahon lurked in the shadows gathering his forces for yet another attack on Mr. Gorton. There they were, two leaders of the Liberal Party. From the way that members on the other side of the Chamber have spoken we are led to believe that the Liberal Party does not have any internal quarrels.

Early this year, with the help of people outside Parliament, such as Sir Frank Packer and Mr. Robinson, the president of the Queensland branch of the Liberal Party, yet another attack was launched. Out went Gorton, and in came McMahon. As soon as he came in he set to work sacking the Ministers who were in the Gorton Ministry, and then he got rid of Mr. Bury and even Mr. Gorton. This is the sort of thing that goes on within the Liberal Party. What a lot of rot it is for the honourable member for Chatsworth to talk about the freedom of members of Parliament.

The battle is not finished yet, because in today's "Courier-Mail" this article appears—

“A Victorian Liberal Party official has called on the Prime Minister (Mr. McMahon) to step down.

The party's Elsternwick North branch vice-president (Mr. Arnold Koppel), said Mr. McMahon should allow the Federal Treasurer (Mr. Snedden) to take his place.

Mr. Koppel has been the branch's vice-president for five years.

He made the statement in a letter to a suburban newspaper.

‘Many people have rung me day and night and have said “Congratulations”,’ Mr. Koppel said last night.

‘They all say I'm 100 per cent right’.

Mr. Koppel said in his letter that the former Prime Minister (Mr. Gorton) had been dismissed because of treachery and disloyalty by colleagues who now occupied ministerial ranks.

Mr. Gorton stood down to preserve party unity in the face of threats that, unless he did so, certain of his colleagues would cross the floor and vote with the Opposition, Mr. Koppel said.

‘If Mr. McMahon is sincere in wanting to create party unity, I suggest that he step down and allow Mr. Snedden, who has great experience and is very popular, to take his place.

‘It is certain that Mr. Snedden would reunite Mr. McMahon and Mr. Gorton’— I think that is an impossibility—

‘to join him in a united Cabinet which would work for the benefit and prosperity of our great country.’”

The Liberal Party is the party that supposedly has no internal quarrels or internal disputes. And how it loves to attack the party of which I am honoured to be a member. Having dealt with that, I hope that will be the last we hear of these political attacks within the Parliament.

A number of items in the Governor's Opening Speech attracted my attention. I should like to refer to them today if time permits. One is in these terms—

“A substantial programme of rural electrification is scheduled, and planning is in progress to determine the next major power station to follow the Gladstone project.”

It is expected that the Swanbank B Power Station will be completed during the 1972-73 financial year and that the Gladstone Power Station will be completed some years later. With a further major power station required after that, it is my contention that it should be constructed on the coalfields of Ipswich.

I urge the Government to give serious consideration to what Ipswich has to offer in such an undertaking. As in the case of the Swanbank Power Station, transportation costs would be kept to a minimum, with conveyor belts taking coal direct from the mines to the power station. The cost of transporting coal from the mine to the point of use plays a very major part in the eventual price of coal, and this is particularly so with electricity undertakings. For this reason alone the Ipswich coalfields are the ideal situation for a future power-house or power-houses. Ample supplies of water are available as well as the services of very skilled tradesmen, and thousands of consumers, both industrial and domestic, are close at hand. Members can be assured that I will watch with great interest the proposals of this and any future Government for the construction of power stations in the State of Queensland.

Another item in the Governor's Opening Speech indicated that the Government plans to purchase additional diesel locomotives and wagons, that is, more rolling-stock for the railways. I have noticed for some time now that the Government has made most of these available for construction outside its own railway workshops. I ask the Minister to give serious consideration to constructing at least the wagons and any other new rolling-stock in its own railway workshops. We have excellent tradesmen in the railway workshops and, at Ipswich, we have two of the largest railway workshops in the State. I appeal to the Government to have the construction of new rolling-stock undertaken within the Government's own departments.

I now refer to an article that appeared in "The Australian" of 24 July 1971, headed "State Aid refused for school where some boys cannot even read." The article refers to the Salvation Army Riverview Training Farm, which is in my electorate of Ipswich East. It states—

"A school which has six illiterate students and 40 others who are severely retarded has been refused Federal and State education assistance because it does not give full-time schooling.

"But obviously these boys couldn't cope with a full curriculum," the teacher, Mr. C. Crosby, said yesterday.

"He said one student, now 14, had not attended school until he was 12 and others of about 15 had reading ages of pupils only six or seven years of age.

"The boys, aged between 13 and 17, are inmates of the Salvation Army Riverview Training Farm, 20 miles west of Brisbane."

"They have been committed to the farm by the Children's Services Department which pays the Riverview administrators \$8.50 a week for each boy.

"The boys were put in the care of the department when they appeared before the courts."

Mr. Low: When did you hear about it? When you read about it in the paper?

Mr. MARGINSON: At least I can read.

A multitude of boys whose behaviour has drawn the attention of the State appear before the Children's Court each year. Generally, a boy's appearance is the result of an unsatisfactory home life and a performance at school which was so poor that it created problems for himself and for the school. This inevitably results in truancy, stealing and expulsion.

In the boys' own interest, so that they may be helped, they are committed to State-subsidised church homes for periods of care and protection or care and control. From these homes scattered throughout the State, with the exception of Riverview, they go out daily to attend the schools of the State Education Department. For a number of these boys, this simply means an improved place to live in, but they face the same school problems. Truancy still provides some means of escape and is associated, in some cases, with more stealing.

Until two years ago, the alternatives were to hold them and educate them at Wilson Youth Hospital or commit them to Westbrook Training Farm, both State institutions. As a means of offering a rehabilitation programme for these boys, the Salvation Army Training Farm at Riverview was geared to receive them and provide further training. Here they are given instruction in dairying, pig-raising and market gardening as well as worship training. Earlier this year, the Salvation Army engaged a full-time qualified teacher to help these boys

to achieve some sort of educational standard. He was previously employed by the Education Department at one of Brisbane's high schools. He resigned to accept this appointment.

It must be remembered that these boys are committed by our courts to the home at Riverview. They cannot leave this institution to obtain daily educational instruction at nearby State schools. Classes are held each day within the buildings of the home at Riverview for periods of up to 1½ hours. The classes are arranged to fit in with farming and workshop instruction. As many as 50 boys are at this home. Approximately half of them are under school-leaving age. The ages of all of them range from 13 to 16 years. If it were not for the interest shown by the authorities who conduct these homes, these boys would have no educational facilities available to them. The authorities do acknowledge, however, the assistance that has been given to them by the Department of Children's Services, local organisations and people interested in their work. The Salvation Army has been able to provide reading and writing laboratories, a small library of reference books (with the assistance of the Children's Services Department) and high-interest and low-reading-age books.

It was hoped that an application for a Federal grant as a private school would allow for the educational programme of these boys to be continued. I am told that this application was rejected because the school did not take each boy for a full day from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. These boys could not concentrate on inside activities for longer than they do now. The farm and workshop education and training is not considered to be part of a full-time educational programme for the purpose of obtaining a Federal grant.

Following this rebuff two years ago, the State Education Department, from which each child is entitled to education until he is 15 years of age, was approached. It would not help to educate these boys, because, it said, other homes would want similar assistance. Where, I ask, are the other homes similar to this one at Riverview, to which boys are committed, where they have to remain on the property, and where they cannot leave to obtain education? Where are the other homes that inmates cannot leave to obtain instruction daily? Even with these refusals, the school was commenced, and this year a full-time qualified teacher was engaged. His salary is being paid by those conducting the home. His appointment has proved a decided advantage for the boys, who have shown considerable interest. Unfortunately, the burden has become too great for the church authorities, and the teacher will have to leave unless some assistance is given by the Government.

I ask the Government to accept responsibility for the teacher's salary. He came to this position in the first place from the Education Department. He could return

to the Education Department and be seconded to this home through, say, the Education Department and the Department of Children's Services. The position is that illiterate boys of 15 and 16 years of age will be discharged as rehabilitated with the average reading ability of an eight-year-old unless some sympathetic understanding is given by the Government to their very serious problems.

I understand that even in prisons (which is where these boys might finish, if they are not given better treatment) certain educational facilities are made available to the inmates, in both primary and secondary education. At the Brisbane Prison I am told that as many as eight teachers give instruction in the evening, and the cost of this service is met by the Government. Even correspondence courses are available to prisoners.

As my time is running out, I shall pass to another important matter. I recently made representations to the Minister for Education for the establishment in Ipswich of a school for deaf children. Although I am still awaiting his decision, I believe I should make brief reference to this matter. There are no facilities in Ipswich for the teaching of deaf children, and to obtain instruction children from Ipswich have to travel to Brisbane each day. Children under five years of age must travel to the Yeronga Pre-School for the Deaf, and those of school age travel to the State School for the Deaf at Gladstone Road, South Brisbane, or the school at Cornwall Street.

These children have to be taken each morning to the Wacol railway station by either train or motor-car and conveyed from there at 8 a.m. or 8.15 a.m., by either bus or taxi, to their schools. They are taken to Wacol by their mothers. At about 3 p.m. each day, the mothers have to journey again to the Wacol railway station to collect their children and take them back to their homes, which in some cases are 14 or 15 miles distant.

Mothers who have children with this unfortunate defect are most anxious to give them every opportunity to learn under teachers who are qualified in such work. Naturally the mothers are under a severe strain, without having to perform this further service of lengthy travel each day. When there are other young children in the family, one can readily appreciate the heavy strain placed on these mothers.

I understand that there are approximately 15 to 20 children in Ipswich who require this specialised schooling, and I ask the Minister to establish a school in Ipswich, to commence not later than the beginning of the next school year. Until the school is established, could the bus that conveys these children to the schools in Brisbane be sent to Ipswich? It could pick up the children at some central, convenient point in the city, and return there with them each afternoon.

I should now like to refer to the litter legislation introduced last session, to which the honourable member for Sandgate referred. He said that the Minister for Local Government and Electricity had given him an astonishing answer to a recent question. I said when the legislation was before the House that the Government would throw the whole responsibility for the administration of the Act fairly and squarely on the shoulders of local authorities, and time has shown that that is what it has done. The Ipswich City Council has had to budget for some thousands of dollars to meet the cost of administering the Act, and many of the shires adjoining Ipswich are somewhat loath, and I believe do not desire, to carry out the requirements. I do not blame them. The Government enacts the law and then throws the responsibility onto the shoulders of local authorities and expects the ratepayers to meet that responsibility without any compensation. It is just one more instance of the State Government's throwing responsibility for the administration of laws onto local authorities.

Mr. B. WOOD (Cook) (4.41 p.m.): As I flew in from the North today, I was struck by the sickly grey smog that hung over Brisbane. I reflected that it must cause considerable distress to people who live here. The housewives who have to hang out their washing under it and the people with infirm chests and others who have to suffer with it must be quite unhappy.

I reflected also that this same smog causes no less distress to the people in the North, 1,000 miles away. It seems to me that the people who run the State from Brisbane cannot see through the smog which envelops the city, nor can they see over the tops of the tall buildings that surround them. I believe that the North suffers considerably because of its distance from the capital city. It suffers particularly in higher costs and poorer services.

Mr. R. Jones: And the Government's limited vision.

Mr. B. WOOD: I warn the honourable member for Cairns that, in interjecting, he may need to put boxing gloves on, after his recent dismissal from the Chamber for an alleged gesture.

Mr. R. Jones: If I did put boxing gloves on, I would be crowned as the winner.

Mr. B. WOOD: That would be right, too.

Mr. R. Jones interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I am waiting for the conversation between the two honourable members to finish. I trust that the honourable member for Cook is not trying to be disrespectful to the Chair when he suggests that I might send the honourable member for Cairns out.

Mr. B. WOOD: Not at all, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I trust that the honourable member is not; I shall see that he is not.

Mr. B. WOOD: It is dissatisfaction resulting from the things I have mentioned that is responsible for the attitude of those people in the North who desire to have a new State for North Queensland. It is the raw deal that people in the North are getting from the administrators in Brisbane that has caused this move.

You know, of course, Mr. Speaker, that Brisbane is in the extreme south of the State.

Mr. P. Wood: Many people in the Government seem to suggest that Brisbane is the centre of the State.

Mr. B. WOOD: Yes. It seems to me that, from this position, people get a distorted view of the State. A very different view would be gained if the capital of the State were situated about 60 miles from the northern boundary of Queensland. I sometimes think it would be desirable to perform some sort of transplant operation. If that could be done, a better perspective would be obtained.

In lieu of that, I will give honourable members a few facts which I am sure they are aware of but sometimes fail to recognise. If we take the eastern boundary of Australia, we find that Brisbane is less than half way between the southern and northern extremities. Brisbane is therefore not in the northern part of Australia. One-third of the length of this country lies beyond Townsville, so I think we can say that although Townsville may be in northern Australia, it is certainly not in northern Queensland.

We have to proceed somewhere just north of Ingham before we move into North Queensland. Three-sevenths of the length of this State still lies beyond Cairns. These facts are known, but I am not sure that they are understood. Southerners, predominantly those in this city, know nothing of the problems of living and working in the towns and country areas of the North.

The northern part of the State is like a luxurious hotel: it is great to live in but it is very expensive. Northerners—and I mean Northerners, people who live well beyond Townsville—pay more than Southerners for almost everything. They pay more for homes, cars, food and holidays. Sugar, which is grown in the North, costs 11c. more for a 4lb. packet there than in Sydney. It costs less in Darwin than in the North as a result of a subsidy scheme. Northerners also suffer in the way of poorer services—for example, television and radio—and insufficient Government facilities, especially roads and schools. We expect some disparity in prices because of distance, but the disparities we face are out of all proportion. The traditional compensation received by people

in remote areas in the way of taxation concessions is quite inadequate, and has remained unchanged for many years. In food alone, the Cairns family would pay between \$1.50 and \$2.50 a week more than the Brisbane family.

Northerners sometimes compare, with some sadness, advertisements for food in Brisbane newspapers with those in their local newspapers. Advertisements for the same product through the same distributors show steep increases in price for every item sold in the North. For example, a packet of razor blades of the same brand and sold by the same retailer will be advertised at 4c. more in Cairns than in Brisbane. Over \$1,000 a ton is paid in freight alone. That sort of thing goes on all the time. The price of food is the cause for the most persistent objections from the North.

Higher prices apply to almost everything. I cite homes and land as examples. I do not believe that any young couple in the Cairns area could build a home on their own land for less than a total cost of \$12,500.

An Honourable Member: Is this through the Housing Commission?

Mr. B. WOOD: Through either the Housing Commission or private sources of finance. The same home could be built in Brisbane, together with land, I estimate, for \$9,500. I have examined this subject very carefully. I know that land around Cairns is sometimes in short supply. Development land is now coming from cane farms, and it is quite expensive to buy.

Mr. Armstrong: What is the average price of an allotment?

Mr. B. WOOD: It is impossible to get one for less than \$2,000. Cane land is expensive to acquire. The Queensland Housing Commission must step in and acquire considerable areas of land for young people in the area to build on, and it must build many more houses at a time than it is now. A reduction in home-building costs will follow if hundreds of homes are built at a time. I refer to the system of project building, which has not yet been developed in our area.

I mentioned that holidays are expensive for Northerners. It is a long way from Cairns to Brisbane or further south. Northerners like to travel occasionally, but to take a family from the North to the South and home again becomes a very expensive operation and far too many Northerners tend to be isolated from the South because of the sheer cost of movement.

Some of the higher prices I mentioned, of course, are due to the higher costs of living in the North, while others result from unfair rail freights, which have been in issue for some time. Other increases just seem to be added on for good measure. Of course, we often have the ridiculous situation where sales tax is added to the freight charge.

While I am talking about rail freights, this Government has been in a muddle for years in this matter. We have only to go back to the Loder Report of about six years ago. It made the point that the northern and central divisions were subsidising the southern division. It said that the Queensland Government might consider remedying this situation by a readjustment of freight rates. That is a long time ago, yet nothing has happened.

Mr. R. Jones: That recommendation was put at the top of the Scott Report, and again at the top of the Beckingsale Report, but nothing has happened.

Mr. B. WOOD: That is so. We have this continual issuing of reports. The Premier, when he was in the North some years ago, made an issue of this matter and got himself into hot water with the Treasurer. That was three years ago, and we are still waiting for something to happen.

Mr. Wright: You won't see the Beckingsale Report.

Mr. B. WOOD: The Beckingsale Report is being prepared, but it is not to be released. The reason for the Government's refusal to release it is not, as it says, that there are confidential matters in it, but simply that there is too much in it that it wishes to hide. One of the reasons the Minister has given as to why it will not be released is that it would give some advantage to the department's competitors. This is not so. What we want is some advantage to people living in the North.

Recently we have seen a report issued by W. D. Scott & Co. The Government is now claiming that this is a biased report, but only because it does not agree with the findings. This report says things that the Government does not want said. I am sure that many of its findings would be similar to those in the Beckingsale Report. I give one quotation as an example—

"South Queensland receives an unfair advantage over the North, an advantage stemming directly from Queensland railway freight rates."

The report also says—

"The statistics indicate that the cost of living in country areas is greatly affected by the level of freight rates, further adding to the burden of the country manufacturer and the country resident."

In the end, the Government must do something to act on these reports. It cannot just drift along and allow those in the North to continue to suffer. I have some remedies to suggest to the Government to overcome the problem of soaring costs in the North. They are not original; they have frequently been detailed to the Government, but no action has been taken on them.

First of all, the Government must take a greater and a really genuine interest in the problems of the North and have an honest

intention to do something. I have said that it is in the power of the Government to correct rail-freight anomalies. All that is needed is some action. We must correct the advantage that southern people have over those in the North, and that the southern producer has over the northern producer. For example, I know one poultry producer who cannot freight his grain to the North as cheaply as southern poultry producers can freight their finished product, which is then sold in competition with the northern product.

Further, we must allocate a more comparable sum for public works expenditure in the northern part of the State. In particular, I refer to expenditure on roads and schools—but I shall have some more to say about those things later in my speech.

The Government should ensure that all vacancies that occur in the Public Service are filled. To revert to the poultry industry for an illustration of the point I am trying to make, I remind the Government that the position of poultry adviser in the North has been vacant for a year. But of course honourable members can rest assured that every vacant position in Brisbane will be filled.

The Government should extend the functions of the Consumer Affairs Bureau so that that body can pay attention to prices. Some months ago I forwarded a list of complaints about high prices in country towns to the bureau, and I received a very polite reply saying that prices were not the bureau's business. That is not good enough. Such a restriction does not do the people in the North any good, and it certainly does not do the Government any good.

As well, the Government should set about providing improved facilities for public servants who are employed in the North. Housing for Government employees in the Cairns and Mareeba areas is very limited.

Although an official committee travelled round the North 18 months ago to inquire into the matter of Public Service sustenance allowances, the Government has not yet made any decision on its recommendations. The Government claims that it has no money to increase the present allowances, although I understand that something may come out of the Budget next week. I certainly hope so.

This Government should take up certain matters with the Federal Government. Time and time again honourable members are told, "This is the responsibility of the Federal Government, and we cannot do anything about it." That type of statement confirms the impression we have that when the Premier attends Loan Council meetings he merely sits there and says nothing. This State wants leaders who will go to Canberra and fight in the interest of Queenslanders. It is no use saying that a matter is a Federal one and therefore nothing can be done about it. The State Government has some authority, but it

fails to exercise it. Its Ministers should go to Canberra and speak out loudly on behalf of the State that they are supposed to lead.

One matter that I wish to raise is the income-tax concession allowed to people in Zones A and B. A family of five living in the area south of the Daintree River could not receive a refund under the zone allowance in excess of \$30. I have in mind a family whose income is well above average. A man who receives a lower wage and supports a wife and three children would obtain a refund of as little as \$6 to \$8. That is the paltry sum that is allowed by way of tax reimbursement. The refund has not been increased for many years, so it is about time that the Premier voiced his objection to this ridiculous situation. I do not intend to deal with other matters, such as the unfairness of one family receiving \$9 because it has a low income, whereas another family, with a higher income, gets approximately \$30.

I urge the Government to reduce sales tax on major items by the amount of freight paid on them. The rail freight on a motor-car from Brisbane to North Queensland may be as high as \$100, and that charge is added to the price of the car. The sales tax is then calculated on the total sum, which makes the car a good deal more expensive than it should be. I see no reason why the Government should not deduct freight charges from the sales tax that is imposed. People in the North pay hundreds of dollars in sales tax, so it is only reasonable to allow them the deduction of freight charges.

Mr. P. Wood: Such a deduction would help balance up their cost of living.

Mr. B. WOOD: It would bring about a major improvement to their conditions. I realise of course that the concession could not be applied to small items, but it certainly could be applied to large items, such as refrigerators, stoves, bathtubs, and so on. That would be a great advantage to the people of North Queensland.

Mr. P. Wood: Do you see it as applying to foodstuffs?

Mr. B. WOOD: It would be more difficult to implement, but it could be extended in that direction.

Sales tax, as I have said, is charged on the price of the goods, plus freight. That is ridiculous. There is no reason why sales tax should not be applied on the basis of the price ex Brisbane. This must be attended to quickly. Action in this matter is long overdue. The granting of justice in these matters would make a great difference to people in the North. It should not be so expensive for people to live there.

According to the latest available Year Book, proportionately, the North is much more productive than the South. Brisbane, with a population of 813,000, is able to produce all sorts of goods, including those from primary industry, worth \$421,000,000

a year, which represents \$518 a head. The Cairns district, with a population of 110,000, produces \$124,000,000 worth of goods, equal to \$1,134 a head. I have always said that one Northerner is worth two Southerners.

This productivity derives from a variety of sources. I have said previously that my electorate is the most diverse electorate in the State. It produces minerals, sugar, tobacco, beef, grain, timber, pearls, trochus and quite a variety of other products. Tourism is becoming increasingly important. Sugar, of course, is the basic and very important product in my area. Anyone who drives to the Central or North Queensland coastal areas sees the numerous towns and cities that depend on the sugar industry, and of course the people who live in them, who also depend on it.

We are all aware of the current disaster in the wool industry. Weakened by drought, it is barely able to withstand the attack by synthetics. The sugar industry could face the same sort of threat. No-one can say with certainty what will happen in the future, especially when Britain enters the European Economic Community.

Mr. Wright: Especially the Premier. He knows least of all.

Mr. B. WOOD: That is right.

We could suffer a most serious loss. This is one sphere in which the Government must play a role. At present the C.S.R. Co. has contracted to market Australia's exports of raw sugar, including the arrangements for sale, storage, shipping, transport and insurance, and the planning and development of markets. The C.S.R. Co. is responsible for all these things, and I emphasise particularly the planning and development of markets, which has been an unsatisfactory policy for a long time.

The Government must accept greater responsibility in this matter. It, and not the C.S.R. Co., is the representative of the people. I do not know, nor do I believe any member of this House knows, what the company is now doing in planning markets for our sugar, or in seeing to it that the demand for sugar is kept at a high level.

Mr. Newbery: Wouldn't you agree that the C.S.R. Co. has done a very good job in marketing Australia's sugar?

Mr. B. WOOD: The only thing the honourable member knows about sugar is that it is the commodity for which he uses saccharin as a substitute.

We do not know what is happening at the moment, nor can we find out. The situation is so crucial that it must be debated in public. This Parliament represents the people, and the floor of this Assembly is the place where the future of the sugar industry must be openly discussed. It can be debated here, where the public and their representatives can see what is, or is not, happening. The board room of the C.S.R.

Co. is not the appropriate place. The State must take an interest in this matter. However, it is not geared for it at the moment.

I said in a previous debate on primary industries that the Government must do more to develop its Marketing Branch, particularly in regard to sugar. I have seen the very fine reports which indicate the excellent work that is being done by the Bureau of Sugar Experiment Stations. That bureau provides a very comprehensive and valuable service. There is no comparable organisation concerned with the marketing of sugar. The Government just has no knowledge in this field.

Mr. Casey: Every major agreement of benefit to the sugar industry has been negotiated by a Labor Government.

Mr. B. WOOD: Of course it has. The newspapers admitted this years ago.

It is no use growing sugar, or any other primary product, unless it can be sold. We can grow anything; the problem lies in marketing it. This is where the Government must display some interest.

I mention briefly the example of the wool industry, which has engaged in a great deal of advertising. But it was left too late. The wool industry had begun to lose its market and, as the advertising experts tell us, one aspect of advertising is to hold what we now have. The sugar industry throughout the world will have to enter this field before it is too late.

I mentioned earlier in my speech some poor educational services in the Far North. A few weeks ago the honourable member for Cairns asked whether an institute of technology would be built in Cairns in the future. The answer was "No." The provision of such an institute is essential. It must come, and it must come fairly soon. People in the South do not realise that Cairns is 240 miles from Townsville. They seem to think that those two cities adjoin each other. Townsville has a university and a teachers' college, and it would be a crime if an institute of technology was provided there instead of in Cairns. The Government repeatedly stresses the need for decentralisation, but there is no point in talking about it and doing nothing. There is no point in centralising all northern activities in Townsville, which, as I have said, is not in the northern part of the State.

I refer also to the poor deal that Mossman receives from this Government. A high school was due to commence operations there next year. However, the money allocated for the building was abruptly taken away and used elsewhere. The need for a new high school is greater in Mossman than in any other part of the State. The Mossman school has the largest secondary department in Queensland, with over 200 children. The school has a substantial number of Aboriginal children, who need special care and attention, and the teachers have a big problem.

The Mossman people were extremely disappointed, and an assurance has been given them that a high school will be built there and opened in 1973. The Government, as some sort of balm for its conscience, will provide a science block that is to be ready for next year. I have forwarded to the Education Department petitions signed by hundreds of people in Mossman objecting to what has happened. They have received shameful and shabby treatment, and we intend to see it does not happen again.

We are also waiting for a second primary school in Mareeba. There has been talk about this for quite a long time. The Government is still looking at land. It takes it a long time to make decisions in these matters.

The other day the Governor, Sir Alan Mansfield, drove from Cairns to Mossman. I do not know how often he has travelled this road, but I suppose I drive over it 50 or 60 times a year. Sir Alan admired it greatly; I think he said it was one of the best drives in Queensland. Although I travel this road so often, I still admire the view. It is certainly the most beautiful scenic drive in the State, if not in the whole of Australia. There are, of course, improvements to be made to the road, but they are coming.

The Cook Highway, between Cairns and Mossman, gives access to beaches that are among the most beautiful in this State, and superior to any elsewhere in Australia. I refer to places such as Ellis Beach, Palm Cove, Trinity Beach, Clifton Beach, and, further north, Port Douglas. Tremendous development has begun at the beaches just north of Cairns. I hope it will be orderly development of a type that will enhance, rather than mar, the beauty of those areas.

We are told repeatedly about tourism, and there is one line of action that the Government could take that would be of tremendous benefit to tourism in my area. I refer to the fact that tourists and local residents cannot swim with safety in the summer months because of the possible presence of sea wasps in the water. I have read that \$17,000 has been spent over five years in the collection of a toxin from sea wasps, and of the subsequent development of an antivenene, which will be soon available. That is good, but the mere availability of an antivenene affords no protection from the threat of a sea-wasp sting. It does not provide safe, worry-free swimming.

I have read also that almost \$200,000 has been spent in a five-year period on the shark-netting of beaches north of Rockhampton. Sea wasps are no less dangerous than sharks. We are told that netting is not the sole answer to the menace of the sea wasp, but I believe that the Government could consider this problem rather more seriously than it has in the past. Good nets can be effective, and I should like to see some experimental work done along these lines. In particular, I call on the Government to

finance a research programme to find the source of sea wasps with a view to attacking the problem there. I believe that \$200,000 should be spent in this way. It may then be possible to find the breeding grounds of sea wasps and to attack this menace there.

I now want to refer briefly to recent developments in the city of Cairns and the shire of Mulgrave. The hills that surround the city of Cairns and spread throughout this area are, of course, logical places for the building of homes so that the beautiful views can be more readily availed of. At the same time, this hillside development is causing serious problems. The environment is being marred, and inconvenience is being caused to people who live nearby, either by changes in the flow of water or from dust and noise from excavations. I believe that the local councils in these areas have to examine hillside development rather more closely than they have done in the past.

I shall give one example only. Development of this type is taking place, in the main, in the Cairns suburb of Edge Hill and in Bayview Heights and Stratford, in the Mulgrave Shire.

Mr. Low: They are beautiful residential areas.

Mr. B. WOOD: They are indeed.

I will cite an example from the Bayview Heights area, where recently a company submitted to the council a plan for subdivision. So far it has sold, I think, about 70 to 80 allotments at good prices. After the plan was submitted and the allotments were sold, an amendment was made to the plan presented to the council and it was said that a hilltop is to be removed. In fact, about 80 feet is to be removed from the top of the hill and about 400,000 yards of soil is to be taken away, yet people who have already bought land were not warned at the time of their purchase that this was to happen.

I believe that some very unfortunate misrepresentation is taking place. It is a shame that people bought land when they were unaware of a very serious hazard that was going to exist for upwards of 10 years. At the present rate of carting gravel, it will take seven, eight or more years to remove 400,000 yards of soil from the hilltop. That is a long time for people to be inconvenienced by dust and by heavy trucks moving past their properties. I know of one case in which a family was prepared to build a home predominantly of glass, to suit the northern climate, and now is not willing to proceed with the plan.

For this reason, councils must examine very carefully all proposals for such development in Cairns and in the Mulgrave Shire. After all, the people who live in these areas are the ones who have to be considered most. There are beautiful hillsides and beautiful views in the area, and they must

be maintained. Development can proceed, but it has to be proceeded with very carefully.

I shall conclude with a brief discussion of problems relating to the northern boundary of the State. Earlier this year the Premier asked what the member for Cook was doing when there was some sort of outburst about the northern boundary being moved south and more territory being given to the Territory of Papua and New Guinea. As I replied in the Press at the time, the Premier should have paid more attention to the work of this House, because my attitude has been stated here.

Mr. Ebia Olewale, who is my neighbour across the border in the House of Assembly in the Territory of Papua and New Guinea, has advocated that certain islands be handed over to Papua and New Guinea. Incidentally, I might say that if all politicians in the House of Assembly in Port Moresby are of his calibre, we need have no fear about the future of that Parliament. However, he has called for the handing over of these islands. Mr. Whitlam has made a statement on the subject and has pointed out the very serious border problems that could occur in the future. The policy of the A.L.P. is to leave the decision in the hands of the people who live in those islands, and that is right and proper. That is my view; it is the view of the Australian Labor Party; but we recognise also the very serious problems that could occur there in the future.

Mr. Ahern: You are having "two bob" each way.

Mr. B. WOOD: No, I am not having "two bob" each way. However, I do wish to say something about the Premier. He has been critical of me and of the Australian Labor Party. He suddenly discovered this issue two years after it had been raised. That is how out-of-date he is; it is typical of him.

The Premier was being very protective of the boundaries of this State on that occasion, so I was very interested to find on my desk recently the brochure that I have here in my hand. It could not have cost less than \$1 to produce.

Mr. P. Wood: From the Premier's Department.

Mr. B. WOOD: Yes.

A Government Member: Don't you appreciate it?

Mr. B. WOOD: I appreciate it, all right. He is the man who defends our boundaries, and who attacks the A.L.P. over its attitude. He left out more than half the islands of the Torres Strait in this map, to which I draw the attention of honourable members. That shows how genuinely interested he is in them.

I also have another book here. I do not suppose it could be prepared for less than \$5 a copy. It contains more than 200

excellent photographs. I suppose copies of it are going overseas, although I have no objection to that.

Mr. Sullivan: Don't you think that is a good thing?

Mr. B. WOOD: Yes. I have no objection to it. But among all the photographs there is not one of anything relating to Torres Strait. It does not cover anything farther north than Weipa. There is not one photograph of anything to do with Aborigines or Torres Strait Islanders. Yet the Premier has the hide to criticise our attitude. He ignores it. He discovered what he thought was a new issue, but it was far out of date. If he wants to defend our northern border, let him do something up there. If he continues the way he is going, he will give those islands to the Territory of Papua and New Guinea by default because there will be nobody left living there. There is a tremendous exodus of people from that area, and the Premier is encouraging it.

(Time expired.)

Debate, on motion of Mr. Hughes, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 5.23 p.m.
