

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 19 SEPTEMBER 1972

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 19 SEPTEMBER 1972

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. W. H. Lonergan, Flinders) read prayers and took the chair at 11 a.m.

OVERTIME PAID IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

RETURN TO ORDER

The following paper was laid on the table:—

Return to an Order made by the House on 8 August last, on the motion of Mr. R. Jones, showing the amount of overtime paid in each Government department (all funds) in 1971-72.

PAPERS

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

Reports—

Operations of the Sub-Departments of the Department of Health—"Eventide" (Sandgate), "Eventide" (Charters Towers), "Eventide" (Rockhampton), and Queensland Industrial Institution for the Blind (South Brisbane), for the year 1971-72.

Agricultural Bank, for the year 1971-72.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

The Rural Training Schools Act of 1965.

Industrial Development Act 1963-1970.

The Irrigation Acts, 1922 to 1965.

The State Electricity Commission Acts, 1937 to 1965.

Regulations under the Irrigation Acts, 1922 to 1965.

Report of the Totalisator Administration Board of Queensland for the year 1971-72.

PETITION

MINERAL LEASES, FRASER AND MORETON ISLANDS

Mr. SHERRINGTON (Salisbury) presented a petition signed by 387 electors and others in the State of Queensland, praying that the Parliament of Queensland will take immediate steps to prevent the granting of any further mineral leases on Fraser and Moreton Islands until an independent, comprehensive land-use survey of these areas has been carried out.

Petition read and received.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

Mr. F. P. MOORE (Mourilyan) (11.5 a.m.), by leave: My personal explanation concerns an article that appeared in "The Courier-Mail" of Friday, 15 September—

The report is headed, "Minister appalled at school claim", and says—

"The Education Minister (Sir Alan Fletcher) has called for a special report on the condition of Innisfail State primary school."

Later, it states—

". . . Sir Alan said he was appalled at the suggestion by Mr. Moore (A.L.P., Mourilyan) that three sets of steps had fallen out."

Today, I should like to place on record in this House the dates on which these steps at the State school did fall out. The first was on the 15th of—

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Is the honourable member in order in making the statement that he is making?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Has the honourable member finished his personal explanation?

Mr. F. P. MOORE: I want to have recorded here the dates on which these steps collapsed. The position is not as the Minister stated.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BURNS (Lytton) (11.7 a.m.), by leave: During my Address-in-Reply speech I withdrew a reference to the fact that a court was held in the Treasury Building in relation to charges of conspiracy to defraud the State Government of funds provided by the Commonwealth Government for drought relief, and that it was revealed in evidence that one of the defendants has said that "Joh" had given him the green light.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that at your request I withdrew the statement after the Premier had raised an objection to it. On the following day, the Treasurer made a personal statement. As these statements have cast some doubt on the matter raised by me and as they reflect on my personal integrity, I point out that committal proceedings were held on 13, 14 and 15 March, in Room 239, on the second floor of the Treasury Building. The prosecutor was Mr. Russell Hanson, the magistrate was Mr. Eric Martin, and the accused were Gaylord Norman Woltmann, Allan Rance Maguire, Keith James McMurdy and John Perrett.

Sir Gordon Chalk interjected.

Mr. BURNS: The Treasurer did not even know what happened.

The holding of this important hearing, where the Premier of this State was mentioned, and the subsequent actions of the Premier and the Treasurer, make me believe that an attempt

has been made to draw a veil of secrecy over proceedings, so far as that was possible without breaking the law.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I rise to a point of order. It is quite clear that the honourable member for Lytton is trying to make an issue out of something that does not exist.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is taking a point of order.

Mr. HOUSTON: I rise to a point of order. The Premier is trying to turn a personal explanation into a debate.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I wish to reply to the statement made by the honourable member for Lytton. There is no veil of secrecy whatever in this issue. The practice of holding court hearings in the Old Treasury Building has been going on, I have been informed, over a long period. They have been held there in various circumstances from time to time for some years because of the tape-recording facilities there. There was no secret hearing. Press reporters were present on the particular occasion to which the honourable member referred.

Mr. BURNS: You denied that it happened.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I will not permit any further discussion on this matter. If I were to allow it, whoever might raise the matter would only be prosecuting an argument.

ADOPTION OF CHILDREN ACT
AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. J. D. HERBERT (Sherwood—Minister for Tourism, Sport and Welfare Services): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Adoption of Children Acts 1964 to 1967 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

LAW REFORM COMMISSION ACT
AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. W. E. KNOX (Nundah—Minister for Justice): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Law Reform Commission Act 1968 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

COMMERCIAL CAUSES ACT
AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. W. E. KNOX (Nundah—Minister for Justice): I move—

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Commercial Causes Act of 1910 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

JETTY FOR GREAT KEPPEL ISLAND

Mr. Ahern for **Mr. Hartwig**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Conservation,—

As many tourists who visit Great Keppel Island each day by means of tourist vessels have to transfer to an open boat, at some risk and great inconvenience, when will a jetty be constructed comparable with those at other Queensland off-shore islands?

Answer:—

“Due to the existing demand for such facilities and funds available for the purpose, it has not been possible to programme the construction of a jetty at Great Keppel Island this financial year, but I will arrange for the matter to be reviewed when the 1973-74 programme is under consideration.”

PROPOSED CANCELLATION OF RAIL-MOTOR SERVICE, ROCKHAMPTON-THANGOOOL

Mr. Ahern for **Mr. Hartwig**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport,—

Will he withhold the proposed cancellation of the rail-motor service between Rockhampton and Thangool until such time as the residents of Biloela and Thangool can be assured of a reasonable delivery of goods despatched?

Answer:—

“The average number of passengers using this rail motor service weekly is 12, or an average of six per return trip. The revenue per week from passengers has averaged \$31 or \$15.50 per return trip. The weekly average revenue from roadside parcels is \$169 or \$84.50 per return trip. The cost of operation per week is \$345, representing an excess of expenditure over revenue of \$145 per week, representing a yearly loss of \$7,540. There are alternative services for the conveyance of roadside parcels by a train service which departs Rockhampton at 6.30 p.m. on Mondays, Tuesdays and Thursdays and at 5 p.m. on Fridays. If the Honourable Member will favour me with details of any delay on goods, the matter will be investigated and, if necessary, remedial action will be taken.”

SYLLABUS SUBJECTS FOR APPRENTICE CARPENTERS

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

(1) What is the number of subjects laid down in the syllabus for an apprentice carpenter in each year of his apprenticeship?

(2) What other apprentices in the building trade are covered by the same syllabus?

Answers:—

(1) “The subjects laid down for study by apprentice carpenters in each of their three years of technical training are:— Carpentry and joinery theory; Carpentry and joinery drawing; and Carpentry and joinery practice. Although there are only three separate subjects, these do, in fact, cover all aspects of a carpenter’s work necessary to ensure that with adequate on-the-job training an apprentice, on completion of his apprenticeship, will be a competent tradesman. The matter of preparation and alteration of syllabi is dealt with by co-operation between my Department of Industrial Affairs and that of my colleague, the Honourable the Minister for Education. The Group Apprenticeship Committee for the Building Industry comprising representatives of unions of employers and unions of employees and a chairman, collaborate with officers of the Department of Education with a view to attempting to ensure that the syllabi are suitable and satisfactory.”

(2) “The only other apprentices in the building trade for whom these subjects are prescribed are those indentured as apprentice joiners. However, because of the small number of apprentices indentured as joinery machinists in the building industry outside Brisbane (two in the first year, one in second, four in third and six in the fourth year) no prescribed course of instruction has been provided for these apprentices. To provide them with some appropriate technical training therefore, it has been arranged that they undertake the same technical training as apprentice carpenters and joiners.”

TAXI-CAB FARES AND LICENCE VALUES,
BRISBANE

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

With regard to metered taxi-cabs in the metropolitan area, what was (a) the gazetted fare at the time of the ballot held in 1964, (b) the price of a licence offered for sale in the 1964 ballot, (c) the gazetted fare at September 1, 1972 and (d) the value of the transfer of a licence at September 1, 1972?

Answer:—

“(a) The ballot following advertisement of 50 metropolitan taxi meter cab licenses was held on December 2, 1964, when the basic maximum fares were—Flagfall including the fare for the first one-fifth of a mile—two shillings; and for every additional one-fifth of a mile—three pence, as published in the *Government Gazette* of October 18, 1964. (b) £3,250. (c) On September 1, 1972, the basic maximum fares were—Flagfall including the fare for the first one-sixth of a mile—twenty-five cents; and for every additional one-sixth of a mile—three cents as published in the *Government Gazette* of January 23, 1971. (d) No metropolitan taxi meter cab license was transferred on September 1, 1972, but the value of a license which was approved for transfer on August 31, 1972, was stated as \$17,000 including a goodwill value of \$16,800.”

SALE OF PINEAPPLE HOTEL, KANGAROO POINT

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to reports in the *Telegraph* of December 7, 1971, and *The Courier-Mail* of December 12, 1971 and January 8, 1972, which indicated that the Pineapple Hotel, Kangaroo Point, was sold for \$410,000 on December 7, 1971, by public auction conducted by A. V. Postle and Co., to a Brisbane solicitor whose name was not disclosed?

(2) In accordance with the provisions of the Liquor Act, was the Licensing Commission notified of the new ownership of the hotel following the reported sale? If so, what was the name of the purchaser?

(3) If the Commission was not so notified, who was the highest bidder at the auction and has the sale since fallen through?

Answers:—

(1) “Yes.”

(2 and 3) “No. The Licensing Commission was not notified of the name of the new owner. As information received by the Licensing Commission was to the effect that the sale had fallen through, no application was required to be lodged for change of ownership and the name of the highest bidder at the auction is not known.”

WOOD-CHIP INDUSTRY, CAIRNS AREA

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

In view of great concern in North Queensland about proposals for the establishment of a wood-chip industry near Cairns, will he institute a public inquiry so that all views may be considered?

Answer:—

“It is not proposed to institute a public enquiry. The position with respect to a proposal to establish a wood-chip industry in the Cairns area was outlined by me in Answer to a Question by the Honourable Member for South Brisbane on September 12, 1972. In examining the proposal, any representations made by interested persons or organisations, particularly from the area in question, will be fully considered.”

DANGER OF PARASITES IN CATS TO UNBORN CHILDREN

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

(1) Is he or his Department aware of a statement made by a biologist, Professor W. M. Hutchison, Strathclyde University, when addressing the Annual Congress of the British Veterinary Association, that cats could carry parasites which in some cases could cause pregnant women to lose their babies or damage unborn children?

(2) Will he have his Department investigate these claims forthwith and make public the findings as expeditiously as possible?

Answers:—

(1) “Yes.”

(2) “The medical facts concerning this condition are well known. The Queensland Health Education Council, in its publication, *Pets and Children* makes reference to this problem.”

SAFETY HELMETS FOR PEDAL-CYCLISTS

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

Have representations been made by road safety organisations, as reported in the news media, for the introduction of legislation to compel pedal-cyclists to wear safety helmets of the type worn by motor-cyclists and, if so, will the viewpoint of the many pedal-cycling clubs and similar organisations be sought before a decision is made?

Answer:—

“No. On June 23, 1972, I advised the Australian Cycling Council following a similar inquiry that there was no present intention to implement such legislation in this State.”

STUDENT QUOTAS FOR MEDICAL COURSE, QUEENSLAND UNIVERSITY

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

(1) How many successful first-year medical students were refused permission to proceed to their degree because of the alleged shortage of funds and facilities at the Queensland University last year?

(2) Were these frustrated students told that they could use their first-year useful medical-course pass to pursue courses in any useless humanities course of their choice and, if so, why are abundant money and facilities available for useless, snob courses and not for the useful medical course?

(3) How many students gained a medical degree last year and how many could have been placed in Queensland hospitals if they had graduated?

Answers:—

(1 and 2) "The Vice-Chancellor of the University of Queensland informs me that the University of Queensland for many years past has been unique among universities of the English speaking world in that no matriculated Queensland student has ever been refused admission to the first year of the medical course and in that all who have passed the first year of the course without failure have been allowed to enter the second year of the course. This has been possible only by a policy of rigid control on the admission of students from outside the State. For some years, the university has reserved the right to restrict the number passing from first to second year to 160; two years ago the number was raised to 185. Although the number of students who passed the first year examination exceeded these numbers on several occasions, none was refused permission to continue. This situation cannot continue at the end of 1972. There are some 320 students enrolled in the first year of the medical course. The number expected to pass the examination will be considerably above 185 and there will be a number who will not be able to proceed with the medical course. Students entering Medicine I for some years past have been aware of the second year quota (185)."

(3) "I have been advised by the Department of Health that 104 of these graduates were employed in Queensland hospitals as first year resident medical officers. An additional 52 first year resident medical officers were also employed. These graduated from universities in other States. The 104 graduates from Queensland and the 52 from other States filled all the vacancies for first year resident medical officers in hospitals in Queensland."

OPERATIONS OF RURAL RECONSTRUCTION BOARD

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

(1) Is the Rural Reconstruction Board functioning to its greatest efficiency and is maximum assistance being given to the greatest number of those in need?

(2) How many applications have been received since the Board commenced functioning and how many applicants have received assistance to date?

(3) Of the applications which have been refused and classed as non-viable, how many of the applicants reapplied for further consideration and of these how many have subsequently received assistance?

(4) How many applicants who have been refused once or twice have subsequently proved, by securing private finance and rehabilitating themselves, that the Board was wrong?

(5) What new criteria will be adopted in an attempt to preclude such mistakes in future, especially when the new Commonwealth finance is being allocated?

(6) How many properties in Queensland are currently to be auctioned because help has been refused by the Board, what are the names of these properties and what is the estimated market value of each?

Answers:—

(1) "The board is functioning within the provisions of the agreement and is adhering to the principles and criteria contained therein."

(2) "2,341 applications have been received and 963 have been approved."

(3) "No separate statistics are maintained of those who seek reconsideration after being declined on the ground of non-viability. The board has changed its decision in favour of a number of applicants after a new factor is introduced or an amended proposal is submitted which indicates that viability can be achieved."

(4) "The board is not aware of any applicants who have been declined on the basis of non-viability and who afterwards have obtained alternative finance. There are, however, a number who would have received such finance after the board declined their applications on the basis that need has not been demonstrated within the provisions of the scheme."

(5) "I am not aware of any mistakes made by the board but I do know that if any have been made, they have always operated in the applicant's favour."

(6) "This information is not available."

LIMITATION ON ENROLMENTS, NORVILLE STATE SCHOOL

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

Will he consider limiting the intake of pupils to the Norville State School by enrolling only those pupils from the immediate vicinity in order to obviate the necessity to erect further demountable buildings for the school until a new block can be constructed?

Answer:—

"Enquiries have revealed that zoning would not have the desired effect of limiting future enrolments at the Norville State school. The younger children now attending the school and the children who will enrol next year live mainly in the adjacent developing areas. It would not be appropriate to divert older children now attending the school as it is confidently expected that permanent accommodation of the same high standard will be ready for 1974."

INDUSTRIAL STRIKES

Mr. Armstrong, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Development,—

How many industrial strikes have there been in Queensland for each of the last three financial years and how many man-days were lost as a result of such disputes?

Answer:—

"In the August, 1972 *Monthly Summary of Queensland Statistics*, issued by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics the following information is given:—

Financial year ending 1970—Disputes, 303; Man days lost, 128,100. Financial year ending 1971—Disputes, 428; Man days lost, 180,700. Final figures for the financial year 1971-72 are not yet available but preliminary figures (which are subject to revision) extracted from the bureau's bulletin on *Industrial Disputes* disclose—Financial year ending 1972—Disputes, 440; Man days lost, 296,200. Calculations made in my Department disclose that, for the period January to May, 1972, disputes under Federal awards were responsible for the majority of stoppages during the period and caused the loss of more than twice as many man days as disputes under State awards. This is despite the fact that in Queensland more employees are covered by State awards than by Federal awards. It must be borne in mind, however, that all industrial disputes in major industries or essential services affect adversely employment in other industries which are dependent upon the operation of the major industry or essential service concerned which is directly involved in the industrial dispute. These indirect effects are not recorded."

AGENCY LEVIES PAID TO NEW SOUTH WALES T.A.B.

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

(1) What charges are levied by the New South Wales T.A.B. when it acts as an agent for the Queensland T.A.B. for mid-week meetings in Queensland?

(2) On what basis are the levies charged?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "The New South Wales T.A.B. does not act as an agent for the Queensland T.A.B. for mid-week meetings in Queensland. In 1968, following a request by the Premier of New South Wales, I approved an arrangement under which the New South Wales T.A.B. transmits investments from its North Coast region branches to the Queensland T.A.B. on certain mid-week race meetings in Queensland. I take the view that the financial arrangements between the T.A.B. authorities of Queensland and New South Wales are matters of a confidential nature."

HANCOCK AND GORE PROPERTY AND WORKS DEPARTMENT WORKSHOPS, IPSWICH ROAD

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

(1) Has the Government or his Department recently finalised, or is it in the process of finalising, negotiations on the property in Ipswich Road, Woolloongabba, which was once the site of Hancock and Gore?

(2) If so, will this property be used for extensions and additions to the Princess Alexandra Hospital and for what purposes will the new buildings be used?

(3) Is the Works Department in Ipswich Road to be shifted to a new site and, if so, what will be its new location?

Answers:—

(1 and 2) "My Department has no proposal before it for the acquisition of the site mentioned, and the Honourable Member might direct item (2) of his Question to the Honourable the Minister for Health."

(3) "There is no proposal at this point in time to relocate the Department's Ipswich Road workshops."

ORTHODONTIC TREATMENT, CHILDREN'S DENTAL HOSPITAL

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

(1) What is the waiting list at the Children's Dental Hospital for orthodontic treatment?

(2) How many orthodontic appliances are supplied per year at this hospital and what age groups are catered for?

(3) How many (a) dentists and (b) dental technicians are employed in the making of these appliances?

Answers:—

(1) "For non-urgent cases, the majority of which are for cosmetic reasons, the waiting time is approximately two years. Urgent cases receive immediate attention."

(2) "In 1971-72, 734 orthodontic appliances were provided. The age of patients treated ranges from one week to 18 years."

(3) "During 1971-72 three dentists and four dental technicians were employed in the orthodontic department at the Children's Dental Hospital."

DENTURES FOR CHILDREN

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

Are children as young as 12 years of age or thereabouts attending various dental hospitals in Queensland to be fitted with full or partial dentures? If so, what is the average number fitted per year and what are the main reasons for the need of this treatment, apart from extractions?

Answer:—

"I am informed that children as young as 12 years attend dental hospitals and dental clinics in Queensland for the extraction of permanent teeth or have had such teeth extracted before attendance. A small proportion of those children require the provision of dentures. No separate statistics covering dentures provided for patients in this age group are maintained. Information available indicates that the number of full dentures provided is infinitesimal and while the number of partial dentures is greater, it is still extremely small. As the practice throughout the State's Dental Services of Queensland is to conserve teeth and not to destroy them, loss of teeth, other than in association with trauma (due to accidents, sporting injuries, etc.), would mainly be due to advanced dental disease, the causes of which are multifactorial. Parent and patient apathy contribute substantially to this problem. The Queensland Dental Health Education Council Committee is well aware of the value of sound dental health and is actively promoting dental health education. The Director of Dental Services, who has recently visited various overseas countries, advised me on his return that he found that this State's dental services are amongst the best in the world."

ESTABLISHMENT OF BARRAMUNDI HATCHERY

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

In view of the dwindling numbers of barramundi to be found in northern rivers which flow into the Pacific Ocean and the

Gulf of Carpentaria, has any thought been given to establishing a hatchery for these fish in Queensland with the object of restocking the rivers and the adjacent Barrier Reef waters? If not, will enquiries be made with the object of establishing such a hatchery in order to preserve this fine fish which has the unique ability to live in either fresh or salt water?

Answer:—

"It must be doubted that the breeding of barramundi in hatcheries would make any significant contribution to population levels of this fish in coastal waters as it has a high spawning potential and spawns naturally in such areas. Some thought has been given to the movement of fingerlings into the upper river systems but the demand for this has not been pressing. The Department has now appointed an experienced fisheries biologist, one of whose main tasks will be to look at this question."

SERVICING OF RAILWAY WAGONS, GREENVALE NICKEL PROJECT

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

In regard to the Railway Department's role in the development of the Greenvale nickel project, are the railway wagons being used to transport the ore to the treatment plant at Yabulu to be serviced and repaired in the railway workshops at Townsville or will this work be let out on private contract?

Answer:—

"The wagons will be serviced at Yabulu and repairs performed in the Townsville railway workshops."

NEW DIESEL SHED, TOWNSVILLE RAILWAY WORKSHOPS

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

(1) When will the new diesel shed in the north yard at the Townsville Railway Workshops be completed?

(2) Approximately how many diesel locomotives will be serviced by this installation?

(3) Has provision been made for the placing and storing of such locomotives whilst they are awaiting maintenance or minor repairs and, if so, what are the details?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) "It is anticipated the extension to the Townsville diesel shed will be completed by mid-November, 1972. Adequate provision has been made for the

placing and storage of the 30 diesel electric locomotives which will be required to be serviced by the installation."

RAIL-MOTOR SERVICE, CAIRNS-CHILLAGOE

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

As no Main Roads Department work is planned for the Dimbulah-Chillagoe section of the Dimbulah-Normanton developmental road for the present financial year and as there has been a big increase in the number of people viewing the Chillagoe Caves, will he consider introducing a rail-motor service which would allow people to travel in comfort, such service to run to a suitable time-table to permit the viewing of the caves and other places of interest?

Answer:—

"I would refer the Honourable Member to the Reply furnished to him on a somewhat similar Question on October 6, 1971."

TOBACCO BLOCKS, MAREEBA-DIMBULAH IRRIGATION AREA

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

(1) How many tobacco-farm blocks are available within the Mareeba-Dimbulah irrigation area?

(2) What is the total area of these blocks?

(3) How many blocks were opened in 1969, 1970 and 1971?

(4) When is it expected that new blocks will be made available?

(5) Has consideration been given to utilising these blocks to accommodate farmers who are on farms with soils unsuitable for tobacco?

Answers:—

(1) "Twenty-eight."

(2) "Gross area, 4,405 acres; Area suitable for tobacco, 2,580 acres."

(3) "Tobacco farms opened—1969, nil; 1970, six; and 1971, nil."

(4) "No indication can be given of when new tobacco farms can be opened as this will depend on availability of quotas which cannot be predicted."

(5) "Yes, but it is considered that new farms should be reserved for allotment by public competition when quotas become available because—(a) There are many experienced share farmers in the area who should be given the opportunity to acquire their own farms when possible. (b) No farms opened for settlement by the Irrigation Commission have inadequate areas of

suitable tobacco soils. (c) The only farms with inadequate areas of suitable tobacco soils are those held by individuals prior to development of the scheme, most of which have changed hands since its implementation. (d) In opening new farms in 1970 existing landholders whose holdings were considered unsuitable to provide more than 50 per cent. of a living area were eligible to apply for the new farms."

COMPLAINT BY DARLING DOWNS HOUSEWIVES' ASSOCIATION AGAINST FIRM, AMERICAN FABLON DIAMOND RINGS IMPORT

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

(1) Has he seen a letter from the Darling Downs Housewives and Homemakers' Association, Toowoomba, concerning a complaint from a person in Toowoomba who sent \$5 to a firm trading under the name of "American Fablon Diamond Rings Import", Box 613, G.P.O., South Brisbane?

(2) Will he investigate the bona-fides of this firm with a view to having the ring supplied or the \$5 refunded and will he issue a public warning against the practice of forwarding money to post-office box numbers in response to advertisements of this nature?

Answers:—

(1) "I received the letter referred to last Thursday—September 14, 1972."

(2) "The business name, American Fablon Diamond Rings Import, was registered at the office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs on September 18, 1972. The person carrying on business under this business name is Malcolm McGregor-Lowndes and business is carried on at 991 Logan Road, Holland Park. The business carried on is the sale of imitation diamond rings and dress rings by mail. When interviewed, Mr. McGregor-Lowndes stated that he had been unable to trace receipt of the order but had telegraphed the person concerned in Toowoomba, accepting responsibility for the loss of her order and requesting her to supply particulars regarding the order. He also asked for instructions as to whether she still required the article or desired the return of her money. I do urge members of the public to be extremely cautious before sending money through the post to anonymous persons at box numbers in response to newspaper or other advertisements. I have received numerous complaints of this nature where members of the public have acted without any inquiry as to the persons or firms they are dealing with or their business reputation. In most cases the inevitable result is that they

either lose their money or receive a product which was far inferior to that which they thought they would receive."

INCENTIVES FOR TOURIST INDUSTRY

(a) **Mr. R. Jones**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Tourism,—

(1) With reference to his Answer to my Question on September 21, 1971 and the need to provide incentives and taxation concessions for the tourist industry to enable it to compete with the adjacent countries of New Zealand, Fiji, Noumea and Singapore, has the prospective building of major international hotels and the foreshadowed large-scale construction of motel rooms in Queensland over the last few years reach a stalemate?

(2) Is he aware that more than half of them, including projects for Cairns, are now classified as having been cancelled, deferred or likely not to be proceeded with because of the lack of encouragement under existing circumstances?

(3) If so, is the future accommodation situation for tourist industry expansion in Queensland thereby threatened?

(4) What is his Government's intention in relation to the urgent need within this State for such incentives and concessions in order to stimulate tourist travel?

Answers:—

(1) "When this Government took office in 1957 there were 16 motels only in this State. The present number is 638. Motel development still occurs and no information has come to me to indicate that a stalemate has been reached."

(2 and 3) "Motel development still occurs throughout Queensland, including Cairns and I have no evidence of cancellation or deferment of building."

(4) "Following the meeting of the Tourist Ministers' Council of which I am a member, strong representations were made to the Right Honourable the Prime Minister for the introduction of incentives for tourist development."

(b) **Mr. R. Jones**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Tourism,—

(1) Were the proposals to provide incentives for the tourist industry and the need for taxation concessions discussed at the Conference of the Tourist Ministers' Council held at Kalgoorlie, Western Australia, on July 10 and 11 and, if so, what recommendations were made?

(2) In regard to incentives, what further requests were made or decisions arrived at for legislative or administrative action by the Commonwealth or States?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "The question of incentives was discussed at the Tourist Ministers' Council meeting held at Kalgoorlie, and as a result, the chairman of the council forwarded to the Right Honourable the Prime Minister on July 11, 1972, strong representations towards the introduction of incentives for the development of the tourist industry."

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

TRADING HOURS, ART EXHIBITIONS

Mr. BROMLEY: I ask the Minister for Education: As he is officially opening the third annual exhibition conducted by the Crafts Association of Australia, Queensland Branch, at 6 p.m. on Wednesday, 20 September, and as nearly all the works in the exhibition will be on sale, is he in fact supporting the representations made to him and other Ministers for exemption from that section of the Factories and Shops Act which relates to restricted trading hours as affecting private art galleries generally?

Sir ALAN FLETCHER: Yes.

PREVENTION OF ACTS OF TERRORISM

Mr. AHERN: I ask the Premier: In view of the recent bomb outrages in Sydney, what action is this Government taking to prevent the spread of similar acts of terrorism to Queensland?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: The Government had made its attitude to political violence and extremism of any kind crystal clear. As was shown by the swift action that was taken following the bombing of the Communist headquarters in Brisbane, we will not tolerate it. Those who may wish to resort to terrorism in this State now know that they will not get away with it unpunished. I fully agree with the Premier of Victoria that any migrant who takes part in terrorist activities should be deported after serving his sentence.

The shocking aspect of the upsurge in these terrorist activities is that it is a direct result of the Labor Party's campaign to spread the idea that if anyone does not like a law he can break it and go unpunished, and that demonstrations and political violence are nothing to take exception to. It is quite clear that these people have created this atmosphere in Australia.

Mr. Houston: Rot!

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: There is no question, argument or doubt about it. Throughout Australia the Labor Party and its organisation have created this attitude in the community. As a consequence, some people now feel that they can defy the law. We of the Government condemn extremism of any kind and warn that we will take strong action to counteract it.

Mr. Houston: You wouldn't know.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition under Standing Order 123A.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I invite the Leader of the Opposition to join me in condemning political extremism.

WORKING TIME LOST BY EXECUTIVE OFFICERS
IN SPORTING ACTIVITIES

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I ask the Minister for Industrial Development: Relative to the answer given to the honourable member for Mulgrave concerning the number of man-hours lost to industry because of industrial stoppages during the past three years, what is the estimated number of man-hours lost to industry during the same period by executives, managers, assistant managers, representatives and others holding executive positions in industry because of their operations on bowling greens, golf courses, mid-week race meetings, etc.?

Sir Gordon Chalk: There is no such Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! To whom is the question directed?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The Minister for Development and Industrial Affairs.

Mr. CAMPBELL: As the honourable member for Salisbury addressed his question incorrectly, I did not take note of it.

INSPECTION OF POLICE FORCE BY
BRIGADIER MCKINNA

Mr. NEWTON: I ask the Minister for Works and Housing: In view of his statement in "The Courier-Mail" of 15 September 1972 concerning the return to Queensland of Brigadier McKinna, who is to check to see how his ideas worked in practice (they were the basis of the reorganisation of the Police Force in Queensland) for the years 1971 and 1972, what staff and equipment will be made available to Brigadier McKinna to carry out this check, will the check cover all the recommendations made by Brigadier McKinna, and will a report on Brigadier McKinna's check be made available to members of this Parliament?

Mr. HODGES: The appointment of Brigadier McKinna in a consultative capacity is a matter for the administration of the Queensland Police Force. Answering the honourable member's first question, no staff is being made available. It is the prerogative of the Commissioner to engage whoever he likes to advise him.

Mr. NEWTON: I direct a supplementary question to the Minister. In view of the many problems confronting the Police Force in this State at the present juncture, involving a number of matters concerning the reorganisation of the force on Brigadier McKinna's recommendations, does he feel that two weeks is ample time to carry out the check that is warranted?

Mr. HODGES: As Brigadier McKinna has been appointed on this occasion, a fortnight will be ample time for him to carry out the inspection required.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS BUREAU ACTIVITIES;
PRESS STATEMENT BY PROFESSOR K. W. RYAN

Mr. WRIGHT: I ask the Minister for Justice: With reference to the article on page 2 of "The Courier-Mail" of 14 September 1972, in which the deputy chairman of the Consumer Affairs Council, Professor K. W. Ryan, made public certain details and statistics concerning the activities of the Consumer Affairs Bureau over the past 19 months, and as the Minister has refused to reveal similar information to honourable members in this Chamber, using as his excuse the fact that the annual report for the year ended 30 June 1972 will soon be presented to Parliament, will he advise what right Professor Ryan has to make such information public, if similar information cannot be made available to parliamentary members.

Mr. KNOX: I have never said that the information would not be made available to parliamentary members. Indeed, it will be made available in the proper form.

Mr. Wright: You have refused to answer questions of this nature.

Mr. KNOX: I have not refused to answer questions of this nature. The point is that there is a proper form for this type of information, and it will be made available in the correct form for members to examine.

ALLEGED USTASHI TRAINING CAMP, MACKAY
DISTRICT

Mr. CASEY: I ask the Minister for Works and Housing: Is he aware that it has been consistently reported in the southern Press that a Ustashi terrorist-training camp exists in the vicinity of Mackay? As there is no local knowledge of such an establishment, and in fact not even a Yugoslavian community in the area, and in view of recent happenings in other parts of Australia supposedly connected with such an organisation, will he have the Police Department undertake a full inquiry into these allegations?

Mr. HODGES: I am not aware of the claim as made by the honourable member for Mackay. If he has any information in this regard, I should be pleased to receive it and to have an investigation carried out.

NOTICE OF QUESTION

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville West) having given notice of a question relating to the Greenvale nickel project—

Sir Gordon Chalk: You're a real "knocker". You're a "knocker" of Greenvale, and you have been all along.

Mr. TUCKER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I take exception to the Treasurer's remark, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Townsville West has asked for a withdrawal.

Sir Gordon Chalk: I withdraw my suggestion that he is not a "knocker".

Mr. TUCKER: I ask for a complete withdrawal.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer has withdrawn.

At 12 noon,

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 17, the House proceeded with Government business.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—SIXTH ALLOTTED DAY

Debate resumed from 14 September (see p. 583) on Dr. Scott-Young's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. LEE (Yeronga) (12 noon): Let me begin my contribution to the debate by congratulating the honourable member for Townsville on his speech in moving the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and the honourable member for Surfers Paradise on his contribution in seconding it.

In speaking to the motion, I pledge my loyalty and that of my constituents in Yeronga to Her Most Gracious Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II. I offer my sincere congratulations to His Excellency the Governor, Sir Colin Hannah, on his appointment as Governor of Queensland, and also to his wife, Lady Hannah.

I place on record my thanks to the people of Yeronga and other areas of Brisbane for the support that they gave me in so many ways during the recent election campaign in Yeronga. Virtually every electorate or suburb of Brisbane was represented at the Liberal Party booths in Yeronga on polling day. Literally hundreds of people phoned my campaign office for weeks before the election to find out how they could assist me. On election day it was embarrassing to me to try to find something for these people to do. I believe that one of the reasons for their offer of assistance was their hatred for the Q.C.E. and the A.L.P. and their Trades Hall policies.

I wish to place on record in this House my appreciation to all who actually assisted me, to all those who offered to assist me, and, of course, to those who re-elected me. May I say that it was a very wise decision.

I felt quite sorry for my opponent.

Mr. Aikens: Who was he?

Mr. LEE: The Lord Mayor—old Clem. He was done like a dinner.

I felt quite sorry for him when I learned that he was offering young people in the electorate \$15 to service the A.L.P. booths in Yeronga on election day. That is how popular he was! He went around all the banks in the electorate and offered young people \$15 to service the A.L.P. booths in the Yeronga electorate. On the other hand, I was embarrassed by the number of people who offered to help me. That was their great A.L.P. vote catcher! That is the way he had to go about it.

Mr. Aikens: He would have taken the "knock" on them if they had accepted. He would not have paid.

Mr. LEE: Very true.

An absurd figure has been mentioned in the House for my expenditure in the Yeronga election. Let me say that I did little in 1972 that I did not do in 1969.

Mr. Sherrington: You do little in any year.

Mr. LEE: I did enough to toss the honourable member's mate.

I had signs erected and pamphlets published, and, in the closing period of the campaign, I authorised scattered radio advertisements. All this was done on the advice of my campaign committee—the same committee, under the same chairman, which has operated ever since I have been the member for Yeronga.

Mr. Sherrington: For about five years.

Mr. LEE: I have had the same chairman for four elections. I say quite definitely that without the loyal support of those people I could not have won the seat. I should like to make special mention of my secretary, who assumed an enormous work-load. She demonstrated a fantastic capacity for work.

Mr. Sherrington: For about a fortnight.

Mr. LEE: That was more than the honourable member could command. He could not get anyone to work for him.

I should like to personally thank Mr. Charlie Wombold, who is about 70 years of age. He worked day and night for me. I also thank Mr. Ron Blines, Mr. David Catsoulis and Mr. Jack Bermingham, as well as field officer, Norm Wright. Without their assistance I certainly could not have won the election. I will be forever indebted to them. It was probably because of their hatred of the A.L.P. and the Trades Hall, and what they represent, that they worked so hard. They realised that this great State of ours needs something better than the socialistic principles espoused by the A.L.P.

Mr. Houghton: Employees of the Brisbane City Council would be sacked if the Lord Mayor found out that they worked for you.

Mr. LEE: Of course. I will explain later how they are sacked. The Lord Mayor spent vastly more of the Brisbane taxpayers' money on his campaign to win Yeronga than we spent altogether. From the time he was endorsed he had at least five minutes every week on television, using Brisbane City Council television time. He spent probably about \$1,000 a week to promote himself, the Labor Party and the ambitions of the Trades Hall. He had his big signs and his little signs; he wrote pamphlets and letters; he imported shadow Ministers and ex-Lord Mayors from the South to help him. The greatest shadow of all, however, was the shadow of the Trades Hall. Never mind about shadow Ministers from the South; the people of Queensland and Yeronga realised that the greatest shadow was that of the Trades Hall.

Mr. Campbell: Did he have permits from the Brisbane City Council?

Mr. LEE: This no-one would ever know, but I can assure the honourable member for Aspley that he had many permits to speak. On occasions when I turned up to speak at a certain place he would be there. I used to say, "I am sorry, Mr. Jones, but I have a permit to speak at this time". He would run away like a naughty boy because he realised that he could not do the wrong thing.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. W. D. Hewitt): Order! The Chamber will come to order and the honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr. LEE: I reiterate that the Lord Mayor was on television at all times of the day and night—sometimes free, but mostly, as I say, at a cost of about \$100 a minute. He used the council's open line radio programme to further his interests and he had a faraway look in his team picture covering a half-page of a Southside suburban paper each week. And in the final few days of the campaign he boosted his hopes with the expenditure of another \$2,000 of foreign capital of a man we all know as "Mr. Crabbe". How he wished later that he had crabbed out of it!

Mr. Low: He was a mud crab.

Mr. LEE: He was a mud crab all right; there is no doubt about that.

The Lord Mayor's over-all campaign would have been the most extensive and the most expensive ever conducted by any candidate in any election in this State or, for that matter, any part of Australia, yet he was done like a Christmas dinner. There has been talk of a figure in the vicinity of \$50,000, but this would represent the minimum limit of the Lord Mayor's expenditure and a fraction of what the A.L.P. spent overall trying to win Yeronga. And, I repeat, they were done like a dinner, so do

not let us have any rubbish from the honourable member for Salisbury or the Opposition about my election expenses in Yeronga.

I was also upset when it was said—I think by the honourable member for Salisbury—that I wanted to get rid of Rocklea out of Yeronga. I have always looked after the people of Rocklea.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I rise to a point of order. I am afraid the honourable member will even be calling you a "Left-winger", Mr. Deputy Speaker, judging by the way he is talking. I did not say that the honourable member for Yeronga tried to get rid of Rocklea; I said he did get rid of it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I think it is a very minor point. The honourable member for Yeronga will proceed with his speech.

Mr. LEE: The honourable member for Salisbury upset me. I am always upset when things are said that I know are absolutely incorrect. I have looked after the people of Rocklea during all the years I have been in this House, and they have supported me in growing numbers at each election.

Mr. Sherrington: How many?

Mr. LEE: In every election I have gained additional support, and my percentage of the vote increased from 23 to 43.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: They gave me an absolute majority.

Mr. LEE: I could not believe that in 1972 they would give Clem Jones greater support than they would give me. I can claim without undue modesty that the Rocklea overpass was built as a result of my constant representations, and the people of the area would well know that. I was sorry to lose the area, and it was my belief that representations had been made by the A.L.P. to have it transferred to Salisbury.

Mr. Sherrington: No.

Mr. LEE: Since the honourable member for Salisbury has already denied this, I accept his denial, but it is interesting to note that the honourable member for Archerfield did not poll too well in Rocklea.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: I got an absolute majority.

Mr. LEE: Over all, yes.

In April, May and June Brisbane languished in suburban squalor. Because Clem Jones had a team of his "very, very busy" aldermen contesting the State election, there were areas of long grass, worse roads than usual and poor services in every electorate, except those where the "civic quins" were trying to get themselves a second job.

Mr. Sherrington: Did you want the aldermen out mowing the grass?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. W. D. Hewitt): Order! The honourable member for Salisbury will cease persistent interjections.

Mr. LEE: At one time the Lord Mayor had a shuttle service of 30 trucks working and shifting soil to drain flooded sections of Yeronga, and he had three grass-slashers brought from outside the electorate to "pretty-up" the footpaths.

Incidentally, a monument to the operations carried out during the election campaign by the Vice Mayor, Alderman Walsh—who is well known to my colleague the honourable member for Windsor—is the new solid bitumen road through the Newmarket railway gates. For years that road has been a disgrace to the city.

Mr. R. E. Moore: I had already made representations about it.

Mr. LEE: Quite true. During the election campaign the Lord Mayor told us what a "snap" it would be for him to carry out his duties of Lord Mayor and also represent the people of Yeronga. How fickle he is! He made no bones about his intention to hold down two jobs. In fact he was even optimistic enough to suggest that he could be the Lord Mayor and, as well, the Minister for Local Government—and, at the same time, represent the people of Yeronga. The stresses of the election must have told on him, because nowadays he is quoted in the Brisbane Press as saying that it would not be possible for him to represent a ward of the city council and at the same time be Lord Mayor. He says that too much would be involved; that the lord mayoralty is a full-time job. All I can say is that he speaks with forked tongue.

The election result will enable Queensland to continue progressive development under the policies of this Government. Unemployment figures issued each month in Canberra—particularly those released today—show what can be achieved with progressive policies. Not only are our unemployment figures very low, and the lowest of those of the mainland States, but also our wage and salary-earners in jobs are increasing by approximately 20,000 each year. That is what I call progress, and it is typical of the State's progress under this Government for the past 15 years.

A few years ago Western Australia was acclaimed as the nation's glamour State. What a shocking mess a couple of years of Labor Government made there. That State has the highest unemployment figure of all the States, a record level of almost 3 per cent, and it is getting near the figure that used to prevail in this State under a Labor Government. The tragedy of Western Australia would certainly have been repeated in Queensland if the A.L.P.-Trades Hall combination had won the election.

New problems will face Australia on a national basis if the Hawke-Whitlam gang gets control of Canberra later this year. God forbid! One thing the people of Queensland can be certain of is that any Federal A.L.P. Government will eliminate the free-hospital system of this State. That has been said by Mr. Hayden on many occasions. The A.L.P. health scheme provides that everyone will pay, and this means that all the people in the State who use the free-hospital system will be paying for something they now receive for nothing. In other words, at present they are being given something at no cost, whereas a Labor Government will ask them to pay for it. As the A.L.P. will centralise health control in Canberra, all the women and girls who work in the medical health offices in Queensland will be out of work. That is true.

Mr. Sherrington: It is not.

Mr. LEE: You are so far behind, you would not know.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. W. D. Hewitt): Order! The honourable member for Yeronga will direct his remarks to the Chair, and the honourable member for Salisbury will cease interjecting.

Mr. LEE: A Federal A.L.P. Government would take away the powers of the States and vest control, wherever possible, in Canberra.

Mr. Kaus: Whitlam said that the other day.

Mr. LEE: That is true.

There will be restriction on State aid for independent schools. There will be a complete broadening of official attitudes to the permissive society as the radical elements of the A.L.P. take over. This is very possible.

Mr. Sherrington interjected.

Mr. LEE: Like your mates Tom and "Gerry".

Many things must be weighed by the voters at the next Federal election before they consider moving from the secure foothold they now enjoy to a probable world of legalised marijuana, abortion on demand, and the opening of the immigration flood-gates—all disguised by A.L.P. Federal election policy.

Mr. Houghton: What about homosexuality?

Mr. LEE: That is another one.

Everyone can be sure that beneath the beautiful exterior of A.L.P. Federal election policies and promises now being revealed the heart of the old A.L.P. plum cake will still beat.

Mr. Sherrington: Are you going to support Jim Killen?

Mr. LEE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you would only stop the magpie over there, I would get on a lot quicker.

Mr. R. E. Moore: He sounds more like a currawong to me.

Mr. LEE: I think they call him a butcher bird.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Mr. Deputy Speaker—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. W. D. Hewitt): Order! Is the honourable member taking a point of order?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Yes. Is the honourable member in order in referring to the honourable member for Merthyr as a magpie?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the honourable member for Merthyr is offended, he will take his own point of order.

Mr. LEE: I make it very clear that the honourable member for Salisbury has been quick to criticise me for my actions during the last State election campaign.

Mr. Sherrington: I did not say that at all.

Mr. LEE: The honourable member did.

Mr. Sherrington: I just asked you were you going to support Jim Killen.

Mr. LEE: Of course, that was to be expected, as he and many other Labor men during the last election campaign spent most of their time in my electorate—at great risk to themselves because they could very easily have been run down by the many council machines brought in from other electorates to cut grass, trim trees, and fix lights and footpaths. Many thousands of dollars of ratepayers' money was spent. On one occasion I noticed that the honourable member for Salisbury was narrowly missed by a council truck. I said to the driver, "Do better next time."

Mr. Miller: Is any work being carried out in your electorate now?

Mr. LEE: Nothing is happening there now.

Mr. Sherrington: It was not a council truck. It was one of Lee's trucks.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! For the last time I ask the honourable member for Salisbury to cease his incessant interjecting.

Mr. LEE: I should now like to tell honourable members about a lady who rang me. She had been trying for about four years to obtain a light at a very dangerous intersection. She said, "You know, Mr. Lee, I have tried in Alderman Roy Dent's day, and now in Alderman Coom's day to get the light." I said, "Madam, you would be very wise if you rang Alderman Jones's campaign room now, because I am sure

that if you did so you would get the light." She rang at 4 o'clock one day and explained the position. By 8 o'clock next morning a gang of men was there putting in not an ordinary light, but a four-foot fluorescent light. That is the type of underhand happening that took place in the Yeronga electorate.

School committees had been trying for years to get repairs done to bitumen footpaths outside school-grounds. Even Alderman Roy Dent, in his day, said that they would have a better chance of getting these things done through me, because he knew he was off side with Clem Jones. I said, "You could not be much further off side than I am." As soon as the Lord Mayor nominated for the Yeronga seat, I said to all my parents and citizens' associations, "This is your chance". I can assure the House that all schools in that area now have new bitumen footpaths, something which they had been trying to get for eight or nine years. And this work was done for political purposes.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: You represent the area.

Mr. LEE: In that connection it is the alderman's job to represent the area.

In State matters I have obtained good education facilities and everything else that has been asked for, which is more than the people of Yeronga will get now in council facilities. This money should have been spent in the electorate during the 8½ years that I have represented it, not in three months for political purposes. These facilities were needed badly, but the money was not spent. I hope that the Lord Mayor does not let this electorate fall into the state of neglect that existed prior to the election, but now that he has been soundly defeated, I am sure that he will.

Let me now detail the snide, underhand tactics that Lord Mayor Jones used. Two projects in my electorate which had not been attended to were subject to council consent. The Lord Mayor could not say anything about education, as the Yeronga electorate has facilities equal to those anywhere else in Queensland, including the first multiple-area teaching centre and many other modern conveniences. He could not say anything about the freeway or the Rocklea fly-over, because over \$4,000,000 had been spent on removing this traffic bottle-neck. He could not say that I have not given faithful and good representation to the electorate.

He could not say that I had made political capital out of the resurfacing of the tramlines, costing \$100,000, because he had agreed that that was a council responsibility and that the council had promised that all tramlines would be covered by the end of 1969 or the beginning of 1970. I would not stand by and allow this road to be left in a dangerous condition simply because the Main Roads Department could not get Clem to pay for the work. My motto was, "Get it done to save lives and sort out the payment later,"

which was the attitude adopted by the Minister for Mines and Main Roads to this project.

The Lord Mayor could not say anything about the Nyanda crossing, because I had, some months prior to the election, obtained approval for the expenditure of \$2,300,000 on the overpass there, and work had already started on it.

However, he did attack me on parking facilities at the Yeronga Technical College and on the Fairfield Road-Yeerongpilly railway crossing. I shall deal with each of his criticisms. This is what Alderman Clem Jones had to say in a pamphlet circulated by him—

“Parking facilities. An A.L.P. Government will co-operate immediately with the City Council in providing parking facilities at the Yeronga Technical College.

“These and all the important works needed in the Yeronga electorate will be completed by an A.L.P. Government.”

As I said, there were only two projects not attended to, and this was one of them.

On 12 August 1971, I wrote to the Minister for Education, and I shall read the letter to show that there are no “beg pardons” in it. It reads—

“Dear Mr. Fletcher,

“I am in receipt of a letter from the Parochial Church Council of Christ Church, Yeronga, requesting me to make representations regarding the inadequate parking facilities at the Yeronga Technical College and the resulting disabilities suffered by neighbouring property owners.

“I cannot agree more with the statement that had this been a private college rather than a Government institution the Brisbane City Council would have insisted on the provision of at least some off-street parking.

“This is borne out by the lack of off-street parking at many Government owned hospitals and it seems to me that there is one law for private enterprise and one law of ‘I don’t care—we are the Government we do as we please regardless of the inconvenience it may place upon local residents’. I am in complete and utter sympathy with the Church and other residents in this area who are denied the privilege of parking between 9.00 a.m. and 7.00 p.m. and also of conducting normal business between these hours.

“Whilst I am not certain of the tenure of the park opposite the Technical College in Villa Street, I am sure that by making an area of this park available for parking much of this intolerable inconvenience to residents would be relieved. I strongly urge that this action be taken and that should any future Government buildings be erected causing conditions similar to those existing at Yeronga Technical College, consideration should be given to including off-street parking.

“Your urgent investigation into this matter would be appreciated.”

As I said, that letter was written on 12 August 1971. Yet on 27 May 1972 Clem Jones said that he would co-operate with an A.L.P. Government to provide these facilities. I asked on 12 August 1971 for that to be done.

Mr. Sherrington: Read the Minister’s answer.

Mr. LEE: I shall. Just to keep the honourable member happy, I will do most things.

On 12 November 1971 I wrote to the Minister for Education in these terms—

“I refer to my previous representations on behalf of the Parochial Church Council, Christ Church, Yeronga, concerning parking facilities at the Yeronga Technical College and your reply of the 16th August, 1971, informing me that enquiries were being made into the matter and you would advise me further as soon as possible.

“As I have received no further information from you I would be grateful if you could let me know what progress has been made in this regard.”

On 16 November I received this reply from the Minister for Education—

“I refer to your personal representations on the question of inadequate parking facilities at the Yeronga Technical College.

“I wish to advise that under existing conditions, apprentices have no alternative but to park along the edge of the roadways in close proximity to the college.

“The number of buildings at present on the small site of the Yeronga Technical College makes it impossible to allow student parking within the grounds. Also, even though the Yeronga Technical College is located such that it is well served by public transport from most parts of Brisbane, it is obvious that quite a large number of apprentices continue to use their own transport either through necessity or choice.

“If my Department has to provide more ground for off-street parking, then the building program for Technical Colleges will be seriously impeded.”

On 24 November 1971 I wrote a further letter to the Minister. It reads—

“I acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 16th instant regarding the inadequate parking facilities at the Yeronga Technical College.

“I am fully aware that under existing conditions apprentices have no alternative but to park along the edge of roadways in close proximity to the College and I also appreciate that the number of Technical College buildings makes it impossible to allow students to park within the grounds.

"However, I believe that you have chosen to ignore my request which was for investigations to be made as to the possibility of a parking area being made available from an unused part of the Yeronga Park. A precedent has already been set up in as much as the Yeronga Memorial Swimming Pool has been allocated some two acres or more for parking purposes. If an area could be made available in the Yeronga Park opposite the Technical College this would alleviate the ridiculous position where parking is not allowed in Cork and Dublin Streets between 9.00 a.m. and 7.00 p.m. You can appreciate that this restriction was placed there because of the congestion caused by the cars owned by those attending the Technical College and this, of course is having a serious effect on the proper functioning of the residents and in particular the Church of Christ, Yeronga.

"I have not forwarded your reply on to the Secretary of the Parochial Church Council as I felt that it did not answer their queries. As it was on the 12th August that I made representations on behalf of the Church I would be obliged if you would give urgent attention to this matter."

The Lord Mayor gave the people a great spiel about the way in which he would help them.

Mr. Sherrington: Read us the reply to that letter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. W. D. Hewitt): Order! The honourable member may make his own speech later, in his own way.

Mr. LEE: Clem Jones said that he would improve parking facilities there if he was elected. That was in spite of my request for improved parking facilities as far back as August 1971. In fact, I have here a copy of a letter dated 1 December 1971 from the Director-General of Education making basically the same request as I made. As at 4 May this year the Lord Mayor had not replied, yet he issued a pamphlet, which showed the people of Yeronga how ridiculous and untrue his statements are and how deceitful he is, saying that he would fix the matters up. Although I had had all this previous correspondence on the matter, he tried to make political capital out of it. It was entirely up to him to give his consent to the request for improved parking.

Mr. Kaus interjected.

Mr. LEE: As the honourable member for Mansfield said, it is typical of the Lord Mayor. It is now 19 September, but still no reply has been received. No doubt the Lord Mayor will make a big splash on the subject just before the council elections are held and again try to make political capital out of it. That is why I wish to bring the subject to the attention of the House today.

Another matter that I wish to raise—unfortunately, I shall not have time to deal with it fully in the five minutes remaining to me—is an overpass on Fairfield Road. The Lord Mayor said that a Labor Government would co-operate with the City Council in financing the immediate building of an overpass in Fairfield Road, Yeronga, to eliminate traffic hold-ups at the present railway crossing. I asked for such an overpass many years ago. The Government is quite prepared to contribute its share of the money, but the Brisbane City Council is not.

Again one sees the same underhand, snide tactics in trying to fool the people. The Lord Mayor has said, in effect, in two pamphlets, "I will co-operate if I am elected".

Mr. Houston interjected.

Mr. LEE: You can fool the people some of the time, but not all the time.

Mr. Houston: The next council election will show you that.

Mr. LEE: The honourable gentleman must be joking. The Leader of the Opposition should say "Thank God" that Clem Jones is not in this Chamber. Between that fellow up at the back, Tom of "Tom and Jerry", and the Lord Mayor, his throat would have been cut long ago.

Mr. TUCKER: I rise to a point of order. This is about the third occasion on which the honourable member for Yeronga has referred to the honourable member for Lytton as "Tom", and now he has referred to "Tom and Jerry". Honourable members have an obligation to refer to other honourable members in a correct and proper fashion, and I ask that the honourable member for Yeronga do so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. W. D. Hewitt): Order! Yes, the honourable member should refer to other honourable members in proper terms.

Mr. LEE: I have a cartoon here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I was reading the heading "Tom and Jerry". If the honourable member for Townsville West takes offence at my reading from a cartoon that says "Tom and Jerry", I will certainly—

Mr. HOUSTON: I rise to a point of order. I move—

"That the honourable member be ordered to lay upon the table of the House the document referred to."

Mr. LEE: I was reading from these cartoons. Certainly I was referring to nobody in particular.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I will put the question.

Motion (Mr. Houston) negatived.

Mr. LEE: There are two things that the Opposition does not like. One is truth and the other is profit, which they regard as the dirtiest word in the dictionary. They certainly do not like those two words.

I have not time to deal with the Fairfield overpass.

Mr. TUCKER: I rise to a point of order. If the honourable member is referring to me specifically and saying that I do not like the truth, I ask him to withdraw that statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member was not referring to specific members.

Mr. TUCKER: I take it that he is referring to me inasmuch as I am a member of the Opposition.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable gentleman can take exception to what is said only if he is maligned in personal terms, and the reference was made to the Opposition collectively.

Mr. LEE: Thank you for your support, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I certainly say to you, the honourable member for Townsville—Townsville West is it? What is your electorate so that I can refer to you properly?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Yeronga will address his comments to the Chair.

Mr. LEE: I certainly was not referring to the honourable member for Townsville West, or North is it? I do not know what his electorate is.

Mr. HOUSTON: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member has now seen fit to start to exclude honourable members. I, too, ask for a complete denial that he was referring to me.

Mr. LEE: All I was trying to do was assure—

Mr. HOUSTON: I ask for a complete withdrawal.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Again I can only say that the honourable member has not referred to any individual Opposition member, and therefore I cannot sustain the point of order.

Mr. LEE: The honourable member for Townsville—what is your electorate? Will you tell me your electorate?

Mr. Tucker: I am the member for Townsville West.

Mr. LEE: Thank you. I was not referring to the honourable member for Townsville West. I do not make personal attacks on anyone in this House. If he is so thin-skinned that he thinks he was the member I was referring to, all I can say is that the cap may fit.

I will deal with the matter of the Fairfield overpass in the Budget debate.

Mr. O'DONNELL (Belyando) (12.38 p.m.): I suppose it is just as well that there are no children in the public gallery today. Had

they been here they would have left with a very poor opinion of the honourable member for Yeronga, and particularly of his attitude in victory. After all, when one wins, surely one can afford to be magnanimous. It is most disappointing that, after winning the election against such a redoubtable opponent as the Lord Mayor of Brisbane, the honourable member should come in here and continue to speak as if the campaign were still on and denigrate that gentleman by using such terms as "snide" and "underhand". If the honourable member used the word "snide" in that sense outside the House, there is no doubt that he would be liable to a lawsuit for defamation.

Mr. Porter: I really doubt it.

Mr. O'DONNELL: We have a legal eagle in the back seat, and if the honourable member for Yeronga carried on in that manner outside, he would find that he was in fact only a legal crow. It would be to his financial detriment if he endeavoured in George Street to accuse the Lord Mayor of being snide and underhand. However, it is not so much that which concerns me, but the fact that, in victory, anyone could be so disappointingly unsporting. This is a place where good examples should be set. We in this House are supposed to be community leaders. The honourable member's attitude would seem to suggest that the election was next month. Perhaps he is preparing now for the 1975 election. Maybe he is so afraid of his future chances that he feels he must start now to prepare for the next election. I point out to him that had he given some consideration to the situation he surely would have realised that he would have stood much higher in the estimation of the public and the members of this House had he accepted his victory and been more magnanimous towards his opponent, who undoubtedly did spend a lot of money, time and energy in endeavouring to win the seat—as no doubt Mr. Lee also did.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. W. D. Hewitt): Order! The honourable member will please refer to other honourable members by the names of their electorates.

Mr. O'DONNELL: The honourable member for Yeronga, who was Mr. Lee when he was attempting to enter this Parliament and thus become an honourable member, spent a lot of time and money to achieve the title "honourable". Having attained it, I think he should have been proud of it and demonstrated it in his reaction to winning the recent election.

And now I must refer to my own election and sincerely thank members of my A.L.P. branches throughout Belyando as well as the electors of Belyando who afforded me the responsibility of representing them for the next three years.

Mr. Lee: You nearly missed out.

Mr. O'DONNELL: Certainly I did not win by many votes.

Mr. Lee: I'll say you didn't.

Mr. O'DONNELL: There goes the honourable member again. If he were astute in politics he would know that the redistribution left me with an electorate in which the majority in my favour was 310. That is what I received from the Electoral Commission, and I feel that my victory by 210 votes was very good in the circumstances, particularly as the names of hundreds of electors were omitted from the roll. That in itself indicates that, in normal circumstances, my victory would have been greater.

During the campaign, the D.L.P. candidate set out to denigrate me. He was defamatory of me and, as a result, very soon received a letter from my solicitors. However, speaking facetiously, he got "even" with me by neglecting to submit his nomination on time. As a consequence, the 400-odd votes that he would otherwise have received would have come off the total received by the Country Party candidate and given me a lead of 600-odd. Although it was all rather amusing, electorally it did not suit me at all. The D.L.P. candidate forgot the closing time for nominations and arrived two hours late. As I say, it was rather disappointing to me that he did not get there in time.

In contradistinction, I should like to mention that throughout the campaign my Country Party opponent did not say one word derogatory to me. He proved that election campaigns can be conducted without this type of behaviour.

Mr. Hinze: This is young Lester you are talking about?

Mr. O'DONNELL: I would not be talking about Russell Hinze, would I.

I appreciate the fact that I was not attacked in the Press as being of doubtful political habits or of being associated with the Communist Party. Of course, over previous years this has been a feature of election campaigns. However, the election is over and I won, and I can say without equivocation that my Country Party opponent was a sporting candidate. I think that when the next election comes along, the mining towns in Belyando will have grown and settled down and it will become a safe seat for Labor. This is my fervent hope.

The election is now over, and it was a hard-fought battle; but amid the stress of redistribution the thing that hurt me more than anything else was not only the elimination of the electorate but also the elimination of the name "Barcoo", which is of great historical significance to the Labor movement in this State. Right up to election day I represented an area that had been excised from my electorate, and, in a sense, I also had to represent a new area that had been given to me. As well as fighting the campaign in

the new area, I had to look after the people in the areas that had been taken from my former electorate. This proved to be rather difficult. I said good-bye three times to the people of Springsure and Barcardine, and twice to those of Blackall. I deplore the elimination of the name "Barcoo", which was one of the hardest blows dealt to the traditionalists in that part of Queensland. That name will not be forgotten, and I hope that one day it will be restored to the area.

I am disappointed that the Minister for Main Roads is not in the Chamber. I do not desire to take him to task, but once again I wish to refer to the Capricorn Highway. Anyone who reads the Central Queensland newspapers, whether they be published in Rockhampton or in any of the smaller towns, will note the continual references that are made to this important highway. In 1961, when I was elected as the member for Barcoo, I had the doubtful privilege of representing an electorate that contained five highways, as well as other roads, such as those linking Aramac with Barcardine and Springsure with Emerald, which could be called main roads, and some developmental roads.

No matter where I stood in my electorate, somebody had a "go" at me about the particular highway nearby. In those days there was unanimity among the electors and the local authorities stretching from Rockhampton to the western border that the Capricorn Highway was of great importance to this State. As time progressed, the Landsborough Highway was completed and the Capricorn Highway was constructed as far as Jericho, which now stands on the boundary of my electorate, and beyond. In addition, some progress was made in the laying of bitumen on the Aramac-Barcardine road; the Gregory Highway was completed as far as Clermont; extensive work was carried out on the Peak Downs Highway, with the result that only 12 miles remains to be done; I was responsible for work being done on the Dawson Highway, so that a stretch of 40 miles is all that remains to be done; and the road from Springsure to Emerald was completed. In those early years, the sections of the Capricorn Highway east of Emerald received more attention than did those to the West.

This is a very long highway, extending 360 miles from Rockhampton to Barcardine, and no doubt certain priorities govern the work to be done on it. If priority were to be determined by actual road conditions, I should say that the Drummond Range section would have the highest priority because it accounts for the greatest damage to motor vehicles. Heavy vehicles cannot use the Drummond Range road. People are very vocal about the broken windscreens, broken axles, broken springs and flat tyres that occur on this section.

However, there is more to the Capricorn Highway than the Drummond Range section. West of the Drummond Range is the town

of Alpha, which is slightly closer to Barcaldine than it is to Emerald. It is a central town that suffers from disabilities caused by isolation. Periodically it is without a resident doctor, but we have been very fortunate in that retired doctors have offered their services. We are indeed proud of the work done by them, but from time to time there has been a hiatus in this service to the community. There is always a risk that, at some time in the future, the town will be without a doctor. It is therefore essential that the Capricorn Highway between Alpha and Barcaldine be completed so that the people of Alpha can get medical treatment at Barcaldine. The Alpha hospital is controlled by the Barcaldine Hospitals Board, and people who are unable to get medical treatment at Alpha have to proceed to Barcaldine, which is the closest town at which they can receive treatment. That is a very sound argument for completing that section of the Capricorn Highway.

In the days when potholes abounded on this road it was a horror highway, and babies were born on the way to the Barcaldine hospital. That is to be deplored. It is essential to have not only a road with a good surface but also one that, within certain safety limits, permits of speed.

Alpha is an industrial town, in that it is both a railway centre and a grazing centre. A major accident could occur at any time in the railway operations, on the properties, or in the town. No doubt honourable members will recall the major rail disaster at Midway Creek, to the east of Alpha. I am very keen to have this section of road attended to for the reasons I have outlined, and because it is the main access road to Alpha. The Minister for Main Roads promised me that he would expedite its completion, and that construction work would then move east of Alpha to complete the Emerald link.

The Drummond Range lies between Alpha and Emerald. As I have said, following the redistribution I was deprived of the Barcaldine-Jericho section of the Capricorn Highway, which was completed, and given another section, which was also completed, from Tolmies to Edungalba. It was completed—in a sense—as a single-lane highway. Over the past few years it has become a death-trap on which a number of my friends have either perished or have been seriously injured to the extent of being incapacitated. In addition, their vehicles have been damaged and they have had to suffer that loss. There is a big difference between being vocal about a broken spring and not being able to be vocal about a broken neck.

I did not visualise that this problem would arise in my electorate following the allocation of money to this section of road. However, because it is narrow and is used by heavy

vehicles travelling to the Blackwater development, it has deteriorated into a dusty death-trap. Both in the morning and in the evening, depending on which way motorists are travelling, the sun shines directly into their eyes. A large amount of money, which it was not expected would have to be spent, will now have to be allocated to the eastern section of that road.

The previous Minister for Main Roads (the late Ernie Evans) claimed that he would develop the Capricorn Highway to the extent of expenditure of \$1,200,000 per annum. However, unfortunately he died, and his ambitions have not reached fruition. I have examined the situation thoroughly and do not blame the present Minister for the position as it now exists.

I shall detail certain facts which will surprise many people who, although they do not live in my electorate, have been vociferous about the Drummond Range section of the Capricorn Highway. Some of these people amuse me at times. They would recoil in horror at the suggestion that they should demonstrate their interest by approaching the Minister and requesting that the Main Roads allocations to their areas be diverted to this section. However, a good deal of criticism does come from well-intentioned individuals and organisations.

The following figures showing the amounts spent on main roads east and west of Emerald indicate that my representations have been pretty good. Commencing with 1961-62, the year I entered Parliament, in round figures they are—

Year	East of Emerald	West of Emerald	Total
1961-62 ..	\$ 380,000	\$ 101,000	\$ 481,000
1962-63 ..	724,000	266,000	990,000
1963-64 ..	668,000	206,000	874,000
1964-65 ..	336,000	150,000	486,000

The year 1964-65 was an important year in this context. Work on the Capricorn Highway was almost complete as far as Emerald. But then Ernie Evans died.

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

Mr. O'DONNELL: As I have said, the year 1965 marked a change in the story that I have been relating to the House. The late Ernie Evans completed his tasks in the portfolio of Main Roads, and the road to Emerald had been completed. The expenditure figures that I am now about to quote

illustrate the change in accent on road construction on the Capricorn Highway. They are—

Year	East of Emerald	West of Emerald	Total
1965-66 ..	\$ 1,600	\$ 178,000	\$ 180,000
1966-67 ..	2,000	368,000	370,000
1967-68 ..	199,000	587,000	786,000
1968-69 ..	5,800	319,000	325,000
1969-70 ..	17,000	499,000	516,000

Honourable members will note from those figures the comparatively small amounts allocated for work east of Emerald. It will also be recalled that this was the period in which there was great acceleration of development east of Emerald, with consequent damage to that section of the road.

In 1970-71, of a total expenditure of \$793,000 the expenditure east of Emerald rose to \$214,000, whilst west of Emerald it was the goodly sum of \$578,000. In 1971-72 there was an increase to \$967,000 in total expenditure. Expenditure east of Emerald, due, I reiterate, to the damage done in that area and the dangerous state to which the road had deteriorated, was \$259,000, whilst expenditure west of Emerald was \$708,00.

In exact figures, the total amount spent during the time I have been the member for that area up till 30 June 1972 was \$6,766,547. The amount spent east of Emerald was \$2,803,212, and, west of Emerald, \$3,963,335. That is considerable expenditure. However, much still remains to be done. I point out that the accent it still on the road west of Emerald, because in the three months of the current financial year \$252,367 has been allocated for operations in the Alpha area alone. That appears to be a very considerable sum, but it illustrates the cost of improving this road as it has been provided for 4.99 miles of road, together with one bridge and its approaches.

Through the years the definite statement has been made by one or other section of the community, either by a group or by individuals inside or outside my electorate, that this was not enough. In fairness, I approached the Minister for Main Roads, who explained to me that the Bruce Highway, instead of involving the Government in lessening expenditure, had become a heavy burden indeed. In view of that statement, I carried out research which proved that his statement was correct.

I point out that the length of the Capricorn Highway is about 360 miles, whereas the length of the Bruce Highway is about 1,040 miles. I have taken rail mileages rather than road mileages because they are easier to obtain. The ratio, therefore, is about 3 to 1. However, if one looks at the

figures showing the annual expenditure on the Bruce Highway, one wonders how the need for it has arisen. The figures are—

Year	\$
1961-62	3,545,840
1962-63	2,852,032
1963-64	3,402,012
1964-65	3,772,348
1965-66	3,833,534
1966-67	4,480,658
1967-68	5,434,589
1968-69	4,680,294
1969-70	5,047,431
1970-71	4,806,842
1971-72	7,186,197

As honourable members will notice, the figures are reasonably even up till 1965-66.

That money had to be expended on a road that it was hoped would have been completed under the administration of the late Ernie Evans—that was the advice given to me by the present Minister—who thought that finality would be achieved and that it would then be possible to concentrate on the Capricorn Highway. However, Honourable R. E. Camm has said that, during his period in office, he has had to spend tremendously large sums of money on the Bruce Highway. All honourable members are aware, I think, of the volume of traffic on that highway, and, as I have pointed out already, in terms of distance the ratio of the Bruce Highway to the Capricorn Highway is 3 to 1. Surely the heavy expenditure I have quoted must indicate the wear and tear caused by the type of traffic that is now using roads in rural areas.

The people of Central Queensland do not sit idly by in matters such as this. We want more money spent on the Capricorn Highway. If possible, we would like to perform a miracle and have the full length of the road completed immediately—if not sooner. However, it must be borne in mind that there are other highways in the State. In fact, there are three in my electorate, one of which, fortunately, has almost been completed. If one bears in mind the amount that has already been spent on the Bruce Highway and the Capricorn Highway, respectively, one realises how difficult the department's job is. The Drummond Range section of the Capricorn Highway is a major contract in itself and will require the expenditure of a tremendous sum of money.

I am in sympathy with those people who have had to seek expenditure on the Bruce Highway. I do not object to their obtaining this money; they needed it and they got it. However, as I said before, there is competition for improved roads. People who support a certain project one day may not support it the next day because in the meantime they may have succeeded in their own particular project. That is why I am concerned that the local government conference will not consider the Capricorn Highway; it may regard it as a regional project.

At one time almost everybody agreed that the Capricorn Highway was a major State project that should be brought to fruition as soon as possible. You, Mr. Speaker, have a similar problem with the Flinders Highway. I know of people who, after getting what they wanted, have very smartly said, "We aren't interested in the Capricorn Highway." They are more interested in some other highway that has been almost completed. I remember the honourable member for Mackenzie disowning the Capricorn Highway after he obtained the road right through his electorate to Emerald. At the time he was very vocal in the House and strongly attacked the Minister for Main Roads, saying that too much money was being spent on the Capricorn Highway and that it should be spent on the road in his electorate down towards Biloela. There was quite a scene in the Chamber on that occasion. That is the type of problem we face. People are strong about something, but when it suits them they become weak on it.

Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt: I had some good reason to ask questions.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I do not blame the honourable gentleman. What I am saying is that after he got what he wanted he found there was a good reason to allocate money somewhere in the central division other than to the Capricorn Highway.

Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt: I had some reason to expect these highways to be accorded equal priority.

Mr. O'DONNELL: Yes, provided the Biloela area got its cut first. However, that is by the way.

I am not worried so much about priorities based on the state of the road as I am about what could happen if certain sections do not receive priority. That is my problem, and I have explained it to the Minister. It is a very worrying problem. I have pointed out the health problem west of Alpha, as well as the problem east of Emerald that has developed because of the deterioration of the road. I am aware that the completion of the Capricorn Highway will take some time, but I should like the Minister to realise that people are reasonable. It would be in his interest, and in the interests of everyone concerned, if a more forthright explanatory statement were made to appease certain people who feel that their own specific section of the highway is the only one.

I realise that as time goes on there will be deterioration of built-up roads. I know of extensive mileages that have had to be constructed on roads that were considered to be completed. I will give an example of a road that was well built. I refer to the Landsborough Highway between Barcaldine and Longreach. It may interest honourable members to know that the Main Roads Department has not spent one dollar on that road in three years. That illustrates the

difference between good and bad construction. I do not blame the engineers for bad construction; when they build roads they do so under the conditions of the day.

Nowadays, heavy vehicles place a tremendous strain upon our roads, and broken road shoulders have reduced some of them from perfectly safe bitumen highways to death-traps. When approaching vehicles meet, one of them has to give way by getting off the surfaced road. This causes dust to rise, and vehicles plunging into the dust haze often collide with terrific force, resulting in fatalities that should not occur.

Mr. Lee: For years when in Government, the A.L.P. built roads only 12 feet wide.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I shall answer that interjection. When the A.L.P. was putting down roads the Government suffered from a lack of finance. The aim at that time was to cover as much distance as possible, and this the Labor Government tried to do. When the A.L.P. was in Government from 1932 to 1957 the heavy-transport problem had not arisen, and the fact that roads were being built apace was welcomed by the people they served.

The honourable member's criticism is unfair. If this Government went ahead with a similar plan and built roadways 12 feet wide, it would be faced with the same problem. In any case, this Government has built some 12-footers and they have deteriorated just as did the roads built by Labor. Let there be no mistake about that. Roads built by this Government have had to be redone within months—not years. If the honourable member wants a specific example, I cite the Landsborough Highway.

Mr. Hughes: What about Fairfield Road, in Brisbane? I could mention a number of examples in this city.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I am not talking about this city, but about the electorate of Belyando. We are again encountering political bias and bigotry. I rose today to give certain people a "fair go", and I did just that. However, the honourable member for Yeronga wants to bring in something that happened in road construction more than 17 years ago.

(Time expired.)

Mr. KAUS (Mansfield) (2.33 p.m.): It is indeed a pleasure to be able to speak in this Address-in-Reply debate. I should like to associate myself with the messages of loyalty to the Crown so ably moved by the honourable member for Townsville and seconded by the honourable member for Surfers Paradise. As new members of this Assembly, they both did a very good job.

I should like to congratulate Sir Colin Hannah on his appointment as Governor of Queensland and wish both him and Lady Hannah a successful term of office. I should also like to wish Sir Alan Mansfield and

Lady Mansfield good health and happiness in their retirement. I represent an area that no doubt was named after Sir Alan Mansfield. He lived in the suburb. I again wish them good health and happiness in their retirement, which, no doubt, they are enjoying since they now live in Surfers Paradise.

In this, the 40th Parliament, I should like to congratulate all new members on their election and to wish them every success. I hope that they bring with them some original thought and the ability to debate the various issues raised in this House, not only for the benefit of their constituents but for that of the whole of this great State of Queensland.

I cannot let this opportunity pass without expressing the sorrow I felt at the passing of some former honourable members of this House, namely, the honourable member for Albert (Mr. Bill Heatley), the honourable member for Callide (Mr. Vince Jones), the honourable member for Maryborough (Mr. Horrie Davis) and the honourable member for Balonne (Mr. Harold Hungerford). It is a great shame to see such men depart from this life while making such a worthy contribution to Parliament.

Although this is the Address-in-Reply debate, very few honourable members deal with the matters covered in the Governor's Opening Speech, for example, rural production, the sugar-cane crop, the Fitzroy Basin brigalow blocks, the development of Crown estates, the development of recreational facilities within State forests, dams and irrigation works that are essential to progress, the Railway Department, works, a metropolitan transport authority, freeways, education, and the subdepartment of sport. However, these matters could be raised during the Estimates debate.

As a Government we intend to continue the high standard of services generally and to introduce improvement to the fullest extent allowed by the finances. No doubt the Treasurer will inform us of these during the presentation of his Budget.

Not one member of the Opposition had a great deal to say on the matters raised in the Opening Speech. Instead, honourable members opposite spoke on matters of general community interest in their electorates. Most of their attention was directed at the character assassination of the Ministers as well as the Premier and the Deputy Premier.

When a man's evidence cannot be discredited, the simplest alternative is to discredit the man himself. This is what honourable members opposite are trying to do. In their midst they have members who think fire will not burn and that if a person jumps off a 20-storey building he may go down but, on the other hand, he may go up. This is insanity. Of course, only recently the name has been changed to "mental health". The malady of intellectual dishonesty has affected large segments of

both Federal and State A.L.P. members and left them quite unable to face the unpleasant truth. Intellectual dishonesty is one of the greatest allies of Communism. The bigger the lie, the more people will believe it. Like cancer, it cannot be treated adequately until its malignancy is recognised.

I recall the time 15 years ago when the Gair faction was expelled from the Labor Party by a power-hungry group that set itself above Parliament. A few days previously Mr. Gair had said of that group, "I have faith in the Q.C.E., and I think they have a sense of justice." In recalling what occurred during recent months, when certain State A.L.P. politicians were not re-endorsed, I ask: Has the Labor Party changed since that time? The answer is, "No." All honourable members are aware of the nauseating campaign of vilification and abuse that was immediately commenced by both factions.

On 23 April 1956, when speaking about Mr. Gair, Mr. Morris, M.L.A., said—

"His defeat at the Labor in Politics Convention in Queensland was the indication that he will be cast aside in due course, when he has served his purpose, for a more militant Socialist leader to be chosen by the Left Wing Socialist Central Executive which now dominates the Queensland Labor Party."

Mr. Morris then went on to say that a vote for Labor at that time would make Queensland a pawn in the faction fights. The position remains unchanged after 15 years; they are still fighting. What Mr. Morris forecast has come to pass. He warned that Labor's fight for the control of Queensland would be a bitter page in the history of this State. That is very true. It is clear that, for many a year, the old Labor Party has been dead. At the Federal level, and in most of the States, the Left-wing socialists have gained complete power, or are in the process of seizing power, over the party machine.

When Dr. Evatt was leader of the parliamentary Labor party, he announced, "Labor is now a Left-wing party." It is indeed. Those who will not willingly follow the dictates of the party bosses have been driven out, purged or alienated. The men now in control have used the techniques of Communism in destroying their opponents. Under the misleading label of democratic socialism, a ruthless attack is planned on our free and democratic institutions. Today, they are trying to kill the goose that laid the golden egg, that is, free enterprise, and, when I say "they", I mean socialists in the Labor Party. We have already had a taste of it in Queensland. We have seen the weapon of character assassination at work daily. It has been truly said that those who live by the sword shall perish by the sword. So watch out boys; the swords are being sharpened at present. If these birds of a feather no longer flock together, they cannot disguise their sinister plumage.

In my role today I do not intend to descend to the level of personalities that are disfiguring our political history. Opposition members are condemned out of their own mouths. They have forced upon us a great question of principle, namely, that in this democracy we shall not tolerate a dictatorship either from outside Parliament or inside; the principal that Governments are made by the people, and not the back-room boys pulling the strings from behind the scenes.

I ask if Labor has a sense of justice today. It did not display it with Mr. Thackeray and Mr. Bennett, but Mr. Casey beat the machine. And I congratulate him. After 15 or 20 years Labor remains the same.

I now turn to matters that are a little more parochial. Firstly, I wish to convey thanks to my people in Hawthorne. As honourable members know, I won the Hawthorne seat on two occasions.

An Opposition Member: You were lucky.

Mr. KAUS: I admit that I was very lucky. I was very fortunate that the sword was wielded at the time I stood for Hawthorne, and Mr. Baxter was not re-endorsed. He was probably doing a very good job in that area. However, the Q.C.E. gave me the opportunity of being elected. I grasped it with both hands, and thereafter cared for the electors of Hawthorne.

I thank the Liberals and other people in Hawthorne for the wonderful assistance they gave me in both elections. I had many friends in that electorate, regardless of their party affiliations. I look after constituents irrespective of their politics, and I mix with most people. When I beat the sitting A.L.P. member, I did have trouble for a while. I was not invited anywhere for quite some time. I overcame that problem and, in the end, was either a member or patron of 34 different associations. I venture to say that, had it not been for the redistribution, I would have been successful again in Hawthorne. I admit that I won it by only four votes on the last occasion, but I would have walked in at the recent election. I would have increased my vote by at least 5 per cent— at a time when Opposition members were claiming that there was a swing against the Government.

Mr. Sherrington: Why don't you do the right thing and thank the commissioners for putting Macgregor into your electorate?

Mr. KAUS: I shall deal with that later.

I shall now read a letter which was sent to me on 20 June 1969, shortly after I had won Hawthorne by four votes. It reads—

"Dear Bill,

"Heartiest congratulations to you on your wonderful victory in Hawthorne at the recent elections. I regard your achievement in being re-elected in an electorate

21

that has always been regarded as overwhelmingly labour as the best performance in all the seventy-eight electorates. It was a personal triumph for you and a tribute from the electors of Hawthorne that must have given you much pride and great gratification. The results certainly gave me a full measure of pleasure.

"I sincerely hope that you will have a very happy and satisfying term of office and that when the next election is held in 1972 the electors of Hawthorne will again indicate that they desire you as their member.

"Kind personal regards and very best wishes,

Yours sincerely."

I will not disclose the name of the writer, but he was an Opposition member.

As the member for Hawthorne, I did a good deal of work for the people in that area. I thank the Department of Education for the amount of money spent on the technical college at Seven Hills. It is not complete yet, but I am hopeful of receiving an invitation to the official opening. In addition, I paid special attention to the rolls. I used to send letters to newcomers telling them they were welcome to the electorate and that I would call on them in time, which I did. This helped me to get re-elected.

My final letter to my electors reads—

"Please accept my sincere thanks for the support you gave me since my election in 1966. As you are aware, the old electorate of Hawthorne has been abolished by the recent redistribution of the State electorates, largely because of the change in the pattern of population growth in Brisbane.

"It is with considerable sadness I accept that I am forced to relinquish my position as your representative. Over the years I have got to know many of you personally, and as a result formed friendships which have not only surpassed the bounds of politics, but will undoubtedly endure the passage of time.

"Since my election to office in 1966, we have seen well in excess of \$2,000,000 spent in the area by the Liberal State Government, and the new Technical College at Seven Hills would be the greatest standing monument to this progress. Helping many of you with your own personal problems has also been a great source of satisfaction. No matter what my own future may hold, may I state my wish that yours will be filled with health and happiness. Again my thanks."

Mr. Sherrington interjected.

Mr. KAUS: That is where the honourable member for Salisbury is wrong, because it is printed on Queensland Liberal Party paper.

Mr. Lee: The honourable member for Salisbury is so far "left" that he cannot be right.

Mr. KAUS: That could be so, too.

I should like to thank the people of Mansfield for electing me. I was the last Liberal member for Hawthorne and I am the first for Mansfield, which is not a bad record. I had to contest a completely new electorate. The main section of it was held by a Labor member, the rural area was held by a Liberal member, and at the same time it had been held by a Labor alderman for 10 years. I had to overcome those substantial problems.

I did in Mansfield what I did in Hawthorne—I got organised and I did my "door knocks". In fact, I visited 4,000 houses personally, as I think this is the only way a politician should operate at all times. It paid dividends, because I finished in front by 563 votes, gaining 52.04 per cent of a total vote of 14,083.

During the election campaign the Brisbane City Council stated that if candidates did not remove their signs within a stipulated period, they would be fined. I wish the council would look at the position in my electorate. A certain Independent or Republican by the name of Kennedy or Kenny still has his signs up. I am told that the A.L.P. financed his campaign and, in addition, paid his helpers \$12 a day for their assistance. He was nominated in an attempt to split the vote and defeat me.

Going into a new electorate did not worry me. My political opponents forgot that I had been born in the area. They forgot that I had chased wild horses there, "lobbied" in the creeks there, and gone to school there. Those good people stuck by me. That was one thing that the A.L.P. overlooked. I will go on trouncing them. At the next election I will increase my vote not by 5 per cent but by 10 per cent.

I should like to thank my campaign director, Mr. Greg Wightman, my committee, and all the branches in the area. I thank the area executive for endorsing me and enabling me to represent Mansfield in this House.

I now wish to speak on another subject. What I have in mind is in effect the reverse of the bush children's scheme. We all know that urbanisation is a world-wide phenomenon, with the concentration of people in towns and cities increasing daily. This has been apparent in Australia since the Second World War. Inhabitants of Australia's concrete jungles cannot deny, however, the call of the wide outdoors, and excursions to quiet places away from the city have become a tradition. There are many havens where the Queenslanders can find fresh air and relaxation in this wonderful State of ours, but the younger generation seldom has the opportunity to enjoy the freedom and spontaneity of farm life. I should like to see

farms converted into holiday resorts for children. As honourable members know, there are no parks in the developing areas. Any who dispute that statement are welcome to come to my area and see for themselves. This is one of the things that people in my electorate are most upset about, and fortunately it is a council problem. The residents are very worried about it. There are not sufficient parks anywhere in Mansfield.

City children find a simple pleasure in horse riding, swimming in a farm dam, making contact with other children and learning to understand life on the farm, or just going for long walks on the farm. Over the years, with amalgamations under the Marginal Dairy Farms Reconstruction Scheme, some old farm houses will become available. They would be ideal for a scheme of this type, and I suggest that it would be a very excellent avenue of investment for a person who has more capital than he needs. It would take a lot of planning and ingenuity on the part of someone with initiative to convert a farm into a holiday resort, perhaps converting barns into dormitories for boys and providing communal living for boys and girls.

A holiday of this type is not merely relaxation and fun for children. It provides an added opportunity for children, especially immigrant children, to learn the Australian way of life, customs and traditions. The young visitors would have plenty of time to play and to get to know a variety of new and interesting things. As I said earlier, children could learn to ride horses, swim, and play games such as cricket, football and tennis. They could go on long walks and learn about plants and animals in nature's classroom. What more important subject is there for young children today, in this age of pollution and conservation? They could also learn about farming methods. If a library service could be provided, book-worms could while away their free time with a book of their choice. I am sure that this would be a wonderful thing for the children of the cities—the freedom of farm life not disturbed by over-organisation, with all activities taking place in a happy and informal manner.

I turn now to another important subject—the intrusion of motor vehicles on beaches, forests, parks and other places. No doubt honourable members have seen the television programme "The Trail Riders". It has been reported that the Victorian Government is to control all off-road vehicles in an attempt to protect State forests and beaches and that it will pass legislation forcing all trail bikes, mini-bikes and beach buggies to be registered. These should be places in which people can find peace from the problems that beset them on the roads.

Although machines such as these are in fact destroying the forests and beaches, causing erosion and retarding growth in some areas because the noise scares much of the

wild life, my greatest concern is for the safety of the community. The family man and his children who visit these places on picnics, as well as nature lovers such as the honourable member for Salisbury, should be protected from the activities of irresponsible drivers who are using these public places in addition to the roads to demonstrate their reckless driving.

Surely it is not too much to expect that the roads which have been built for motor vehicles should be used by them. Is it reasonable to use parklands and beaches where all the traffic laws and signals and crossings that are appropriate to roadways do not afford any protection for the community? Motor vehicles and these public areas are not compatible.

The problem will grow with the apparent increase in the sale of vehicles of these types, not for use on the roads but for use in places in which they constitute a danger, particularly to women and children. Pedestrians using declared roads on which motor vehicles are expected are being killed in increasing numbers; but the position will be much worse when these vehicles take over parklands and beaches where the public would not expect to encounter them.

I have noticed advertisements extolling the virtues of mini-bikes and beach buggies for off-road use. In my view this could well be irresponsible advertising which engenders a disregard for the purposes for which our beaches, parks and forests should be used. If motor vehicles are to be allowed in these places, they should be confined to clearly designated roads with proper signposting. They should be prohibited from moving off these recognised roadways into areas where they can endanger life and limb.

If these types of vehicle are not registered and do not come under the present traffic laws, there is no guarantee that the drivers have any proficiency or are of sufficiently mature age to recognise their responsibilities. At the present time there is apparently nothing to stop a very young person from driving these vehicles without passing any driving test whatsoever, and, in the case of motorcyclists, without the protection of safety helmets, which have to be worn by licensed drivers on roads.

It seems tragic to me that all the efforts that are being taken to protect the public from motor vehicles being driven legitimately on the road could be nullified by these vehicles leaving roads constructed for their use and taking over areas which were, and should be, the preserve of the people. I know that this problem has become acute in the United States of America, where it has become necessary to prohibit the use of motor vehicles, with their pollution, noise and danger, in national parks.

Surely the people should retain the right to some areas where they can walk in safety and not have to contend with motor vehicles

being driven without regard for the rights of others. While it is right that we should consider the environment, that we should protect dunes as well as the great stretches of our beaches and the peaceful pathways of our national parks, is it not more important that we have greater concern for the protection of human life? In the coming summer children and their parents will be enjoying the beaches, playing in parks and enjoying a rest in quiet areas—we hope. Are they to be deprived by the motor vehicle of these last refuges?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much audible conservation in the Chamber.

Mr. KAUS: Is it not urgent that we take a stand now to prevent fatalities from motor-vehicle accidents in parks, State forests and beaches? We are shocked with the road toll, and all efforts are being made to reduce it, but do we now have to pursue these efforts in public places where the motor vehicle has intruded without the public's consent?

Recently a child was injured by a mini-bike whose rider was using the walking path in a State forest as a racetrack. That sort of thing must not continue. Bushwalkers, who like to appreciate the beauty of parks, forests and beaches (our national heritage), should not have this privilege denied to them by drivers who could not care less about the environment. By all means let us have laws to protect the environment, to protect our beaches, dunes, trees, flora and fauna, but let us not forget to protect the people who use and appreciate them. Without people, these areas would not have any significance: it is only because of people that we recognise the importance of the environment.

Usually these areas do have a parking area where vehicles can be safely parked, but on the beaches, on the walkways and on the tracks, the sunbather, the picnicker or the bushwalker must surely be protected from physical assault by the mini-bike, the beach-buggy, or other type of vehicle.

Another matter to which I should like to draw attention is the use of flashing-lamp signalling devices on motor vehicles. Nowadays there is a tendency for these devices to be used for purposes for which they were not intended or, in fact, not to be used at all. I know that motorists diverging or turning to the right or to the left are now required to use their flashing-lamp signalling devices. These signals are given to warn other road users of intended movements and, if properly used, are an indication to the driver of a following vehicle of what he can expect. But there is a growing tendency for these legitimate devices to be misused. In some cases the signals are used by drivers as an indication to the driver of a following vehicle that conditions are safe for an overtaking manoeuvre. This misuse of the signals is extremely dangerous. I feel that the responsibility for ensuring that it is safe to overtake another vehicle must rest entirely with the driver who proposes to pass that vehicle.

The flashing of an offside indicator light on the vehicle ahead should indicate only that the driver of that vehicle intends to turn to the right, and vice versa in the case of a nearside indicator. No attempt to pass should be made until the leading driver's intentions are thoroughly understood and the road ahead is clear. In addition, the driver of the vehicle being overtaken should move as close to the left of the roadway as possible and should not, as often happens, increase his speed to make it more difficult for the overtaking vehicle to make the passing manoeuvre.

The proper use of flashing-lamp direction signals as provided by the Traffic Regulations should give to other road users a message that will contribute to road safety. Improper use of these signals can only produce additional hazards which can place an overtaking vehicle in a dangerous situation and lead to a fatality. If necessary, the Traffic Regulations should be amended to ensure that these indicators are used only for the purposes for which the regulations provide. Any other use of them by any driver should render him liable to prosecution and a heavy penalty. The use of these flashing signals should be unambiguous and should contribute to road safety. The signals should not be used to endanger the safety of drivers of overtaking vehicles or that of other road users, particularly in oncoming vehicles.

I should like to take this opportunity of congratulating the Commissioner of Main Roads on the very timely pamphlet his department has issued on freeway driving. Some of the advice given is, in my opinion, equally applicable to driving on our steadily improving highways. Let me quote this piece of advice—

“Avoid lane-chopping—Stay in the left-hand lane unless overtaking and passing. Do not impede or block faster moving traffic by driving in the passing lane. Do not straddle two lanes.”

One very frequently sees this breach on the Story Bridge.

How often on a highway have we encountered two cars travelling abreast in two parallel lanes, invariably below the maximum permitted speed, thereby preventing faster traffic from passing safely? This, in my opinion, is not good highway manners. It is an undisputed fact that many Queensland drivers do not drive courteously. And speaking of highway manners leads me to think of the defensive-driving courses conducted by the Queensland Road Safety Council. I commend these courses to anyone desirous of improving his driving.

Whilst on the subject of main roads, I should like to thank Main Roads officers for the assistance they have given me in my new electorate. In Hawthorne I had no main roads problems because the electorate contained no major roads. The electorate of Mansfield has some main roads and I

appreciate the tremendous assistance which Main Roads officers have rendered to both me and my electors. They, too, greatly appreciate it.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER (Archerfield) (3.9 p.m.): It is a tremendous honour to speak here today as the first representative in this Parliament of the new electorate of Archerfield. The area covered by my electorate has a long history of A.L.P. representation. Before the recent redistribution, the greater portion of the area was represented in this Parliament by the honourable member for Salisbury (Mr. Doug. Sherrington). The consistently high vote of support for the Labor Party within the electorate is a clear indication of the well-deserved personal respect that Doug. Sherrington has enjoyed among the citizens I now represent.

As a member of the A.L.P., I am proud of the great traditions that have been established over generations by trade-unionists and their political representatives. It has been a never-ending struggle for social and economic change and for that equality within our community that gives everyone, irrespective of occupation, income or family tree, a “fair go”.

The Labor Party was conceived and born during the great struggles of the 1880's and 1890's. At that time the shearers, the seamen and the miners fought for a principle, and the symbol of that principle was the right to organise and strike as a trade-union body. But the symbol that they supported and fought for represented something much deeper and more valuable for those men and for the future of this country. It was the battle of the divided, separated and defenceless worker against the entrenched power of capital. It was the struggle against inequality, lack of opportunity, discrimination and even heartless repression. Workers went to gaol to fight for this principle, and some even died. It is incontestable that the sacrifice of those men accelerated the social and economic development of this society of ours towards becoming a much freer one.

Ironically, many of the people who now stand in opposition to Labor owe a debt to the struggles and sacrifices of those earlier Labor men, who hammered out a situation in which opportunity could be made available to these people to break through what would otherwise have been insuperable social and economic barriers. It is sometimes said by those opponents of Labor, who are afflicted by some sense of guilt because they know only too well that their affluence and success have been made possible by the sacrifices and struggles of the Labor movement in earlier years, that the things that Labor stood for—its causes—and the battles that it had to fight are gone, and that there is no further cause for the Labor Party in the context of fighting for social and economic change. That is nonsense.

When I look at the statistics on education and see that four children out of five who enter the wealthy non-Catholic private secondary schools complete their full term of secondary education, whereas four out of five of those who enter State secondary schools drop out before completing their full course of education, I do not need a university degree to realise that there is something radically wrong as between the two systems. The former is gold-plated education, providing all the luxuries and benefits that wealth is able to provide. By contrast, the inadequacies—I think it is fair to go further and say the “very meanness”—of facilities provided at the State secondary schools, together with the seeming imperception of our State education authorities towards the cultural-enrichment needs of children from moderate-income homes, guarantee that large numbers of children will be squeezed out of the education system well before they are given any opportunity to develop intellectually to their full potential.

As I move about the community and note how gloriously attractive are the pre-school centres in the wealthier suburbs of Brisbane and contrast them with the inferior standard, and more often than not the total absence, of pre-school centres of acceptable standards in the poorer areas, I realise that today there is as much cause as ever to struggle against the social and economic disadvantages that deprive so many of our young folk of an adequate opportunity in life.

I am mindful of the Government's proposals on pre-school education, but I am entirely suspicious of them, for they have been poorly planned. I am aghast at the sort of damage that can be done to our young children if those from the poorer and moderate-income-earning areas are to be crammed into rooms as ugly and unstimulating, and indeed as depressing and as poorly equipped, as primary-school classrooms. I am also horrified by the cheap political gimmickry that has gone into this sort of proposal.

I wish to give some more examples of the sort of social and economic discrimination that I find appalling in our society and that give me every sense of justification for wanting to carry on in the tradition of struggle—the tradition that has been set and maintained over the years by the Labor Party. I cite, for instance, the fact that poverty exists in our community.

As an illustration, let me quote some figures from official sources. In 1966 the Melbourne Institute of Applied Social and Economic Research pointed out that one in every four aged people was either poor or marginally poor. The survey pointed out that the poverty level was struck at an austere line—a level that none of us would want to live at. It represented fairly extreme deprivation within the terms of the sort

of living standards that we in this community are used to. On this basis, Queensland has special problems.

The appalling conditions of Aborigines throughout the Commonwealth—and more especially in this State—the total denial of their land rights, their cultural repression, and the overwhelming sense of paternalism—and, in cases where they wish to strike out independently, the displays of impatience and intolerance towards them—stand as a monument to the selfishness and insensitivity of this so-called “businessman's Government”, which has been very successful in selling out our natural resources—the people's heritage—at rock-bottom, bargain-rate prices to overseas investors but has been a spectacular failure in the field of human rights and civil liberties, and the development of a free, tolerant and democratic society.

I mention these matters briefly as some indication of the sense of anger I feel at a system which can so calmly proceed as does ours in Queensland, under a coalition elected on a minority vote—I repeat, on a minority vote—while there is such glaring evidence of social and economic disadvantage which perpetuates itself generation after generation solely because the decision-makers here in George Street in the Government are too foolish, too lazy, too selfish, or too unintelligent—or all of these things together—to take appropriate steps to attack the causes and root them out of this unequal opportunity in society.

Let us be clear on my fundamental philosophy. Summed up in a very few words, it is this: The productive system is there to serve man, not to dominate him; not to enrich a few at the expense of the majority; not to create a destructive, repressive system which throws up an ugly, polluted neurosis-inducing environment.

Society, and the things about society and that go with it, should be for people and should always be there to serve them, not to dominate them. But even those in the community who are not interested in qualitative things, who are not outraged by the way in which people's rights (including their right to an adequate opportunity in life in which they are able to reach their full realisation) are beaten, battered and throttled by a Government more interested in making quick money by selling out our natural resources—the heirlooms of future generations which we merely hold on trust—such hard-headed people should surely at least be alarmed at the poor economic performance of this State.

I intend to spend a few minutes talking about the unimpressive performance of this so-called practical, businessman's Government. I took the opportunity of checking through the Commonwealth Grants Commission 38th Report for 1971, which is the latest such report available. As a source for

statistical information it is beyond reproach, and everything I am about to say is verifiable from official Government statistical sources.

We hear ad nauseam from Ministers of the great achievements of this State's economic development. That is utter nonsense. On all the figures I have been able to extract, Queensland has the least impressive economic record of any State in the Commonwealth, and I am appalled and alarmed at this situation. Let us look at secondary industry. We hear a lot on this subject from Government spokesmen. From the Grants Commission report that I have just mentioned, I discover that the value of manufacturing per capita in Queensland is less than \$379. This is the lowest level in the Commonwealth and is much lower than the Australian average of \$623.52. We are more than \$200 per capita below the average in South Australia, a much smaller State, and one with less bountiful resources than we have for economic development in secondary industry.

Because of the unimaginative, uninspiring, unadventurous administration of the State of Queensland, we are becoming increasingly a branch-office State. Business people with whom I have spoken have made it clear that there is an increasing tendency—and an accelerating one at that—for head offices in Brisbane to close down and become branch offices, and for the operations of the business to be administered from distant Sydney or Melbourne. Just how influential and able is this so-called businessman's Government which, in its term of office, is literally driving head-office operations out of this State to Sydney and Melbourne?

At the personal level, we discover that personal income in Queensland is the lowest of all the main States per head of population. The Australian average is \$1,822 per capita; the Queensland average is only \$1,609 per capita. Because personal incomes per capita here are so low, cash benefits from public authorities—that is, in blunt and direct terms, social service benefits in some form or another from public authorities—represent a greater percentage of total personal income in Queensland than in other States of the Commonwealth. The figure for Australia is 7.2 per cent, but for Queensland it is 8.84 per cent. When we measure this fact against the miserable nature of most of the benefits provided in Queensland, and especially the mean sort of means testing, we realise just how extensive is the dependency of Queensland people on benefits of this type.

There can be no disputing what I say about the poor economic performance of this State under the Country-Liberal coalition. Only a few months ago it scuttled off in frenzied haste to the Grants Commission, desperately seeking financial assistance to pull it out of the mess it has been getting into year by year—a worsening mess—through its incompetent financial administration of the affairs of this State.

Imagine! Under this Country-Liberal coalition—under the administration of the so-called practical businessmen—Queensland has once again become a mendicant State. Let us remember that the word “mendicant” is a euphemism; it is a gentle word for this humiliating description of “beggar”. Queensland has become a “beggar” State under the administration of this so-called businessmen's Government. That is the level to which this Government has reduced Queensland over the years.

In spite of the unconscionable way in which it has allowed our natural resources to be plundered by any foreign investor who happens to come along and make some sort of offer, and in spite of the promised riches we were supposed to get from this criminal sell-out of our heritage—which, I repeat, we only hold on trust for future generations—this Government—this so-called practical businessmen's administration—has been unable to balance the books. It has got us into a financial mess and has had to go scuttling off to Canberra begging money and has turned Queensland into a “beggar” State. Every Queenslanders should be humiliated at the level to which this State has been reduced under the administration of this coalition Government, whose only outstanding success has been to gerrymander the electorates so as to guarantee that, even with a minority vote, it can still be elected with a generous majority in this Parliament.

Our financial problems arise through the incompetence of the Government. That is incontestable. Before any Government member embarrasses himself by springing to the defence of his colleagues in the Ministry, I ask him to read the Commonwealth Grants Commission report published earlier this year especially to explain the background to Queensland's special financial need. In it, the Federal Treasury makes it clear that it looks askance at the quality of Government administration in Queensland and of its submissions to the Federal Treasury. This is a long-standing joke in Canberra and such a view is so commonly held that I have seen, in our own Press, reports by Canberra correspondents that Queensland makes poor submissions on important and high-priority development projects when seeking aid from the Commonwealth, and misses out because New South Wales is able to win the day on the sheer weight of the quality of its well-documented and expertly prepared cases on much less important proposals.

We cannot tolerate this state of affairs any longer. We need Ministers and members in the bureaucracy who are competent enough to match the big States, otherwise we will continue to be disadvantaged in this way. Let us look quickly at the administration of this State, of which the Federal Treasury was so testy. I have frequently referred—and I will continue to mention it in the future—to the way in which our natural resources are being sold out. It is a shame

that the Treasurer is not in the House, because this is of great importance today. The Grants Commission report, in paragraph 24 on page 11, reads—

“The Commonwealth Treasury suggested that the value of mining output might give some indication of capacity to raise mining royalties. This would suggest that Queensland’s capacity is above standards; and as the royalties collected per head of population in Queensland are below the average per capita for the standard States, it would appear that Queensland makes a relatively low effort in this field.”

What trenchant criticism by a Federal authority of a State Government. It asserts clearly and unequivocally that this State Government is selling out Queensland’s resources at unreal prices. It indicts the State Government for plundering what is really the heritage of future generations, which we hold in trust. It points out even more. It says that the Country and Liberal Parties are poor criminals; that they are not even getting a decent return from the proceeds of their robberies. Indeed, I remind the House that at Goonyella, for instance, they arranged for coal to be sold by contract at 5c a ton—a lousy pittance. The contract is binding until the year 2010. By that time we will be lucky if the 5c of today is worth 2c. Is that what the Liberals have promised us in making a so-called practical businessman’s approach to the administration of the affairs of this State?

At page 11 of the report, the Commonwealth Treasury slams the Queensland Government for the confused, unreliable and uncertain way in which submissions were made relating to railway charges. I understand that the Government will not release details of the railway charges levied. Some people are unkind enough to suspect that there is some sort of conspiracy of silence to save the Government from embarrassment for wilfully manipulated differential freight-charge systems. The Treasurer talks about the tremendous gains from the rail transportation of these foreign-bound minerals, but he refuses to provide financial details. However, one point is clear. Despite these tremendous, anonymous and nameless gains claimed by the Treasurer, the Queensland Railway Department showed a record loss last financial year. I believe that the Government is charging foreign mineral companies such low freight rates that, after operational and maintenance costs are deducted, the profit margin is virtually nil. I challenge the Treasurer to supply detailed financial evidence over recent years to prove otherwise.

I am not so sure that this is the full explanation, although I am certain that it is part of it. From what I can gather, the full explanation is more likely to be based on the fact that freight charges are in such an unholy mess that it is impossible to sort them out. Indeed, there is a strong

suggestion that not even the Commissioner for Railways could present a comprehensive listing of freight charges for commodities between various points on rail links throughout the State. That is the sort of mess that the railways are in at the present time. For instance, it costs about \$1.58 a ton to transport coal from Goonyella to Hay Point. It costs four to five times that amount to transport wheat about the same distance on the Queensland railways. That is the peculiar sort of logic on which the Government operates.

Let us look at another aspect of the Grants Commission report. At page 12 it is stated in relation to education—

“The Commonwealth Treasury . . . would assess relative needs in education by comparing the percentage of the eligible population of the total State population of the claimant State with the corresponding percentage of the standard States. Applying this comparison to Queensland would show a positive need (i.e. a need for a higher level of expenditure per head of population than in the standard States), in contrast to the single ‘negative’ need shown by the Commissioner’s method of comparing education expenditures on the basis of actual school enrolments.”

This is substantial and authoritative evidence verifying the long-standing complaint of the Opposition, and of educationists in Queensland, that this State has a poor record in education expenditure.

Let us have none of the nonsense so often heard that, because Queensland is a hot State climatically, it does not have to install central-heating systems as are installed, for instance, in many of South Australia’s schools, and accordingly spends less. If it is good enough for South Australia to put central heating systems into its school buildings because of cold weather, conversely Queensland ought to be putting air-conditioning units into school rooms because of the extreme heat of this State. Of course, this argument just does not “wash”. The fact is that excluding any heating systems that might be provided in schools in other States, Queensland still has a poor record—the worst in the Commonwealth—in investment in education.

The Commonwealth Treasury submission forthrightly supports this contention, and exposes the weakness and inadequate commitment of the Queensland Government. For instance, this Government spends only \$40 per head of population on education, compared with \$53.50 in South Australia. That is one advantage of living in a State controlled by a Labor Government. If the same effort was made by the Queensland Government, allowing for the fact that there is a higher proportion of this State’s population of school age—between 5 and 18 years—than is the case in South Australia, Queensland should be spending at least \$18,000,000 a year more on education than it spent in 1970.

This is the type of failure that I am talking about, and the type of failure that results in the perpetuation of socio-economic discrimination in our education system. The gaps have to be closed by fetes, raffles and door-knock appeals by hard-working parents on parents and citizens' associations. Dollar-for-dollar subsidies are obtained under certain conditions from the State Government, but let us look quickly at the effect that this produces. High-income areas are able to raise more money because financial sacrifice is easier to make in such areas than it is in low-income areas. Accordingly, the lion's share of the money available from the Government in subsidy of parents and citizens' activity is earmarked for high-income areas. The result is that schools in wealthier areas are much better set up than those in relatively poor or moderate-income-earning areas. It is therefore seen why children from higher-income areas are able to proceed further and, by and large, do better in education than their confreres from moderate and lower-income areas. Those in wealthier areas have more money spent on them, and most of it is coming from the State.

I mentioned earlier the case for pre-school education. I also referred to the frantic efforts of the Government to buy votes by promising pre-school education in Queensland as part of its election programme. The Government is rather late in arriving at this decision. Until now, seven out of every eight children of pre-school age in Queensland had not attended, and could not have attended, an approved pre-school institution because the facilities just were not there. I have mentioned the Government's election promises in pre-school education, and I accuse it of deliberate deceit. The Government's propaganda was designed to hoodwink people into believing that pre-school education on a wide scale could be introduced virtually the day after voting. We now learn that a comprehensive scheme is more than three years away. All that we will receive next year will be a few pilot schemes in hand-picked areas.

The Leader of the Opposition was correct when he pointed out during the election campaign the falsity of the Government's promises. He was correct when he said that the first priority in the provision of complete pre-school training must be the training of adequate teachers.

I venture to predict that, at the pace followed by the Government in educational matters, comprehensive pre-school education is at least five, six or seven years away. Many of the four-year-olds of today will be at secondary school before this Government, if it is lucky enough—God forbid!—to retain office through its rigged boundaries, provides adequate pre-school training. The Australian Capital Territory was further advanced in pre-school education 10 years ago than Queensland will be in 10 years from now. What a shocking indictment!

The Government attempted to buy votes by glamorising its pre-school proposals. As we have seen so often, Mr. Deputy Speaker, once the votes have been counted both the glamour and the election enthusiasm vanish. Indeed, the general lack of stimulation and incentive for Queensland children to continue through the school system is apparent when one contrasts our standards of achievement with those of other States. About 78 per cent of our school-age population—that is, children between five and 18 years of age—are attending schools, compared with 84 per cent in the Commonwealth as a whole.

If this so-called practical businessmen's Government is so competent, I wonder why it is, to take another tack, that Queensland has fared so poorly at the hands of the Federal Government in terms of Commonwealth payments. In the five years to the end of June 1971—the latest years for which I have figures—if Queensland had received Commonwealth payments on the same basis as South Australia, it would have received an additional \$123,500,000. What excuse has the Government for the gross incompetence that tolerates this shocking discrimination against Queensland?

Professor Russell Matthews of the Australian National University, Canberra, in a paper that he presented in November 1971, made an analysis of the actual per capita allocations to States and what he believed to be the warranted per capita allocations to them. He condemned the arbitrary way in which the payments had been made and pointed out that Queensland had fared badly—and, I would add, solely because there was no protest or adequate submission from this Tory State Government.

Let me give Professor Matthews's figures. In 1968-69, the per capita general revenue grant to Queensland was \$90.11. According to the professor, it should have been another \$14.94, making a total of \$105.05. In the aggregate, that would have meant another \$26,000,000 for Queensland in 1968-69.

I should like to take another dimension of the economic problems of this State and consider it, and this is probably the most important matter that I intend to raise. I refer to unemployment.

The Queensland Government seems to take some satisfaction from the unemployment figures in the State. I do not, nor does anyone who is unemployed or who is associated with those unfortunate enough to be unemployed. There is no room for any smugness on the part of the Government; unemployment in this State is showing signs of a long-term worsening. July figures over the past three years indicate that. In July 1970, 1.01 per cent of the State's work-force was unemployed; in July 1971, 1.15 per cent; and in July 1972, 1.39 per cent. Clearly the position is getting worse.

What is even more disturbing is the increasing degree to which hard-core unemployment exists. In 1970, one in three of those unemployed was on unemployment benefits; in July 1972, two in five were drawing unemployment benefits. Those drawing unemployment benefits represent the hard core of unemployed—those who have been unemployed for at least a fortnight.

I am alarmed at the degree to which young people are represented within the ranks of the unemployed. More than one in every three unemployed is a junior. What a terrible outlook for young people in the community! Early this year, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we found young people forced back to school for a further 12 months because of lack of job opportunities. Others revised their career plans to meet the job situation. These cold, hard facts of employment do not reflect themselves in the statistics, but they are very real to those affected.

This Tory Government takes pride in the present unemployment figures in Queensland. I heard an interjection about a statement in this morning's "Courier-Mail", but what appears there means nothing. Let us remember that there are many who have left this State in despair to look elsewhere for jobs. Let us remember, too, that under the decentralisation practised by this Government the populations in many country centres are at bedrock. Businesses have closed and, again, many people have departed. Our level of employment is the result not of increased job opportunities but rather of an exodus from the State, or a return to school, by those who have sought jobs in vain. What do the people of Queensland have to look forward to—the aspect of the dole line!

I repeat that the position in Queensland is pretty grim. It is worsening, and that is what worries me. For instance, in July 1970 vacancies as a proportion of the unemployed amounted to 30 per cent; by July 1972 this proportion had dropped to 23 per cent. To look at the matter in another way, unemployment in July 1970 increased 14 per cent on the same month in the previous year. In July this year the increase over the same month in the previous year was 20 per cent. An analysis of the unemployment figures shows why I feel alarmed.

Those in the most vulnerable position are the ones who are worse off in the present unemployment situation. If we break up unemployment figures between employment classifications, and also job-vacancy notifications between employment classifications, what I mean can be quickly realised. For the professional and semi-professional job registrant there are nearly three jobs available for him to choose from. For the skilled worker there are about nine vacancies for every 10 who register as unemployed. But when we get to the semi-skilled and the

unskilled, we find that there is no job vacancy for three out of every four who register, and for those in the service industries there is no job for two out of every three who register.

For those in clerical employment there is no job for four out of every five who register, and for the rural employee there is no job for four out of every five who register. Country Party members please note. What a terrible indictment of the Country Party!

When we look at some of the areas in Queensland we find what can be fairly described as "unemployment disaster areas". The State average for those receiving unemployment benefits as a proportion of the total unemployment is about 40 per cent. I repeat that these are the hard-core unemployed, and the greater the proportion of these the worse is the long-standing problem of unemployment.

Compared with the 40 per cent figure for average in the State we find that in Atherton the proportion on unemployment benefits is 87 per cent, at Cairns 52 per cent, and at Maryborough, 45 per cent. Anyone who cares to work his way through the figures for various large centres in the State will find other areas that give cause for considerable alarm.

I repeat the point that I made earlier. The Country-Liberal Government's record in handling the economic affairs of this State is pretty grim. It takes a gerrymander of electorates to preserve such a bungling and incompetent Tory Government.

Let me now move on to social welfare in the community. It is indicative of the priority that the Country-Liberal coalition gives this important area of public administration, which is directly associated with people's rights, when it tags it on the end of a list of "catch-em-all" portfolios for the most long-standing junior member of the Ministry. The portfolio is Tourism, Sport, and as an afterthought the Government added "and Welfare Services".

Let me make my position clear right from the outset. I believe that if the counterpart of this coalition in Canberra was "fair dinkum" and accepted its public responsibilities, all social security payments should be paid from Canberra. In that way we could end this terrible business of the Commonwealth avoiding its responsibility by funding half the cost of social-security payments under the States Grants (Deserted Wives) Act. This leaves the States with the odium of applying tough means tests on unfortunate women.

For about another \$8,000,000 or \$10,000,000 the Commonwealth could fund the whole of this programme, and do it much more generously and, certainly on the comparative records of Queensland and the Commonwealth so far, much more humanely than is currently the case. This would allow the State Government to concentrate on supportive or field welfare services.

Let me deal quickly with some of the financial arrangements that operate in this State. It seems crazy to me that the State Children's Services Department, at the direction of the Government, of course, will pay \$2.50 a week, after applying a tough means test, to a mother for her dependent child. If she fosters the child out, the foster parent would receive \$8.50 a week, plus free medical care, books and so on, plus \$1.50 child endowment, and there would be no means test. The present system has an inbuilt incentive to break up families instead of keeping them together.

I should like the Minister in charge of these matters to explain rationally just how this peculiar situation has developed and why it is allowed to persist. Again, is not the obvious and rational way to finance programmes where needy dependent children are concerned to adequately finance the supporting parent? I repeat that the supporting parent will get only \$2.50 a week, thus encouraging a break-up of families for the reasons I have outlined.

Let me give another example. I estimate that the cost to the State of supporting a child in an institution is at least \$16 a week. Therefore, all the priorities, incentives and thinking have been geared in a way that is clearly designed to sever family ties, and the very thing we ought to be working against is happening in our type of society. I urge much more generous payments to supporting parents of dependent children who are entitled to State aid.

Whilst I am on the matter of children and institutions, I should like to make another criticism of the orientation of child-care services where institutions are involved. By and large, my impression is that these institutions are too big. Even with the best will in the world and the best, most compassionate and loving people in charge, there will nevertheless be some degree of impersonality in the relationships between staff and the unfortunate child inmates. I strongly recommend to the Government the institution of a vigorous foster-parent programme.

The sort of thing I envisage is a situation where no more than, say, a dozen children go into a home-like environment under the care of a suitable mother/father figure. Of course, the mother/father figures would have been carefully selected beforehand. In this sort of intimate family situation, I am sure that much of the trauma and neurosis which seems to appear in children who go through institutions would be greatly minimised, even if it cannot be totally avoided.

On this score, I stress that this sort of thing must be undertaken urgently and with a great sense of priority where it concerns Aboriginal children. No special consideration is being given to our Aboriginal children, who, with the adult Aborigines in our society, are the most neglected, deprived and denied people in Australia.

I am alarmed that, according to reports I have received, as many as 15 per cent of all children in institutions are Aborigines, yet they represent less than 2 per cent of the population of the State. I should like the Minister to explain this disproportion. I do not want some airy-fairy, superficial explanation but one that bites into the reasons why there is cultural deprivation and breakdowns amongst Aborigines in our society. These breakdowns occur because of obtuse administrators who do not really appreciate the serious disadvantages under which these unfortunate people labour.

I have mentioned the need for support of welfare services, and I think I should outline briefly what I have in mind. I am thinking of multi-service centres at which a range of social welfare services can be made available at the one point. I am thinking not only of the social worker but also of some sort of co-ordinator or adviser who can link a client with departments with whom he wishes to have dealings or who can defend or represent his or her interests with those departments. I am thinking of more than this again. I am thinking of a sort of "store-front" legal representation right in the suburbs where people live. We need this type of service as a part of free legal aid for people on moderate or low incomes, and especially for the poor and for Aborigines. But we must have it right in the suburbs, where the people who need it can reach it easily.

As things stand at the moment, the legal-aid system in Queensland is just not good enough. Dr. Paul Wilson, I think it was, has exposed its defects more than convincingly. It is disturbing that no public finance is going into the system of financial aid so that the types of services about which I am speaking may be made available to people who have the greatest need for them. In the final result, it cannot be a free and democratic society if freedoms and democratic rights are based on one's opportunity to seek redress in the law courts and if the cost of doing so under the system that now operates is beyond the resources of substantial numbers in the community. This is the case today.

The type of programme I propose should not be undertaken meanly. Already our welfare workers in the Children's Services Department are overtaxed. There is overwhelming evidence that they are not involved with their client families and that they rarely have the opportunity to interview them. Indeed, one official of Client Power, an organisation worth encouraging and supporting, pointed out that 30 per cent of foster parents had not had a visit for two years. This is dreadful and cannot be allowed to continue. It disturbs me because I am advised that there are something like 200 foster parents in Inala alone, and that is substantially where my electorate lies.

Having mentioned Client Power, I should like to say a few words in support of this organisation. If we are to have democracy we must have consumer involvement. Social services should not be seen as some system of charitable hand-outs from the forbearing, compassionate givers to the "deserving poor", in inverted commas. If people do not have enough to live on and do not have sufficient supporting services to get by in our society, they suffer from a defect in the social system. Accordingly, the community has a responsibility to provide adequacy in these areas.

The programme ought to be aimed at getting people into a situation of self-sufficiency, self-respect, independence, and so on. But in doing this, and in introducing a democratic system based on the recognition of people's freedoms, we must ensure that there is consumer representation. A few years ago Prime Minister Trudeau of Canada financially supported and sponsored a national Client Power conference at Ottawa. We in this State should be thinking in similar terms.

I wish to conclude by making a special appeal to the Government for the construction of a public hospital in Inala to serve the 60,000 people who live there and in the surrounding areas. This Government has a deplorable record in the field of hospital expansion in Brisbane. Outer suburbs such as Inala and Acacia Ridge have been allowed to grow without any "George Street" planning in hospitalisation or the provision of rail-transport facilities. The south side of Brisbane is experiencing an outer-suburban population explosion, and this trend will accelerate rather than slacken. Yet the entire south side—both inner and outer suburbs—has to rely on one public hospital, the Princess Alexandra Hospital.

We have heard talk of the provision of a new hospital at Jindalee. Such a proposal has emerged not to meet over-all community requirements but only for shabby political reasons. In what was previously regarded as a safe Liberal seat, the present Liberal incumbent had his majority slashed at the recent State election.

Jindalee is probably a whole decade away from full development, and it is separated from Inala, Acacia Ridge, Oxley, Darra and the surrounding areas in the provision of public transport. Inala has an indisputable case for the immediate construction of a perimeter-type hospital, embodying both out-patient and bed amenities. Surely this Government is not going to limp through another three years ignoring the needs of outer suburban areas such as Inala, and also ignoring the lessons of international experience, which shows that there should be a very real recognition of the amenities that must be provided in expanding cities to meet the suburban sprawl.

A hospital at Inala would relieve the tremendous pressure on the Princess Alexandra Hospital. It would also reduce the

travelling time and cost experienced by thousands of people who seek to claim their right to free hospitalisation. I might add that such travel is undertaken at a time when people are either sick or injured. And so I ask the Government to give Inala top priority in its free-hospital plan.

Under an A.L.P. Federal Government, which almost certainly will be elected within the next three months, an additional \$22,000,000 a year in Commonwealth finance would be available to Queensland's free hospital system. In the allocation of this finance, the outer suburbs of Brisbane should rate highly in Government thinking. People should not be penalised because they accept the development of their city and establish their residences away from the tightly populated inner suburbs. Hospitalisation is an essential provision of society. People are entitled to adequate services according to need, not according to whether they live two, three or seven miles from the Brisbane G.P.O.

Dr. CRAWFORD (Wavell) (3.48 p.m.): Each year during the Address-in-Reply debate this House is subjected to a series of speeches that are geared to the political philosophy of the particular members who speak, and naturally the political philosophy reflects the party affiliation of each individual speaker. However, there is more to this process than the practical functioning of democracy. From time to time a need exists to attempt to assess the actual meaning of "democracy", and to make an analysis of the term to ascertain whether we practise it in its original and best context.

During last year's Address-in-Reply debate I made a rather detailed analysis of a new Act that had then been introduced into Papua-New Guinea and was geared to an attempt to remove any temptation from those in the Territory associated with politics, either as politicians and Members of the House of Assembly or as employees of Government. From subsequent discussions with politicians and one or two Ministers from the Territory, I believe that this Act has been successful to date. At that time, it will be recalled, the idea was that every member of the House in the Territory should produce full details of his financial and other dealings during the year and, if necessary, they could be subjected to public scrutiny, so that temptation of every sort could be removed from his dealings. That situation could apply until he ceased to be a member for some years, either because of resignation or defeat at an election.

There is great merit in this concept, particularly in the light of what has happened in recent weeks when we have heard a great deal of discussion about land dealings, land holdings, and so on. It is not an irrational thought to suggest that it would be worth while in our community for those in politics and those serving political parties to make public, if necessary, their land dealings and

land holdings over a five-year period. That would remove a great deal of the odium from the situation in which we have found ourselves in recent months when there have been charges and counter-charges.

When we try to define democracy as such we meet very great difficulties. When thinking about this matter I found that the description was best obtained by reverting to the ancient Greeks, particularly during the time of Pericles, who lived in Greece between 490 and 429 B.C. His was the epitome of the initial attempt to establish a functioning democracy on our planet. During the Peloponnesian War in 430 B.C., when the Athenians—Pericles was the ruler of Athens at the time—were being pressed by Sparta, Pericles delivered what has become known as the "Funeral Oration". This was an attempt to cheer the Athenians in their fight with Sparta. It embodied a very great number of the concepts of democracy as he practised them, and every word that he used at that time is pertinent to our day. He said—

"Our constitution is called a democracy because power resides in the hands not of the few, but of the many. When it is a question of settling private disputes, everyone is equal before the law; when one person is to be preferred to another in an appointment to a position of public responsibility what counts is not membership of a particular class, but the actual ability which the man possesses. No-one, so long as he has it in him to be of service to the State, is kept in political obscurity because of poverty. In our private lives we are free and tolerant; but in public affairs we keep to the law. This is because it commands our deep respect."

Pericles' concept was for a society where free and intelligent obedience is rendered to an equitable code of laws, where merit is awarded *per se* and where military efficiency is found along with free development of the State in other directions and strangles neither commerce nor art. He sought to educate by precept and example the whole community to political wisdom and to parallel this with an active interest in promotion of aesthetic tastes by encouraging the best in drama and music.

A further quote from Pericles, which is often used to epitomise the best type of immortality for which man can hope, is relevant to this situation. It reads—

"The whole earth is the tomb of great men; nor is their story graven only on stone that covers their clay but abideth everywhere without visible symbol wrought in the stuff of other men's lives."

I often wonder whether our modern democracy, 2,500 years after Pericles' death, can in any way compare with the ideal he sought to bring to fruition in his day. Perhaps we

are asking for Utopian proclivities in this matter, but certainly his concept of democracy has never really reached fruition.

G. K. Chesterton once remarked that "progress is the maker of problems". Modern technological advances have posed a legion of problems, which make the mind recoil from the gross magnitude of them when viewed with care and attention. The word "problem" in our modern context has itself become ubiquitous, and because of the influence of mass-media debate on the matters of concern, the word "problem" is served up in our homes with apocalyptic overtones, mainly because doomsday pronouncements provide another new thrill of a mass type.

I do not believe that the media are actually interested in promoting solutions to how we can survive, perched precariously in a world of polluted air, contaminated water and depleted natural resources. I feel that all citizens, if our democracy is to reach fruition, must seek solutions as a co-ordinated effort which will unite men of good will without hysterical overtones and promote dissemination of information of a factual nature via the news media.

The mass media have a very great responsibility in this respect. I urge them to accept their responsibility with enthusiasm and a true response to the needs of the public. One can but deprecate the tendency of modern journalism to seek the headline for its own emphasis and not for the intrinsic value of a message it could convey. Probably one would ask for a crusade of truth and honesty in vain, but at least I believe one should expect of the mass media no over-emphasis on or eulogising of the macabre, the deprived and the pornographic aspects of life.

In the Queensland context, it is important for our democratic principles that we appoint, at the earliest possible time, a correct type of ombudsman. It is most important that this occur so that justice to the individual citizen can always be guaranteed. Some basic rules in this matter are also of great importance. First of all, under no circumstances must the ombudsman be responsible to any member of Parliament as an individual. He must not be responsible to the Premier, a Minister, or a back-bencher. He must be responsible only to the Parliament. He must report only to the Parliament. He must also be in the situation where he can examine all relevant files of government, and I completely agree with the concept which, in recent years, has been brought forward by Ralph Nader, namely, that secrecy in government, if not abolished, should be diminished to the irreducible minimum. If we cannot govern with public scrutiny—and it is for this reason that I raised the subject of the Rural Reconstruction Board in a question today—we will not be able to govern in the best interests of the individual person.

Mr. Houston: What about the files in the Special Branch of the Police Department?

Dr. CRAWFORD: Certain aspects of government must remain secret because of public security. These are very few indeed. Some of the activities of the Police Force are in that category, and I am sure the Leader of the Opposition will agree with that. We must be constantly vigilant in this Assembly so that any unnecessary secrecy is abolished. In my view, this is a basic concept of democracy. If we do not have an ombudsman who is above Public Service control and who is responsible to Parliament, we will not have the type of person who can report to Parliament without fear or favour, thus protecting the individual citizen at all times.

Mr. Houston: Who would appoint him?

Dr. CRAWFORD: That is a question that I shall attempt to answer. I think that would be an extraordinarily difficult decision to make. I should like to see the judiciary involved, although I do not necessarily advocate the appointment of a judge. I should like to see citizens of merit in the community involved also, and I would not like to see the appointment of an ombudsman come under any form of Government control.

Mr. Houston: He would not be under the Public Service Board?

Dr. CRAWFORD: I envisage him being beyond the control of the Public Service Board. The appointment of an ombudsman could be a substitute for an Act of the type brought down last year in the Papua and New Guinea House of Assembly, the purpose of which was to prevent corruption. Such an appointment would mean that there would be more satisfactory protection for the people of Queensland than there is for those in Papua-New Guinea.

I should now like to mention projects that are for the general benefit of the community. I think it was an honourable member opposite who previously discussed in this House a project based on the open university that is presently functioning in the United Kingdom. There would be many advantages to Queensland in the institution of such a service for Queenslanders. The size of this State is such that there is extraordinary difficulty in providing an adequate educational service for the whole of it. I mentioned before that Queensland represents 22 per cent of the land area of Australia, and is four or five times the land area of the entire United Kingdom. This geographical fact presents very great difficulty in the provision of adequate educational facilities for the entire State.

After much discussion and much soul-searching, the British established their open university at the beginning of 1971. Available reports therefore deal with one year of that university's functioning. There is in Queensland an External Studies Department of the university, and this could well become the nucleus of an open university. Even at this late stage, I should like to

see this inaugurated at Mt. Gravatt, because it could be established at approximately 20 per cent of the capital cost of a conventional university, and it could have very great benefits indeed for a State with Queensland's geographic features.

British experience during 1971 is that 90 per cent of students of the open university gained, at their first year examinations, either credits or credits with distinctions. The system has been, and largely still is, elitist with a vengeance. Destruction of the concept of an elite group attending the university can be accomplished if higher education is not limited by arbitrary decision but is based solely on the number of students who are able and willing to benefit from the facilities provided.

It is probable that in the United Kingdom more than 1,000,000 additional people would have been qualified for higher education had the Robbins proposal—that is the one that initiated the setting up of the university—been applied 30 years earlier. That means, of course, that over that period—in Australia we can divide the approximate figures by about four to obtain comparable figures here—very large numbers of youngsters have not been able to find university accommodation. An open university would enable that very gross anomaly to be removed from society.

In the open university, written material is programmed for self-instruction. It is propagated by television and radio programmes transmitted by the B.B.C. on Sunday mornings and between 5.30 and 7.30 p.m. Student assignments, some of which are graded by computer, others by a national network of part-time tutors, are used in a way exactly similar to that used in the ordinary university set-up. Face-to-face instruction, which, of course, is believed by all educators to be important, is carried out by the setting up of summer schools within a traditional university setting for all the students. In science, a \$300 practical kit for laboratory experiments is provided by the university and is used in the home.

It is doubtful, really, whether any of the individual components used in the United Kingdom in this experiment is in itself novel. What certainly is new is the combination of all these components into an over-all system and a completely new concept.

The full-time academic staff in the open university is about 200 and is divided into six faculties—science, humanities, social science, mathematics, educational studies, and technology. The new university at Mt. Gravatt is adopting a similar principle. Instead of having degree courses in specific disciplines such as medicine and engineering, the faculties provided initially will be along the same lines—science, humanities, and social science.

The United Kingdom is divided into 12 regions, each of which has a small full-time academic and administrative staff whose functions are to organise the nation-wide tutorial system and summer schools. Spread among the 12 regions are more than 250 local study centres. The tutorial and counselling functions are handled by more than 3,000 part-time academics of three types. The first of these is the institution of counsellors who offer professional and operational advice on the learning system, the second class tutors who lecture and conduct seminars, and the third correspondence tutors.

Summer schools, which, as I mentioned earlier, involve face-to-face confrontation with tutors and with the type of instruction that other universities offer, are compulsory and all students must attend.

Each week's normal study—each unit that the student carries out—nominally requires about 10 hours' work, six hours of self-instruction, a half-hour of television instruction, a half-hour of radio instruction, a half-hour of self-assessment tests, and about a half-hour for "subjective" assignments to be graded later by computer or one of the tutors. In science there is also about one hour each week for home experiments. The television programmes, incidentally, are mostly documentaries, not the usual televised lectures. Under-use of study centres must be regarded as one of the least successful aspects of the university's work, and it is hoped that that particular difficulty will be overcome this year. Summer schools were an unqualified success.

As I said, it is quite possible in this State and throughout the nation—of course, we already have the example of the School of the Air in Queensland—to institute university education of this type, and I repeat for emphasis that the British have found that to set it up costs 20 per cent of the capital cost of establishing a conventional university. They have found that with those students who have persisted with their studies there is a 90 per cent success rate.

I might add that there is no entry examination or entry qualification. Any person who considers that he is able to carry out the course of instruction, or would like to give the course of instruction a trial, can be enrolled as a student. This has removed in the United Kingdom, and would remove in Australia, a very great number of the disadvantages of the conventional university system. It also means, of course, that students have to work hard, because they are part-time students. But if they are motivated with the necessary energy to carry out their studies, they have been, and will continue to be very successful.

Mr. Porter: Is it your proposition that the amount of money now being spent on tertiary education could, in this way, cover a lot more students?

Dr. CRAWFORD: That is true enough. If you have been listening to my figures, Mr. Speaker, you would realise that we could actually obtain five of these universities for the sum we spend on one conventional university in Australia. We could cover the entire country as a result. That is a figure that should appeal to anybody who has any financial training or is worried about the financial affairs of the State.

The next matter with which I should like to deal is associated with medical services in our State. I wish to draw attention to the improvement which would be manifest in our community if we established coronary-care ambulances. Compared with other parts of the world where these have been established—the first was established in Belfast several years ago—it could be said that we are several years late in giving consideration to establishing units of this type. When I first entered this Chamber I was quite vocal in urging for the establishment of coronary-care units in hospitals. We now have these units in our major hospitals, and they are saving large numbers of lives.

Approximately 7,500 coronary attacks occur per annum in Brisbane. These occur in a male age group which varies in the early thirties—I recently heard of one gentleman aged 29 who died—and extends into the sixties and seventies. They are mostly men who are good earners, with a high potential in earning capacity which, if cut off in its prime, would be very much to the detriment of their families. Of approximately 7,500 persons who suffer coronary attacks each year in Brisbane, 2,300 die. Half of the people, that is, about 1,100 or 1,200, die within a couple of hours of onset of the attack and before being admitted to hospital. With a coronary-care unit available immediately to the patient, about one-third of these cases could be saved. Therefore, about 400 would be saved annually in Brisbane if coronary care in a mobile unit were available to the patient in his home. Nothing at all can be done about the other 700 or 800; their deaths would never be prevented, whatever we did.

The parts of the world that have provided coronary-care ambulances, and where they are functioning well, are widely scattered. My first intimation that this service was provided came from a British journal, which announced that it had been set up in Belfast. I understand that this service has also been instituted in Moscow and in many towns in the United States. The only place in Australia where I know such a service exists is Perth. Coronary-care ambulances have been equipped to deal with this urgent health problem, and in those parts of the world that have them they are working well and saving lives. The purpose of the coronary-care ambulances is to bring the necessary life-saving equipment, that is, the defibrillator, the intravenous therapy, and a cardiac monitor to the patient who has suffered the sudden cardiac arrest.

In some centres, initially, medical officers accompanied the ambulance. However, when the ambulance personnel were trained in coronary care, in the same way as nursing sisters are trained in coronary-care units in Brisbane and elsewhere, it was no longer necessary to have medical personnel accompany the ambulance. Either nursing sisters or ambulance officers can function in this way. In Columbus, Ohio, where Dr. James Warren, Professor of Medicine, organised coronary-care ambulances, in the first year of operation there was an over-all saving of 10 per cent of apparently dead people by immediate cardio-pulmonary resuscitation and defibrillation by the coronary-care ambulance. As I mentioned, this in time becomes an appreciable figure of life saved in the community.

The second value of the coronary-care ambulance is the transport to hospital of patients who have had a myocardial infarction and who at that time are not in need of resuscitation but have a sudden collapse in the ambulance. In Belfast, a patient being transported to hospital is always attached to the monitor, which shows what his heart is doing as the ambulance drives along, and, as the defibrillation equipment is available in the ambulance, the ambulance driver can travel at normal speeds until he reaches the coronary-care unit in hospital.

These ideas are now generally accepted throughout most of the world and are available in many parts of the world where medical services are really well organised. There seems to be some reluctance to introduce them in Brisbane where progressive ideas sometimes have to overcome a stultifying, bureaucratic stubbornness. We need, in Brisbane, four coronary-care ambulances, one to be sited in the inner-city area, one in the inner suburbs of South Brisbane and one in each of two outer suburbs, for example, Chermside and Mt. Gravatt. Maybe the honourable member for Archerfield would like one sited at Inala. I would have no objection to that, since Inala and Mt. Gravatt are geographically in the same area.

These ambulances would need to be equipped with battery-operated monitors (which, as I said, show the persons reading them the exact situation with regard to heart action), defibrillators, and the usual intravenous drugs, Xylocaine, Atropine, Sodium Bicarbonate and Calcium Lactate. A programme should be undertaken to train the ambulance personnel in the principles of coronary care, and this course would need to last from eight weeks to 12 weeks, with in-service training of the ambulance personnel comparable to that of nurses who are eventually used in the hospital coronary-care units.

The suggestion that people who are virtually lay personnel should be given training in a highly specialised branch of medicine may sound revolutionary, but in practice it has been shown throughout the world that

nurses who have had no special training previously can, with intensive training, be taught to carry out these services most adequately. In the ambulance services in the parts of the world I have mentioned, the personnel have already been so trained.

The organisation would need to be publicised to general practitioners, through their magazines, and to first-aid officers, industrial health officers and other key personnel in business and industry. Training courses in cardio-pulmonary resuscitation could be organised through the St. John's Ambulance. If this over-all plan were put into effect, it would lead to the saving of at least 400 lives in our community each year. Some of the persons now suddenly dying of heart attacks are in the prime of their life and still have many years of productive activity ahead of them. The contribution that they would make to the community could only be guessed at, but still it cannot be underestimated and it could only be a useful contribution.

There are other general health problems which are perhaps worth mentioning briefly. In Brisbane we are experiencing a very great shortage of hospital beds for intermediate and private patients. The shortage is so gross that the situation could be described as being totally inadequate. This shortage has occurred for various reasons. For example, certain hospitals have closed down while, at the same time, the population has continued to expand. However, the situation is able to be corrected, and could be corrected quite rapidly if the State Health Department declared certain public beds in certain circumstances to be intermediate beds. This would help accommodate the demand. It is not tolerable to force people who wish to have the freedom of choice of their medical attendant into public beds simply because insufficient intermediate beds are available. A realistic view must be taken of the best use of all beds for the good of the public. It is simply not good enough to pay lip-service to some form of parochial or political philosophy.

A year or two ago St. Martin's Hospital closed down with the result that an emergency arose. Unfortunately the Health Department did not see fit to use the hospital either as a convalescent hospital for people who had been accommodated in public beds or as an intermediate hospital run by a particular authority while the whole situation relative to the number of beds is being corrected.

Another matter of medical importance to South-east Queensland is the killing of beef in the metropolitan abattoir area. Within it adequate inspection, chilling and transport of meat is carried out; however, the regulations that apply to the abattoir area do not apply to Killarney and other near-country areas where killing proceeds without supervision. On several occasions I have contacted the appropriate authorities about this matter, and it is factual that at least 14 per cent of all cattle slaughtered contain offal that is unfit

for human consumption. In the abattoir area this is removed under supervision by inspectors.

Mr. Sherrington: This is not in the metropolitan area?

Dr. CRAWFORD: No. The abattoir area is the metropolitan area, and it extends as far south as Beenleigh and westwards to Ipswich and Toowoomba. In that area the removal of offal is carried out properly and correctly. I have produced coloured photographs of some beasts that contain offal that is unfit for human consumption, and these photographs have been forwarded to the appropriate authorities.

In Killarney no inspections are carried out, and the meat is transported to the Gold Coast and other places for sale. There is no reason why that meat should not be inspected in the same way as other meat. It poses a very real health hazard and should not be tolerated, especially in view of the fact that in the metropolitan area meat is handled correctly.

It is interesting to note that, on each occasion when new regulations are to be introduced, the Americans allow Queensland abattoirs to complete a contract prior to conforming to new regulations. This seems to me to be a peculiar situation. No doubt the Americans are being polite. However, if there is a breakdown in the preparation of Queensland meat for export, we could find ourselves in the situation where American consumers look upon Queensland meat with disdain and suspicion. For example, a consignment that did not conform to the new regulations as laid down in the United States could slip through.

Mr. O'Donnell: Do you see the new regulations as a means of clamping down when the Americans do not want any further meat?

Dr. CRAWFORD: I am aware of that possibility.

Mr. Sherrington: It arises from a bit of political influence.

Dr. CRAWFORD: No, it is not even that. It is a peculiar situation, and the authorities need to examine the regulations as they are promulgated in the United States. If poorly prepared meat can get through—and I believe it does—it may be condemned by the United States. Our national pride and our wish to protect our national export market should ensure that this does not occur. It is a difficult situation, but it is not necessarily a political one.

Mr. Sherrington: By the same token, some American abattoirs do not meet the requirements that are imposed on Australia.

Dr. CRAWFORD: I agree with that.

In the over-all situation, this is a health problem. It could well be a matter that would bring us into disrepute overseas and therefore it should be looked into.

I mentioned in recent days, by medium of a question, my worry about the over-all difficulties that we are experiencing with our children's services. It is true that our services are overtaxed, particularly at the Rogers Street clinic. I have attempted to ascertain how we can correct the year's delay that exists at that clinic in order to provide full services on an immediate basis. I think the Minister said that urgent cases are treated immediately, but that is not completely factual. There is no method by which a clerk, sitting in an office, can ascertain whether a child with minimal mental defects, or specific learning defects, is an urgent case or otherwise. The only way to correct the whole situation is to have enough trained personnel so that a particular child can be seen as soon as the parents or some other responsible person is aware that there are difficulties.

In this context, we have just held Handicapped Persons Week. It is important that we should stop the fragmentation of services to children with various troubles and difficulties. There are organisations in our community that deal with the various subdivisions of handicapped children. There is no need for me to delineate those subdivisions—they all run well individually. The very big risk is that a child may be slotted into the wrong place for treatment, with nobody to blame. He may have seen a psychologist but may never have had a complete assessment by a psychiatrist. If a mistake is made with a three, four or six-year-old child in this context, it is very likely that, by the time he is 14, 15 or 16, he will have given up the struggle against unequal odds and become a juvenile delinquent.

I am calling for some central authority, which could be established under the auspices of the Health Department or the Department of Education, and under which all the services for children who are handicapped or need remedial education or treatment could be co-ordinated. It would then be possible for a doctor, a teacher, or a guidance person, to refer any problem to the authority so that it could be assessed at the outset.

I have a further comment to make on Labor's health plan, and I will deal with this matter again at a later time. I believe it is important for any party that produces a health plan to have the specific welfare of the individual patient as its only criterion, and as its only, and prime objective. If that is not carried out we will have the situation where, for political purposes, the wrong type of health service is introduced into our community.

Mr. HARVEY (Stafford) (4.29 p.m.): In speaking in the Address-in-Reply debate, I do so with humble gratitude to the people who have made possible my presence in this, Her Majesty's Queensland Parliament. I sincerely trust that I can live up to their expectations of me, discharge the obligations

reposed in me, and represent the people in a humane and understanding rather than a machine-like manner. I am here despite the re-arranged, gerrymandered electoral boundaries, boundaries that were changed after I was endorsed. And I point out that the particular area that was added to my electorate contained the only booth in the whole electorate where I failed to gain a majority. So may it be.

I assure the House that I took my oath on the Bible for what it and the Bible symbolise.

I congratulate the Governor, Sir Colin Hannah, on his appointment, and Lady Hannah. I wish them a very happy and rewarding association with the people of Queensland, to the benefit of themselves, the people and the State.

I entered Parliament after serving 21 years in the largest local authority in Australia. I was the longest-serving alderman. I served three years under Mr. Frank Roberts, six years in Opposition under the C.M.O. and 12 years under Clem Jones. Therefore I am able to assess the situation from both the administrative and Opposition points of view. My local authority experience will stand me in good stead when I settle down in this aspect of government.

During the 12 years that I was chairman of the Transport and Electricity Committee I had some trying times. Firstly, the Paddington fire was a considerable set-back to public transport. At a later date, following the Government's rationalisation of electricity, generation in the south-east corner of the State was placed under one authority, as was distribution in Brisbane, thus removing the uneconomic overlapping that previously existed. Later again, following publication of the Wilbur Smith Report, Brisbane converted from trams to buses. If the decision had depended on a report prepared by De Leuw Cather & Company attitudes may have been different.

I pay the highest commendation to the council staff. Every council employee is a dedicated officer. Quite often, council employees are criticised and castigated unjustly by members of the community, and people in authority must speak in their defence when unjustifiable criticism is levelled at them. When an injustice is being done either to a member of the public or an employee, it is incumbent on those in authority to defend him, because he does not have any right of redress or defence on his own behalf.

The vast scientific, industrial and social changes taking place in our society today will affect our way of life not only now, but in the future. Our attitudes towards those problems will determine the future. More advanced machinery, more powerful sources of energy and better means of education and travel have reduced the size of the universe. Today, we speak in time rather than in

distance. We are much closer to England and other countries than we were 10 years ago. We can no longer rely on our isolation for our defence, because our neighbours and enemies are virtually at our back door.

Decentralisation is often referred to. Regrettably, not only in Queensland and in every other State, but also throughout the world, there is movement to the urban area and environment; so much so, that the United Nations Assembly appointed a session solely to deal with it. In Queensland over 60 per cent. of the State's population resides in one per cent. of its area. It is predicted that by 1980 over 85 per cent. of the State's population will be confined within one per cent of its area. This is cause for a great deal of concern, and I feel that in many ways we are probably not doing all we should to see that other parts of the State are developed.

It is very regrettable indeed that the Snowy Mountains Authority, established by the Commonwealth Government to implement the Snowy Mountains hydro-electric scheme, has been reduced to its present status. I believe that that organisation of highly skilled personnel could have been used for the implementation of other projects throughout Australia.

When we look at rail freights, electricity charges, and the like, we must realise that not enough is being done for the pioneers on the land in this State and in other parts of Australia. I have found statistical evidence to show quite definitely that the people of the Outback receive less consideration than people in many other areas. For example, many people on the land are paying for electricity as much as 32 times what is being paid by overseas investors who are speculating in this country for their own monetary gain.

As a previous speaker suggested, freight charges require urgent consideration. Rail freights were one of the matters considered by the Commonwealth Grants Commission, and they will no doubt be referred to in the annual report of the Commissioner for Railways. They warrant consideration, and, to be quite candid, I consider that financial assistance for their reduction should be made available by the Federal Government. Later I shall give examples of what is being done overseas in this matter.

It is acknowledged that we are living in a world of change. Changes are taking place in academic qualifications and levels of knowledge. Over 90 per cent of scientists who have ever lived are alive today. Technological advances are changing the pattern of life. Dr. Kenneth Bocking of the University of Michigan has pointed out that in today's changing world technology in industry was wiping out over 35,000 jobs every week in America alone. He predicts that the world of the future will require only 10

per cent of the population to produce all the commodities required, taking into account the increase in population in the future.

I believe that there are many people in many avenues of life who have much to contribute to Parliament. There are many who could take a much greater interest in the welfare of the country, but fail to do so. Quite often, because of their neglect and disregard of their responsibilities, they find that they are being ruled by Governments of the wrong type. The onus is upon them to correct that situation, because it arises from their failure to interest themselves in this field. Government today is getting bigger rather than stronger. It is moving further away from the people it is alleged to represent. The tendency in some avenues is to become fat, flabby and inefficient. There is a need for placing people in their right niches in the system, so that they can use their talents to the greatest advantage. The present situation is costing more and achieving less. I believe there is a great need for us to analyse the situation to determine whether the maximum return is being obtained. It is my firm belief that it is time to rethink and reappraise our attitudes and objectives, in a bid to wipe out the evils of present-day society.

Conditions exist now that have never existed before, and they are dangerous to us simply because the Government is not facing up to them and providing the strong leadership that one is entitled to expect from it. I acknowledge that there is an attitude in this country today of "She'll do, mate", which is very much the nucleus of the status quo and the basis of the complacent philosophy that second best will do. Therefore, more than ever we need a strong, truly effective, performing type of government.

I note that in recent weeks there have been comments about daylight saving. I do not propose to deal directly with daylight saving today, but there is one aspect of it that does concern me. I have graphs here that prove definitely what peak-hour demands in public transport and electricity are now costing the community, particularly in the City of Brisbane. Fortunately, the position I have occupied has enabled me to obtain accurate information on this subject, and I can tell honourable members that Brisbane has the most acute peak periods in the fields of road transport and electricity of any capital city in Australia. Road transport includes, of course, public transport and other peak-hour traffic movements. This is costing the community a great deal of money, because the peak hour determines the establishment strength of both vehicles and staff.

Mr. Miller: Would you agree to the introduction of staggered working hours?

Mr. HARVEY: Indeed I would. I believe there is a definite need for the Government, the trade unions and employer associations

to get together and consider the introduction of staggered working hours.

Mr. Miller: I agree.

Mr. HARVEY: I will give the honourable member one example. The graph that I am displaying—any honourable member who wishes to look at it later may do so—has on it a curve showing the domestic load on electricity. It illustrates the advantages of a decrease in usage between 5.30 p.m. and 6.30 p.m. If action was taken to stagger working hours, 30 megawatts of electricity could be saved in Brisbane, which would mean a capital saving of \$6,000,000 through one avenue alone.

Then, taking the peak-hour demand on all forms of public transport—rail, road and ferry—one finds that in the off-peak period about 12 noon there is a load demand of about 6,000 passengers on the public transport system. It begins to climb at 4.15 p.m., and in 1968 between 4.30 p.m. and 5.15 p.m. it was the equivalent of 26,000 people—20,000 more. Those additional 20,000 determine the number of vehicles required, whether road or rail, and the number of personnel needed in the industry.

As I said earlier, the difference between the off-peak period and the evening peak period is more acute in Brisbane than in any other capital city in Australia, and that imposes a very heavy economic burden on the community. Let me take road use first, Mr. Speaker. I think honourable members will acknowledge that if they finish here at 6 p.m. they probably are able to travel home in 15 minutes. On the other hand, if they finish during the evening peak they may often take up to an hour to travel home. Many people in the community spend two hours a day travelling in order to carry out eight hours' work. To allow such a situation to continue is both unwise and unsound economically.

The road system, although probably capable of handling off-peak traffic, certainly is not capable of handling peak-hour traffic. That is why heavy capital cost is now being incurred in road construction—freeways and the like—and I believe that that money is not being used in the best and most economical way. Everyone in the community would benefit if representatives of the Government, trade unions and the employers sat round the table and agreed to the staggering of working hours. People would move to and from their place of employment in greater ease and comfort, and there would be economic savings in the fields of public transport, road use, electricity and water. The community generally would benefit, both financially and by way of comfort, but to date very little has been done to this end. I commend consideration of this step to the Government, because of the benefits that would accrue from it.

I have analysed the figures. I am not saying whether or not I subscribe to the idea of daylight saving, but I do point out that

the greatest peak-hour demand for electricity occurs during the winter months when there is simultaneously a high household and traction-power demand. However, I leave the argument about daylight saving in the hands of the Government. What I say is not only applicable to this country. In an American publication, "Traffic Safety", of May 1972, mention is made of the use of the highway systems in large city areas and the fact that the greatest benefit is not being obtained from them, so what I have been saying does apply in other parts of the world. Mention is also made of staggered working days, no doubt because of the introduction of greater technology in industry and the reduction in the need for labour in the manufacturing supply industry. Probably we will have shorter working hours in the future, and therefore we may have to consider a staggered working week. Without a doubt there is a definite need at the present time to stagger working hours. To prove my point I can produce the Wilbur Smith Report and graphs from the Electricity Supply Association's report as well as figures for the Brisbane City Council's consumption requirements, all of which lead to the one logical conclusion that the State's resources are not being utilised to the greatest advantage.

I turn now to the subject of local government. I know that there is a local government conference this week, and no doubt there will be a great deal of discussion and deliberation. Bearing in mind the attitude of the various States towards local government, as expressed at recent Premier's Conferences, there is no doubt that local government is an integral part of the machinery of government. Whilst it may be the third arm of government, it is the level of government closest to the people. Local government is responsible for a whole host of matters ranging from dirty drains and dusty roads to barking dogs and crowing roosters. It is involved when somebody is burning rubbish in an incinerator in his back yard. Then there are all the other amenities and services that local government provides. Quite often local government is unjustly criticised. Nobody can challenge the right of a person to criticise; it is the inalienable right of every Australian. But the right to criticise carries an obligation to ensure that those who criticise do so in a fair and just manner, and do not misdirect their comments.

Today, and for many years, the Commonwealth Government, designedly, has consistently refused not only to do justice to local government, but also to treat local government as part of the governmental structure in Australia. It has been isolated in such a manner that it could be said to have been singled out for discriminatory treatment. To back up my argument, I refer to the March 1971 figures of the Bureau of Census and Statistics. In its report at page 24 it is indicated that for 1960-61 the loan raising of local government and semi-governmental authorities in this State was

\$44,744,000, which attracted a subsidy of \$12,477,000. In 1969-70 loan-raising by local government and semi-governmental authorities in this State was \$86,000,000 an increase of \$41,000,000. Loan-raising almost doubled but the increased subsidy it attracted amounted to an additional \$2,855,000. That is an example of how subsidies to local government are being cut back in this State.

Mention was recently made here of the Brisbane City Council. The estimated loan indebtedness of the Brisbane City Council as at 30 June 1972 was \$235,212,000 less Sinking Fund contributions of \$40,700,000-odd, leaving a loan debt of \$194,452,000. The assets of the council are worth \$386,700,000, disregarding roads, bridges and suchlike.

Looking at the situation in Brisbane, our total expenditure from both City and Loan Funds in 1960-61 was \$65,900,000 and in 1970-71 it had increased to \$133,300,000, whilst our total general rates had increased from \$9,300,000 to \$15,500,000. Our average expenditure over that period had increased from \$393.58 per head of population to \$649.74 per head of population, an increase of nearly 50 per cent., while the average rate revenue per head of population had increased from \$15.7 to \$75.66 per head of population. This clearly indicates that, whilst our expenditure has doubled, we have endeavoured to keep the cost per ratepayer down to the barest minimum.

One must acknowledge that there is a limit to the amount of the community burden a ratepayer can bear. This is a very important facet, and in this regard we believe that local government in general needs greater financial assistance from many other avenues. If local government is to rely solely upon the ratepayer to meet its obligations in local development, it will not be able to survive and carry out the task expected of it. It is unreal to expect the general ratepayer to bear this burden while the Commonwealth and States, through the Commonwealth, have the taxing means and ability to extract revenue from others within the community who are not direct ratepayers but who nevertheless enjoy the benefits of community development.

Industry in the various local authority areas would not be able to function effectively if local authority did not provide roads and necessary amenities to enable people to reside close to their respective establishments. Industry, in turn, therefore, has an obligation to contribute something towards the community purse from the return on the commodities it manufactures for resale. Under our present financial arrangements that contribution can only come back to local government from the Commonwealth through the States.

I note that the Premier of Victoria was reported in "The Australian" of 17 June as saying that bigger allocations of funds for local government would be one of the main objectives of Victoria's delegation at the

State Premiers' Conference in Canberra on Thursday of that same week. The Premier of New South Wales adopted a similar attitude and said that greater financial assistance should be given to local government.

In referring to the subsidies that the Brisbane City Council has received from this Government, I wish to read from a letter to the council dated 23 June 1961, in which the Under Treasurer says—

"Since 1955-56, the amount of subsidy payable under the scheme has increased by 66½% with the anticipated payment this year approaching \$6 million. These payments are made from the State Loan Fund. Over the corresponding period, the new loan raisings available to the State have increased by 29% only. The State thus finds itself in a position where it must curtail the over-rapid increase in the growth of subsidy payments."

On 8 August 1969 the council received a further letter from the Under Treasurer, which stated that cut-backs would be made in subsidies payable on water supply, sewerage, road works, swimming pools, and so on. Once again the Under Treasurer repeated—

"Hence Cabinet has had no alternative but to make the decision to contain the rate of growth in subsidy commitment commensurate with its resources."

I have related these figures to Brisbane, but I am sure that similar figures apply to other local authorities.

In 1969-70 the subsidy on roads was reduced from 20 to 15 per cent, and the subsidy on bridges and culverts was also cut back.

Mr. Lee: What about the freeways we built?

Mr. HARVEY: I am talking about subsidies to local authorities. Money for freeways comes from the Commonwealth and from the registration of motor vehicles. Commonwealth allocations to roads is a different matter altogether.

As for mosquito eradication, whereas previously the Brisbane City Council received a subsidy of 50 per cent, nowadays it does not receive any subsidy at all. So much for the Government's concern about mosquito eradication. In 1969-70 the subsidy payable on street improvements decreased from 20 to 15 per cent, and that payable on concrete water channelling was cut back from 25 to 15 per cent. In 1968-69 the subsidy payable on sea and river retaining walls, about which we have heard a good deal, was reduced from 25 to 20 per cent. In addition the subsidy payable on sports grounds and recreation areas was eliminated.

When Mr. Dewar represented the Wavell electorate, we heard a good deal about what the Government would do for our young people. If they are to be kept healthy and free from vice, they need to be encouraged

to participate in sport. But what is happening? Although the Government has appointed a Director of Sport, in 1969 it completely eliminated the 20 per cent subsidy payable to local authorities on recreation areas. The result is that they do not receive 1c by way of subsidy on the development of parks and areas for recreational pursuits. Whereas prior to 1960 the Brisbane City Council received a subsidy of 50 per cent on the reclamation of refuse tips for development as park areas, in 1960-61 it was reduced to 20 per cent, and in 1969-70 it was eliminated altogether. The sterling efforts of local authorities throughout the State in providing sporting and recreational facilities must be acknowledged, but they are today carrying out this work with no subsidy from the Government, whereas formerly they did receive some assistance.

Mr. Miller: How do subsidies in Queensland compare with those in the other States of Australia?

Mr. HARVEY: To be honest, I have not compared the subsidies and therefore cannot speak about them.

Whereas previously the Brisbane City Council received a subsidy of 20 per cent on automatic water valves, service reservoirs and so on, today it does not get a cent. Much has been said about sewerage. Years ago the council received a 50 per cent subsidy for sewerage submains and branch lines. It was reduced to 40 per cent in 1962-63 and eliminated in 1970-71.

Mr. Hughes: You cannot deny that this Government has given the council more money for roads than any other Government.

Mr. HARVEY: In reply to the interjector I point out that when we relate money to money values, or compare man-hours and output, we see that today we are getting less than ever before.

I acknowledge that the Government is carrying out freeway work in Brisbane, but I remind honourable members that that money is coming from the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act allocation. Rather than be distracted at this stage, I will come to this point in a couple of minutes and cite some enlightening figures.

In water reticulation, there was formerly a 50 per cent subsidy on six-inch mains, but today that subsidy does not apply. If this is the situation in Brisbane, it must apply to local authorities throughout Queensland. If it does, is it any wonder that local government is in its present plight, and that the ratepayers are bearing such an enormous burden?

I am glad that the matter of Commonwealth aid for road construction has been referred to. Today, motorists using diesel fuel are paying more in tax than the actual cost of the fuel. For example, the Brisbane City Council pays 17.5c per gallon in tax while the actual cost of the fuel is 14.5c.

I will now deal with what has come to the State through this avenue. Between 1950-51 and 1970-71 Queensland received \$382,155,000, or 18.41 per cent of allocations under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act. I will now show how that \$382,000,000 was dispersed, and what was done with it. Of that sum, \$64,468,000 was allocated to local authorities. From the latter amount the Brisbane City Council received \$3,203,311, or 4.96 per cent.

Mr. Camm: What about the \$15,000,000 the Main Roads Department spent?

Mr. HARVEY: I will come to that.

Between the inauguration of the scheme on 1 July 1950 and 3 June 1971, \$382,000,000 was allocated to Queensland. All local authorities within the State were allocated \$64,468,000, or 18.86 per cent of the total, but the Brisbane City Council received only \$3,203,311, or .83 per cent of the State total, and 4.96 per cent. of the allocation to local authorities.

In reply to the Minister's interjection, the Brisbane City Council, between 1962 and 1967, received special grants totalling \$260,300 for the Mt. Gravatt-Capalaba (Market Access) Road, Mt. Cotton Road, Lytton Road, Scrubb Road, Cribb Road, and Gardiner Road. Between 1963 and 1967, the council received \$15,769 in matching grants. The Brisbane City Council did receive some money from the Main Roads Department.

I point out that 703,000 or 39.07 per cent of the people in this State reside in the Brisbane City Council area. Assuming that, of the 661,271 vehicles registered in Queensland, 257,895 are used in Brisbane, and that everybody uses 4 gallons of petrol a week, the petrol tax paid by them amounts to \$6,597,985. But the council does not receive that tax. In 1969-70, the council paid \$111,413 in petrol tax and \$224,018 in diesel fuel tax, a total of \$335,431—on fuel for its own vehicles used on its own roads. In return, it received a Commonwealth grant of \$600,000.

The council received no subsidy for State highways and suburban arterial roads, but its permanent works liability is as follows: Main Roads, 20 per cent over 30 years; urban subarterial roads, 20 per cent over 30 years; developmental roads, 10 per cent over 30 years; and secondary roads, 25 per cent over 30 years.

Expenditure on main roads during the year 1969-70 was as follows:—

For the whole State:	
Permanent works ..	\$38,403,634
Maintenance works ..	\$10,088,989
For Brisbane:	
Permanent works ..	\$2,455,914
	or 6.39 per cent
Maintenance works ..	\$345,525
	or 3.42 per cent

Mr. Camm: What about the \$13,000,000 spent last year on arterial roads?

Mr. HARVEY: I acknowledge that the Main Roads Department reviewed main roads and major arterial roads recently, and roads which were, in the past, the responsibility of the council, such as Sandgate Road, the Virginia overpass—

A Government Member: Ipswich Road, the freeway—

Mr. HARVEY: Yes, Ipswich Road and the freeway.

Mr. Camm: The Rocklea overpass and Shafston Avenue?

Mr. HARVEY: As the Minister knows, funds for those roads come from other avenues. I appreciate what is being done in this regard, but it is the obligation of the State to carry out that work. If the State did not do it, the council would not have the financial resources to do it.

I had hoped to touch on transport and electricity, but time does not permit. Briefly, I submit that the Commonwealth Government fails to realise and face up to its obligations to finance the capitalisation and operation of public transport in this country. In the United States of America, a Bill was passed by 327 to 16 votes to grant \$3.1 billion for the capitalisation and subsidisation of the operation of public transport throughout the United States whether publicly or privately owned.

(Time expired.)

Mr. HUGHES (Kurilpa) (5.10 p.m.): Mr. Speaker,—

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: I'll keep it nice and clean and I won't say any nasty things about the Lord Mayor until the end of my speech.

At the outset, I offer my congratulations to the mover of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, the honourable member for Townsville. He did it very ably, and I believe in many of the things that he said. I will stand up and be counted among those in the House who will associate themselves with the sentiments that he expressed. I refer to the fact that in the main part of his speech the honourable member spoke against probate and succession duties. I am in support of what he said about this tax. I believe it is iniquitous and unjust, and stifles initiative and saving in those who have these laudable characteristics. I am not speaking for myself, but for the community at large. That is the way I always speak here. I am here to represent the people, and I put people before politics.

I also congratulate the seconder of the motion, the honourable member for Surfers Paradise. I am looking forward to hearing him discourse at great length from his knowledge of tourism, meter maids, and other things of interest to the people of this State.

Mr. Sherrington: He took sand from the Gold Coast out west.

Mr. HUGHES: I cannot always agree with what the honourable member may do or say, but at least he has to account to his people at election-time and so far he has been successful.

Mr. Sherrington: Eminently successful.

Mr. HUGHES: In more ways than one—both administratively and in a business and financial sense, no doubt.

I think all honourable members are worthy of congratulation, particularly the new members, because the last election was one of the most torrid that I can remember in 15 years. The Labor Party, to its credit, ran a good campaign. It is a pity, from its point of view, that it was not successful in terms of numbers, but, in giving credit where it is due, I will say that it ran a good campaign. In fact, I was rather fearful in the closing stages of the campaign. I would have liked to see the election held two weeks before the actual polling day, because from then on the Labor Party turned the issue of law and order to its political advantage, and it seemed to have unlimited funds for television advertising.

Mr. Sherrington: The people were turning to us.

Mr. HUGHES: It was not that they were turning to the Labor Party at all. One has only to look at the numbers in divisions in this Chamber to see how fallacious is the honourable member's reasoning. The simple fact of the matter is that the Labor Party had money to pour into the campaign. At a later stage I shall discourse on the source of those funds. Whilst the Labor Party may have an argument for compulsory unionism, I am vehemently opposed to the forms of coercion exerted on the work-force today under which workers, whether they like it or not, have contributions deducted from their wages for political parties to which they do not subscribe. Is that democracy?

Mr. Lane: So-called voluntary levies.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. They are no more voluntary than was anything done by any of us who served in the armed forces when told, "I want three volunteers—you, you and you." In this case, it is not a matter of "You, you and you"; rather is it, "I want 20c from you whether you like it or not."

Mr. Sherrington: That's a lot of rot.

Mr. HUGHES: It is not. I can produce statutory declarations to prove it. If the honourable member challenges me to debate this subject, either publicly or in the House, I will have him on.

Mr. Sherrington: You are challenging me now. I will show you the balance sheet from my election campaign if you will show me yours.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Sherrington: I want to call his bluff.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! When I call "Order", I expect the honourable member to observe my call. I warn him under Standing Order 123A. If he continues to interject I shall deal with him, however short the remainder of the sitting may be.

Mr. HUGHES: I have nothing to hide. If the honourable member will show me all his personal and private financial affairs—

Mr. Sherrington interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I do not propose to warn the honourable member for Salisbury again. I now ask him to leave the Chamber.

Mr. Sherrington: That's a bit tough. He challenged me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Sherrington: He challenged me and I accepted his challenge.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Salisbury to leave the Chamber.

Whereupon the honourable member for Salisbury withdrew from the Chamber.

Mr. HUGHES: I did not want to begin on a contentious note.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the honourable member should continue with his speech.

Mr. HUGHES: That is what I am doing, Mr. Speaker. I reiterate that I did not want to begin on a contentious note because I have many constructive things to say. It is unfortunate that the honourable member for Salisbury is not with us. In deference to him, I shall not continue on that subject. I shall return to where I was before I was so rudely interrupted and completely sidetracked.

I congratulate all honourable members on their election, and I think deservedly so. I wish all honourable members who sit on the benches on the opposite side of the Chamber many happy years in Opposition.

Mr. P. Wood: I don't want your good wishes. Keep them to yourself.

Mr. HUGHES: If the honourable member thinks he does not need anyone's good will, he has a long way to go and a great deal to learn. Maturity does not come easily. Perhaps his attitude will mellow and he will become more mature after he has been here a few years. At least I know I have the respect of many honourable members of this Chamber. In the many years that I have been here, I have learnt that each of us is only a little fish in a big pool. Another thing that I have learnt is that to be

a successful politician one has to have a very good memory and be sincere. There are people on this side of the House who have both those qualities and who will cut the honourable member back to size. I suggest to him that he will earn more good will if he ceases being facetious.

Let me now turn to the subject of His Excellency the Governor. Queensland has a new Governor, and I join with other honourable members in extending congratulations to him. He is a member of the armed services who has known privation, has shown courage and initiative, and has served his country well. I believe that he has the attributes needed to do his job well, not only in a personal sense but also in an official capacity. I am sure that he will endear himself to the community and prove to be a very capable Governor who always acts in the interests of the people of this State.

Mr. Murray: You will agree that the Army would be the senior service?

Mr. HUGHES: The Navy really is the senior service, of course. Perhaps the Army may be senior to the Air Force, but I think that the Minister for Lands, who served in the Air Force, as I did, will agree with me that although the Air Force may be the youngest in terms of service it is the greatest in deeds. I may be slightly biased, of course.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr. HUGHES: I express my appreciation to the many people who gave of their time and their talents, at some cost to themselves, in assisting me in my campaign at the recent election. It needed to be a good campaign, because it was hard fought and hard won. Redistribution did not assist me in Kurilpa; in fact, my supporters and I carried a cross. The honourable member for Greenslopes, who is now Minister for Transport, no doubt was quite happy to shed some of the bottom portion of his electorate and see it included in Kurilpa because the people in it voted Labor. I door-knocked every house and I can assure honourable members that it was a tough, hard campaign. The cross that I had to bear was that I am a Liberal in a Labor area. However, I was returned, and the test is not how many votes one succeeded by but who actually won the election. That is the name of the game. It does not matter whether a person wins by 300 or 500 votes, as I did, or by 3,000. It is the name of the one who wins that goes down in the book of records.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUGHES: I want to have some audience left!

I extend my thanks to the electors of Kurilpa, and again give them my assurance of my dedication to duty and their welfare.

One thing about the election that I could comment upon unfavourably is the method of the conduct of the election up to polling day and thereafter. There was a great delay in the declaration of the result. This is always undesirable because it means that members cannot be sworn in, Parliament cannot meet and there is merely executive government over this period of time. It is a travesty of justice that there should be a lengthy delay before declaring the result of a poll. To a great extent, such a delay results from the fact that magistrates, top public servants and school teachers are carrying out the job of returning officers almost as a spare-time job. I cannot speak for other electorates, but in Kurilpa the last votes were not counted until 17 June, which was a considerable time after polling day. Of course, I personally knew the result a long time before that, as many others would, but that is not the point. The poll cannot be declared, a date cannot be set for Parliament to sit, and members cannot be sworn in and the machinery of legislation got under way until such time as the result of the election is sufficiently clear and it is gazetted. I know that you, Mr. Speaker, had very grave problems in this regard. The honourable member for Gregory and Labor people from Cairns also faced this problem. But it is a problem that can be overcome. I believe that the Minister for Justice will need to give in-depth consideration to all aspects of the conduct of future elections. It is just not good enough that final votes are still being counted about three weeks after the election.

I make the suggestion that, as a starting point, in the week before the taking of the poll, as well as in the week following it, the returning officers apply themselves full time to their task, and be instructed so to do regardless of their normal vocations.

Mr. Murray: Do you think it would be an advantage to be able to appoint your own returning officer?

Mr. HUGHES: That is such an inane interjection that it does not warrant my spending time in considering a reply. I would expect better from the honourable member for Clayfield.

The week following the taking of the poll, the returning officers should dedicate themselves full time to the task of assembling the votes. I know that under the Act the returning officer cannot count certain votes in that week, nor can he do certain other things, but it could mean that he could clear up the marking of his roll and the processing of the papers in connection with the taking of the count for the section votes, and thus would be able expeditiously to bring to a conclusion the result of the poll.

In the interests of efficiency and the democratic processes of representing people, this matter will have to be given full consideration. The returning officers work under

pressure—they have problems in the conduct of the count—and they cannot do the job efficiently as a spare-time occupation. It is not only desirable to have an earlier declaration of the poll; as well, it is undeniably in the interests of justice and the representation of people.

As to the representation of people, it is time that the Government took a good look at the *modus operandi* of the workings and sittings of Parliament. I am cognisant of the fact that there can be an onerous responsibility on country members. Frankly, I do not think that country members get a “fair go” as it is. They are entitled to certain secretarial assistance and other facilities that metropolitan members enjoy. Do not think, from the way I speak now, that I am averse to honourable members receiving consideration irrespective of their political ilk. Whether they be Labor, Independent, Liberal or Country Party, country members are deserving of greater consideration and assistance in secretarial and other services to enable them to carry out the work of representing their constituents more efficiently.

I also believe that it is not good enough for this Parliament to remain in recess for a period of eight months. I should hope that this will never again happen, and that consideration will be given to a more even spread of sittings.

Mr. Jensen: I said that in 1969.

Mr. HUGHES: I said it in 1969, I said it before 1969, and I will continue to say it. I have some tenacity and sense of purpose about the things that I believe in. I believe this to be right, and I reiterate that greater consideration has to be given to country members.

Mr. Murray: Are there any vacancies in membership of the midnight club?

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member can have my place after midnight.

When Parliament is not sitting, I am not opposed to Cabinet and the Executive Council conducting the affairs of the State as a board of directors charged with these responsibilities, but I do take umbrage at this practice being spread over a period of time when Parliament is not sitting for months on end and the Executive Council is policy-making and bringing in regulations and other things that impinge on the rights of people and their way of life. While it is in recess, Parliament has no opportunity of being acquainted with these actions or to debate any of them.

I believe that more of these things should be brought before Parliament and that private members should have a greater say in what shall be Government policy. With all the respect I have for Cabinet members and their ability, I do not think it is good enough when something that affects the community can happen and private members

are not given an opportunity to use the facilities of Parliament to voice the community's concern and views on it. This happens simply because Parliament is not sitting, and also because too many of the legislative aspects of policy have become the sole preserve of the Cabinet.

I believe that back-benchers have too little opportunity to make their views known, let alone to vote on matters of great public importance. Certainly in the matter of daylight saving such an opportunity was given to us, as it has also been in the subject of legal abortion and one or two other controversial questions. But in the period that I have been associated with government in this State, these opportunities have been all too few. I believe that much more could be done and a greater role played by back-benchers if they were given the opportunity to do so, not only through the usual committees but also through parliamentary all-party committees. I do not believe that all the brains are on the Government side.

Mr. R. E. Moore: Most of them are.

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member may well be right. I said, “Not all the brains are on the Government side.” I believe it is worth our while to listen to the point of view of Opposition members who may have sound experience and skills in certain directions. For this reason, I am all for the implementation of all-party committees. Members of the Opposition must possess some degree of intelligence, and in a personal way I believe that many of them have a degree of sincerity which probably entitles them, to some extent, to legitimately criticise something the Government may have done. I believe this, and I hope that the future will see more rapport between Government and Opposition members, working together in the interests of the community on all-party committees and investigating matters that could well deserve the attention of Government.

At 5.30 p.m.,

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Standing Order 17 provides that the debate on the Address in Reply shall cease at 5.30 p.m. However, the Speaker has a discretionary power to allow the member who is speaking to complete this speech. I extend this concession to the honourable member for Kurilpa.

Mr. HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the exercise of your discretion.

Time will not permit me to discuss certain other aspects of the *modus operandi* of Parliament. However, I do claim that we should examine the present method of introducing Bills. Legislation by exhaustion should be eliminated; members should not be required to sit after midnight. A Bill should be introduced simply by laying it on the table, and when it was printed its first reading could be moved so that members could study it for a week or two before

being required to debate it. Introductory speeches and waffling—this “Around Australia in 20 minutes” procedure—should be done away with. If they were, we could get down to more constructive and efficient contributions to legislation.

Further, bureaucracy should not be allowed to run riot. A rein could be kept on it by allowing members of Parliament a greater say in the affairs of State than they have now.

Having dealt with the ramifications of Parliament, I wish to turn now to a matter of tremendous importance to a section of my electorate, namely, town planning. The Brisbane City Council proposes to rezone certain lands in Yeronga West from future-urban and open space to industrial use. In spite of protests by many people, the council is persisting with this course, and in doing so is riding roughshod over those affected. It is not paying any regard whatever to their fears, needs and demands. The council is wantonly implementing its town planning powers.

In “The Courier-Mail” of 1 July, the council published its intention to rezone to industrial use certain land at Yeronga West, situated on the riverside drive overlooking the university. The citizens of the area were incensed, and rightly so, because the industrialisation of this area would have a tremendous effect upon its environment, and its peace and quiet. This land is located on a riverside drive and backs onto another road. People built homes in the area with the full knowledge that, whilst some industry was located some distance away, no further industrialisation would be allowed to occur. I might point out that the industrialisation that has occurred is in itself a travesty of planning. However, it was there before anybody could do very much about it—it was certainly there before I was an alderman—and it could not be removed. The people have learned to live with it, but that is no reason why another area should be rezoned for industrial use.

While I was an alderman the whole of this area, from Fairfield to Yeronga, was planned to contain playing fields. At that time the council had planned to fill the area and convert it into one containing 22 cricket pitches and 22 football fields, as well as sporting facilities for women. In addition, a riverside drive was planned, and was in fact constructed. The Brisbane City Council has done some excellent work, but now it wants to spoil all that has been done by establishing industry in the area.

Brisbane suffers from a shortage of open space and parklands. Often they are referred to as the “lungs” of a city. Once parkland is built upon, it cannot be restored for the benefit of future generations. We must plan for our children and be deeply concerned about smog, pollution, the environment, noise and many other things which today are matters that deeply concern the people.

Honourable members know the feeling engendered by the French bomb test in the Pacific Ocean. People are terribly upset by pollution. Why should the council want to increase the atrocities of noise and pollution, or interfere with a riverside area that enjoys a quiet, peaceful village-like setting and should be solely residential in nature? These people were rightly incensed. The land should be designated for public use. The proposed move is a travesty of proper planning. The council claims that the rezoning will allow drain pipes to be installed at the subdivider's expense in return for the industrial-zoned land.

Mr. Burns: Tell us about Brisbane Securities.

Mr. HUGHES: I would not know a thing about Brisbane Syndications, except that I do know that a syndicate is in voluntary liquidation.

Mr. Burns: Aren't you a director of it?

Mr. HUGHES: No, I am not.

Mr. Burns: Aren't you?

Mr. HUGHES: No. The honourable member should try again. He is as misinformed on this as he is on most things. If the honourable member were properly informed, at least his voice would be listened to in this House. At the moment he gets himself “rubbished” because he does not have his facts straight.

Mr. Burns: You aren't a director of it?

Mr. HUGHES: Does the honourable member want me to put it in writing? I will make a statutory declaration, if that would help him.

Mr. Burns: It would help.

Mr. HUGHES: Very well; I will make a statutory declaration.

I spoke previously about inane interjections, but the honourable member's interjections are so completely misinformed they do not warrant my spending any more time on them.

The residents in the area to which I am referring have rebelled. At a public meeting in the R.S.L. Hall on 31 July this year, the residents, in their hostility—they were strongly up in arms—expressed their objection to this proposal. They were vociferous in doing so, and a petition, a copy of which I have here and can show to the Chamber, was signed by 1,845 people. That number encompassed almost the whole of the population of the area. Almost to a man, the people were so concerned that they formulated this petition and wrote hundreds of letters to the council. I received over 100 letters and innumerable phone calls, and the Minister for Local Government has also received numerous complaints.

The grounds for the petition are fairly straightforward and should have been heeded by the council. Included in them were—

“The increase in smoke, noxious fume and noise pollution resulting from the establishment of as yet unspecified types of industrial undertakings will be a hazard to the health and happiness of the residents of the area.

“The increase in all types of traffic on the surrounding roads will be a hazard to life and limb.”

That would be so, particularly with children. This is an area with many new houses built by young couples with children. The proposed industrial development would destroy the village-community atmosphere of the area. Many of these residents purchased land and erected expensive homes after having been assured that the land referred to in the council's rezoning proposals was to be filled and developed as parkland and playing fields. In fact, the area was filled as a controlled rubbish-tip.

The honourable member for Stafford acknowledged that in some respects this is a charitable Government that has been generous to the local authority of Brisbane in the amount it has paid out in subsidies. This Government has given the Brisbane City Council more in subsidies than any other Government has given any council in Australia. The fact that the Lord Mayor may have misused some of the funds is a story for another day. The simple fact is that the honourable member said that 20 per cent of the cost of filling playgrounds, parks and open spaces was paid to the council in subsidy. The Government paid this money by way of subsidy, but the council now wishes to prostitute its planning principles by selling to a subdivider—a rapacious land developer.

Mr. Burns interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: What for—the price of a 72-inch pipe through the area. And the council did not give a damn about the people there!

Mr. Burns interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: You should be at the abattoir. That is where the goats are kept. You should do your bleating at the abattoir. You are completely ineffectual so far as the Lord Mayor is concerned. To the Lord Mayor, your voice is like a drop in the bucket. It does not mean a thing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Kurilpa will address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. HUGHES: I apologise, Mr. Speaker.

The matters in which the community is vitally concerned include the survey conducted by a qualified engineer which indicated that the land was unsuitable for industrial development. He said that the refuse fill would require rafting and piling to support

building foundations. He said this would be a costly process. It is inevitable that property values would decrease.

I pledged my support to a citizens' committee because I believe that its case should be taken up. I believe that its plea is genuine and honest, and is in the interests of the people and their families, and children yet unborn. We need these parks, playing fields, open spaces and riverside drives now if we are to do anything for future generations. Not everything has a price on it for the council or Lord Mayor Jones. It is not a case of what they can get back and rake in through the selling or rezoning of land.

In its proposal to rezone this land, the council said that the developers would meet the cost of any drainage that was necessary. The Works Department had two plans prepared, and the feasibility and costing have been refuted by engineers. It has been claimed that there is a demand for industrial land in the Yeronga area. The demand is small, and rezoning will not affect it. In fact, the citizens' committee says that the demand is so small as to be minimal. The rezoning proposal is contrary to State Government industrial planning practice and will concentrate industry in certain outlying areas.

The Minister for Development and Industrial Affairs has done a good job in getting industries out of the inner-city area and locating them where people can be employed. This State has the best employment record in Australia. It is second to no other State. Opposition members should take a good look at their expressed concern for the working man. They should look at the position in Tasmania, South Australia and Western Australia, which have Labor Governments. Labor Governments could not care less about the working man. For political purposes, they take his money by way of a supposedly voluntary levy but, to care for his welfare, and that of his wife and family, they would tax him out of the health scheme in Queensland. What an atrocity! They want to tax Queensland people for something they now get free under this Government. They want to keep the worker out of employment. They have no administrative or other ability to do anything about it.

Mr. Burns: What have they done in Brisbane?

Mr. HUGHES: That is what they want to do in Brisbane, too. Labor does not care about the worker's environment or his welfare. This is indicated by what the Brisbane City Council is doing in Yeronga.

Mr. Burns interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: The inane interjector is bleating like an emasculated lamb.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Lytton under Standing Order 123A. We will adjourn in five minutes'

time, but the way he is going I doubt whether he will make it.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not think he will either, Mr. Speaker. If he spoke sense, I would listen to him. He should get out among the "emasculated lambs" in Lytton, who cannot understand him. He claims to be a champion of the worker. He is not. He is one of the greatest puppets of all time. He dances every time the strings are pulled by the Q.C.E.

Mr. Burns interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Lytton will now leave the Chamber.

Whereupon the honourable member for Lytton withdrew from the Chamber.

Mr. HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am glad that I have your protection.

I shall wind up my speech by simply saying that in the matter of the Yeronga land the principles of town planning have been completely prostituted. The council received a petition and protest, and coldly, calculatingly and perversely proceeded, at a meeting on 29 August, to say, "We are going to proceed regardless of the wishes of the people." They completely disregarded the objectors within the community.

I made a plea to the Minister for Local Government, and I believe that he has the ability and the downright common-sense approach to problems to concern himself with this proposal and look at it in the way a matter concerning people should be considered. I believe that he will hear the protests following the ruthless use of power by the bureaucrats in "Frustration Castle" in Adelaide Street, the autocracy of the Brisbane City Council. I asked the Minister for Local Government to look into this matter. He not only made a promise to do so, but he made an inspection of the area with me and his officers, including the Director of Local Government. They are at least giving consideration to a matter that the council could not care less about.

Mr. Hanson: Did the Minister go in a taxi?

Mr. HUGHES: No, he did not go in a taxi. What he did was a practical example of what Ministers of this Government do in meeting their obligations and responsibilities where concern for the people is paramount. I am confident that at least the plea of these people will be given a fair and just hearing. If they did not get such a hearing from the council, they will certainly get it from the Government. I have made this plea to the Minister, and, from the interest that he has taken in the matter and his common-sense approach to the problems of people, their needs will be given every consideration.

The House adjourned at 5.47 p.m.